УДК: 339.9+330.3:328.122+329.8
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30838/EP.207.48-56

Panchenko Volodymyr
Dr. of Economic Sc.
Mariupol State University
Панченко В.Г.
доктор економічних наук
Маріупольський державний університет
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5578-6210

Reznikova Nataliia
Dr. of Economic Sc.
Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Резнікова Н.В.
доктор економічних наук
НН інститут міжнародних відносин
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2570-869X

Grod Myhailo
PhD in International Economic Relations
National Academy of Statistics, Accounting and Audit
Грод М.І.
доктор філософії з міжнародних економічних відносин
Національна академія статистики, обліку та аудиту
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7539-5778

Vitchenko Stanislav
Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Вітченко С.Е.
НН інститут міжнародних відносин
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8575-3333

THE ARCTIC AS A SPACE FOR THE FORMATION OF A NEW INFRASTRUCTURAL ECONOMY

The purpose of this article is to justify the concept of the Arctic infrastructural economy as a new and independent model of global development rather than a peripheral extension of the world economic system. The Arctic is interpreted as a strategic region where models of sustainable growth, international cooperation, and infrastructural diplomacy are being tested. It represents a dynamic environment that combines economic, environmental, and security dimensions, forming a unique space of interaction between states, industries, and natural systems. From this perspective, the article seeks to expose how the Arctic fosters its own principles of balance among technological progress, ecological responsibility, and geopolitical stability.

Unlike the traditional infrastructural economy, which relies on stable institutions, predictable markets, and short-term efficiency, the Arctic model is based on resilience, flexibility, and long-term adaptability. Infrastructure in this context becomes multifunctional, simultaneously supporting economic activity, research, communication, and security. The region develops through public-private partnerships, scientific collaboration, and international coordination, linking innovation with sustainability. In this way, the Arctic infrastructural economy emerges as a new conceptual framework where economy, ecology, and governance are integrated into a single system of durable equilibrium, shaping the future of global interdependence.

The significance of this approach lies in recognizing the Arctic not merely as a geographic frontier but as a laboratory of future infrastructural interaction. Here, the principles of sustainable development are tested under the most demanding conditions, forcing the integration of economic pragmatism with ecological ethics and strategic foresight. The Arctic infrastructural economy embodies a new logic of global cooperation, where competition and partnership coexist within shared frameworks of responsibility and technological innovation. This synthesis redefines the traditional understanding

ISSN друкованої версії: 2224-6282
ISSN електронної версії: 2224-6290

of development by linking security, environmental stewardship, and connectivity into one coherent model that reflects the emerging architecture of global governance in the twenty-first century.

Key words: *security, energy independence, the Arctic, Arctic routes, natural resources, infrastructure, infrastructural economy, infrastructural diplomacy, Arctic infrastructure, dual-use infrastructure, energy infrastructure, communication infrastructure, coopetition, co-opetition, fragmentation, integration, cluster, logistic corridors, digital connectivity, resilience, public-private partnership, environmental governance, economic interest*

JEL Classification*: D33, D72, E25, E65, O15*

АРКТИКА ЯК ПРОСТІР ФОРМУВАННЯ НОВОЇ ІНФРАСТРУКТУРНОЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ

Метою статті є обґрунтування інфраструктурної економіки Арктики не як периферійного відгалуження глобальної економічної системи, а як її новий концептуальний центр, де випробовуються нові моделі сталого розвитку, міждержавної кооперації та інфраструктурної дипломатії. У цьому контексті Арктика розглядається як регіон, здатний не лише реагувати на виклики глобального потепління й геополітичної конкуренції, а й продукувати власні принципи балансування між безпекою, екологією та економічною ефективністю. Стаття покликана продемонструвати, що досвід Арктики має універсальне значення для розуміння трансформацій сучасної інфраструктурної економіки загалом. Традиційна інфраструктурна економіка ґрунтується на припущенні про наявність стабільних інституцій, передбачуваного середовища та сталих ринкових зв'язків. У такій системі інфраструктура розглядається передусім як інструмент прискорення економічного зростання, підтримки мобільності, підвищення продуктивності та забезпечення ефективного функціонування ринків. Основна увага приділяється питанню оптимізації витрат, інтеграції транспортних і енергетичних систем, формуванню регіональних кластерів, створенню умов для масштабування приватних інвестицій тощо. Інфраструктура тут виконує лінійну функцію: вона обслуговує попит, формує пропозицію і забезпечує безперервний обіг ресурсів. Економічна логіка цього підходу полягає в ефективності та прибутковості, а його політична мета полягає у створенні передбачуваного простору для взаємодії між державою, бізнесом і суспільством. На відміну від цього, інфраструктурна економіка Арктики не може функціонувати за тими самими законами. Вона формується не на основі сталих ринкових зв'язків, а через поєднання оборонних, наукових, екологічних і соціальних ініціатив. Інфраструктура в Арктиці має багатофункціональний характер: порт або аеродром водночас є елементом безпеки, торговельним вузлом, центром досліджень і джерелом життєзабезпечення місцевих громад. Ключовою відмінністю є також інституційна логіка. Якщо класична інфраструктурна економіка спирається на централізоване управління або ринкову конкуренцію, то арктична модель розвивається через партнерські механізми, гнучкість і децентралізовану координацію. Тут важливу роль відіграють державно приватні партнерства, науково-промислові консорціуми, міждержавні угоди та спільні інвестиційні фонди. Такі інструменти компенсують брак ресурсів, мінімізують ризики і створюють середовище, у якому ефективність поступається місцем стійкості. Арктична модель існує у довготривалому вимірі, де результат визначається не прибутком. Екологічне урядування перетворюється на економічний інструмент, який визначає напрям розвитку і забезпечує легітимність інвестицій. Окреслені особливості роблять Арктику не просто периферійним простором глобальної економіки, а лабораторією, де випробовуються майбутні моделі глобальної взаємодії між державами, бізнесом і природним середовищем.

Ключові слова: *безпека, енергетична незалежність, Арктика, арктичні маршрути, природні ресурси, інфраструктура, інфраструктурна економіка, інфраструктурна дипломатія, арктична інфраструктура, інфраструктура подвійного призначення, енергетична інфраструктура, комунікаційна інфраструктура, коопетиція, конкуперація, фрагментація, інтеграція, кластер, логістичні коридори, цифрова зв'язність, резильєнтність, державно-приватне партнерство, екологічне урядування, економічний інтерес*

Introduction. The Arctic region in the twenty-first century is gaining exceptional importance as a space of strategic intersections where economic interests, geopolitical ambitions, scientific research, and environmental challenges converge. Climate change, which has opened new sea routes and made significant natural resources more accessible, has transformed the Arctic from a peripheral territory into a central element of global politics. At the same time, the growing activity of states and corporations in this region is accompanied by a search for new models of governance that can combine efficiency, security, and sustainability.

The infrastructural economy of the Arctic is the key to understanding this new order. It is not limited to transport or energy but encompasses a complex system of interconnected networks, including logistics, digital, scientific, and social dimensions. Through infrastructure, the interdependence between states, the private sector, and local communities becomes evident. It determines the pace of development, the level of integration, technological capacity, and the region's ability to adapt to climatic and political transformations.

The Arctic serves as a laboratory of global processes where three main forces interact: economic necessity,

technological innovation, and environmental responsibility. Within the contemporary Arctic space, a new type of interaction is emerging that combines economic, technological, and managerial approaches to regional development. This is not about isolated initiatives but about a systemic alignment of policies, investments, and practical solutions aimed at creating resilient infrastructure. A key role in this process is played by cluster models that bring together industrial, scientific, and logistical resources around the most promising areas, such as port zones, transport hubs, research stations, and energy facilities. These clusters act as centers of development, concentrating innovative potential and enabling coordination among governmental structures, private companies, and local communities [17].

In parallel, the concept of logistic corridors is being developed and gradually implemented. Its goal is to create a network of routes that will connect Arctic locations with the main transport and economic centers of the northern hemisphere. Such projects have both economic and strategic importance since they ensure resource mobility, rapid response to emergencies, and strengthened defense readiness. Digital connectivity is a fundamental condition for the system's functioning. Without stable communication, monitoring, and coordination, it is impossible to maintain the operation of complex networks in a harsh climate. The development of satellite technologies, fiber optic lines, and local digital platforms reduces the isolation of Arctic territories, ensuring efficient management of transportation, energy, and scientific processes. At the same time, the resilience of infrastructure becomes the key criterion of its effectiveness. Robust systems capable of functioning with minimal external support guarantee security and continuity of operations under conditions of climatic uncertainty.

Literature review. The academic perception of the Arctic has undergone a profound transformation, shifting from its earlier portrayal as a distant geopolitical margin to a contemporary understanding of it as a multidimensional space of infrastructural, institutional, and functional interconnection. Recent research interprets the region not through the lens of territorial sovereignty but as an evolving framework of coordination and interoperability. According to M. Łuszczuk [11] and colleagues, the European Arctic operates as a system of multilevel governance, in which cross-border arrangements such as the Barents Cooperation and the Northern Periphery and Arctic Program sustain regional stability through institutional alignment rather than political unification. Their findings suggest that even fragmented regional structures can achieve coherence when supported by shared governance mechanisms.

S. Knecht [10] advances the concept of Arctic regionalism as a gradual transition from cooperation toward integration. He argues that the harmonization of norms, joint practices, and diplomacy grounded in mutual trust can convert dispersed initiatives into a consistent and enduring network of collaboration. The editors of the Arctic Yearbook [20] likewise present the region as a prototype of network governance, emphasizing that integration here takes the form of coordination among diverse actors and infrastructures instead of top-down hierarchies.

O. Young [21] contributes to this discussion by demonstrating that governance in the Arctic evolves through functional rather than geopolitical channels, including maritime navigation, environmental protection, and safety systems. His framework of overlapping regimes reveals that integration emerges through the interoperability of international norms, particularly within the context of UNCLOS. This pattern is substantiated by the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment [2], which identifies how shared maritime standards and cooperative safety practices form the basis for sustainable Arctic transport. The Polar Code adopted by the International Maritime Organization [9] further consolidates these approaches into a unified regulatory framework that fosters both technical integration and mutual confidence among stakeholders.

The Agreement on Enhancing International Arctic Scientific Cooperation [3] reinforces this perspective by establishing a binding framework for transnational scientific collaboration, confirming that the circulation of data, logistics, and expertise now functions as a key infrastructure of regional integration. Similarly, the European Union’s Joint Communication on the Arctic [7] situates the region within the European Green Deal, stressing the need to align environmental, digital, and investment standards as instruments of coherence. China’s White Paper on Arctic Policy [16] presents the Polar Silk Road as a northern extension of the Belt and Road Initiative, promoting multilateral cooperation in science, infrastructure, and trade based on the principle of mutual benefit.

The experience of the Barents Cooperation [8] further demonstrates the resilience of multilevel Arctic governance. Through the Barents Euro-Arctic Council and the Barents Regional Council, it integrates national, regional, and Indigenous actors into a shared institutional network that sustains coordination and dialogue. Collectively, these perspectives confirm that the Arctic is no longer a remote frontier but a managed system of interdependence, where interoperability among standards, infrastructures, and knowledge regimes defines the new architecture of integration.

Despite the growing body of research that highlights the strategic, economic, and environmental significance of Arctic development, the region remains insufficiently conceptualized as a distinct system of infrastructural economy. Unlike traditional approaches that view infrastructure primarily as a driver of economic growth and market integration, the Arctic forms its own model based on resilience, interdependence, and the interplay of economic, environmental, and security dimensions. Its infrastructure not only sustains economic activity but also functions as an instrument of political coordination, scientific cooperation, and ecological balance.

The purpose of the study is to examine the Arctic as a space for the formation of a new infrastructural economy, to define its structural and functional characteristics, to identify its key differences from conventional economic models, and to demonstrate how, within this region, a unique system emerges that integrates resilience, technological innovation, and political interaction. The article aims to reveal the logic of Arctic infrastructure as a

laboratory of global processes where new forms of partnership, resource governance, and equilibrium between development and security are being tested.

Main results of the research. The Arctic region is increasingly emerging as a space that unites the strategic, economic, technological, and security interests of the USA. Its importance continues to grow due to global climate change, the opening of new transport routes, and greater access to natural resources. The Arctic is no longer an isolated frontier but a key element of the global geopolitical architecture. Control over this region determines not only regional influence but also the ability to shape global trade and defense routes that connect North America, Asia, and Europe [10]. At the center of these processes lies Alaska, which is geographically and strategically a bridge between continents and the main point of support for the USA in the polar zone.

Alaska occupies a unique position. It is the USA territory closest to Russia and one of the few places where the American and Asian geopolitical spheres directly intersect. This makes the region highly significant in the context of contemporary competition among major powers. However, its geographic advantages are not matched by an adequate level of infrastructural development. Roads, ports, airfields, energy systems, and communication networks remain fragmented and often fail to meet the needs of either the civilian population or the defense sector. Many communities are isolated for most of the year, which complicates supply chains, raises living costs, and lowers security levels. At the same time, Arctic territories are increasingly drawing the attention of other states, which are actively investing in the construction of ports, research stations, and military bases. Under these conditions, the most effective response of the USA is to create infrastructure capable of serving dual functions that benefit both civilian and military purposes.

The concept of dual-use infrastructure is based on the idea that the same facilities can meet economic, social, and defense needs. A port that receives commercial vessels should also be able to service the USA Coast Guard or naval ships. An airport that handles passenger flights can serve as a base for military aircraft. An energy network supplying electricity to local communities must be capable of maintaining the operation of strategic facilities during emergencies. This approach not only reduces costs but also creates a more flexible and resilient system that can function under extraordinary conditions.

Transport infrastructure plays a special role. For Alaska, roads, ports, and railways are not merely means of transportation but indicators of its integration with the rest of the USA. Building modern transport corridors provides not only mobility for the population but also the ability to ensure the rapid deployment of defense forces if needed. In this context, the Port of Nome plays a key role. It has the potential to become the main logistical center for servicing both civilian and military vessels. Its development would result in the first USA deepwater port north of the Bering Sea, enhancing the nation's capacity to operate amid growing activity in northern waters. Railway projects connecting Alaska with Canada would open new trade routes, facilitate the transport of energy resources, and enable the swift movement of equipment when required.

Energy supply remains one of the most vulnerable sectors. Most communities rely on diesel generators, which are both expensive and environmentally harmful. High fuel prices limit economic activity and create risks for survival during supply disruptions. Transitioning to new energy models is therefore a strategic priority for the USA. Local energy systems, microgrids, small hydropower plants, and modular nuclear reactors can ensure autonomy and resilience even in the most remote settlements. Such solutions not only improve living conditions but also enhance defense readiness by sustaining critical infrastructure during emergencies. They also create conditions for economic growth, reduce logistical costs, and increase private investment.

Communication infrastructure is equally important. Weak internet coverage, limited satellite capacity, and the vulnerability of undersea cables make the region informationally isolated, which in the modern world equates to a loss of control over space. Reliable communication is the foundation of management, coordination, and data exchange, especially under conditions of climate variability and potential crises. Expanding fiber optic networks, modernizing satellite systems, and introducing low-orbit communication platforms will ensure stable coverage across the entire region. This will strengthen both civilian and defense infrastructure of the USA while increasing the safety of maritime and air routes.

Social infrastructure forms the basis for sustainable regional development [10]. The lack of housing, educational institutions, and medical facilities limits the ability to attract qualified personnel, which complicates the implementation of projects of any scale. The construction of modular housing complexes that can be quickly deployed and relocated will support labor flexibility and reduce costs. Such solutions benefit both civilian communities and temporary military bases in remote areas. The development of educational and research centers will enhance the region's attractiveness by fostering local expertise in energy, transportation, construction, and resource management, thereby reinforcing the strategic presence of the USA in the Arctic.

Innovation is becoming a key factor in the development of the Arctic. The region's conditions make it possible to test technologies that can later be scaled for use nationwide. These include autonomous transport systems, unmanned observation technologies, new types of energy installations, and durable materials for construction. Alaska serves as a kind of laboratory for testing technologies capable of functioning in extremely challenging natural conditions. Its potential lies not only in its strategic location but also in its ability to combine research, economy, and security within a single innovative system.

The situation in the Arctic shows that the USA must restore its infrastructural presence or risk losing influence in the region. Other states are already actively developing their northern territories using modern technologies and long-term planning. For the USA, the issue of the Arctic is not only a matter of defense or environmental concern but a strategic necessity directly linked to the nation's future

within the global system. Dual-use infrastructure represents the most effective means of achieving a balance between security and development, as well as between investment and strategic autonomy. It allows the USA to simultaneously sustain community livelihoods, create jobs, attract innovation, and guarantee national security.

The development of the Arctic requires coordinated action across all levels of governance, from federal to local. It is essential to establish effective cooperation among state institutions, the private sector, scientific organizations, and defense structures. Only through such coordination can an efficient, resilient, and flexible infrastructure be built to meet future challenges. The Arctic has the potential to become not merely a region of survival but a space of growth that demonstrates how strategic thinking and technological progress can ensure harmony between national interests, security, and development.

The melting of Arctic ice and the opening of new transport and economic opportunities are transforming the region into one of the most important geopolitical spaces of the twenty-first century. A territory once considered peripheral and confined by harsh natural conditions is now becoming a field of strategic competition among major powers, including China, Russia, and the USA. The Arctic is rapidly gaining significance as a key energy, logistical, and political hub where access to natural resources, control over emerging sea routes, and long-term influence on global supply chains and communication networks intersect.

Climate change, which has led to a significant decline in sea ice, has made seasonal navigation along the Northern Sea Route and the potential opening of a transcontinental route across the North Pole possible. This results in a significant reduction in the distance between Asia and Europe, by up to forty percent compared to traditional routes through the Suez Canal. Such savings in time and cost create a powerful economic incentive for states seeking control over these maritime corridors [12]. Moreover, the Arctic contains vast reserves of oil, gas, rare earth metals and marine biological resources that could account for up to one quarter of the world's untapped energy reserves. For Russia, the Arctic represents a strategic resource base and a new artery of external trade. For China, this presents an opportunity to diversify its supply routes and reinforce its status as a global maritime power [15]. For the USA, it is primarily a matter of maintaining control, ensuring security, and preserving its leading role in the global economy. Thus, the Arctic is becoming not only a natural but also a strategic resource that shapes the global balance of power.

Russia and China are gradually establishing a unique form of cooperation in the region, one that is based on the combination of resource capabilities and financial interests. Russia possesses a long coastline and a historical presence in the northern seas, providing a territorial base and infrastructure. In contrast, China, lacking direct access to the Arctic, compensates with financial resources, technology, and political ambitions. Together, these two states are forming a partnership in the development of the Northern Sea Route, which Russia views as a strategic transport artery and an alternative to the Suez Canal. China positions itself as a near-Arctic state, seeking access to projects related to resource extraction, port construction, scientific research stations, and transport hubs [16]. This interaction strengthens the positions of both countries in the region, creating a new axis of influence that reshapes the balance of power in the northern part of the world and challenges the USA and its allies. The Arctic is no longer a neutral zone of international cooperation, but is gradually becoming a northern front of competition between authoritarian and democratic states.

The USA, although declaring the strategic importance of the Arctic, still lacks an adequate level of presence in the region. Its infrastructure is outdated, and its icebreaking fleet consists of only two operational vessels, which is minimal compared to Russia's capabilities. The country lacks a developed network of ports and logistics bases necessary for stable operations along its northern maritime routes. Domestic political divisions and competing economic priorities reduce attention to Arctic issues, which are often viewed as peripheral. As a result, there is a strategic gap between official statements about the importance of the Arctic and the actual capacity to operate there effectively. The USA relies on cooperation with Canada within the framework of the NORAD system (North American Aerospace Defense Command) and on the support of its NATO partners, yet these mechanisms are insufficient to ensure control over new sea routes and maintain a permanent presence in the region.

At the same time, the Arctic presents the United States with an opportunity to reassess its vision of security and development. The region requires a multilayered policy that integrates scientific research, modernization of transport and military infrastructure, expansion of international partnerships, and adherence to environmental standards. Only through such a comprehensive approach can the balance of power be maintained and the Arctic be prevented from becoming a zone of confrontation.

Therefore, the modern geopolitics of the Arctic is shaped around a triangle of interests in which Russia seeks to consolidate control over resources and routes, China aims to gain access to energy reserves and global influence, and the USA strives to preserve strategic balance and ensure freedom of navigation. This configuration will determine not only the future of the North but also the overall state of international security, economic pathways, and the direction of energy transition policies in the coming decades. The Arctic is gradually becoming a symbol of a new era of world politics where environmental change, technology, and economic interests merge into a single system of global interdependence.

The infrastructural economy of the Arctic emerges as a unique space where new forms of interaction between states, corporations, and local communities are being shaped. Within this system, competition and cooperation coexist alongside resistance and mutual dependence. The Arctic is becoming a laboratory of coopetition where strategic rivals must simultaneously compete for resources and routes while also cooperating to maintain resilience, security, and technological progress. The northern environment does not allow isolated action; harsh climate conditions,

ecological vulnerability, limited infrastructure, and high operational costs force even geopolitical opponents to construct interdependent systems of action.

Coopetition in the Arctic is most clearly expressed in the fields of logistics, energy, and communication. The countries that seek influence in the region understand that complete isolation or a policy of confrontation under such conditions is economically unsustainable. For instance, the construction of new ports, cable lines, and transport corridors requires joint investment and coordination. Even under conditions of political tension, states exchange information, standardize technological processes and coordinate systems of monitoring and maritime safety. This type of cooperation does not eliminate competition but transforms it into pragmatic interdependence. The Arctic is becoming a territory where rivalry changes its form, replacing direct confrontation with competition for standards, technologies, routes, and political influence.

However, coopetition does not eliminate fragmentation. On the contrary, it represents its natural continuation. The Arctic region develops unevenly. Some territories are integrated into global supply chains and information networks, while others remain isolated or marginalized. This fragmentation creates asymmetry between northern communities, industrial clusters, and state decision-making centers. It is also reflected at the political level in the differences of strategic approaches among Arctic Council countries, in the distinction between civil and military interests, and in the contradictions between environmental goals and economic ambitions. Fragmentation serves as both a challenge and a resource. It complicates governance but creates opportunities for flexible and decentralized development models in which local communities become active participants in economic processes.

Polarization of the Arctic economy appears at several levels. First, there is polarization between decision-making centers such as Washington, Moscow, and Beijing, and the remote northern communities that directly experience the effects of climate change and industrial activity. Second, there is polarization between economic models. Countries with developed capital markets seek to build infrastructure through public-private partnerships, while others rely on centralized state investment. Third, there is growing technological polarization between states capable of implementing high-tech solutions for extraction, monitoring, and logistics, and those that remain dependent on external suppliers. Such polarization not only determines the political balance but also shapes the future economic integration in the Arctic.

In this context, standardization becomes an instrument of stabilization. It serves as a common language through which different states and corporations can coordinate their actions. Standards cover issues of construction, maritime safety, environmental monitoring, communications, and technological protocols. They form a foundation of trust in an environment where political alliances are fragile and climatic conditions are unpredictable. Technological standardization reduces costs, ensures compatibility of infrastructure, and creates a base for further integration. At the same time, it becomes a tool of influence, since those who set standards define the rules of the game. This is why the struggle for technological and environmental standards in the Arctic acquires a geopolitical dimension.

The infrastructural economy of the Arctic develops at the intersection of global and local, state and private, strategic and technological dimensions. It represents a new form of global interaction, characterized by key categories of resilience, interdependence, and adaptability. Coopetition provides a foundation for maintaining relative stability under tension, while fragmentation brings flexibility and multidimensionality to the space. Polarization stimulates technological competition, and standardization creates predictability in an environment of constant change.

All these processes form a new model of northern development that combines economic benefits with political prudence. The Arctic becomes a testing ground for the future of global infrastructural interaction, a space where national interests do not preclude coexistence, and strategic rivalry gives rise to new forms of cooperation capable of maintaining balance between development, security, and the natural environment. In this sense, the Arctic is not only a territory of challenges but also a symbol of a new logic of international relations where the boundary between competition and partnership becomes fluid, and it is precisely this fluidity that sustains stability in a rapidly changing world.

The infrastructural economy of the Arctic takes shape as a coordinated system that unites transport, energy, digital technologies, science, and resource management. Its development depends on practical interaction between states, the private sector, and local communities that maintain scientific bases, ports, and industrial facilities. In harsh climatic conditions, this model cannot rely solely on centralized decision-making [13]. It requires a comprehensive approach that combines economic efficiency, technological innovation, and environmental sustainability within a single structure.

One of the most important instruments of development is the cluster organization. Clusters unite industrial enterprises, research institutions, transport companies, and energy facilities into a single functional space. Within such associations, coordination of actions, technological exchange, cost optimization, and enhanced logistical efficiency occur. Clusters help to avoid duplication of investments and create synergy between different sectors, which is especially important under conditions of limited resources and high construction costs.

Logistic corridors have decisive importance for the Arctic economy [4; 5;11]. They connect maritime routes, railways, aviation paths, and pipelines, forming the foundation for the transportation of resources, goods, and people. The Northern Sea Route, together with the networks linking northern ports to inland regions, determines the geo-economic role of the region in global trade. The development of such corridors requires the coordination of interests among several states and the attraction of investment, which is why they are viewed not only as economic projects but also as elements of international cooperation.

Digital connectivity serves as the backbone of modern Arctic infrastructure [5; 11]. Without reliable

communication, it is impossible to ensure transport management, environmental monitoring, and energy security. The development of fiber optic lines, satellite systems, and digital platforms enables the integration of remote facilities into a unified information network. This improves forecasting accuracy, enhances coordination among economic actors, and enables remote control of production and logistics systems. Digital infrastructure reduces the isolation of Arctic territories, making them more attractive for investment and research [14].

The concept of resilience in the Arctic context refers to the capacity of infrastructure to operate continuously, even under extreme cold conditions, limited access, and climatic risks. Resilient systems rely on autonomous energy sources, local management networks, and remote maintenance technologies. This approach reduces the region's vulnerability to external disruptions and ensures the stability of critical facilities. Resilience is viewed not as a response to crisis but as a foundational planning principle that incorporates both technical and social aspects of life in the Arctic.

Most infrastructure projects are implemented through public-private partnerships. The state provides strategic vision, regulation, and political guarantees, while the private sector contributes capital, technology, and management expertise. This format helps overcome limited budget resources, reduce risks, and create more flexible financing models. Importantly, these projects contribute to the development of local economies as they require skilled labor, new services, and supply systems. Partnership between the state and business thus becomes the cornerstone for the practical implementation of strategic objectives in the region.

Environmental governance is a crucial component of Arctic policy [11]. Any investment or industrial activity must consider the fragility of natural systems. Environmental management in the modern sense encompasses not only pollution control but also land use planning, the protection of marine ecosystems, and the preservation of the traditional way of life of Indigenous peoples. The implementation of environmental standards and monitoring systems enhances the legitimacy of projects and fosters trust among governments, scientists, and the public.

Infrastructural diplomacy is emerging as a new form of international interaction in the northern region. Cooperation in the construction of ports, transport routes, energy networks, and digital systems has become an instrument for strengthening mutual trust. Joint projects facilitate the exchange of technology, the standardization of procedures, and the harmonization of environmental requirements. In this context, infrastructure functions not as an object of rivalry but as a means of creating stability. It becomes the foundation of a policy of practical coexistence where economic benefit aligns with long-term security interests.

The modern Arctic is developing as a space of balanced interaction between economic and natural processes. Its infrastructural economy is based on rational resource use, technological innovation, and responsible governance [18]. Clusters, logistic networks, digital systems, resilient infrastructure, partnerships between the state and business, environmental standards, and diplomatic initiatives together form the practical framework for regional development. This model does not aim for rapid profit but rather creates conditions for steady growth and the gradual integration of the Arctic into the global economic space.

Conclusion. The Arctic infrastructure today is not only a material foundation for development but also an important political and strategic instrument. It defines not only the direction of economic growth but also the form of international interaction. The construction of transport, energy, and digital networks in the northern region is gradually shaping a new logic of coexistence among states where competition transforms into interdependence and rivalry turns into coopetition. The Arctic is becoming a testing ground for models of practical partnerships between governments, corporations, and scientific communities.

The cluster structure ensures the concentration of innovation and resources around key hubs, promoting more efficient use of capital and knowledge. Logistic corridors create the material foundation for integration by linking the Arctic with global markets. Digital connectivity removes spatial isolation and turns the region into an active participant in the global exchange of data. The resilience of infrastructure ensures stability even under extreme conditions, while public-private partnerships enable the realization of large projects that require long-term financing and technological flexibility. Environmental governance introduces the principle of responsibility toward nature into management systems, and infrastructural diplomacy transforms cooperation in construction and logistics into an instrument for strengthening international trust.

As a result, a multidimensional model of the Arctic economy is emerging in which development proceeds in harmony with nature rather than in opposition to it. Infrastructure becomes not only a technical phenomenon but also a mechanism of regional integration, a platform for cooperation, and a source of political stability. Through it, the Arctic maintains its balance between competition and partnership, between national ambitions and global interdependence. The future of the Arctic will depend on the ability of states and corporations to collectively manage this shared space. The infrastructural economy based on the principles of integration, resilience, and responsibility may become the foundation of a new model of development in which the Arctic evolves into a sphere of cooperation, innovation, and strategic equilibrium.

The Arctic infrastructural economy represents a unique phenomenon within the global economic system. Unlike traditional models that rely on stable institutions, predictable markets, and temperate environments, the Arctic infrastructural economy operates within conditions of uncertainty, scarcity, and extreme climate. Its distinctiveness lies in the combination of multifunctionality, adaptability, and strategic interdependence. Every element of Arctic infrastructure simultaneously serves economic, social, scientific, and security purposes. A port can act as a hub for trade, a research platform, and a base for defense operations. Energy networks must ensure both civilian supply and critical resilience, while digital systems connect isolated communities and support real-time monitoring of

environmental change. This multifunctional character turns infrastructure into a living system that links humans, technology, and nature. The Arctic thus embodies a new stage of infrastructural evolution, where sustainability and security are inseparable, and where development becomes an experiment in balancing innovation, responsibility, and survival under the planet's most demanding conditions.

References:

1. Addie, J.-P. D., Glass, M. R., & Nelles, J. (2020). Regionalizing the Infrastructure Turn: A Research Agenda. Regional Studies. Regional Science, 7(1), 10–26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2019.1701543
2. Arctic Council. (2009). Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009 Report. Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME). Tromsø: Arctic Council Secretariat. URL: https://www.pame.is/projects/arctic-marine-shipping/ams
3. Arctic Council. (2017, May 11). Agreement on Enhancing International Arctic Scientific Cooperation. Fairbanks: Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting. URL: https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/items/9d1ecc0c-e82a-43b5-9a2f-28225bf183b9
4. Arctic Economic Council. (2023). Digital Infrastructure in the Arctic: Opportunities and Challenges. URL: https://arcticeconomiccouncil.com/reports/
5. Bennett, M. (2017). Development on Ice: Global Transportation Infrastructure and the Arctic Frontier. University of California eScholarship Repository. URL: https://escholarship.org/content/qt0nx346qd/qt0nx346qd_noSplash_59192d025024947a39a4553ae2818458.pdf
6. Bulatova, O., Zakharova, O., & Reznikova, N. (2024). Modern scientific and methodological approaches to monitoring the economic security of countries. In Transformations, Challenges and Security (pp. 68–92). Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University.
7. European Commission & European External Action Service. (2021). A stronger EU engagement for a peaceful, sustainable and prosperous Arctic: Joint communication to the European Parliament and the Council. Brussels: European Commission
8. Glass, M. R., Addie, J.-P. D., & Nelles, J. (2019). Regional infrastructures: Infrastructural regionalism in practice and theory. Regional Studies, 53(12), 1651–1661. DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2019.1667968
9. International Maritime Organization. (2017). International Code for Ships Operating in Polar Waters (Polar Code). London: IMO Publishing. URL: https://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/Safety/Pages/polar-code.aspx
10. Knecht, S. (2013). Arctic regionalism in theory and practice: From cooperation to integration? Arctic Yearbook 2013. URL: https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic-yearbook/2013/2013-scholarly-papers/39-arctic-regionalism-in-theory-and-practice-from-cooperation-to-integration/arcticyearbook.com+1
11. Łuszczuk, M., Götze, J., Radzik-Maruszak, K., Riedel, A., & Wehrmann, D. (2022). Governability of regional challenges: The Arctic development paradox. Politics & Governance, 10(3), 29-40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v10i3.5341
12. Reznikova, N., & Grod, M. (2024). Macroeconomic impacts of the circular transition: The green swans of decarbonization on the path to sustainability. Actual Problems of International Relations, 1(160). DOI: https://doi.org/10.17721/apmv.2024.160.1.110-120
13. Reznikova, N., & Grydasova, G. (2024). Determinants for modification of dependence paradigm in the context of synergetic world order. In Modification of economic dependence and achievement of climate neutrality at the crossroad (pp. 9–73). Boston, USA: Primedia eLaunch. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46299/979-8-89504-809-2.11
14. Reznikova, N., Panchenko, V., Karp, V., Grod, M., & Stakhurska, S. (2024). The relationship between the green and digital economy in the concept of sustainable development. Economic Affairs, 69(Special Issue), 389–399. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.1.2024.41
15. Reznikova, N., & Tarasenko, L. (2024). Mizhnarodna ekonomichna polityka SShA i KNR yak faktor heopolitychnoi frahmentatsii svitovoi ekonomiky [International economic policy of the USA and China as a factor of geopolitical fragmentation of the world economy]. Investytsii: praktyka ta dosvid – Investments: practice and experience, 9, 59–68. https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.2024.9.59 [in Ukrainian]
16. Reznikova, N. V., Panchenko, V. H., & Ivashchenko, O. A. (2021). Vplyv konkurentsii infrastrukturnykh proiektiv SShA ta KNO na hlobalnu ekonomichnu koniunkturu ta ekonomichnu bezpeku krain, shcho rozvyvaiutsia: borhovi, tekhnolohichni i finansovi vazheli tysku na stalyi rozvytok [The impact of competition between US and PRC infrastructural projects on the global economic situation and the economic security of developing countries: debt, technological and financial levers of pressure on sustainable development]. *Ekonomika ta derzhava – Economy and the State*, (8), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6806.2021.8.10 [in Ukrainian]
17. Reznikova, N., & Panchenko, V. (2023). *Reportazhi iz tsyvilizatsiinykh frontiv. Na peredovii mizhnarodnoi ekonomichnoi polityky* [Reports from civilizational fronts. On the front line of international economic policy]. Kyiv: Ahrar Media Hrup. [in Ukrainian]
18. Reznikova, N. V., Panchenko, V. H., & Ivashchenko, O. A. (2021). Infrastrukturni proiekty v tsentri hlobalnoho supernytstva KNR i SShA: instytutsiini vazheli vyrishennia problem staloho ekonomichnoho rozvytku [Infrastructure projects at the center of global competition between China and the USA: institutional levers for solving sustainable development problems]. *Ekonomika i orhanizatsiia upravlinnia – Economics and Organization of Management*, 4, 55–70. https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2021.4.6 [in Ukrainian]
19. State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China. (2018, January 26). China's Arctic Policy: White Paper. Beijing: The State Council Information Office of the PRC. URL: https://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white_paper/2018/01/26/content_281476026660336.htm

20. The Arctic Yearbook (2015). Governance & governing in the Arctic: Introduction to Arctic Yearbook 2015. Northern Research Forum. University of the Arctic. URL: https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic-yearbook/2015/12-yearbook/2015-arctic-governance-and-governing/121-governance-governance-in-the-arctic-an-introduction-to-arctic-yearbook-2015
21. Young, O. R. (2016). Governing complex systems: Social capital for the Anthropocene. MIT Press.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Addie J.-P. D., Glass M. R., Nelles J. Regionalizing the Infrastructure Turn: A Research Agenda. Regional Studies. Regional Science, 2020. Vol. 7(1), P. 10–26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2019.1701543
2. Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009 Report. Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME). 2009. Tromsø: Arctic Council Secretariat. URL: https://www.pame.is/projects/arctic-marine-shipping/ams
3. Agreement on Enhancing International Arctic Scientific Cooperation. 11.05.2017. Fairbanks: Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting. URL: https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/items/9d1ecc0c-e82a-43b5-9a2f-28225bf183b9
4. Digital Infrastructure in the Arctic: Opportunities and Challenges. Arctic Economic Council. 2023. URL: https://arcticeconomiccouncil.com/reports/
5. Bennett M. Development on Ice: Global Transportation Infrastructure and the Arctic Frontier. University of California eScholarship Repository. 2017. URL: https://escholarship.org/content/qt0nx346qd/qt0nx346qd_noSplash_59192d025024947a39a4553ae2818458.pdf
6. Bulatova O., Zakharova O., Reznikova N. Modern scientific and methodological approaches to monitoring the economic security of countries / Transformations, Challenges and Security. Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University. 2024. pp. 68–92
7. A stronger EU engagement for a peaceful, sustainable and prosperous Arctic: Joint communication to the European Parliament and the Council. European Commission & European External Action Service. 2021. Brussels: European Commission
8. Glass M. R., Addie J.-P. D., Nelles J. Regional infrastructures: Infrastructural regionalism in practice and theory. Regional Studies. 2019. Vol. 53(12). P. 1651–1661. DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2019.1667968
9. International Code for Ships Operating in Polar Waters (Polar Code). International Maritime Organization. 2017. London: IMO Publishing. URL: https://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/Safety/Pages/polar-code.aspx
10. Knecht S. Arctic regionalism in theory and practice: From cooperation to integration? Arctic Yearbook 2013. URL: https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic-yearbook/2013/2013-scholarly-papers/39-arctic-regionalism-in-theory-and-practice-from-cooperation-to-integration/arcticyearbook.com+1
11. Governability of regional challenges: The Arctic development paradox / Łuszczuk M., Götze J., Radzik-Maruszak K., et al. Politics & Governance. 2022 Vol. 10(3). P. 29-40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v10i3.5341
12. Reznikova N., Grod M. Macroeconomic impacts of the circular transition: The green swans of decarbonization on the path to sustainability. Actual Problems of International Relations. 2024. Vol. 1(160). DOI: https://doi.org/10.17721/apmv.2024.160.1.110-120
13. Reznikova N., Grydasova G. Determinants for modification of dependence paradigm in the context of synergetic world order / Modification of economic dependence and achievement of climate neutrality at the crossroad. Boston, USA: Primedia eLaunch. 2024. P. 9-73. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46299/979-8-89504-809-2.11
14. The relationship between the green and digital economy in the concept of sustainable development / Reznikova N., Panchenko V., Karp V. et al. Economic Affairs. 2024. Vol. 69 (Special Issue). P. 389–399. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.1.2024.41
15. Резнікова Н., Тарасенко Л. Міжнародна економічна політика США і КНР як фактор геополітичної фрагментації світової економіки. Інвестиції: практика та досвід. 2024. № 9 (травень). С. 59-68. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.2024.9.59
16. Резнікова Н. В., Панченко В. Г., Іващенко О. А. Вплив конкуренції інфраструктурних проєктів США та КНР на глобальну економічну кон'юнктуру та економічну безпеку країн, що розвиваються: боргові, технологічні і фінансові важелі тиску на сталий розвиток. *Економіка та держава.* 2021. № 8. С. 10–16. https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6806.2021.8.10
17. Резнікова Н., Панченко В. *Репортажі із цивілізаційних фронтів. На передовій міжнародної економічної політики.* Київ: Аграр Медіа Груп, 2023.
18. Резнікова Н. В., Панченко В. Г., Іващенко О. А. Інфраструктурні проєкти в центрі глобального суперництва КНР і США: інституційні важелі вирішення проблем сталого економічного розвитку. *Економіка і організація управління.* 2021. № 4. С. 55–70. https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2021.4.6
19. China's Arctic Policy: White Paper. Beijing: The State Council Information Office of the PRC. State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China. 26.01.2018. URL: https://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white_paper/2018/01/26/content_281476026660336.htm
20. Governance & governing in the Arctic: Introduction to Arctic Yearbook 2015. Northern Research Forum. 2015. University of the Arctic. URL: https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic-yearbook/2015/12-yearbook/2015-arctic-governance-and-governing/121-governance-governance-in-the-arctic-an-introduction-to-arctic-yearbook-2015
21. Young O. R. Governing complex systems: Social capital for the Anthropocene. MIT Press. 2016.

Дата надходження статті: 23.10.2025 р.
Дата прийняття статті до друку: 06.11.2025 р.