



LEVERAGING GLOBALIZATION



How Global Venues Offer a
Comparative Advantage for IPO
Influence on Arctic Policy

CAUSAL EXPLANATIONS

Gritsch (2005):
Globalization has further empowered states to marginalize civil society within their own borders.

Clarkson and Wood (2010): Globalization has created opportunities for civil society to gain influence beyond borders.

Haas (1992): Epistemic communities differ at national and international levels.

BROAD INSTITUTIONAL DYNAMICS

With traditional state-based international decision-making on environmental issues, Indigenous groups are given the same status of NGOs: as participants in the shaping of norms.

Party politics are also not very good venues for IPOs to achieve better representation in Arctic policy decisions.

At the Arctic Council, IPOs participate more directly as 'permanent participants' and the level of consultation required for proposals results in some IPO veto power.

COUNTRY OBSERVATIONS

Canada, Russia, the United States and to a lesser extent Norway can be seen to circumvent IPO influence where it is seen to conflict with resource development projects

Sweden and Finland's shortcomings in this area appear to be characterized by inaction arising from systemic compartmentalization of indigenous issues.

Greenland (Denmark) is an outlier with meaningful IPO influence on Arctic policy.

RUSSIA

- RAIPON: success internationally, subversion nationally
- Constant re-evaluation and reform of governing bodies tasked with crafting policy on indigenous issues
- The ministry tasked with developing legislation for its indigenous peoples is the Minister of Economic Development and Commerce
- Provinces vs. autonomous *okrugs* at the fore of indigenous rights protection in Russia.

CANADA

- Cooptation of indigenous perspectives and knowledge i.e. The BQCMB.
- The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB)'s reviews of Geo-mapping for Energy and Minerals (GEM) projects
- IPOs sitting as permanent participants of the Arctic Council involved to a significant degree in the ACIA and related policy recommendations.
- Federal-territorial structure of BQCMP and NIRB vs. the structural inclusion of indigenous people as equal contributors to the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.

UNITED STATES

- Similar to Canada, IPOs often form regional corporations and participate directly in the economy as private landholders. The result of this in Alaska has been that these corporations have eclipsed the AFN; i.e. *Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act* (1971).
- The Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC) has worked with Arctic Council-led bodies to produce influential documents such as the *Arctic Biodiversity Assessment* (2013).
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the ICC's petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

SWEDEN, NORWAY AND FINLAND

- Saami parliaments vs. international Saami Council
- Norway:
 - More political participation and ratification of the ILO Convention no. 169. The *Finnmark Act* (2005) stipulates that the Saami Parliament has the right to make assessment guidelines for the use of land in the Northern expanses on its people. However, these must be approved by the Ministry. Acknowledgement of Saami land and water rights in Finnmark is also ill-defined.

GREENLAND

- Home Rule policy
 - Provides mostly indigenous Greenlandic authorities with decision-making power over internal matters.
- Why the outlier?
 - Greenland's population is 85% indigenous
 - No desire to exploit vast natural resources in Greenland

INDIGENOUS POPULATION STATISTICS FOR THE ARCTIC (2008-2012)

Russia: Less than 1%

U.S. With other indigenous groups, 1.2%; 14.8% of Alaskans

Canada: 0.2% of country or approx. 50% of territorial residents

Norway, Sweden, Finland: Less than 1%

Greenland: 85%

Arctic as a whole: 10%

LIMITATIONS

- The record of international organizations in terms of implementing IPO objectives is not without its failures; for example, the fact that the *UN Framework Convention on Climate Change* (2003) failed to mention the Arctic as an ‘at risk’ region of the globe is considered an egregious oversight in light of the ACIA’s findings that the Arctic and its peoples are critically affected by climate change. However, the ACIA is considered to have provided a turning point in the acknowledgement in international discourse on the Arctic as “synonymous globally with the impacts of climate change” (Fenge and Funston, 2009: 15)

CONCLUSIONS (1 OF 3)

How was Gritsch right?

- The structure of domestic politics and its emphasis on majority support for policy initiatives, and the state's competitive role in initiating lucrative Arctic resource projects to the detriment of indigenous rights are factors

CONCLUSIONS (2 OF 3)

How were Clarkson and Wood right?

- IPOs have themselves been active in choosing venues that deal with the jurisdictional area of a circumpolar Arctic in which they have better demographic representation than in their individual states.

CONCLUSIONS (3 OF 3)

How was Haas right?

- At the international level, business is less privileged in overall decision-making as courting business is less integral to maximizing comparative advantage.