

Leveraging Globalization: How Indigenous Peoples' Organizations Gain Agency for Arctic Policy through Global Mechanisms.

Marguerite Marlin, M.A.

PhD Candidate, Comparative Public Policy at McMaster University; Canada.

Abstract: Amongst Arctic states, national governments have each presented unique platforms for domestic Indigenous representation and consultation in Arctic policy and projects. However, these have proven to have largely been hindered by two main factors: the structure of domestic politics and its emphasis on majority support for and prioritization of policy initiatives, and the high level of state interest in lucrative Arctic resource projects driven by profit-oriented actors to the detriment of indigenous rights. This article provides evidence to support this assertion and examines how theories of globalization's effect on citizen influence within states and at the global level can be used to explain this phenomenon. At the same time, state reliance on actors bound by the common purpose of achieving knowledge to be used for the purpose of resource extraction is considered to constitute a lack of diversity in the epistemic communities considered to be substantively influential for state-led Arctic policy. It is further contended that for Indigenous Peoples' Organizations (IPOs), working through international bodies has historically proven to be more advantageous in terms of achieving expressed objectives and meaningful consultation on Arctic policy.

While some scholars operate with the theory that globalization has reduced the power of states, others contend that globalization increases the power of states overall as the remoteness of decision-making loci heightens the ability of states to dissipate popular dissent on policy issues (Gritsch, 2005). Still others accept the premise that globalization offers more opportunities for the state to leverage its mechanisms for greater power, but argue that civil society organizations also construct governance mechanisms to manage and manipulate globalization (Clarkson and Wood, 2010). The first of these theories provides a useful frame of reference for globalization's effect on the limitations indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) face when attempting to influence policy through state governments. Clarkson and Wood's application of this theory to the dynamics of global civil society is equally important in terms of

explaining the comparative effectiveness of IPO influence on Arctic policy through global channels.

Included in the consideration IPO agency at the international vs. the national level is the level of substantive inclusion of indigenous knowledge for environmental assessments done by national and international institutions. With respect to this particular aspect, Haas' work on epistemic communities (1993) provides useful analytical framework for explaining differences, as approaches to knowledge accumulation differ significantly from one another depending on what bodies initiate the studies and for what purpose the studies are expected to be used for.

In providing evidence for these phenomena, an emphasis is placed on objectives directly related to the environment and climate change; however, in keeping with the theory consistent with many IPO proposals that biological and cultural factors should be conceptually integrated for a more holistic understanding of the Arctic (Kassam, 2009: 3), objectives such as representation in policymaking/resource project approval and other forms of discretion over land usage are not omitted from the analysis.

Contextual factors are also deemed to contribute significantly to an explanation of why IPO objectives are most effectively pursued at the global level. For example, the demographic representation of indigenous peoples is much larger when framed within the limits of a global Arctic region as opposed to individual states with mostly sub-Arctic geography. In addition, the homeland and cultural communities of Arctic indigenous peoples such as the Inuit, Saami and Aleut span across national boundaries (Feng and Funston, 2009), and international bodies are not as constrained by neoliberal and neo-pluralist Arctic policy objectives prioritizing resource development – as discernible in the Arctic policy and practice of states such as Canada, Russia, the United States and Norway. Thus, the international bodies IPOs work through to achieve their objectives can serve to counteract the tendency of states to follow those policies to the detriment of indigenous rights in the Arctic.

Given the considerable differences between Arctic states in their relations with IPOs, these general assertions must be qualified by more specific observations, supported in the ensuing pages. For example, as previously noted, Canada, Russia, the United States and to a

lesser extent Norway can be seen to circumvent the protection and provision of IPO rights where such rights can be seen to conflict with resource development projects even if these states have provided for effective representation in other areas. Sweden and Finland's shortcomings in terms of addressing IPO objectives appear to be characterized by inaction arising from systemic compartmentalization of indigenous issues so that such issues do not rise to a critical level of public salience for prompting state action.

In all these states, international bodies and international legislation have served to counteract the shortcomings of national policy by providing mechanisms and decision making loci which can then be leveraged by IPOs. Denmark, through the creation and implementation of the Greenland Home Rule policy, is considered to be somewhat of an outlier among Arctic states in that it has largely (although not entirely) addressed IPO objectives at the state level. This is here acknowledged, and thus the example Greenland is only briefly discussed as it does not help to explain the general dynamic observed with the other Arctic states.

To provide adequate conceptual clarity in the discussion of globalization, it must also be acknowledged that from a historical perspective, the internationalization of the Arctic is not a new phenomenon. Trade and cultural contacts have existed in the Arctic for thousands of years – from early Saami and Karelian exchanges to Viking English and Dutch exploration and trade excursions to the international militarization of the Arctic brought on by the Cold-War. The Arctic as a canary in the coal mine for environmental issues is also not a new phenomenon, as impacts of DDT and radioactive materials have been most marked there in the past (Heinenen, 2005).

However, the globalization of the Circumpolar Arctic here refers to a mid-to-late 20th and early 21st century phenomenon involving the general acceleration of communication flows and incorporation into the world economy and the rapid development and expansion of Indigenous Peoples Organizations (IPOs) which emerged as early as 1956 and burgeoned in the early 1990s. In 1956, the Finnish Saami parliament joined forces with Saami groups in Sweden and Norway to form the Nordic Saami Council, which became the Saami Council after the

dissolution of the USSR at which time Saami from Russia were able to join (Josephsen, 2010: 15).

While there are many examples of the globalization of IPOs, a notable watershed moment for globalization of IPOs in the modern sense was in the immediate post-Soviet period of instability that wreaked havoc on Northern Russian communities in the 1990s, when circumpolar indigenous groups reached out to Russian Arctic indigenous communities – providing food and hunting supplies, initiating exchanges to encourage capacity building in traditional use of lands, and appealing to international bodies on behalf of their interests (Kassam, 2004: p. 1-2).

Through greater interaction evidences by initiatives such as this, Indigenous peoples of the Arctic have in recent years been amassing greater levels of social and political capital from increased networks with other Indigenous groups, international organizations and the international scientific community. A few of the key pillars of progress at the global level for Arctic IPO objectives related to climate change include:

1. International bodies with IPO representatives such as the Arctic Council, the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC), the Global Indigenous Peoples' Caucus, the Saami Council, the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII).
2. International conventions, environmental assessments and norm-creating documents that either stem from a heightened level of meaningful consultation with IPOs or provide conditions that encourage future consultation for climate change policy. Examples discussed in this paper include the *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA, 2004)*, the *Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR, 2004)*, the *ILO Convention no. 169*, and the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007)*

Results for IPOs at the National and Global Level

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 – which is not sufficient for substantial influence to be realized. Conversely, at the Arctic Council, Arctic Indigenous peoples participate in a more direct manner as ‘permanent participants’ at the ministerial level, where they are consulted for recommendations before decisions are made final. (Heinamaki, 2009: 209). The level of consultation with indigenous groups required for proposals at the Arctic Council results in the IPOs having a modicum of veto power. This is coupled with increased political representation through bodies such as the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) where a vision of the Arctic as a land inseparable from its indigenous inhabitants is promoted (Tennberg, 2001: 267).

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); as it found that in the past few decades the average temperature in the Arctic has risen twice as much as the global average (Heinamaki, 2009: 207-208).

Nationally, each of the Arctic states uses different approaches to provide for indigenous representation; for example, the Scandinavian countries each have a Saami parliament, Canada is noted for its four key Arctic comprehensive land-claims agreements (Oceans North Canada, 2010-2013), and Russia has the Autonomous *Okrugs* which uphold legal entitlements of its Arctic indigenous peoples (Wessendorf, 2005: 30). As was revealed at international round tables on the subject in 1999 and 2003, the experiences of indigenous peoples with each approach include unique successes and shortcomings; however, literature arising from an international Round Table on indigenous Arctic issues in 2003 concluded that even countries

with very humanistic reputations showed “a surprising amount of reluctance and opposition” towards IPOs and their stated objectives (Wessendorf, 2005: 12-13, 35).

Nor is party politics within nations considered to be conducive to IPO representation. In the first place, indigenous peoples have in many instances eschewed party politics; in Sweden, for example, the Saami have eschewed mainstream national party politics altogether to the effect that not one *Riksdagen* member since the introduction of general suffrage has been Saami (Wessendorf, 2005: 13, 189). Even where political positions in mainstream politics are achieved, these are not considered an optimum form of representation for IPOs because the nature of mainstream party politics is considered to “lead to individualism, opportunism and cooptation into the system” (*Ibid*).

A comparison of outcomes for IPO representation at the national and global levels is useful for illustrating the particularities of IPO agency within each state or group of similar states:

The Russian Federation

Arising from the increased organization efforts of indigenous activist groups during Perestroika, the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) was created in 1990 at the first Congress of the Indigenous Peoples of the North, where delegates were sent to Moscow from indigenous associations within Russia with the aim of creating a national organization through which to lobby the government. From its inception, RAIPON developed and proposed principle laws for national legislation affecting indigenous peoples from 1991 to 2001, which were subsequently rejected by the Russian Federation due to the “declarative character” and “impossible reinforcement and application.” (Semenova, 2007: 25).

After appealing to President Putin to protest this decision, the Presidential Administration provided for the inclusion of RAIPON representatives in working groups under the Kozak Commission alongside other stakeholders such as scientists. The results of this inclusion in the working groups have been mixed for the achievement of RAIPON objectives and substantive representations, as some issues have been resolved through the working groups

but compromise has yet to be reached in many issues pertaining to the use of traditional lands. (Semenova, 2007: 24-25).

Importantly, Semenova (2007) attributes the failure for the Russian state to provide solutions for indigenous issues to constant re-evaluation and reform of governing bodies tasked with crafting policy on indigenous issues. She writes:

As long as there is no established special governmental body responsible for indigenous policy that is based on a comprehensive ideology, it will not be possible to eliminate the causes, rather than merely the consequences, of the existing problems. (p. 27)

Bereft of a comprehensive ideology for indigenous policy, it is state practices which are the best indicator of the state's position toward IPOs. With respect to this, it is telling that in Russia the ministry tasked with developing legislation for its indigenous peoples is the Minister of Economic Development and Commerce, and the reason why discussions are taking place on the consolidation of provinces at the expense of the autonomous *okrugs* at the fore of indigenous rights protection in Russia is that the *okrugs* have not provided for enough economic development and exploitation of Northern resources (Wessendorf, 2005: 26).

While RAIPON has met with limited success at the state level within Russia, the organization has made a more substantive impact at the international level for objectives on sustainable development. In 2003, RAIPON's proposed expansion of the definition of sustainable development to encompass not only social, economic and environmental factors but also spiritual-cultural and legal factors failed to be adopted by Russia into its contribution to the WSSD; however, this proposal received a boost when environmental NGOs and Canadian representatives voiced support for this proposal at Johannesburg and it was subsequently expanded to include the legal sphere.

Furthermore, RAIPON is an active permanent participant at the Arctic Council with an elected representative sitting on the UN's Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. (Semenova, 2007: 29). The fact that RAIPON's impact in those fora is of consequence was made particularly evident by Russia's decision in 2012 to suspend RAIPON's activities at the Arctic Council,

presumed to be a result of a divide in Russian policy toward a more centralized approach and one promoting more international engagement (Weber, 2012).

Canada and the United States

Globalization has also led to increased dialogues between scientists on global change and Indigenous Arctic peoples, which has furthered the cause of Inuit environmental activism by promoting the idea of the Inuit as global representatives of the environment (Martello, 2008). This is accompanied by the rising prominence of the notion that indigenous peoples must be included in environmental and impact assessments – particularly in Canada where the duty to consult with IPOs over land use affecting them is enshrined in national legislation.

Accordingly, a constellation of land-management and consultation boards exist for this purpose in Canada, but the effectiveness and substantive representation of indigenous priorities and perspectives is unclear. For example, Spak (2009)'s study of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB) points to various schemes of "incorporation" of Indigenous Northern perspectives in Canadian-Indigenous co-management agreements which fail to meet the promise of what they purport to do.

After engaging in extensive fieldwork in Northern Dene communities in the late 1990s, Spak concluded that what is labeled Traditional Environmental Knowledge by the West does not truly represent Indigenous conceptions of the environment, and the way in which it is expressed is highly dependent on the power relations of the co-management boards. For example, Spak points out that the very term "resource management" is highly culturally charged with Western values and a utilitarian view of that which is seen as sacred by Indigenous peoples, and that members of the scientific community involved in the BQCMB were not very open to hearing from Inuit perspectives of caribou and caribou migration (Spak, 2009). While these may be seen as symbolic points, Spak is adamant that this co-optation of perspectives into Western frames undermines the level of representation that can be achieved on the co-management boards.

Moreover, attention is drawn to the fact that although most of the BQCMB are from Inuit communities, the BQCMB agreement is a formal agreement between the federal government and the territories and provinces involved and the structure and form of the BQCMB meetings were like any other Western bureaucratic meeting. Finally, despite claims by the BQCMB that it relied heavily on traditional Inuit knowledge, Spak notes that interviews with Indigenous representatives on the BQCMB revealed that these representatives had not been given the impression that the board had an interest in their traditional knowledge (Spak, 2009).

Territorial initiatives for adaptation to climate change such as the Nunavut Climate Change Strategy and the Yukon Climate Change Strategy, and the Inuit Action Plan and workshops for adaptation strategies by the Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated have also yet to translate into substantive policy on adaptation in Canada – despite the fact that the effects of climate change are already being felt in some communities. (Ford et. al., 2007: 151-156).

Perhaps the most egregious example, the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) that conducts systematic reviews of Geo-mapping for Energy and Minerals (GEM) projects has not conducted significant consultation with Inuit communities, gives insufficient notice for community input meetings when such meetings are held, and only informs affected communities for exploration and development projects when such projects are in their final phase of review. Even under these conditions, only one GEM project has not been approved by the NIRB on the grounds of strident opposition from the Indigenous community it would affect (Medalye and Foster, 2012: 106-108).

In cases where the NIRB allowed GEM projects to proceed in spite of direct opposition from the Inuit communities affected by the project, it has been found that the concerns of the communities involved were “overtly ignored” by the NIRB. (Medalye and Foster, 2012: 107). The cause of this is fairly clear when considering the privileged status of resource development in Canadian national policy. That resource development is the highest priority in the Canadian government’s Arctic policy vision is evidenced by its 2009 Northern Strategy and particularly the Geo-mapping for Energy and Minerals (GEM) program. The Northern Strategy stressed the development of oil, gas and mineral resource exploration as a key to development in the Arctic,

and of all economic development expenditure commitments, GEM received the highest level of investment at \$100 million in expenditures – representing approximately 42% of total expenditures (Medalye and Foster, 2012: 104).

By contrast, environmental and impact assessments undertaken by international bodies have been deemed more successful at bridging the gap between traditional knowledge and modern science. For example, the members of the Arctic Council – which as mentioned include several key IPOs as permanent participants – initiated the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004 which “distilled and synthesised available scientific information, traditional knowledge, and indigenous perceptions” in the assessment of climate change and its effects in the Arctic (Arctic Council, 2004).

It has been observed in reports unconnected to the Arctic Council that the IPOs sitting as permanent participants of the Arctic Council were involved to a significant degree in this assessment, and that these IPOs also contributed to the subsequent development of policy recommendations to the Arctic Council – which were then adopted (Feng and Funston, 2009: 14).

To be sure, the ACIA has not been without its critics; for example, Ford et. al. (2007: 150) have argued that the ACIA showed a weak understanding of the problems posed to Arctic communities through climate change and very limited consideration of adaptation policy in Canada. However, the contrast of the federal-territorial structure of the BQCMP and NIRB vs. the structural inclusion of indigenous people as equal contributors to the ACIA makes clear that that the latter is more conducive for IPOs to achieve a greater degree of representation.

Like Canada, the United States also has a relationship with IPOs largely defined by land claims – most of which were negotiated by the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN). Also 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; in particular, the *Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act* (1971) transferred lands owned by tribal governments directly to the corporations and abolished Alaska Natives’ hunting and fishing rights (Wessendorf, 2005: 108).

In response to state policies such as these, the Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC) – which is based in the Yukon but includes member organizations such as the Allakaket Tribal Council located in Alaska – has prioritized working with Arctic Council-led bodies to produce influential documents such as the *Arctic Biodiversity Assessment* (2013). For this environmental assessment, the AAC sat on the steering and technical committees and provided information on the use of renewable resources by Arctic indigenous peoples, particularly a case study on the caribou and the Athabaskan indigenous people. An AAC statement issued since the publication of the ABA predicts that the document will be used “to improve policies for wildlife habitat protection and management in northern Canada and Alaska, and internationally through implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (AAC, 2013).

Another strategy for Arctic Indigenous influence in Canada and the United States galvanized by the forces of globalization is appealing to international legislation such as the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* to have the impacts of climate change upon their peoples defined as a human rights issue. The argument for this is that climate change denies Indigenous people of their subsistence way of life, and thus it violates their right to uphold their traditional culture (Heinamaki, 2009: 214).

The implementation stage of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples has particular significance for the United States; the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has been recognized as having adopted the principles of the Declaration (Allen, 2011: 55), and the first attempt to make a state accountable for breaching its principles was done against the United States.

This attempt began when Sheila Watt-Cloutier, a former Inuit Circumpolar Council president, together with 60-plus Inuit in Canada and Alaska filed a petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to hold the United States accountable for negative impacts climate change had caused for the Inuit. The language of the petition was based on the ACIA, used scientific evidence of a dramatically changing environment in the Arctic, and purported to represent all Inuit of Canada and the U.S. through its signatories. The Commission rejected the petition in 2006, declaring that the link between climate change and human rights

as protected in the Declaration was not clear enough according to the Commission. The difficulty of finding and holding accountable a single state responsible for such a global problem is also considered to have added to the rejection of this petition (Heinamaki, 2009: 218-212).

However, Fenge and Fulston (2009) note that the petition “appeared to stimulate UNEP and UNDP to characterize climate change as a question of human rights and arguably led the International Council on Human Rights Policy to propose human rights as a “lens” through which to approach the governance of climate change” (p. 18). Similarly, Heinamaki asserts that the petition’s true significance and intent to be more of a call for greater Inuit influence in decision-making than a direct attempt to have rights infringements addressed by those responsible – particularly as effects of climate change are often irreversible (Heinamaki, 2009: 208-209).

In Canada, the case being made for climate change as a human rights issue is a relatively new phenomenon. Canada has signed and endorsed the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, but has yet to respond to a private members’ bill from James Bay Cree MP Romeo Saganash requiring that Canadian law be consistent with this UN Declaration. The bill was introduced on January 28th, 2013 but it is still in First Reading – the beginning stage of the legislative process – despite the fact that other bills introduced at that time have seen a much swifter course.

Still, Saganash has suggested that the UN Declaration may bear significance for the upholding of indigenous rights even if the Canadian government does not pass his bill, stating that “our judges and our courts are impartial and they have the right to interpret domestic laws, to interpret domestic rights, or aboriginal rights in this case. They have the absolute right to consult the UN declaration in order to interpret domestic rights” (Galloway, 2013). If this is true and domestic courts in Canada do end up consulting the UN Declaration in this way, it may be the greatest case example for IPOs to concentrate efforts on working through international bodies in existence.

Sweden, Norway and Finland

In the Nordic Countries of Sweden Norway and Finland, the dominant IPO of the Saami have individual Saami parliaments within each country. The separate international Saami Council is a permanent participant of the Arctic Council and enjoys consultative status at the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (Minority Rights Group International, 2008). An issuance of the Saami Council, the Nordic Saami Convention regulates legal relations between the Saami, Norwegians, Finns and Swedes, and recognizes the Saami as an indivisible people – providing some basis for self-determination.

Significantly, the Saami Convention also states that Saami representation and participation shall be promoted in international institutions and meetings (Tennberg, 2007: 265). Because of the Saami Convention, the Saami can now make their concerns known through the Council to the three states together (Abate and Kronk, 2013: 289), and Article 31 of the convention states that “The states shall make efforts to ensure that regard is paid to Sami traditional knowledge in decisions concerning Sami matters” (Fenge and Funston, 2009: 20).

Within national boundaries, the impact of the Saami bodies has been more modest. For example, Swedish legislation does not recognize the Saami as an indigenous people – despite declarations to the contrary in the *European Council’s Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities* – and along with Finland and Russia has yet to ratify *ILO Convention no. 169* (Wessendorf, 2005: 183-185). The ILO Convention, among other things, requires signatories to recognize and protect cultural requirements of indigenous peoples and involve IPOs in consultations through representative institutions (International Labour Organization, 1996-2013).

Similarly, in Finland the rights acknowledged by the Saami Parliament there have yet to be implemented in any meaningful way, as there has been no articulation at any level of conditions providing for official exchanges wherein members of the Saami Parliament can advise the Finnish government on whether legislation is meeting the conditions put forward by the Saami (Wessendorf, 2005: 183).

Norway is a distinct case from Finland and Sweden in two respects as regards Saami representation: the Saami are more active in mainstream politics, and unlike the others Norway

has ratified the *ILO Convention no. 169*. Stemming from Norway's ratification of the ILO Convention is the *Finnmark Act (2005)*, which stipulates that the Saami Parliament has the right to make assessment guidelines for the use of land in the Northern expanses on its people. As this seems to merely formalize what should be standard state procedure in the case of exploiting natural resources, the fact that the *Finnmark Act* then provides the condition that these assessment guidelines must be approved by the Ministry which considers their appropriateness makes the *Finnmark Act* underwhelming in its impact. Section 5 of the *Act* does provide acknowledgement of Saami land and water rights in Finnmark; however, these are ill-defined so that the *Act* is not thought to have effectively changed the legal status for Saami land and water rights (Abate and Kronk, 2013: 541).

Conditions requiring some measure of Saami approval for use of uncultivated land and property transfers in Finnmark are delineated in Section 10; however, if none of the three Saami-elected members of the Finnmark Estate approve particular changes, these changes can then be brought before the Saami Parliament and Finnmark County Council and if these bodies still do not approve the changes, the issue can then be brought before the King to decide (Abate and Kronk, 2013: 541). This last condition defangs the requirement of Saami approval for changes, as there is a clear process in place to circumvent Saami opposition if desired by the state in the case of resource projects being too economically valuable to reject. Thus, what the *Finnmark Act* provides is more along the lines of enhanced consultation.

Denmark (Greenland)

The Danish policy of Home Rule for Greenland is considered an outlier to this study because it provides Greenlandic authorities (which are mostly indigenous) with decision-making power over its internal matters. While Greenland does receive transfers from Denmark for approximately 50% of public expenditures and Danish language and customs remain an integral part of political culture in Greenland (Wessendorf, 2005: 152-153), this is considered to be a successful example of state-led initiatives toward the achievement of IPO objectives. A big reason for Greenland's outlier status is perhaps rooted in the fact that 85% of its inhabitants are indigenous (Greenland Representation to the EU, 2009), as opposed to the other nations

where indigenous people represent less than 1% of the total population (Statscan (2011) European Commission (2013) U.S. Census (2012) and Russian Census (2010)).

Conclusion

Although there is some dispute over whether globalization forces have provided sufficient benefit to Arctic indigenous social and political capital to outpace the burgeoning power of trans-national resource industries in the Arctic, international organizations and the conventions and assessments stemming from these international bodies have provided an additional set of tools for IPO groups to use to achieve policy influence in the Arctic sphere.

At the same time, states have each presented unique platforms for domestic IPO representation and consultation in Arctic policy and projects – but these have proven to have largely been hindered by two main factors: the structure of domestic politics and its emphasis on majority support for and prioritization of policy initiatives, and the high level of state interest in lucrative Arctic resource projects to the detriment of indigenous rights. At the national level, prioritizing resource development can explicitly be made a part of public policy, whereas at the international level it becomes more expedient for parties to agree that a global direction of more resource exploitation and less indigenous representation by all states is not what is desired by all parties.

Hungry for revenues expected to result from resource exploitation in the Arctic, states have been able to prioritize international business actors over national citizens by simply designing programs such as Canada's GEM which rely only on the ability to attract resource investment to be deemed successful within the program's expressed mandate. This shows one way in which states circumvent the wishes of their own citizens by relying largely on increasingly powerful global business actors for program delivery, which supports Gritsch (2005)'s thesis. At the same time, the bureaucratic actors involved in state programs like GEM are also examples of epistemic communities as imagined by Haas (1993), as these actors are bound by the common purpose of achieving knowledge to be used for the purpose of resource extraction and little to nothing else.

While it is here argued that working through international bodies has historically proven to be more advantageous for IPOs than working at the national level for reasons consistent with Clarkson and Wood (2010)'s theory on global civil society, it is of course acknowledged that working within states is a necessity for IPOs as well. Not only must international conventions and norms be implemented at some stage via state authoritative bodies, but states must also be actively discouraged from eschewing more progressive international bodies or "venue shopping" (Pralle, 2003) when it comes to indigenous issues.

Bibliography

Abate, Randall and Elizabeth Kronk. (2013). *Climate Change and Indigenous Peoples: The Search for Legal Remedies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Allen, Stephen. (2011). *Reflections on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* Oxford: Hart.

Arctic Athabaskan Council. (n.d.). Arctic Biodiversity Assessment. Retrieved May 16, 2013, from <http://www.arcticathabaskancouncil.com/aac/?q=node/13>

Clarkson, Stephen and Stepan Wood. (2010). "Global Law beyond the State: Governance by Business and Civil Society" in Clarkson and Wood, *A Perilous Imbalance* (Vancouver UBC Press)

European Commission. (2013). [*The Euromosaic Study*](#). Retrieved: May 2013.

Fenge, Terry and Bernard W. Funston. (2009). *Arctic Governance: Traditional Knowledge of Arctic Indigenous Peoples from and International Policy Perspective*. Anchorage, AL: Indigenous Peoples' Global Summit on Climate Change (Conference Paper).

Ford, James, Tristan Pearce, Barry Smit, Johanna Wandel, Mishak Allurut, Kik Shappa, Harry Ittusujurat and Kevin Qrunnut. (2007). "Reducing Vulnerability to Climate Change in the Arctic: The Case of Nunavut, Canada" *Arctic* Vol. 60, No. 2 pp. 150-166.

Galloway, Gloria. (2013). "NDP MP Saganash tables bill to align federal laws with UN native declaration" *The Globe and Mail*, Jan 28, 2013.

Government of Canada. (2009). *Canada's Northern Strategy: Our North, Our Heritage, Our Future*.

Gritsch, Maria. (2005). "The Nation-State and Economic Globalization: Soft Geo-Politics and Increased State Autonomy?" *Review of International Political Economy* 12(1): 1–25.

Greenland Representation to the EU. (2009). [Facts on Greenland](#). Retrieved: May 2013.

Heinamaki, Neena. (2009). "Rethinking the Status of Indigenous Peoples in International Environmental Decision-Making: Pondering the Role of Arctic Indigenous Peoples and the Challenge of Climate Change" in Koivurova, T., Keskitalo, E. C. H., Bankes, N., & SpringerLink (Online service). 2009. *Climate Governance in the Arctic*. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.

Heininen, Lassi. (2005). "Impacts of Globalization, and the Circumpolar North in World Politics." *Polar Geography* 29(2): 91–102.

Hoglund, Morton. (2010). *Arctic Cooperation in Education and Research*. European Parliament. Accessed May 6, 2013 at: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/arcticparl/Report%20Mr%20Morten%20Hoglund%20SCPA R.doc](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/arcticparl/Report%20Mr%20Morten%20Hoglund%20SCPA%20R.doc).

Josefsen, Eva. (2010). *The Saami and the National Parliaments: Channels for Political Influence Mexico: Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and UNDP*.

Kassam, Karim-Aly S. (2009). *Biocultural Diversity and Indigenous Ways of Knowing Calgary: University of Calgary Press*.

Lambden, J., Receveur, O., Marshall, J., & Kuhnlein, H. (2012). Traditional and market food access in Arctic Canada is affected by economic factors. *International Journal Of Circumpolar Health*, 65(4).

Marsh, David, Nicola J. Smith, and Nicola Hothi. (2006). "Globalization and the State" in Colin Hay, Michael Lister, David Marsh (eds.) *The State: Theories and Issues* (Palgrave Macmillan).

Medalye, Jacqueline and Ryan Foster. (2012). "Canadian Arctic and Climate Change" in *The Politics of Protest*, Studies in Political Economy: A Social Review, Issue 90 (Autumn 2012).

Martello, Marybeth Long. (2008). "Arctic Indigenous Peoples as Representations and Representatives of Climate Change." *Social Studies of Science* 38(3): 351–76.

Minority Rights Group International. (2008). *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples - Norway: Sami*.

Oceans North Canada: Northern Voices and Communities. (2010-2013). Pew Charitable Trust. <http://oceansnorth.org/northern-voices-and-communities#inuivialuit> (accessed April 16, 2013)

Pralle, Sarah B. (2003). "Venue Shopping, Political Strategy, and Policy Change: The Internationalization of Canadian Forest Advocacy." *Journal of Public Policy* 23(3): 233–60.

Russian Federation Census. (2010). [Population Data](#). Retrieved: May 2013.

Semenova, Tamara. (2007). "Political mobilization of northern indigenous peoples in Russia" *Polar Record* 43 (224): 23-32.

Spak, Stella. (2005). "The Position of Indigenous Knowledge in Canadian Co-management Organizations" *Anthropologica*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (2005), pp. 233-246.

Statistics Canada. (2011). [Aboriginal Peoples in Canada](#). Retrieved: May 2013.

Tennberg, Monica. (2010). "Indigenous Peoples As International Political Actors: A Summary" *Polar Record* 46 (238): 264-270.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). [State and County QuickFacts: Alaska](#). Retrieved May 2013.

Weber, Bob. (2012). "Russia stuns Arctic Council by suspending aboriginal group from meetings" *The Globe and Mail*, Nov. 15, 2012.

Wessendorf, Kathrin (ed.). (2005). *An Indigenous Parliament? : Realities and Perspectives in Russia and the Circumpolar North*. Copenhagen: IWGIA Document.