Northern Dimensions, Policies, Strategies and Programmes as Means to Respond

Lassi Heininen

Chairman of the Steering Committee for the Northern Research Forum

I have tried to take literally the title of the Plenary "Societal impacts of flows of globalization and climate change in the North – the influences of Northern Dimensions, Policies, Strategies and Programmes", which represents and reflects two-three of the sub-themes of the 4th NRF Open Meeting, and start by some questions. These questions I found relevant when trying both to analyse key phenomena of the current world such as global problems, flows of globalization and climate change and resulting societal impacts, and to find proper and effective responses to them such as northern dimensions and policies or northern strategies, programmes and other practical tools and resulting influences.

It might be relevant to analyse these phenomena and to try to synthesise them, but before doing that, there are, however, some relevant questions to ask and points of view to discuss ,for example, what is really global and what is new?

Some Relevant Questions to Ask

First, climate change is a global phenomenon. It has been recognized as global, and it deals with world-wide North - South relations, and there is even a universal consciousness to recognize it and act against its impacts. At the beginning of the 21st century there are many phenomena and things that we interpret and claim to be global, but are in fact rather international than global. For example, according to a recent research study on the activities of the Fortune Global 500, covering 320 of the largest 500 multinational enterprises, only 10% are "truly global, with at least 20 percent of their sales in all three parts of the triad" and correspondingly, the vast majority are "home-triad based, with only modest sales in the other two regions" (Moore and Rugman 2005). Thus, unlike Nokia, which is global, most of the so-called global TNCs are actually international, Outokumpu Oy being one example.

Second, a relevant question to ask and think on is, what is really new in and about globalization?, and further, to distinguish between flows of globalization and global problems. The latter ones include for example, security problems such as nuclear arms race, poverty, scarcity of natural resources, pollution and climate change and refugees (e.g. Hakovirta 2005, 33-36). Correspondingly, flows of globalization include several categories of flows like for example, natural resources and raw materials, processed goods and finished products, pollutants and waste material, capital and investment, and human resources (see Lapland Meeting 2005).

Many of these are not new per se but have been there either for centuries such as results of colonialism, or for decades due to either internationalization for example, through mass-scale information technology, communication and cultural imperialism, or a growing global consciousness for example, against nuclear weapons. At the same time many of these are new and followed from the current globalized world economy or the post-Cold War political globalization. All this is a good reason both to argue that a history of globalization should be written and a more exact definition for globalization might be useful.

Northern regions of the globe might be interpreted as a special target and reference area for flows of globalization. In the colonial history North – South relations were relevant in Northern regions like for example, the discovery of a Northern sea route from Europe to China and India which brought Holland and England into Northern seas in the 16th and 17th centuries to harvest and fish, and explorations and utilization of natural resources by western European countries in the North.

Correspondingly, at the beginning of the 21st century flows of globalization in the North include an increased demand for transportation, heightened tourism, longrange air and sea pollution, militarization, an increased scientific research and activities, and presence of global and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The North is a periphery which is rich in natural resources as the Annual Gross Product of \$ 230 billion shows. This production is essentially based on the intensive exploitation of energy sources "to meet energy needs of developed countries and the centres of them" (Duhaime 2004). This means both concern for, and trouble with, scarcity of energy resources, i.e. energy security hegemony, and further, growing competition on energy such as in Central Asia

Partly followed from this, and partly due to other reasons, the circumpolar North is no more a traditional periphery but is of growing importance in world politics. Thus, the North is becoming more interesting for the rest of the world and human kind for example, in the following five ways: first, geopolitical perspective, i.e. large reserves of oil and natural gas and transportation of them (e.g. Gunnarsson 2005) and as a deployment area for the military such as the strategic submarines (SSBNs) and the National Missile Defence system; second, scientific perspective, i.e. the North as a former "laboratory" has become a global workshop for science in many fields; third, diversity of life including cultural diversity and the voices of Indigenous peoples; fourth, peaceful region as a model of "conflict prevention" to solve conflicts as they begin, or even before they have been created, like for example, the Nordic Peace as a real peace project (Archer 2003); and fifth, as an innovation centre (Heininen 2005; also the five points by President Grimsson in this volume).

Proper and Effective Responses?

Thinking about the current Northern dimensions, strategies and programmes and policies in and for the North, and other practical means they have many good elements and aspects, and also cover most of the relevant fields. Many of them are effective and flexible. They would not exist without political will and agreement. Some of them such as the Nordic Programme on the Arctic, the Northern Dimension of Canada's Foreign Policy and the European Union's Northern Dimension go across national borders, promote cooperation and formulate a common policy. Here my case study is the latter one which is in an interesting state due to the confirmation of the new Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document (2006).

Northern Dimension as a Policy

Since the end of the 2nd World War in spite of the arms race and political tension, and especially in the post-Cold War period, North Europe as well the circumpolar North in general has been mostly stable meaning reforms, democracy with devolution and political and legal innovations in governance and economies to meet the needs of the peoples without rupturing the larger political systems in the region. There is also a new kind of international and interregional cooperation both by governments and sub-national actors instead of conflicts between states and peoples, in spite of conflicts of interests on how to use land and waters. On the other hand, at the beginning of the 21st century there is both a more intensive utilization of energy resources and a significant growth of transportation; new kinds of challenges are mostly from outside the region such as longrange air and sea pollution, climate change and growing needs of fossil energy sources. All this is important for North Europe, and especially for the Nordic countries and Russia who have cooperated more closely in order to make relations stronger. As a result, North Europe is maybe not a unique region but in a dynamic transition with a special regional dynamic; this is also the main geopolitical context for the European Union's Northern Dimension (EU's ND).

Being geographically broad and flexible, the EU's ND crosses several international borders, and its formally stated intent is to address "the specific challenges of those regions and aims to increase cooperation between the EU member states... and Russia". The "areas for cooperation" under the EU's Northern Dimension have included, among others, the environment, nuclear safety, energy cooperation". From the EU's point of view it is a framework and process for continuous dialogue on cooperation between the EU and its neighbours in North Europe and for coordination, even management, of cross-border cooperation across the EU borders (The European Union 2003; also Henriksson in this volume). Further, the EU's Northern Dimension is a means both to increase stability and peace, also a response to the new comprehensive human security agenda (e.g. Hoogensen 2005) in ways which were mindful of the security and geopolitical realities of the Cold War period, and to promote cross-border cooperation when trying to decrease the importance of national borders in northern Europe.

In the EU-Russian relations the EU's Northern Dimension has played a constructive role as a practical political means for functional cooperation in many fields for example, in dealing with the environment it ensures, or should ensure that EU, or Nordic, environmental requirements are met and necessary actions taken to monitor relevant and acute environmental threats such as nuclear wastes and risks. Further, the definition of the four "Common Spaces" on economic cooperation, freedom and justice, external security, and research, education and culture between the European Union and the Russian Federation is another step toward the same direction. More is, however, needed when thinking for example, of challenges of flows of globalization and climate change, and the growing strategic importance of Northern energy resources. This is evident in a heightened interest towards building the capacity for cooperation in environmental issues between Russia and the EU and in "securing the border" while harmonizing legislation, standards and procedures in the interest of protecting and promoting civil society and environmental security. The latter is of a particular interest to the coastal countries of the Baltic Sea due to growing sea transportation of crude oil and the planned new oil pipelines from Russia to Germany on the bottom of the Baltic Sea, as well as to the Northern-most counties of Norway due to growing heavy oil and liquid gas transportation from the new Russian oil terminals in the Kola Peninsula to Central Europe and North America (e.g. Frantzen and Bambulyak, 2003; UPI News 2005; Ministry for Foreign Affairs 2006).

Another step was taken by the adaptation of a new policy framework document for the Northern Dimension, signed in November 2006, between the European Union, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation. According to this new document the ND will in the future be a common policy of these four political actors, or partners, on North Europe, and thus to mean the deepening of EU-Russian relations as well as cooperation between the Nordic countries and Northwest Russia.

Due to the fact that the EU's Northern Dimension has already played a constructive role in the EU-Russian relations, it would also be a useful political tool both for functional cooperation in many fields and in general for deeper trans-boundary cooperation in North Europe. The new Northern Dimension with substantial policy framework might be a much needed practical means to decrease tension and increase confidence in some EU-Russian borders. It also helps to promote mutual economic and political cooperation within the region and makes the borders within the region lower. It would bring Russia as an equal partner into European politics (in today's world of globalization) to give its contributions and participation in all fields of activities which is valuable in both European politics and Northern policies. Finally, the new ND might assist in transferring the borders between the EU and Russia into borderlands in the near future. Behind this is the geopolitical thinking that in North Europe both regionalism and regionbuilding has been accepted as an alternative approach to traditional geopolitics. This is relevant for North Europe, because not only the Nordic Region, but the whole North Europe has then the potential to become a "borderless political space".

Other Responses

All combined this is good or at least a good start. However, there might be a problem since on one hand, most of them are a bit too weak, or too late, and on the other hand, something might be lacking (e.g. Arctic Council 2006). This is due to first, political - either international or national - strategies and programmes, in general policies are compromises; second, in most of the cases they are not holistic enough; third, they do neither go nor are able to go beyond the above-mentioned faith of technology and that of a growth-oriented economy; fourth, they are so often based on norms and legislation, which are mostly national, and thus they are based on the unified-state system, i.e. the mainstream of international politics. After saying this, it is difficult to say anything positive.

After those, what I call, relevant questions the next step is to try to define what might be good ideas and elements for proper and even effective responses for challenges like for example, to mitigate impacts of climate change, and even more for proper procedures for further processes to promote the existing success stories (e.g. Young and Einarsson 2004) and create something new and hopefully better. Here I discuss several, both proposed and potential, responses such as an Arctic "risk" technology, an Arctic convention, governance, and a change of life / attitude; adaptation is, however, excluded but discussed in other articles (e.g. Flöjt, Lajunen and Pearce in this volume). After, that I will discuss Northern dimensions, strategies and programmes, and policies in and for the North.

An Arctic "risk" technology" does not really exist yet, but it is a typical Western response, even an ideology, which is according to western knowledge and science and modern technology (e.g. Brainstorming meeting 2005). Behind is faith toward technical solutions and faith of market economy, or capitalism, saying that economy should always grow which correspondingly is based on the growth-oriented economy and more generally modernization based on the Enlightenment (e.g. Heininen 2006). For example, there is a belief that most of the problems of developing countries can be solved by Western economic growth, not necessarily democracy and civil society, which have been mentioned as preconditions for sustainable development. Correspondingly, an economic growth has been seen as a precondition for solving environmental problems, and further, climate change is seen to be solved by more advanced technology, and thus there is no need for changes in the current polluting politics. There is also a fundamental question on how to find a common language between experts on technology and its users in society.

All in all, this kind of discourse is very much behind the main theme of "Tech-knowledgy in Economies and Cultures" as both a reason and means to search for an alternative way, and to have a more holistic picture including understanding, which does not necessarily mean a solution but might open some new aspects (also Hietala, Lajunen and Heininen in this volume).

An Arctic Convention, or other international political and legal instruments, for Northern, arctic regions is mentioned as a proper and needed political response. This kind of international regime for the Arctic has recently been much discussed (e.g. Loukacheva in this volume) and also supported by scholars and policymakers, especially the Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (e.g. Report 2004; Conference Statement 2004). This political response is based on international negotiations and international law, and behind there is a belief in legislation based on the aims of the moral and legal school of Idealism like for example, those by Hugo Grothius. Correspondingly "Governance" is a social response based on one hand, on democracy and devolution of power, which has been a strengthening political tendency in many parts of the North and one of the basic themes of the legal systems of the Arctic states within the last decades (Bankes 2004, esp. 114-116). On the other hand, it is based on traditional and local ecological knowledge (TEK) as a new governance system for northern resources (e.g. Caulfield 2004), and a hope of some sort of global governance.

Further, there are activities and protests by non-governmental organisations and civil movements (NGOs) representing civil societies, or at least parts of them. Even without collective activities a "change of life" is a real response by individuals, because it is based on values. In other words, you change your consumption, and the habits of your consumption. Correspondingly, this has its influences in business, especially in the case of companies, which not only use natural and human resources and expertise for the making of (more) profit, but also have societal responses on human beings, local communities and the environment, which actually mean a good image and new brand among consumers. Thus, a change of life by each consumer in a society might influence a big change in business and social life and mean a "change of attitude". It is a more philosophical response based on a deeper understanding of the dynamics of a human society with a respect for nature and a simple principle of solidarity.

There are different kinds of responses, some are weaker and some are stronger. For example, it might be too risky to trust too much in technology and wait for a better one to solve problems of pollution and climate change. Correspondingly, faith in technology as well that of a growth-oriented economy might sound modern, but is too naive. An Arctic Convention or other international regime "to address the sensitive issues of the future" (Report 2004) earns all the support but has, however, its weaknesses. For example, it is very difficult to have a legally-binding agreement on the most relevant activities in Northern regions like the utilization of natural resources which is very much based on economic interests. Generally speaking it is in principle not so credible to believe that legislation will make the world better (e.g. Kanniainen 2006, 17), and correspondingly, "governance" alone can hardly give a real recipe or formula for success, and finally, "ecology as a new discipline for disciplining" is neither fair nor a proper social way (Haila & Heininen 1995).

Though neither positive nor a deadlock, it is, however, too simple to be pessimistic and draw a dark picture of the future. No, neither is there a need to be dramatic and predict the end of civilization, nor be naive and believe in nice dreams of the future like having a glass of wine and listening to classical music on the deck of a sinking ship, which is, however, not Titanic but called the Earth like Matti Wuori (1995) wrote some ten years ago. There are good reasons to be optimistic but well informed, be knowledgeable and conscious (not necessarily idealistic), take care and be social and tolerant, and have solidarity in order to understand new, even strange, and complex and multi-functional things and phenomena. And further, to be active, goal-oriented and tough if needed, and know what is needed to do, at least what first steps are needed, and finally understand that nothing is determined in a life.

Finally, What Else Might be Needed?

What is left is a holistic point of view with both an understanding of development and solidarity as an equal way. For example, preconditions for sustainable development can be interpreted to include political will, i.e. democracy and devolution, finance, governance and legally binding legislation both internationally and domestically, human security, culture, and civil society and civic security (Heininen 2006; Dwivedi, Kyba, Stoett and Tiessen 2001; Heininen, Jalonen and Käkönen 1995, 141-158).

At the beginning of the 21st century it is needed to work hard to re-think of, and re-learn from, traditional ways to do politics in order to find an alternative way out from a barbarian world of armed conflicts and wars, poverty and environmental degradation. There are, and always have been, crimes against human beings. There is always an alternative way to think; it needs only be discovered and redefined, and there are some preconditions for that. First, what is needed is an atmosphere of peace and willingness toward cooperation across national and other borders, which does not necessarily mean total harmony, but agreement based on dialogue and debate. In this thinking peace is sexy and cooperation is cool, and a conflict / war is dangerous and costly destroying not only property but also trust between peoples (e.g. Cooper 2004). To say this out loud and act for peace and cooperation both requires and indicates real leadership, and correspondingly, an implementation of these ultimate aims needs highly qualified knowledge and expertise, as well as a tolerant and open-minded attitude.

Fortunately, in the current politics of the North there is no need for "conflict prevention", neither long-term building of sustainable societies / peace-building exercises nor short-term conflict prevention (Gaiffe 2004). There is room for a deeper and equal cooperation based on the region and regional actors, and even more proper experiences and experienced political means for a search of peace and cooperation such as in the abovementioned Nordic Peace and the Barents Euro-Arctic Region as a post-Cold war peace project to decrease tension and increase stability (e.g. Heininen, forth-coming). They can be viewed as opportunities for learning, not necessarily something to copy per se but to apply and use as an example, or model, of good practises.

Second, what is needed is to have on one hand, the interplay between science and politics, and on the other, general dialogue both between peoples, societies and cultures in the world, and between different stakeholders across sectoral borders in a society. Further, more and new global and regional stages and platforms are needed as discussion spaces for more and deeper open discussions and innovative dialogues (e.g. Newsweek, July 30, 2001; Heininen 2005b; Korhonen 2006, 61-66). Here a dialogue is seen as strengthening, almost as a necessity, prior to decision-making (also Heininen in this volume). A dialogue does not, however, stand alone but comes jointly with decisions, which are followed by deeds and action. This does not mean a dominance of meritocracy instead of democracy but to draw up a comprehensive picture, and analyse it, and finally synthesize and draw up a holistic picture. After these steps there is an increased readiness to face real challenges of a human kind.

Finally, as an example of both the interplay between science and politics and how to cross sectoral borders, and as a real added value, what the new ND policy framework could bring into these relations and common European activities, is to create a new kind of a cross-cutting theme. The theme would consist of the fields of research & development & technology & economics with an aim to develop environmentally friendly and secure energy production, technology and distribution. This would easily become an important, even attractive, common issue on one hand, for bilateral inter-relations between the EU and Russia, and between a Nordic country and Russia, and on the other hand, even more natural for multilateral cooperation either between the Nordic countries and Russia or among the Arctic states.

References

Archer, Clive (2003). "Introduction". In: *The Nordic Peace*. Eds. by C. Archer and P. Joenniemi. ASHGATE, Great Britain, 2003, 1-23.

Arctic Council (2006). *Salekhard Declaration*. On the occasion of the tenth Anniversary of the Arctic Council by the Fifth AC Ministerial Meeting, the 26th of October, 2006, Salekhard, Russia. (mimeo)

Bankes, Nigel (2004). "Legal Systems" In: *AHDR (Arctic Human Development Report)* 2004. Akureyri: Stefansson Arctic Institute, Reykjavik, Iceland, 101-118.

Brainstorming meeting (2005). Brainstorming meeting by Tarja Cronberg, Pauli Jumppanen, Markku Kivinen (host), Kari Laine, Sauli Rouhinen and Lassi Heininen (chair) on potential themes for the 4th NRF Open Meeting at Aleksanteri Institute, Helsinki in October 4th of 2005. (mimeo)

Caulfield, Richard A. (2004). "Resource Governance". In: *AHDR (Arctic Human Development Report)* 2004. Akureyri: Stefansson Arctic Institute, Reykjavik, Iceland, 121-138.

Conference Statement (2004). The Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in Nuuk, Greenland in September 2004. (mimeo)

Cooper, Robert (2004). "Notes on Conflict Prevention". In: *Developing a Culture of Conflict Prevention. Anna Lindh Programme on Conflict Prevention. 2004 Edition*. Ed. by Anders Mellbourn. Madariaga European Foundation. The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation. GIDLUNDS. Södertälje, 47-52. Duhaime, Gerard (2004). "Economic Systems". *In: AHDR* (*Arctic Human Development Report*) 2004. Akureyri: Stefansson Arctic Institute, Reykjavik, Iceland. p. 69-84.

Dwivedi, O.P. et. Al. (2001). Sustainable Development and Canada – National & International Perspectives. Peterborough: Broadview Press, Canada.

The European Union (2003). *The Second Northern Dimension Action Plan (2004-2006)*. http://europa.eu.int/external_relations/north_dim/ndap/ap2.htm (12/11/2003).

Frantzen, Björn and Bambulyak, Alexei (2003). *Oil Transport from the Russian part of the Barents Region on July 1, 2003.* Barentssekretariat. Svanhovd miljösenter. http://www.svanhovd.no/nhetsarkiv/OilTransport.Eng. PDF

Gaiffe, Marie-Ange (2004). "Towards a Stronger Role for Europe as an International Actor". In: *Developing a Culture of Conflict Prevention. Anna Lindh Programme on Conflict Prevention.* 2004 Edition. Ed. by Anders Mellbourn. Madariaga European Foundation. The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation. GIDLUNDS. Södertälje, 16-22.

Gunnarsson, Björn (2005). "Geopolitics of the Northern Sea Route". A presentation at the 3rd International conference, *Dynamics of Socio-economic Processes in Northern Regions*, April 7-9, 2005 in Apatity, Russia. (mimeo)

Haila, Yrjö and Heininen, Lassi (1995). "Ecology: A New Discipline for Disciplining?". In: *Social Text* 42 - Spring 1995. Duke University Press, 153-171.

Hakovirta, Harto (2005). "Muutama suositus ihmiskunnan uudelleenkoulutukseen. Globaaliongelmat ja niiden hallinta". In: *Kosmopolis* – Vol. 35: 4/2005, 30-45.

Heininen, Lassi (forth-coming). "Barents Sea energy resources and regional cooperation: progress achieved, challenges to overcome". In: *Energy & Dispute Management in the Barents Region. Anna Lindh Programme on Conflict Prevention.* 2006 Edition. Madariaga European Foundation. GIDLUNDS.

Heininen, Lassi (2006). "Politics or Economics defining Sustainable Development; what is the importance of Democracy (incl. dialogue-building) when trying to implement the ultimate goal?" In: *Resources and Sustainable Development*. KINR1314 / KAES1402 Workshop, April 5-7, 2006. University of Lapland / Lapin yliopisto, 6.

Heininen, Lassi (2005a). "Impacts of Globalization, and the Circumpolar North in World Politics". In: *Polar*

Geography Vol. 29, 2005, No. 2 (April-June): 91-102. Issue: Challenges of Globalization for the North. Heather Nicol and Lassi Heininen (eds).

Heininen, Lassi (2005b). "Importance of Interplay between Science and Politics when Building New Stages". In: *Negotiating Futures – States, Societies and the World. Proceedings of the International Conference, Riga, November 11-14, 2004.* Edited by Eda Ansone and Ieva Zarane. Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Latvia, Advanced Institute of Social and Political Resarch and Strategic Analysis Commission. Riga, 2005, p. 15-24.

Heininen, Lassi, Jalonen, Olli-Pekka and Käkönen, Jyrki (1995). "Expanding the Northern Dimension. The final report of the International Arctic Project of TAPRI". Written together. *Tampere Peace Research Institute. Research Report No. 61.* University of Tampere, Jäljennepalvelu.

Hoogensen, Gunhild (2005). "Human Security in the Arctic". Presentation to *ICARP II*, Copenhagen, DK, 11. November 2005. (mimeo)

Kanniainen, Vesa 2006. Moraali ja markkinat. Tieteessä tapahtuu 3 - 2006, 15-17.

Lapland Meeting (2005). "Flows in globalisation: Opportunity and Understanding flows: Different impacts on the European societies". Rovaniemi, Finland, August 22-25, 2005. (Notes).

Ministry for Foreign Affairs (2006). "North meets North. Navigation and the Future of the Arctic". Report of a working group of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Iceland.

Moore, Karl and Rugman, Alan (2005). "Globalization is about Regionalization". In: *McGill International Review, Fall 2005, Vol. VI, No. 1, p. 27-30.*

Newsweek (2001). "The World needs a bigger forum". July 30, 2001.

Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document (2006). Adopted in November 24th, 2006. (mimeo)

Report (2004). "Northern Dimensions – Expanding Circumpolar Cooperation". Symposium in Brussels on June 3-4, 2004. (mimeo and www.nrf.is)

UPI News (2005). "Analysis: Oil Rich Norway's Troubles" by Roland Flamini.

Wuori, Matti (1995). Faustin uni. WSOY, Helsinki.

Young, Oran R. and Einarsson, Niels (2004). "A Human Development Agenda for the Arctic: Major Findings and Emerging Issues". In: *AHDR (Arctic Human Development Report) 2004*. Akureyri: Stefansson Arctic Institute, Reykjavik, Iceland, p. 229-242.