



8TH NRF OPEN ASSEMBLY

THE TRANS ARCTIC AGENDA

ENGAGING
CULTURAL HERITAGE
WHEN BUILDING
RESILIENCE

SUMMARY REPORT

An international academic seminar in Reykjavik, 14-15 October 2015



THE TRANS-ARCTIC AGENDA & 8TH NRF OPEN ASSEMBLY 2015:
ENGAGING CULTURAL HERITAGE WHEN BUILDING RESILIENCE

An international academic seminar in Reykjavik, 14-15 October 2015

Organized by the Centre for Arctic Policy Studies (CAPS), University of Iceland
in cooperation with the Northern Research Forum (NRF).



INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL
AFFAIRS
CENTRE FOR ARCTIC
POLICY STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF ICELAND



Northern Research Forum

Introduction

The third annual Trans Arctic Agenda seminar focused on how the Arctic communities can engage their cultural heritage when building resilience. This year the Trans Arctic Agenda merged with the Northern Research Forum's 8th open assembly. As in 2014 the seminar created a link into the Arctic Circle that took place in Reykjavík 15-18 October.

The seminar consisted of three plenary sessions according to the following themes:

- Cultural heritage and human resources as part of 'industrial civilization' - case studies of para-diplomacy and Indigenous / local knowledge;
- Representation of Arctic stakeholders and their internal communication;
- The interplay between science diplomacy, material and immaterial values: How can the Arctic be a space / model for peace, sustainability and innovation?

The seminar focused on the rapid changes that increased international attention and climate change, amongst other external factors, bring to the circumstances and livelihoods of the people of the circumpolar Arctic region. It built on the need to redefine cultural heritage, including Indigenous / local (environmental) knowledge, and 'paradiplomacy', as part of 'industrial civilization', given its importance in relations to fossil fuel-based development, such as offshore-drilling and the shaping of the future of the circumpolar North. By focusing on resilience, rather than sustainable development, an emphasis was put on the capability of institutions to learn and fix problems by themselves as they emerge.

The consequences of regional and global processes happening in the Arctic directly affect a multitude of actors, including important non-state local and regional ones, such as the scientific community. On every level of Arctic development, one can hear the voices of these actors, but are they given enough attention by policy-makers and researchers? How are the voices of different communities being heard, or not heard, in public and political discussions? It is also important to consider the role of different stakeholders, such as scholars and scientists, their participation in shaping Arctic futures and how, in turn, it influences other actors in the region.

The seminar shed light on the importance of maintaining and further developing the interplay between science and politics, between scientific knowledge and Indigenous / local knowledge, as well as between material and immaterial things and values, as it supports and promotes high political stability in the Arctic. Faced with grand challenges and unforeseen problems, the value and validity of an open trans-disciplinary and inter-sectoral dialogue, where participants focus on issues and engage each other, is more important than ever.

Opening session

The seminar began with an opening session where Jón Atli Benediktsson, Rector of the University of Iceland, welcomed everyone on behalf of the University of Iceland and



the Centre for Arctic Policy Studies (CAPS). He discussed the changes brought to the circumpolar region by climate change and increased international involvement, and the strains that these changes put on the small societies in the north. The small nations often rely on natural resources and traditional livelihoods. Due to that reason their inhabitants will be affected by the developments within the region, both manmade and those brought by the forces of nature. He welcomed Árni Þór Sigurðsson, Ambassador and Senior Arctic Official of Iceland, to the podium for his opening remarks.

Sigurðsson used the opportunity to stress the importance of cooperation when addressing the changes faced by the societies of the circumpolar region. He further reiterated the contribution of the academia, which according to him cannot be underestimated since science and knowledge is fundamental to policy and decision-making. He pleaded for an increased awareness, understanding and knowledge of the Arctic and its global impact, so that policy-makers, scientists, the media, and the society at large can become more mindful of their responsibility towards future generations.

Sigurðsson described the Arctic as a region defined by its natural environment, its resources and its inhabitants. He discussed the substantially increased significance of the Arctic on the international stage in recent years, which he linked to the effects of climate change and the subsequent debate on the utilisation of natural resources, territorial claims, social changes and new shipping routes. While the causes of climate change are global, the effects are most rapid and visible in the Arctic. These changes are occurring at an even faster pace than anticipated: they are multifaceted and affect our societies in various ways – economically, socially, culturally, environmentally, and in terms of security. This, according to Sigurðsson, made it highly appropriate to focus on cultural heritage when building resilience.

Referring to Iceland and the role of the eight Arctic States, Sigurðsson emphasized the common responsibility of the Arctic States and a mutual interest in the protection and sustainability of the Arctic. He stated that as an Arctic Coastal State and a founding



member of the Arctic Council, Iceland has great interests at stake in the Arctic, shaped strongly by its geographical position and the importance of access to natural resources and their sustainability. This further underlined Iceland's commitment to the Arctic as a region of peace, stability and cooperation. He then discussed Iceland's Arctic policy, which encompasses twelve wide-ranging principles, and specifically underlines promoting education about the Arctic as well as research on the region in the broadest possible sense. An important part of Iceland's Arctic policy is the human dimension and making sure that the people of the Arctic and their societies benefit and develop in a sustainable way. Sigurðsson stressed the importance of ensuring that the work of the scientific community feeds into public debate, whereas public policy is supported by a strong knowledge base. Improved understanding of the circumstances helps governments identify problems and strengthens their ability to implement solutions aimed at supporting strong and sustainable communities in the Arctic.

Sigurðsson further discussed the growth within the Icelandic academia in research engaged in the Arctic, which this seminar bares witness to – a development that he considered very much welcomed. He stated that responsible policy should be based on the best available information in order to better understand and predict the on-going changes and meet new challenges and opportunities in the most expedient, effective and economic way. He stressed the importance of international cooperation between scientists in fostering trust among various stakeholders and mutual understanding of the region's fragile environment and Arctic communities, and how to respond to changing environmental and social conditions in the region.

At last Sigurðsson emphasized the necessity of ensuring that indigenous and local communities are able to maintain and cultivate their cultural uniqueness, strengthen the infrastructure of their own communities, and work towards improving their living standards. He concluded by welcoming the topic of the Trans Arctic Agenda & 8th NRF Open Assembly 2015 and paying tribute to the extensive work carried out by the scientific communities, in Iceland and elsewhere, on the fascinating and somewhat mysterious Arctic.

Lassi Heininen, Chairman of the Northern Research Forum (NRF) and professor of Arctic Politics, University of Lapland in Finland welcomed everyone on behalf of the Northern Research Forum. In his opening remarks he emphasized stability and cooperation in the Arctic, as well as the importance of immaterial values, human capital and the interplay between science and politics for the future of the region and its people. Heininen discussed the resilience of the man-made Arctic stability, its value for the Arctic states and the shift from military confrontation to growing international cooperation in the post-Cold war era. Heininen then discussed the creativity of the region, which he said relied on the power of immaterial values and human capital - such as engaging cultural heritage - and the cumulative, 'soft' methods in politics and governance. He further discussed its manifold representations and results, such as a new kind of environmental governance, depicted in the Polar Bear Agreement, the self-determination and self-governing, found in the Home Rule Government of Greenland, and the UArctic, a 'university-without-walls' for higher education in the Arctic, to name but a few.

Heininen stated that the solid foundation for international cooperation relied on the high stability of the region. He considered the Arctic states and nations, including the Russian Federation and the USA, unlikely to open a new front in the Arctic, and international cooperation in science and research to be stronger than ever. However, he also stressed the challenges and uncertainty faced by the Arctic region, which he thought to be the first real test of the stability in the region and an indicator of how the Arctic will fare in the face of the real challenges of the 21st century: e.g. global environmental problems and new geopolitical disorder.

Heininen also talked about the impact of others in the Arctic and the global effect of developments within the region. The future of the region does no longer lie solely in the hands of the Arctic actors, and what happens in the Arctic has significant implications worldwide. This makes the future developments of the Arctic region, with its rich biodiversity and diverse culture, crucial is for its nations, as well as for all humankind. Innovation and resilience plays a big role there, as well as commitment to the well-being of the inhabitants of the Arctic, the protection of its environment and sustainability.

Heininen discussed the objective of the Northern Research Forum (NRF)¹ and introduced the Global Arctic project www.globalarctic.org and its relevance to the themes up for discussion. Heininen concluded by saying that the Arctic region, not overtly plagued by conflicts, can be seen as an exception in international politics. It might, as well as Iran after the nuclear deal, become a new metaphor for 'Exceptionalism' and be used as an example on how to shape alternative premises of security and politics. There is neither reason nor right to underestimate the value of human capital, including cultural heritage, representation of several actors as subjects (e.g., participatory approach, paradiplomacy),

1 Provide an international, interdisciplinary platform for, and to promote an intensive dialogue among members of the research community and a wide range of other stakeholders; to facilitate research on issues relevant to the contemporary Northern agenda with global significance; and to engage researchers, the policy community and other stakeholders to discuss, assess and report on research results and applications.

and an open discussion to implement the interplay between science and politics. Much opposite, it is important, even critical, to maintain and further develop both the interplay between science and politics, and that between scientific knowledge and traditional/local knowledge, as well as trans-disciplinarity. Over the next two days the Trans-Arctic Agenda and NRF Open Assembly come together and offer a joint platform for open discussion on relevant Arctic and global issues. Among the tasks of the academic community is to share experiences and explore new methods. By creating new links and cooperating better scientific results can be expected as well as increased credibility.

The Centre for Arctic Policy studies and the Northern Research Forum wishes to thank the Letterstedska fund, the Arctic Studies fund, the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC), the University of Akureyri, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Delegation of the European Union to Iceland for their support. The centre also expresses gratitude to the young researchers contributing to this summary report, they are: Andrian Vlachov, Jennifer Spence, Kjersti Irina Rosanoff Aronsen, Laura Olsén, Marion Ravna, Muhammad Ardhi, Nikolas Sellheim, Oda Nyborg. Special thanks to Adjunct Professor Alyson Bailes for consultation.

First Plenary: Cultural heritage and human resources as part of 'industrial civilization' - case studies of para-diplomacy and Indigenous / local knowledge

In the first session, chaired by Þorsteinn Gunnarsson, six presentations were heard.

The Thule-Base - The struggle over its existence?

The first presentation by Maria Ackrén focused on the Thule Air Base, particularly on its potential economic and political role for Greenland. Maria gave a historical overview of defence cooperation between Denmark/Greenland and the United States.

On 9 April 1945 Denmark and the United States made a defense agreement, allowing the US to establish bases in Greenland. The agreement was extended in 1951, and the Thule Air Base was built. The local population, having lived there for centuries, was forced to move 150 km further north, to Qaanaaq, in 1953. This case was brought up in the Danish court system, and some families were compensated.

The functions of the base were strategic during World War II as Greenland was used for transferring aircrafts to Britain, and to defend the trans-Atlantic sea lanes. The base remained strategic during the Cold War when it was used as an immediate take-off and recovery base. It also has a history of failed missions, such as an B52 aircraft carrying four hydrogen bombs crashing near the base in 1968 - an event considered a scandal for Denmark. A particular note was made of another unsuccessful project known by the name 'Project Iceworm' where the US wanted to test the feasibility of a nuclear missile site under



the ice. The project proved to be unsuccessful, spoiled by changing ice conditions.

Today the Air Base is used for allied surveillance of the northern polar regions by a team of 400 Danes, 50 Greenlanders, 3 Canadians, 140 US military and support staff. The base has also been put to use by NATO and is furthermore used for research purposes. However, recently there have been debates about financial and legal issues concerning the base. An example of that concerns the competition between contractors, Greenland Contractors vs. Exelis Services A/S (US cover company). This competition has both financial and legal implications (should contractors be Danish or Greenlandic). The stakes are rather high as the contract is worth 2,4 billion DKK. The issue has been appealed in the US court system.

The main points raised by Ackrén are that the impacts of forced relocation of Greenlanders during the construction of the Air Base were drastic: people lost their hunting and fishing grounds and had to completely adapt to a new environment and that the Thule base plays a bigger role in economic debates than in sovereignty debates.

Change and continuity: Tourism framework transitions in the Russian Svalbard settlements

The second presentation by Andrian Vlahov dealt with tourism in Svalbard and different strategies taken by Russia and Norway to deal with the unprofitability of mining. A special focus was on the role of tourism, having the potential to be both a blessing and a curse for the socio-ecological constructs on Svalbard. In his presentation Vlahov used Barentsburg as an example, a Russian mining town with a little under 500 inhabitants located several miles from Norwegian settlements.

The coal industry in Barentsburg went through crises in the 1990s. Norway and Russia approached the difficulties in different ways. While the Russian approach was to linger on state funding to keep the unprofitable mines, the Norwegian approach was to increase profit by enhancing research and developing tourism. In the late 2010s tourism was developing and reached a new era after 2014 through market economy, modernization and building of



a new Arctic identity to replace the Soviet identity and communism. Vlahov concluded by stating that the community in question was unique in many ways, remote and structurally different from other Russian settlements. He also claimed that when comparing the two different approaches it should be noted that Russia has tried to sit in two chairs at once, still eager to extract coals but at the same time seeking new opportunities. Norway, on the other hand, is gradually abandoning the coalmines.

When asked about the degree of cooperation between Russia and Norway in Svalbard to overcome the difficulties in the mining sector, Vlahov responded that cooperation is the key, but that it had been negatively affected by the the difficult political situation and the bad images produced of both countries in the respective national media. With regard to the so-called 'backlash tourism,'- meaning tourism becoming a driving force for the economy, for instance in Longyearbyen where tourism-related issues constitute already a third of the work force - similar developments seem to be accuring in the tourism in Barentsburg.

Conflicting cultural representation of the Arctic

In the third presentation Kristinn Schram discussed different narratives on the coast, being a provider of building material in the form of driftwood, as well as a sphere of mystery and even fear, unravelling different gender perspectives.

In his presentation Schram explained the importance of driftwood as a basic wooden structure for turf houses, and the complicated sense of ownership over driftwood and driftwood beaches. Many driftwood beaches belonged to the king and the church, giving a way to harsh narrative over theft of driftwood. In folklore, stories can be found on how men and women were created by driftwood - the currents were the language of gods. It must also be borne in mind that the same beaches that gave driftwood also collected human deaths. This became apparent during World War II when the corps of German soldiers washed ashore along with food, material and equipments. When the Germans tried to claim the corps the Icelandic lords insisted that everything that washed ashore belonged to them so the Germans had to pay for the corpses. Schram concluded that "whatever washes ashore

has local and global significance in representation of the north and its people.”

Lively debates followed Schram's presentation. Among the topics that came up was the role of whales. Whaling is closely related to the Icelandic shore and constitutes an internationalisation of Iceland, e.g. through the establishment of illegal whaling stations on the Icelandic shore, drastically impacting the cultural environment. Also, that the current debate links international discourse with local culture. Schram mentioned different strategies by e.g. Greenpeace, campaigning to warn Icelanders that if they continued whaling tourists would be driven away. Now whale meat is being presented to tourists as representing Icelandic heritage and tradition. Conservation groups thus attempt to make tourists stop eating whale so Icelanders stop hunting them.

Sámi people in decision-making - Analyzing Sámi people's possibilities to participate and influence on decision-making processes in Finland, Sweden and Norway

Laura Olsén showed how the Sámi in the Nordic countries struggle with different security threats. Olsén pointed out that generally the situation in the Sámi homeland is good, but that in situ research unveils difficulties in implementing Sámi rights, as exploitation of natural resources in the Sámi homeland increases.

Olsén started by explaining that the Sámi people, with a population of 75.000-100.000, are the only officially recognized indigenous peoples group in the European Union. The Sámi groups differ in some ways, as the nine different Sámi languages bear clear witness to. None the less they share important common features such as the Sámi parliaments, self identification and language basis. Currently there are conflicts between the states and Sámi communities and Olsén hopes that her research helps build basis for an open discussion between the states and the Sámi people.

According to Olsén, conflicts have heated up lately: The Sámi parliament put great effort into developing the act on the Sámi parliament, 2nd subsection about how to define who is Sámi, only to have the act rejected by the Finnish parliament. For the Sami people a meaningful participation in the decision making in the communities is seen as a crucial condition for human dignity. At the same time the Sámi council is a permanent participant in the Arctic Council and can thereby affect its decision making. Olsén concluded by stating that in theory, the position of the Sámi people is good but the same did not apply in practice, which causes tensions. During the discussions following the lecture Olsén clarified that it is rather political than legal avenues that Sámi pursue in order to impact and change current legislation.

Indigenous lives and natural resources in the 21st century: A view from Alaska

The second part of the first plenary was opened by Tok Thompson who presented the importance of salmon for Alaska Natives. His presentation was based partly on the research of Alan Boras. Thompson started out by explaining that Alaska is the US's only claim to the

Arctic, but is located far away from the contiguous states. Alaska also has a big population of indigenous peoples, with most of Alaskans predominantly indigenous. Thompson traced the story of the Alaskan Natives from the Russian Colonial power, through when Alaska was sold to the US in 1867, the gold rush, post World War II settlements and the oil boom of the 1970s. The oil boom brought about big changes, new people with money, infrastructure, religion and culture. Coal, copper and oil changed the local communities and state politics were changed by the extractive industries. Although there were different native groups with different cultures and languages they were all dependent on natural resources, hunting, fishing and gathering and salmon played an important role there. Even though the salmon is a part of the ecosystem and thus should be continually renewable it is disappearing, due to devastating effects of capitalism. This poses risk for the so-called salmon cultures that depend on the salmon for food and income. The salmon allows the Native Alaskans to thrive in their communities. This recent threat to the salmon population has posed a great risk of cultural fights between groups with different goals. Thompson thus demonstrated that salmon constitutes a lifeline for the Natives in Alaska, and with the numerous threats putting the sustainability of the salmon at risk, the sustainability of Alaskan Native cultures was put in great danger as well. Thompson concluded by making the point that humans must seek wisdom from the cultures that have survived, learn from them.

During the discussions Thompson talked about the inherently unjust playing field explained by the power of the different stakeholders and litigants. Thompson furthermore made the point that although there is a divide between Alaskan Natives as to the benefits of the industry, in general there is a consensus amongst all Natives that their cultures are more likely to sustain for another 1,000 years than the capitalist model. No corporation would plan ahead for a 1,000 years.

Re-scaling sovereignty and development in the Canadian North

The final presentation was given by Heather Nicol who discussed the politicisation of sustainable development and how far sovereignty issues and economic development may contradict each other. She pointed out how governmental control in essence decreases by strengthening neoliberal forces and weakening co-management bodies. Nicol claimed that sovereignty had been scaled up and has become the biggest discourse, from the perspective of neo-realism, making the Arctic a testing ground for national sovereignty and military training. Nicol saw this as a problematic development, contested by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK - Inuit United with Canada) and the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC). She pointed out that Canada's northern mining industry experienced a fall in GDP in 2009 and the Canadian government believed it happened because of too many regulations, influence of the indigenous peoples, environmental issues and so on. Furthermore, the government claimed that a part of the solution would be to limit the representation of the indigenous peoples in the decision making procedures.



During the discussions Nicol exposed the flawed logic of the conservative's decision making in the Arctic as it is creating conditions of loss of control by creating a corporate landscape. She in return asked: How can they get control back if they're creating conditions for even greater lack of control? She concluded on a more positive note stating that if the conservative government does continue, the continuance of a broken system will be seen, but with a new government the debate on the sustainable development would in all likelihood increase.

Second Plenary: Representation of Arctic stakeholders and their internal communication

The Second Plenary session was chaired by Alyson Bailes and concentrated on non-state actors in the Arctic, which are extremely important to take into consideration while formulating the politics of the region.

Arctic voices: The relevance of local stories for a global problem

Auður H Ingólfssdóttir was first to give her presentation which concentrated on her ongoing research. With her research Ingólfssdóttir wants to stress the link between global issues and local consequences. She aims to bring a bottom-up feminist approach to the discussions concerning climate change. She claimed that current dominant political discussions dealing with climate change concentrate on technical information and are often based on so called "masculine" and hard values.

Climate change is often raised as a security threat at the global level, but according to Ingólfssdóttir this is not always the case at the local level. She referred to her field-work in Iceland which shows that hardly any of the interviewed locals mentioned climate change as a threat. Instead more concrete issues were raised among her informants. To conclude Ingólfssdóttir emphasized that if this bottom-up approach was taken into consideration, it would definitely



change dominant narratives in discussions dealing with climate change issues.

The mandate of Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN)

The second speaker of the session was Sigurjón Hafsteinsson. His presentation dealt with indigenous people's television network in Canada. Hafsteinsson sees media and television as a good channel to bring up local voices. He claimed that nowadays the role of NGO's and non-state actors is increasing and their activities affect the global governance as well as national level governance for example, in this case, by forcing to take indigenous people into consideration.

In his presentation Hafsteinsson introduced an Aboriginal people's television network (APTN), which could be a great channel to enhance democracy, but the framework for its actions is defined by the national television network CRTC. This in turn has negative effects on APTN's possibilities to have the impacts that it could have in keeping aboriginal culture alive.

The recognition of Arctic communities in the EU seal regime

The third presentation was given by Nikolas Sellheim where he spoke about the EU's seal regime, referring to EU's regulation that bans trade in all seal products and to its implementation, adopted in 2009. He concentrated on the on the local Arctic Communities. In his presentation Sellheim discussed the negative impacts of this regime on local traditional livelihoods for both indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. In many cases it seems that the importance of animal welfare overcomes the wellbeing of human beings. While formulating this regime it was not fully understood what it would mean in practice for the local's livelihoods - in this case study for people in Newfoundland. However, according to Sellheim indigenous people's seal hunt is not seen as bad as non-indigenous people's commercial seal hunting, but by reducing the trade with non-indigenous people, EU indirectly hinders the position of indigenous seal hunters.

The second part of the session continued the animated discussion of various encounters found in the Arctic, both on global and local levels. The overarching theme of the session was the importance of the different voices in the Arctic and beyond its boundaries. The session had three presentations, delivered by Dearbhla Doyle, Marc Lanteigne and Malgorzata Smieszek.

Presentation on the EU Arctic policy

The first presentation of the session, by Dearbhla Doyle, EEAS Arctic Representative, contained a description of the official framework of the European Union policies in the Arctic. The EU has three policy areas in the Arctic focusing on knowledge, responsibility and engagement. The EU considers itself to be a global actor. Three EU states are members of the Arctic Council, two more Arctic Council members are partners with the EU through EEA, not to forget the strategic partnership the European Union has with Canada and the United States. In her presentation Doyle gave an overview of the steps already taken by the EU in various areas and a thorough description of programs undertaken and opportunities offered by the EU. Doyle stressed the importance of the EU's focus on the challenges that the Arctic is facing, emphasizing climate change, environmental pollution and resource extraction. Furthermore, the EU has much at stake in the Arctic. It is responsible for a great deal of carbon emissions and has interests in fishing and other resources in the Arctic. In turn many of the EU's policies affect the Arctic.

According to Doyle the EU clearly aims to be coherent in its strategies, trying to conform the Union's common policies in other areas and regions, focusing on the sustainable development of the Arctic. Another point raised in Dearbhla's presentation is that a clear Arctic strategy is to be developed, and it's highly important that multiple actors have their voices heard, at least presumably, when developing this strategy (including NGOs, indigenous groups and local communities). The general framework for the EU Arctic policy was coined by Doyle as "evolution, not revolution", with notable emphasis on research, innovation and international cooperation.

During the discussions Doyle emphasized that the European Union plans to take all the possible actors into account, listening to their concerns and taking their interests into account, especially the local and indigenous communities.

Defining China as a 'Near Arctic State': Exercises in identity-building

The second presentation by Marc Lanteigne dealt with the construction and deconstruction of the Chinese Arctic identity. He raised the question about what is happening to the Chinese Arctic plan. Lanteigne pointed out that the identity of China as the "Near-Arctic state" is obviously being constructed by conscious and deliberate steps taken by various actors such as government, business, science etc. But why is China building this identity, what are they seeking? One thing is that China has been greatly affected by climate change

in the recent years and thus claims to have stakes.

Lanteigne outlined three important aspects of identity-building for China, these being science diplomacy, China has research stations in Svalbard and North of Iceland; economic issues, both concerning natural resources and shipping routes; and legal and organizational aspects, wanting to be observer in the Arctic Council and thus having to prove its Arctic commitment. Lanteigne also elaborated on the role of climate change for China and the development of resource extraction; he noted that these are global processes affecting Chinese policies, and that China itself in turn affects global developments. The Arctic identity of China, in Lanteigne's opinion, is being constructed not only by China itself but by other actors as well.

In the discussions Lanteigne highlighted how different actors present their own opinions concerning Arctic issues, including China, Russia, Arctic Coastal States and other Asian states. This matter was also brought up in relations to negative attitudes to Chinese development, and the manifold Russian-Chinese relations involving their cultural aspect. He also stressed that China should be taken into account in the long-term planning, leaving the question whether China will want a new role in the Arctic open.

Role of the Arctic Council chairmanships

The third presentation by Malgorzata Smieszek focused on the Arctic Council chairmanship. Smieszek provided insight into the theoretical background on decision making, collective action and formal leadership, and presented a thorough analysis of possible failures and ways of avoiding them. The important factors of these processes include the design of the institution, formal and informal rules, and other issues. This theoretical background was then applied to the real situation — the Arctic Council Chairmanship. The talk featured a historical analysis of the development of the chairmanship and the approaches used by different chairs of the Arctic Council. Smieszek attempted to forecast what can be the possible path for the development of these processes during the US chairmanship in the Arctic Council. According to her findings the chair matters, it plays an important role both in regards to politics and the environment. The chair both controls the agenda setting and has privileged access to information. The organizational design also matters, as do the formal and informal rules.

In the case of the Arctic Council the chairmanships have changed, they have grown in status over time, by default rather than by design. It has grown in a different way than was intended. For an example one could mention that non-Arctic observer states have the ability to affect the chairmanship. Other examples could be the influence of domestic politics and external developments.

During the discussions Smieszek talked about how the Arctic Council serves as a playground for discussing various actors' interests and how these interest can collide and interact and how different actors learn to listen to each other and negotiate about these issues.



Such emphasis put on the multitude of voices links this session with its first part, where it was discussed how the voices of different communities are being heard (or not heard) in the public and political discourse. This also creates links between the session and the general research question of the forum: how do the various stakeholders participate in the building of the Arctic futures, and how does this building of the futures influence the other actors in the region. There are multiple actors directly affected by the results of the global processes happening in the Arctic; and on every level of the Arctic development, one can hear the voices of these actors. It seems that they ought to be not only heard but also carefully listened to both by policy-makers and researchers.

Third Plenary: The interplay between science diplomacy, material and immaterial values: How can the Arctic be a space for peace, sustainability and innovation?

This final plenary session, chaired by Kristinn Schram, built effectively on the first two sessions by looking at the broader Arctic and its place as a case study, a model and even a global metaphor for regional governance. The plenary brought together five presenters that introduced issues and questions about the state of Arctic governance and the dynamic environment stakeholders must navigate.

The Arctic paradox (and how to solve it). Oil, gas and climate change ethics in the Arctic

The first presentation by Teemu Polosaari set out to explore the “Arctic Paradox.” He pointed to a growing literature that establishes a connection between climate change and increasing conflict. Despite the fact that the Arctic is experiencing some of the greatest impacts of climate change there have not been any conflicts in the region so far. According to Polosaari this can be partly explained by the fact that the Arctic enjoys a strong history



of negative peace through a system of governance and a tradition of cooperation that began in the early 1990s. Polosaari went on to propose that evidence of positive peace is more challenging to confirm, given the human and environmental security concerns that currently face the region. As a result of the peace that the Arctic enjoys, the effects of ongoing climate change in the region leads to a potential for more economic developments, which in turn will generate more climate change - "by burning oil we get more oil" – a self-perpetuating cycle. This, of course, raises questions about what should be done with the resources that become available.

In this context, Polosaari suggests that the framing of the issues, or the storyline adopted, brings out different ethical undertones, which translate into different approaches to solving the Arctic paradox. For example, is stopping access to resources framed as a "moratorium" or "mummification"? Is allowing access to the resources framed as the "new north" or "BP-ing the Arctic"? Polosaari concludes that the Arctic Paradox must therefore be resolved hand-in-hand with a systematic review of global climate change ethics.

Natives or scientists, who owns traditional knowledge?

Robert Wheelersburg's presentation provided an equally thought provoking look at who owns traditional knowledge. In order to tackle this question, he began by proposing that there are clear examples of where traditional knowledge has been or has the potential to be important, including for global health issues like cancer. Wheelersburg went on to demonstrate the magnitude of the challenge of answering this question. He began by recognizing that what traditional knowledge is and who produces it has not been clearly defined. He illustrated this issue by using the Arctic as a case study, where the term traditional knowledge is commonly used interchangeably with indigenous knowledge and the knowledge of the original inhabitants. Not only are none of these terms defined, it raises questions about the value of the knowledge of people who live in the Arctic who are "non-original," "non-traditional" or "non-indigenous."

Wheelerburg then turned his attention to the systems in place to protect intellectual property globally. He demonstrated that the processes for establishing intellectual property rights are highly complex and technical, including tools such as patents, copyright, and trademarks. Furthermore, these systems have been designed to protect commercial and privately owned intellectual property, which is poorly aligned with most forms of traditional knowledge which is communally held. Wheelerburg concluded by recommending that the Arctic Council should form a working group with the tasks to come up with definitions of the terms commonly used in the North; develop traditional knowledge to protect the protocols by educating Northern communities; and to establish a programme for Arctic communities to record their traditional knowledge.

Arctic science diplomacy as a case of the role of knowledge in global governance

The third presentation by Rasmus Bertelsen focused on the role of science diplomacy in the Arctic. He began by arguing that we are currently living in a period of power transition as some states become less powerful while others become more powerful. He focused specifically on the shift in power taking place between the United States and China. He suggested that these periods of power transition can be very dangerous moments in history and they can often generate conflict. He proposed that the cooperative nature of governance in the Arctic offers alternative approaches that could serve to inform a peaceful transition of power.

Bertelsen proposed that the role the Arctic plays in the globe is becoming a more prominent area of study, which is supported by initiatives such as the GlobalArctic Project. In this context, he argued that science in the Arctic plays an important role in managing the ongoing power transition. Whereas direct investment in the Arctic by China is often met with suspicion; scientific engagement is welcomed and serves to establish more harmonious relationships. In particular, he considered how science enables Arctic communities to understand global interests, facilitates the outside world's understanding of the Arctic and is used to build shared knowledge between communities inside and outside the Arctic.

Science diplomacy and constructive international Arctic cooperation

Egill Þór Níelsson was the fourth presenter and he also considered the importance of science diplomacy through an analysis of Iceland-China science cooperation. Níelsson indicated that science has always been an important factor in the Arctic, compared with business, because science offers outside stakeholders legitimate means to engage in the Arctic. He pointed out that 60% of the world's population is in Asia, while the Arctic has very few people. He encouraged us to consider what this means for how the Arctic is perceived from a Chinese perspective.

Níelsson then went on to analyze the China-Iceland Arctic cooperation, which has been very active since 2011, apparent in the China-Iceland Arctic Symposium (2011), framework

agreement (2012), Chinese icebreaker crossing the Northern Sea Rout (2012), freetrade agreement (2013), establishment of CNARC (2013), agreement on aurora observatory (2013), establishment of a research centre in Shanghai (2013) and fellowship exchange (2014). He furthermore emphasized that there is a continuity to the scientific partnerships that have been developed and the projects being undertaken are often extremely practical and concrete. He proposed that these partnerships serve as a model for constructive cooperation on Arctic issues irrespective of the stakeholders. Scientific cooperation provides important means for information sharing and cultural exchange that enables productive relationships.

The Arctic as a trans-disciplinary space for resilience and peace-building

The session concluded with a final presentation by Lassi Heininen, where he considered the role of the scientific community in the Arctic. He argued that it is important to recognize the subjectivity of science and the active role this community has played in maintaining the high stability in the Arctic. Heininen emphasized that the scientific community is not an observer in the Arctic, on the contrary it is an active participant playing an important role in the region's governance. He pointed out that there are many soft ways for science to influence policy and it is important that the maintenance of peace in the Arctic should not be left to politicians.

Heininen observed that the Post-Cold War era has now come to an end and we can see a shift from regionalism to the internationalization of the Arctic. In this context, he pointed out that a classical geopolitical analysis is too narrow to understand the dynamics at play, and he proposed that the approach of the GlobalArctic could provide new methods to understand the region. This new analytical frame creates space for non-state actors and stakeholders from outside the region. It also emphasizes the social relevance of science, which promotes and strengthens inter- and transdisciplinary research between a diverse set of stakeholders. He suggests that the Arctic offers an important case study for governance and security because of the high stability it has maintained, while facing dramatic and urgent change.

About the organisers

The Centre for Arctic Policy Studies (CAPS) was launched at the 2013 Trans Arctic Agenda. CAPS is a forum for interdisciplinary collaboration in the field of Arctic research with an emphasis on the role and policies of states and institutions, non-state and corporate actors, and broader aspects of governance, culture and society in the Arctic and High North. CAPS organizes conferences, seminars and lectures on Arctic issues. The centre also runs two publication series, offering occasional papers as well as working papers, available in hard copy and online. For more information visit www.caps.hi.is



The Northern Research Forum (NRF), launched in 1999, provides an international platform for an effective dialogue between members of the research community and a wide range of other stakeholders. The main mission of the NRF is to address critical issues and highlight the opportunities faced people living in the regions of the Circumpolar North. NRF's main activity is an Open Assembly every second year, where NRF emphasizes open discussion and the participation of young researchers. For more information visit www.nrf.is

Wednesday 14 October

13:30 Registration and Coffee

Poster session by young researchers from the University of Iceland

14:30 Opening Remarks

Jón Atli Benediktsson, Rector, University of Iceland

Árni Þór Sigurðsson, Ambassador / Senior Arctic Official, Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Lassi Heininen, Chairman of the Northern Research Forum (NRF) and Professor of Arctic Politics, University of Lapland

15:00 First plenary: Cultural heritage and human resources as part of 'industrial civilization' - case studies of para-diplomacy and Indigenous / local knowledge

- | | |
|---|---|
| Chaired by Þorsteinn Gunnarsson, Northern Research Forum (NRF), The Icelandic Center for Research, Rannís | <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) The Thule-Base – The Struggle over its Existence?
Maria Ackrén, University of Greenland.ii) The recognition of Arctic communities in the EU seal regime
Nikolas Sellheim, (NRF/YR), University of Lapland / Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge.iii) Change and continuity: tourism framework transitions in the Russian Svalbard settlements
Andrian Vlakhov (NRF/YR), European University at St. Petersburg.iv) Conflicting Cultural Representation of the Arctic
Kristinn Schram, University of Iceland. |
|---|---|
-

16:00 Discussions

16:30-16:45 Coffee and tea break

16:45 First Plenary Continues

- v) Sámi people in decision-making processes – Analyzing Sámi people's possibilities to participate and influence on decision-making processes in Finland, Sweden and Norway.
Laura Olsén, (NRF/YR), University of Lapland, the Arctic Centre.
 - vi) Indigenous Lives and Natural Resources in the 21st Century: A view from Alaska
Tok Thompson, University of Southern California.
 - vii) Re-scaling sovereignty and development in the Canadian North
Heather N. Nicol, Trent University, Canada.
-

17:30 Discussions

18:00 Reception at Radisson Blu Saga Hotel

The reception is hosted by the Delegation of the European Union to Iceland.

Ambassador Matthias Brinkmann welcomes the guests

Thursday 15 October

09:30 Second Plenary: Representation of Arctic stakeholders and their internal communication

- | | |
|---|---|
| Chaired by
Alyson Bailes,
Adjunct Lecturer,
University
of Iceland | <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Arctic Voices: The Relevance of Local Stories for a Global Problem
Auður H Ingólfssdóttir, Bifröst University.ii) The Mandate of Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN)
Sigurjón Baldur Hafsteinsson, University of Iceland.iii) States, SOEs and TNCs and Russian Arctic hydrocarbons
Jussi Huotari (NRF/YR), Aleksanteri institute, University of Helsinki, Finland. |
|---|---|

10:30 Discussions

11:00-11:15 Coffee and tea break

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 11:15 Second Plenary
Continues | <ul style="list-style-type: none">iv) Presentation on the EU Arctic Policy
Dearbhla Doyle, EEAS Arctic Representative.v) Defining China as a 'Near Arctic State': Exercises in Identity-Building
Marc Lanteigne, NUI, Norway.vi) Role of the Arctic Council Chairmanships
Malgorzata Smiezek, Arctic Centre, University of Lapland. |
|-----------------------------------|---|

12:15 Discussions

12:45-13:45 Light Lunch hosted by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs

13:45 Third Plenary: The interplay between science diplomacy, material and immaterial values: How can the Arctic be a space/model for peace, sustainability and innovation?

- | | |
|--|--|
| Chaired by Dr.
Kristinn Schram,
Assistant Professor,
University of
Iceland | <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) The Arctic Paradox (and how to solve it). Oil, gas and climate change ethics in the Arctic
Teemu Palosaari, University of Tampere.ii) Natives or scientists, who owns traditional knowledge?
Robert Patrick Wheelersburg, Fulbright Researcher at CAPS.iii) Arctic Science Diplomacy as a Case of the Role of Knowledge in Global Governance
Rasmus Bertelsen, UiT – Arctic University of Norway. |
|--|--|

14:30 Discussions

15:00-15:15 Coffee and tea break

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 15:15 Third Plenary
Continues | <ul style="list-style-type: none">iv) Science diplomacy and constructive intercontinental Arctic cooperation
Egill Þór Nielsson, CNARC.v) The Arctic as a trans-disciplinary space for resilience and peace-building
Lassi Heininen, University of Lapland. |
|----------------------------------|--|

15:45 Discussions

16:00 Summaries from NRF/YR

16:30 Closing remarks

Pia Hansson, Director, Institute of International Affairs, University of Iceland
Guðrún Rósa Þórsteinsdóttir, Director, Northern Research Forum Secretariat and University of Akureyri Research Centre

The Institute of International Affairs (IIA) at the University of Iceland is a research, instruction and service institute. The Centre for Small State Studies (CSSS) and the Centre for Arctic Policy Studies (CAPS) are run under the auspices of the Institute.

The Centre for Arctic Policy Studies (CAPS) was launched at the 2013 Trans Arctic Agenda. CAPS is a forum for interdisciplinary collaboration in the field of Arctic research with an emphasis on the role and policies of states and institutions, non-state and corporate actors, and broader aspects of governance, culture and society in the Arctic and High North. CAPS organizes conferences, seminars and lectures on Arctic issues. The centre also runs two publication series, offering occasional papers as well as working papers, available in hard copy and online. www.caps.hi.is

The Northern Research Forum (NRF) launched 1999 provides an international platform for an effective dialogue between members of the research community and a wide range of other stakeholders. The main mission of the NRF is to address the critical issues and highlight the opportunities which face people living in the regions of the Circumpolar North. NRF's main activity is an Open Assembly every second year, where NRF emphasizes open discussion and the participation of young researchers. The 2015 event will be the 8th NRF Open Assembly, now in co-operation with the Centre for Arctic Policy Studies. www.nrf.is



INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL
AFFAIRS
CENTRE FOR ARCTIC
POLICY STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF ICELAND



Northern Research Forum

Institute of International Affairs - Centre for Arctic Policy Studies

University of Iceland - Gimli - Sæmundargötu, 101 Reykjavík

Tel: +354 525-5262 / +354 525 5841 / email: ams@hi.is / www.iiia.hi.is / www.caps.hi.is

