

**THE TRANS-ARCTIC AGENDA 2015:
Engaging Cultural Heritage When Building Resilience**

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

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

Introduction

The third annual Trans Arctic Agenda seminar was designed to focus on how the Arctic communities can engage their cultural heritage when building resilience. This year the Trans Arctic Agenda merged with the Northern Research Forums 8th open assembly. As in 2014 the seminar created a link into the Arctic Circle that took place in Reykjavik 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 climate change and increased international attention bring to the circumpolar Arctic region. These changes offer new opportunities for resource exploitation, human settlement and travel, but they can also disrupt the present natural conditions and living environment for all concerned in the High North. Prudent, cooperative and sustainable handling of the challenges involved will be crucial for gleaning as much as possible from the positive effects of change while minimizing the potential damage.

With the main focus on the governance and management of the Arctic region following the Arctic Council meeting in Kiruna of 2013, the focus was not only on the perspectives of the circumpolar states, but also on the influence of different actors, state, non-state and corporate; permanent participants; and observers. This was achieved by looking at different perceptions and policies, how they are formed and what actors have a voice strong enough to influence policy making. This involved examining the interplay of business development and environmental protection, emerging sub-regions and the possibilities and limitations of Arctic governance. The seminar offered both a retrospective and a forward-looking perspective on North American leadership in the Arctic Council with the US taking over from Canada in 2015.

Opening Session

The Trans Arctic Agenda conference for 2015 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. Iceland has led two projects that focussed on the people of the Arctic and their living conditions, which are examples of the tremendous research and work already being carried out on the Arctic. Mr. 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 our 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 the Trans Arctic Agenda 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. The abundance of scientific work, some of which presented at the Trans Arctic Agenda, offered a meaningful contribution in this respect. He concluded by welcoming the topic of the Trans Arctic Agenda 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, 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 give a good idea 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 not only lie in the hands of the Arctic actors alone any more 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 further discussed the objective of the Northern Research Forum (NRF), which is to provide an international, interdisciplinary platform for, and promote, an intensive dialogue among members of 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. He also 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, as is the International Space Station. 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), 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. This has been much done in NRF Open Assemblies. This was also done in this very conference, where Trans-Arctic Agenda and NRF Open Assembly came together and offered a joint platform for open discussion on relevant Arctic and global issues. Among tasks of the academic community is to share experiences and explore new methods, and the more we do that in cooperation the better scientific results we will have and more credibility there is for science and research as a part of our modern societies.

The Centre for Arctic Policy studies wishes to thank the Letterstedtska fund, the Arctic Studies fund, 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 Vlahov, Jennifer Spence, Kjersti Irina Rosanoff Aronsen,

Laura Olsén, Marion Ravna, Muhammad Ardhi, Nikolas Sellheim, Oda Nyborg. Special thanks to Adjunct Professor Alyson Bailes for editing and consultation.

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

During the first plenary of the Trans-Arctic Agenda, six presentations on the theme “Cultural heritage and human resources as part of ‘industrial civilization’ - case studies of para-diplomacy and Indigenous / local knowledge” were heard.

The first presentation by **Maria Ackrén** focused on the Thule Airbase, particularly on the role it could have economically and politically for Greenland. Maria gave an historical overview of defence cooperation between Denmark/Greenland and the US.

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 Airbase 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 got some compensation.

The functions of the base were strategic during World War II as Greenland was used for transferring aircrafts to Britain, and to defend the transatlantic 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. This event was 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 as it was spoiled by changing ice conditions.

Today the Airbase 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 airbase 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.

The second presentation by **Andrian Vlahov** dealt with tourism in Svalbard and what different strategies were 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 the small mining town of Barentsburg as an example. Barentsburg is 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 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 said 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 the difficult political situation and the bad images produced of both countries in the respective national media has negatively affected the cooperation. With regard to the so-called 'backlash tourism,' meaning tourism becoming a driving force for the economy - for instance in Longyearbyen - tourism-related issues constitute already a third of the work force. Similar developments seem to be in the tourism in Barentsburg.

The third presentation was by **Kristinn Schram** on different narratives on the coast both as a provider of building material in the form of driftwood and 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 to the church and there was a harsh narrative over theft of driftwood. In folklore we can find stories about how men and women were created by driftwood, the currents were the language of gods. We must also bear in mind that the same beaches that gave us driftwood also collected human deaths, during World War II the corps of German soldiers washed ashore, and so did food, material and equipments. The Germans tried to claim the corps but 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 that 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, How they fought 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.

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. He 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 Alaska 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. However, the salmon is connected to the rest of the ecosystem and should be continually renewable. Due to devastating effects of capitalism the salmon is disappearing. This poses risk for the so-called salmon cultures that depend on the salmon for food and cash income. The salmon allows the Native Alaskans to thrive in their communities. Now we are looking at cultural fights between groups with different goals. Thompson concluded by making the point that humans must seek wisdom from the cultures that have survived, learn from them.

Thompson showed that salmon constitutes a lifeline for them. None the less there are numerous threats putting the sustainability of the salmon and thus the sustainability of Alaskan native cultures at risk.

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 native 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.

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 or increasing exploitation of natural resources in the Sámi homeland.

Olsén started by explaining that the Sámi people, with a population 75.000-100.000, are the only officially recognized indigenous peoples group in the EU. The Sámi groups differ in some ways, for an example there are nine Sámi languages. 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 community and Olsén hopes that her research helps build a 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 decisionmaking 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. All in all, in theory the Sámi position is good, but in practice it is very different and this causes tensions.

During the discussions following this session Olsén clarified that it is rather political than legal avenues that Sámi pursue in order to impact and change current legislation.

The final presentation was given by **Heather Nicol** who discussed the politicisation of sustainable development and in 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 claims that we have scaled up sovereignty which is now the biggest discourse, from the perspective of neo-realism, making the Arctic a testing ground for national sovereignty and military training. This is a problematic development and contested by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK - Inuit United with Canada) and the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC). Canada's northern mining industry experienced a fall in GDP in 2009 and the Canadian government believes it happened because of too many regulations, influence of the indigenous peoples, environmental issues and so on. Furthermore, the government claims 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 left on a more positive note stating that if the conservative government does continue the continuance of a broken system will be seen. If a new government comes the sustainable development debate is likely to 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. In this session there were three presentations given by Auður H Ingólfssdóttir, Sigurjón Baldur Hafsteinsson and Nikolas Sellheim.

Auður Ingólfssdóttir was first to give her presentation titled *Arctic Voices: The relevance of local stories for a global problem*, which concentrated on her ongoing research. With her research Ingólfssdóttir wants to enhance 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 up 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 up 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.

During the discussions Ms. Ingólfssdóttir got many questions about her research dealing for example with her theoretical premises and possible risks that the feminist approach might set for her research.

The second speaker of the session was **Sigurjón Hafsteinsson**. His presentation *The mandate of aboriginal peoples television Network (APTN)* 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 to the global governance and also national level governance for example, in this case, by forcing to take indigenous peoples in consideration.

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

The third presentation *Recognition of Arctic Communities in the EU seal regime* was given by **Nikolas Sellheim**. Sellheim spoke about the EU's seal regime by which he refers to EU's regulation that bans trade in all seal products and to its implementation, adopted in 2009. He concentrated on the impacts of this regime on the local Arctic Communities. In his presentation Sellheim emphasized those negative impacts that this regime has had for 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 clearly 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 peoples' 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 also the position of seal hunters who are indigenous people.

Both Hafsteinsson's and Sellheim's presentations evoked a lot of conversation and interesting questions rose up such as a question concerning the lack of maximum sustainable yield when it comes to seals.

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 is 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.

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 perceives 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 a good 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 Arctic is facing, with the most emphasis on climate change, environmental pollution and resources extraction. Furthermore, the EU has a lot 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 the same sense 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 to the Union's common policies in other areas and regions, focusing on the sustainable development of the Arctic. Another interesting point of Dearbhla's presentation is

that a clear Arctic strategy it so be developed, and it's highly important that multiple actors need to have their voice 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 EU 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.

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 claim to have stakes.

Lanteigne outlined three important aspects of identity-building for China, these being the 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 observers in the Arctic Council and thus having to prove their 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 the Chinese policies, and that China itself in return affects the global developments.

The Arctic identity of China, to Lanteigne's opinion, is being constructed not only by China itself but by other actors as well.

In the discussions Lanteigne highlighted how the different actors present their own opinions concerning Arctic issues, including China, Russia, Arctic Coastal States and other Asian states etc but 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 emphasized 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.

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 and 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 interests 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 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. The Arctic is experiencing some of the greatest impacts of climate change and yet there has not been any conflicts. According to Polosaari this can be partly explained by the fact that the region 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 development, 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 proposes 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.

Robert Wheelerburg'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. However, Wheelerburg then demonstrates the magnitude of the challenge of answering this question. He begins with a recognition that what traditional knowledge is and who produces it has not been clearly defined. He illustrates 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 that is communally held. Wheelerburg concludes by recommending that the Arctic Council should form a working group with the tasks to come up with definitions of the terms we commonly use 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.

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 the governance in the Arctic offers alternative approaches that could serve to inform a peaceful transition of power.

Bertelsen proposed that the place that 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 power transition that is taking place. 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 the Arctic and is used to build shared knowledge between communities inside and outside the Arctic.

Egill Þór Niélsson was the fourth presenter and he also considered the importance of science diplomacy through an analysis of Iceland-China science cooperation. Niélsson indicated that science has always been an important factor in the Arctic, compared with business, because science offers outside stakeholders a 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.

Niélsson then went on to analyze China-Iceland Arctic cooperation, which has been very active since 2011, we could mention 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 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 an important means for information sharing and cultural exchange that enables productive relationships.

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 that plays an important role in the region's governance. He pointed out that there are many soft ways that science can influence policy and it is important that the maintenance of peace in the Arctic 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 argued 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 provides a space for non-state actors and stakeholders from outside the region. It 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.