



THE FRIDTJOF NANSEN INSTITUTE

**Report from
the Canadian-Norwegian
Arctic Cooperation Seminar
2–3 April 2001**

Edited by Olav Schram Stokke and Arild Moe

FNI Report 5/2001



FRIDTJOF NANSENS INSTITUTT
THE FRIDTJOF NANSEN INSTITUTE

Tittel/Title Report from the Canadian-Norwegian Arctic Cooperation Seminar, 2-3 April 2001	Sider/Pages 41
Publikasjonstype/Publication Type FNI report	Nummer/Number 5/2001
Forfatter(e)/Author(s) Stokke, Olav Schram and Arild Moe (eds.)	ISBN 82-7613-407-6
Program/Programme	ISSN 0801-2431
Prosjekt/Project	
Sammendrag/Abstract The Canadian-Norwegian Arctic Cooperation Seminar, held at Radisson SAS Park Hotel and the Fridtjof Nansen Institute near Oslo, 2-3 April 2001, was organised jointly by the Canadian Embassy in Norway, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, and the Research Council of Norway. The purpose of the seminar, which gathered 30 scholars and practitioners from the two countries, was to improve contacts between researchers and practitioners in Norway and Canada engaged in arctic cooperation policy; to identify issues of mutual interest that deserve further exploration; and to stimulate scholarly engagement in the refinement of cooperative structures in the Arctic in order to improve effectiveness. The core of this report is made up of short summaries prepared by the contributors of the presentations they made during the seminar. In addition, a brief account is given of the discussion that followed each session: National Strategies for Arctic Research; New Challenges for Policy-Oriented Arctic Research; Cooperative Fora in the North; Coordination Among and Beyond Arctic States; and How can Norwegian and Canadian Scientists Together Contribute to Cooperative Processes in the North?	
Stikkord/Key Words Arctic research, Norway, Canada, Arctic Council, polar research	
Bestilling til/Orders to: Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Postboks 326, N-1326 Lysaker, Norway. Tel: (47) 6711 1900 Fax: (47) 6711 1910 Email: sentralbord@fni.no	

Contents

	FOREWORD, <i>by Jan Tore Holvik and Marie-Lucie Morin</i>	iii
	ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	v
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR ARCTIC RESEARCH.....	3
	National Northern Science Initiatives in Canada, <i>by Peter G. Johnson</i>	3
	Strategy for Norwegian Research in the Arctic, <i>by Anders Elverhøi</i>	3
	Discussion	4
3	NEW CHALLENGES FOR POLICY-ORIENTED ARCTIC RESEARCH.....	7
	Developments in the North Since the End of the Cold War – Changing Conditions for Cooperation, <i>by Willy Østreg</i>	7
	Northwestern Russia – a New Actor in Polar Politics?, <i>by Geir Hønneland</i>	8
	Indigenous Peoples: An Emerging Voice in Arctic Cooperation <i>by Johnny-Leo L. Jernsletten</i>	9
	Transnational Openings and Postmodern Obstructions to Cooperative Politics of the Arctic, <i>by Stuart Robinson</i>	10
	Global Climate Change: Impacts on Arctic Societies, <i>by Alf Håkon Hoel</i>	12
	Discussion	13
4	COOPERATIVE FORA IN THE NORTH.....	15
	Outline of the Arctic Cooperation Architecture: Strengths and Deficiencies <i>by Åge Mariussen</i>	15
	Organisation of Work in the Arctic Council – Important Reorganisation Issues <i>by Mary Simon</i>	16
	Arctic Council – Important Reorganisation Issues, <i>by Jan Tore Holvik</i>	17
	Discussion	19
5	COORDINATION AMONG AND BEYOND ARCTIC STATES.....	21
	Area Protection in the Arctic Marine Environment: Interplay of Arctic and Broader Processes, <i>by Tiina Kurvits</i>	21
	Managing Arctic Fisheries: A Comparison of Canadian and Norwegian Approaches, <i>by Knut H. Mikalsen</i>	22
	Nuclear Dumping in the Arctic: The Interplay of Global and Regional Regimes, <i>by Olav Schram Stokke</i>	24
	The Climate Change Agenda in Canada and International Implications, <i>by Peter G. Johnson</i>	25
	Health, Children, Youth and Education, <i>by Karla Jessen Williamson</i>	27
	Discussion	27

6	HOW CAN NORWEGIAN AND CANADIAN SCIENTISTS TOGETHER CONTRIBUTE TO COOPERATIVE PROCESSES IN THE NORTH?	29
	Introduction to Discussion <i>by Kit M. Kovacs</i>	29
	The University of the Arctic: A New Context for International Cooperation in Northern Research and Education, <i>by Aron Senkpiel</i>	30
	Discussion.....	31
	APPENDIX I: Programme, Canadian – Norwegian Arctic Cooperation Seminar	33
	APPENDIX II: Participants	35
	APPENDIX III: Some Examples of Recent Canadian-Norwegian Research Cooperation on Northern Issues.....	39
	The Institutional and Social Structure of Aquaculture: A Comparative Study	39
	Social Movements, Citizenship and the Globalising State: A Comparative Analysis of Urban Britain and Arctic Norway	39
	International Northern Sea Route Programme	39
	Riding Out the Storm: Sustainable Development and Fishery Dependent Economies	40
	APPENDIX IV: Nordic Association for Canadian Studies	41

Foreword

By

*Jan Tore Holvik** and *Marie-Lucie Morin***

We are very pleased to have initiated this bilateral circumpolar seminar from which the following report is drawn. Both the tradition of transnational co-operation and the new emphasis on human security are particularly applicable to the shaping of the bilateral partnership between Norway and Canada. There are many new challenges and opportunities brought on by new trends and developments. Most of the challenges take the shape of trans-boundary environmental threats having major impacts on the health and vitality of northern communities, lands, waters and animal life. The opportunities are driven by increasingly confident northern societies and emerging multilateral fora such as the Arctic Council which now stand poised to take up the challenges presented by globalization. Canada and Norway play a vital role in facing these challenges.

Our objective for this seminar was to improve contacts between researchers and practitioners in Norway and Canada engaged in arctic cooperation policy; to identify issues of mutual interest that deserve further exploration; and to stimulate scholarly engagement in the refinement of cooperative structures in the Arctic in order to improve effectiveness. We wanted to contribute to policy formulation in regards to political and social sciences in addition to or to flavor our already existing cooperation in natural sciences. By bringing together Norwegian and Canadian researchers at this occasion, we laid new foundations for more Canadian-Norwegian co-operation in the political and social processes in the north. Furthermore, we contributed to the current process of streamlining the work of international organizations active in the North, and in particular to a better coordination and dialogue between them. Finally, we adhered to the resolution of the Arctic Council Barrow Meeting of making the public more aware of contributions being made to the sustainable development and well-being of northern populations.

The bilateral ties between Norway and Canada have traditionally been very strong, so also in the north - the great Norwegian explorers of the past have left lasting imprints on the Canadian map. These ties of yesteryears were followed by northern co-operation within the framework of NATO. The new challenges noted above need more informed responses, hence more research and co-operation. At the moment, a greater awareness as to northern research is emerging in Norway and Canada: the Northern research component of the Research Council of Norway and the recent review of northern research in Canada are examples. The many potential co-operation projects discussed and identified in the course of the seminar proved that there is an abundance of issues and research

* Special Advisor for The Arctic and The Antarctic, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

** Ambassador, Canadian Embassy to Iceland and Norway

that both countries can direct their attention to. In this regard, let us mention one of particular importance to our two nations: more respect for and use of the traditional knowledge of aboriginal peoples in research which eventually has direct impact on them. It is our expressed hope and desire that the seminar will lead to enhanced future cooperation on northern research between the two countries.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACIA	Arctic Climate Impact Assessment
AEPS	Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy
AMAP	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme
ASC	Assessment Steering Committee (ACIA)
BEAR	Barents Euro-Arctic Region
CAFF	Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora
CCAF	Climate Change Action Fund
CFCAS	Canada Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences
CPAN	Circumpolar Protected Areas Network
CSO	Committee of Senior Officials
EU	European Union
GHG's	Greenhouse Gases
GRSMPA	Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas
IASC	International Arctic Science Committee
ICES	International Council for Exploration of the Seas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IQ	Individual quotas
ITQ	Individual transferable quotas
IUCN	World Conservation Union
NAFO	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization
NEAFC	North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission
NFR	Norwegian Research Council
NSERC	Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council
PAME	Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment
SSHRC	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas

1 Introduction

The Canadian-Norwegian Arctic Cooperation Seminar, held at Radisson SAS Park Hotel and the Fridtjof Nansen Institute near Oslo, 2-3 April 2001, was organised jointly by the Canadian Embassy in Norway, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, and the Research Council of Norway. The purpose of the seminar, which gathered 30 scholars and practitioners from the two countries, was to improve contacts between researchers and practitioners in Norway and Canada engaged in arctic cooperation policy; to identify issues of mutual interest that deserve further exploration; and to stimulate scholarly engagement in the refinement of cooperative structures in the Arctic in order to improve effectiveness.

The core of this report is made up of short summaries prepared by the contributors of the presentations they made during the seminar. In addition, a brief account is given of the discussion that followed each session: National Strategies for Arctic Research; New Challenges for Policy-Oriented Arctic Research; Cooperative Fora in the North; Coordination Among and Beyond Arctic States; and How can Norwegian and Canadian Scientists Together Contribute to Cooperative Processes in the North?

The report has been compiled by Research Director Olav Schram Stokke and Deputy Director Arild Moe, both with the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, with technical and language assistance from Maryanne Rygg. The seminar and the preparation of this report have been funded by the Canadian Embassy in Oslo and the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The report is available on the Fridtjof Nansen Institute website (www.fni.no).

2 National Strategies for Arctic Research

National Northern Science Initiatives in Canada

*By Peter G. Johnson**

The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) in Canada released a report in September 2000 on northern science capacity. Phase 1 documented the decline in emphasis on northern research in academia and Phase 2 proposed a plan for the revitalisation of research and training. The plan, fully endorsed by the councils, calls for a dedicated program with five components. These are: Northern Research Chairs; Northern Research Projects; Post-Graduate and Post-Doctoral Scholarships; Community-University Research Alliances; and support for infrastructure.

In the Federal Government of Canada a Committee on Northern Science and Technology composed of Assistant Deputy Ministers of science based departments with northern interests is preparing a submission for funds to revitalise national northern science initiatives. The granting council proposal has been included in this discussion but may make a separate submission to the Federal Cabinet for support.

There are no direct circumpolar components to these proposals but strengthening the overall research effort will permit greater participation of Canadians in international programs and expanded programs in the Canadian Arctic with international implications.

Strategy for Norwegian Research in the Arctic

*By Anders Elverhøi***

The arctic region has a key role in the global environmental problems regarding climate change and the ozone layer. Research in the arctic region started well over 100 years ago, but was mainly directed towards exploring economic reserves. Since the mid-1980s there has been a shift towards environmental research. In this regard there is a need to gain an understanding of the fundamental physical and biological processes in the arctic 'natural laboratory', to improve knowledge about managing the Arctic and to explore the prospects of industrial growth while preserving the status of the region as Europe's only remaining wilderness. In light of the above, the Norwegian Research Council (NFR), through their committee on Polar Research, has identified the following key

* Professor, Department of Geography, University of Ottawa

** Professor, Department of Geology, University of Oslo.

issues in arctic research with the aim of promoting the Norwegian contribution in the field:

- Describing the arctic atmosphere/ionosphere, accounting for past climate changes and being able to predict any future changes in climate
- Achieving and ensuring environmentally friendly and economically sustainable development of renewable natural resources and industry in the area.

During the past year, NFR has allocated an annual sum of NOK 50 million for Norwegian polar research. The target area for such studies includes land areas north of the tree line together with the Arctic Ocean, northern part of the Norwegian Sea and the Greenland, Barents and Kara seas. Areas lying outside this region may also be relevant provided the work carried out contributes towards understanding of the phenomena within the arctic region. The key disciplines in this regard are atmospheric sciences (upper atmospheric studies), earth sciences (changes in climate and ocean circulation through time and the controlling mechanisms) and biological sciences (response of fauna and flora to changes in climate and UV-radiation; fluxes and effects of toxic compounds; nutrient cycle). Efforts are being directed towards increasing recruitment in these areas of arctic research through initiation of more national as well as international research programmes in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR). The programmes are set up and managed in a way so as to ensure high quality of research and a rapid dissemination of results. Efficient coordination of logistical resources is a pre-requisite in this regard. Svalbard is ideally suited to serve as an international platform for research activities in the Arctic and efforts are under way for its development for such a purpose. In the latest polar research initiative an attempt will be made to study the biological processes in relation to changes in climate. Currently, work in NFR is under way to devise a new strategic plan for polar research in Norway during the coming decade.

Discussion

The discussion following these two presentations focussed on the delimitation of arctic research. One strand dealt with the role of *social sciences* in arctic science, spurred by the observation that especially the Norwegian presentation had been silent on the matter. It was argued that the definition of arctic research should include not only research that is carried out *in* the Arctic but also research *on* arctic affairs, including the sustainable use and conservation of arctic resources. In defence of the emphasis on natural science it was pointed out that this reflects the priorities of those organisations and agencies that provide funds for arctic research. Others maintained that there is a need to integrate social science perspectives with the natural and technical sciences, especially in matters related to resource use and protection of the arctic environment.

Such integration is rare despite some large scale and multi-disciplinary projects such as the International Northern Sea Route Programme.* If arctic research is to support the development of sound policies in the broad area of sustainable development, it must generate knowledge about trends and causal relationships both regarding the biogeophysical and the socio-economic environment.

Another issue that was brought up in the discussion was the role of traditional knowledge. It was argued that ‘native science’ is often overlooked unless their implications correspond with the priorities defined by Western scientific communities. The implication of this is that valuable contributions relevant to environmental impact assessments or measures that address social problems among the indigenous populations in the Arctic go unheeded. What is needed, it was held, is a better marriage between various sources of knowledge.

* See Appendix III.

3 New Challenges for Policy-Oriented Arctic Research

Developments in the North Since the End of the Cold War – Changing Conditions for Cooperation

By Willy Østregg*

During the Cold War, the Arctic was for the first time in history included in actual military planning on a permanent basis, gradually assuming a highly prominent position in strategic deterrence. As a rule of thumb, security considerations gained the upper hand in setting national priorities in the North, and civil issue areas like resource exploitation, transport, environmental protection, research etc., were regarded as integrated in the realm of military-strategic competition. Whenever the military establishment perceived a conflict between the two types of interests, the civil sector was obliged to yield. This political framework deprived the Arctic of an international cooperative atmosphere and structure, and directed the civil sector to conduct its activities mostly under the auspices of *national regime*, only rarely *bi-nationally*, and more rarely still, on a *multinational basis*. Mutual suspicion and fear of espionage resulted in segmentation of the region into five national compartments with little or no interaction taking place between them. The hegemonic conflict of the Cold War and its associated all-embracing concept of national security was to blame.

The first public attempt to break out of the Cold War security thinking came from the party most rigorously insisting on it in the past. On 1 October 1987 Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev gave a speech in Murmansk in which he signalled a determination to distinguish more sharply between military and non-military issues in the North. In identifying suitable civil areas of cooperation - among them environmental protection, research, transportation and resource exploitation – Gorbachev also introduced a distinction between *military* and *civil* security. Compared to the Cold War period with absolute priority of military issues over civil issues and integration of the latter in military planning, the new security order would be based on a *decoupling* of the two issue areas with increased emphasis on the civil/political sector.

On the basis of this decoupling, three sets of interrelated processes have brought important changes to the cooperative atmosphere of the post-Cold War Arctic:

- *Civilianisation*, i.e. the multiplying of cooperative regimes in civil issue areas,
- *Regionalisation* of decision-making processes, and
- *Mobilisation* of non-state actors in arctic policy formation.

* Director, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute. Illness prevented Østregg from attending the seminar in person; what follows is a summary of the presentation he had prepared.

These three processes concur and comply in addressing the same topic: *international civil cooperation*, but differ when it comes to focus: regionalisation highlights the changing pattern of decision-making from central to regional governments, civilianisation is preoccupied with the processes of regime-formations between different levels of politics, whilst mobilisation addressed the participatory dimension of politics inviting indigenous participation. These processes find expression in varying degrees in the International Arctic Science Committee, The Northern Forum, The Arctic Council, The Barents Euro-Arctic Region, and The Aboriginal Summit.

Northwestern Russia – a New Actor in Polar Politics?

*By Geir Hønneland**

The presentation raises the question: To what extent does the northwestern part of the Russian Federation emerge as a new actor in polar politics? This embraces two main sub-questions: What is 'Northwestern Russia', and to what extent does it appear to be an independent and active participant in international politics in the Arctic? The first question can be addressed in geographical, administrative and political terms. Russia is a federative state consisting of 89 federal subjects. In the West, 'Northwestern Russia' is often perceived as the Russian part of the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR), i.e. Murmansk and Arkhangelsk Oblasts, the Republic of Karelia and Nenets Autonomous Okrug. The Russian definition of 'Northwestern Russia' is considerably wider, comprising federal subjects as far south as St Petersburg and Kaliningrad. Several administrative arrangements at national level exist that encompass the federal subjects that are included in the 'wide' definition of Northwestern Russia, among them the northwestern Association and the newly established northwestern federal okrug. No such structures exist for the 'narrow' conception of Northwestern Russia although international arrangements such as the BEAR probably contribute to some sense of unity also here. Politically, it would be an exaggeration to claim that Northwestern Russia stands forth as a particularly coherent and autonomous region at the moment.

Murmansk Oblast has emerged as a rather active participant on the international scene in issues related to the management of natural resources and the environment. In the management of the rich fish resources of the Barents Sea, regional authorities are represented in the bilateral cooperation with Norway, and federal agencies located in the region are represented in multilateral arrangements such as the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) and the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC). Regional authorities appear to have had a certain influence in recent years,

* Senior Research Fellow and Director of the Polar Programme, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute. The presentation draws upon material published in G. Hønneland and H. Blakkisrud (eds) *Centre-Periphery Relations in Russia. The Case of the Northwestern Regions*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 2001.

but not always to the effect of contributing to Western management objectives. For instance, regional Russian authorities are believed to have contributed to the establishment of cod quotas far above the scientific recommendations in recent years. In the field of nuclear safety, regional authorities are also represented in bilateral arrangements with Norway and various multilateral organisations. They appear to have enjoyed a growing influence in recent years, but mainly of a 'negative' character, i.e. they may be able to halt undesirable federal initiatives in the region, but can do little to influence overall federal politics.

Indigenous Peoples: An Emerging Voice in Arctic Cooperation

*By Johnny-Leo L. Jernsletten**

I have been given the following title for my presentation 'Indigenous peoples: An Emerging Voice in Arctic Cooperation'. I didn't want to make any changes in this title because it gives me an opportunity to discuss this statement. The title indicates that the indigenous people are emerging into the arctic cooperation arena with one voice and as a new partner in arctic cooperation. Is this really the case?

The University of Tromsø is founded on the task to give special focus towards the Saami society and people and to contribute with research to the Saami society. The traditional Saami settlement areas in Norway are comprised of the northern-, lule- and southern Saami areas. Thus, Saami research is not just a contemporary priority for the university, but has always been a university responsibility. Scientists – both saami and non-saami – have been active in arctic cooperation for many years. The focus has been towards Canada, Alaska, Russia, Scandinavia and Greenland. This also applies for the Saami College and Nordic Saami Institute in Kautokeino. Through the established Research Network for Indigenous Peoples our Centre has built networks with these research institutions.

The rising number of Saami students in higher education and on the Ph.D.-level shows that this is not a new phenomenon, and there are many Saami working as senior scientists, associated professors and professors divided between the natural and social sciences, humanities, law and medicine. Today most faculties and disciplines are in one way or another involved in research related to the Saami.

Last year (2000), the university board approved the new 'Strategic Plan for Saami Research at the University of Tromsø' for the period 2000-2010. One of the new initiatives in the plan is to increase the exchange of indigenous students. The Centre for Saami Studies at the University of Tromsø has since the beginning of the 1990s offered

* Project Manager, Centre for Sàmi Studies, University of Tromsø.

a 6-month scholarship to Saami students at the university. The students have visited relevant foreign universities to get new input and impressions from other indigenous students. As far as we can see, this scholarship is a success among the students and they return to Tromsø with new perspectives on their own situation.

Thus, I allow myself to present an idea about a reciprocal student exchange for indigenous students. An appropriate place to start would be an exchange between Canadian universities and Tromsø University. We believe it could be a fruitful experience for indigenous students from Canada to stay at our university, which could be characterised as both an indigenous and Saami university. We are also in a phase of developing various education plans in English. Today we can offer an introductory course called 'Arctic Norway'. We have also started to develop a Master in indigenous studies.

I believe there are a lot of possibilities for cooperation, and a first step could be student exchange. In this way we could share common experiences and learn from each other.

Transnational Openings and Postmodern Obstructions to Cooperative Politics of the Arctic

*By Stuart Robinson**

Cooperative arctic politics should be inclusive, embracing in particular the indigenous populations. Their emancipation is the necessary foundation of a democratic and progressive Arctic. Such an agenda faces formidable institutional and cultural challenges, however.

You will see lots of 'Indian' bric-a-brac across Saskatchewan but no comparable Saami 'merchandise' in north Norway. Rather you will find the Saami themselves, dressed in 'traditional' garb. They are less proselytised and more of an identifiable, living, human presence. These cases of the relative reification of indigenous culture illustrate a central issue facing arctic peoples and their role in arctic governance: the need for self-defence via demarcation and segregation of linguistic and cultural space. Fear of globalisation as an integration that threatens to assimilate and reduce aboriginal culture to a set of marginal tourist-commodities, is the motor of globalisation's flip-side: fragmentation. The challenge is not to avoid integration per se but to integrate on favourable terms, most importantly by collaborating and effecting a common voice with other arctic peoples.

* Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science, University of Tromsø and visiting scholar, University of Keele (UK).

Transnational Openings

Transnational interactions and mutual sensitivity, through economic internationalisation, cross-boundary spillover of ecological problems, and social and organisational contacts (via the internet, for example), strengthen the potential for an 'arctic voice'. Moreover, these transnational tendencies are reinforced supra-nationally, through the regionalisation expressed by such organisations as the Arctic Council. This body, in particular, has institutionalised a role for sub/trans-national peoples and encouraged their transnational cooperation.

Obstacles, Part One: Institutional Pitfalls

Such institutionalisation can nonetheless impede genuine democracy. One danger is the rise of a technocratic, closed style of intergovernmental decision-making, exemplified by the European Commission and the secretive multilateralism of NATO. The Arctic Council can be sidelined by the intergovernmental negotiation and construction of international treaties, and indigenous peoples by the Council's own institutional framework. Their participation also risks a cultural assimilation whereby tutelage in Western political practices and vocabulary silences the aboriginal voice.

'Postmodern' Strategy

Globalisation also encompasses a cognitive shift or postmodern turn, the breakdown of the unity of the (universalist and inclusive) modern project. One consequence is the rise of identity-politics. Practically, a more assertive self-defence (facilitated by the liberalisation and weakening of the nation-state) reconfigures the vocabulary of oppression, making Inuit of Eskimo and Saami of Lapplander. Such self-assertion, the demarcation of a cultural space by appropriating and defending the validity of names, clothing and forms, resists assimilation and marginalisation.

Obstacles, Part Two

Self-assertion contains its own inherent danger, however. It might impede communication and mutual understanding between the disenfranchised. Demarcation of cultural space can curtail outsiders' rights to join the identity-group's 'discourse'. Despite the ease of contact, via internet or institutional channels, there are cultural barriers to working together towards common goals.

Conclusion

Indigenous peoples, with their rootedness in and knowledge of the region, promise a positive contribution to arctic governance. The challenge is to turn mutual respect for difference into mutual recognition of common circumstances and goals, and to work

together to overcome the institutional and cultural barriers to progressive action and change.

Global Climate Change: Impacts on Arctic Societies

*By Alf Håkon Hoel**

Global changes in climate are now well documented. The third assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) provides a picture of a warming world. The global average surface air temperature has increased, and the magnitude of warming in the 20th century is the largest of any century during the last 1000 years. The 1990's was the warmest decade. Changes in climate occur as a result of human-induced and natural factors. A major driving force is the emission of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide, the atmospheric concentration of which has increased substantially. The rate of increase is unprecedented, and most of it is due to fossil fuel burning.

The evidence of human influence on the climate is stronger than ever. The scenario for the next century is that global average temperatures and sea levels will rise. The IPCC's recent assessment indicates that the increase from 1990 til 2100 will be in the range +1.5 to +6°C, which is unprecedented over the last 10000 years.

The regional impacts of climate change are uneven. Impacts vary in the Arctic, and are likely to continue to do so. The arctic temperature trends show significant increases in NW Canada and Alaska, as well as in Siberia. Northern Scandinavia appears unaffected or only slightly increasing. The temperature of the Atlantic water layer of the Arctic ocean has increased.

The consequences are many: The extent of sea ice has decreased by about 10% since the late 1960's. Snow cover is reduced. Permafrost is thawing in many areas. The discharge of the Siberian rivers into the Arctic Ocean has increased. These physical processes cause shifts in ecosystems and biota: Species composition change, ecosystem boundaries change and severe weather events increase. This in turn may have significant impacts on Arctic societies and the living conditions there.

This is the background for the establishment of an Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) under the auspices of the Arctic Council. The idea of an ACIA was brought forwards by the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) in 1999, and IASC has together with the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) and the Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora programme (CAFF) worked out a structure for ACIA.

* Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Tromsø

The goal of the ACIA is a) to evaluate and synthesise knowledge on climate variability, climate change, and increased UV radiation and their consequences, and b) to provide useful and reliable information to the governments, organisations and peoples of the arctic region in order to support policy-making processes and to IPCC's further work.

The actual work is carried out through a lead author concept, where lead authors are assigned responsibility for the substantive chapters. An Assessment Steering Committee (ASC), with representatives of the participating organisations as well as the lead authors, is directing and coordinating the work. A secretariat is set up at the University of Alaska (Fairbanks).

The work under ACIA is essentially about assessing the state of knowledge about climate change and its impacts in the arctic region. It is, however, already clear that we face major challenges in terms of generating new knowledge in this realm, not least with regard to the social impacts. A substantial increase in efforts to understand the effects of changes in climate on arctic communities is urgently needed, as a basis for developing mitigating strategies.

Discussion

The discussion following these presentations focussed on the growing interlinkage of the Arctic research priorities that are defined within various scientific disciplines. For example, increased insight into the nature and causes of climate change in the Arctic calls for research on strategies to combat such change, which is a global issue, but also to develop ways to adapt to climate change - clearly an area where arctic communities face similar or even common challenges. The first priority at present, it was held, is to get better and more detailed data on the pattern of climate change in the region, and on this basis explore socio-economic impacts.

Similarly, many opportunities and cross-disciplinary challenges for arctic research are results of the 'opening' of Russia during the 1990s. For instance, the recent announcements of plans for import of spent nuclear fuel as well as the possibility of transit of such fuel through the Northern Sea Route will require environmental impact studies, coupled with knowledge on political and economic processes in Russia, including relationships between the central government and regional actors.

Several commentators emphasised in this context the need for better insight into the functioning and effectiveness of the new international institutions set up across the old East-West divide, especially with regard to their ability to involve and engage northern communities in their work. These issues were followed up in greater detail during the subsequent session.

4 Cooperative Fora in the North

Outline of the Arctic Cooperation Architecture: Strengths and Deficiencies

*By Åge Mariussen**

The Nordic institutions evolved after the Second World War. They created and dominated a field of cooperation between countries in the north of Europe for four decades. At the end of the Cold War, however, several new international councils were established to promote cooperation between Nordic countries, the new Baltic countries, Russia, and on a circumpolar basis, Canada, and USA. The common set of problems identifying these councils was the attempt to *bridge the gap created by the Cold War*. However, in 1995 the field was also invaded by EU Interreg programmes. They have an objective which, at least until EU enlargement is on the road, is distinctly different: to promote *integration of the Europe of 15, and their neighbouring countries*. Within the framework established by these councils and programmes, thick networks between public officials and institutions, as well as civilian society organisations, have evolved, thus increasing integration and cooperation at the *operative* level. At the same time, operative level integration has been accompanied by *fragmentation* at the level of *institutions* of cooperation. One empirical indication of this fragmentation is a prevailing ‘overlap’ between the activities of the councils and between the councils and Interreg. Recently, the question of ‘co-ordination’ has been raised, in particular through the Finnish Northern Dimension initiative, but also by other actors involved.

From the point of view of the inter-governmental paradigm, phenomena like councils and inter-reg partnerships may be seen as rational attempts to solve common problems in the North. However, in the case of the post Cold War councils, these collective decisions only laid the basis of a set of loosely organised secretariats and councils, with no administrative biceps. The corresponding Interreg programmes, although equipped with substantially stronger financial and administrative muscles, tend to evolve through ad hoc secretariats and partnerships firmly negotiated between national and regional level representatives. The autonomy at the *institutional* level of both these arrangements, which may have enabled the institutions to co-ordinate better between themselves, is strictly limited. Overlapping activities obviously do not pose any threat to existing institutions, in terms of closing down or radically reshaping the arrangements from their founders. The Northern Dimension initiative attempts to bridge the gap between the councils and the EU Interreg programmes, by focussing on the *converging*

* Senior Research Fellow, Nordregio, Stockholm. The paper is based on a report prepared for the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Å. Mariussen, H. Aalbu, and M. Brandt, *Regional Organisations in the North*. Stockholm: Nordregio WP-8, 2000.

of the two problems that generated the divide: as EU enlargement transfers and applies the instruments of EU regional policy to closing the east – west divide in Europe. So far, the Working Programme emerging from the initiative has a quite vague approach.

Organisation of Work in the Arctic Council – Important Reorganisation Issues

*By Mary Simon**

The northern regions are fundamental to sovereignty, prosperity, the natural environment, and aboriginal heritage of the countries represented in the region. This has been recognised in the growing importance of the North as a central part of our foreign policies, and has been reflected in unprecedented multilateral and bilateral cooperation, as well as institution-building in the circumpolar North. The inauguration of the Arctic Council in 1996 is one example of this development.

In addressing reorganisation issues, one of the challenges facing the Arctic Council is the issue of funding. Since its creation, the Arctic Council has been funded through voluntary contributions on a project-by-project basis. Although this has unarguably led to the funding of many valuable projects, the uncertainty of future funds inherent in this structure places great pressure on human resources in the targeting of funds for projects. The issue of the structure of the Arctic Council is another challenge. Since its creation, the working groups of the Arctic Council have taken on more responsibilities and some overlap has been inevitable. The Finnish Chairmanship of the Council has now initiated a review of the structure of the Council, and time may be ripe to find new solutions to issues that member states were not ready to tackle during the negotiations on the creation of the Council.

A unique feature of circumpolar cooperation in the Arctic Council is the role and involvement of international indigenous peoples organisations representing the arctic indigenous peoples as permanent participants. Direct involvement by northerners in the Arctic Council ensures that those with most at stake have a clear voice, and thereby gives the Council particular legitimacy and relevance. It is important, though, that we ensure that indigenous peoples are *true* partners in the work of the Arctic Council. As a consensus-based body in which indigenous peoples are not involved in decision-making, the Arctic Council could further develop its meaningful involvement of indigenous peoples. At times perceived as a multilateral body run by bureaucrats from the capitols of member states, the Arctic Council should strive to make traditional

* Canadian Ambassador to the Kingdom of Denmark and Ambassador for Circumpolar Affairs, Canadian Embassy, Copenhagen.

knowledge an integral part of the *collective understanding of the circumpolar Arctic*, as stated in the *Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council*.

Far from being isolated, what happens in the North matters to the rest of us - and what happens elsewhere matters to the North. There is a recognition in both the Arctic Council and the European Union that future security and prosperity are closely connected to our ability to effectively manage northern issues. It is important that in finding solutions to the Arctic's challenges, links be made between international fora and institutions dealing with similar matters. Some overlap is inevitable and perhaps even beneficial. However, we should strive to ensure that our efforts generally complement rather than duplicate each other. The efforts of the Finnish Chair of the Arctic Council in regard to sharing a commitment to work more closely with relevant international fora on issues of importance to the Arctic are welcomed. We need partnership to realise the full potential of the north and to let our northerners realise their full potential.

In conclusion, it must be stressed that it is increasingly important for the Arctic Council to devote more time to making itself known, both in the Arctic and beyond. A study on the improvement of the flow of information from the Arctic Council is presently being undertaken by the Arctic Centre of the University of Lapland. The findings of this study will be important in improving awareness about the Arctic Council, and thereby facilitating cooperation on Arctic issues.

Arctic Council – Important Reorganisation Issues

*By Jan Tore Holvik**

A reflection after the discussion yesterday is that we certainly need a stronger involvement of the political and social scientists if we want to focus on the broader political framework for circumpolar co-operation. These new challenges have a definite place in the new Norwegian Strategy for Arctic research and the scope explained by Professor Elverhøi is too limited. Here it is a question of not only doing things in the right way, but also a question of whether we do the right things. Continued research in the field of natural science is important, but we must bring in the social and political sciences to a greater degree if we want to participate in formulating the new agenda in the Arctic. Canada and Norway are key actors here.

It is necessary to put more emphasis on the need for better co-ordination of different regional bodies in the North. At the same time, one must remember that each regional

* Special Advisor for The Arctic and The Antarctic, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

body has specific tasks and is the result of a particular political process. We must not be concerned by some overlap and the aim should not be to establish a master plan for division of labour. As recommended in the report from Nordregio, one avenue for better co-ordination could be an annual meeting between the chairs of the four regional Councils. The Norwegian foreign minister has recently issued an invitation to the chairmen of the CSOs (Committee of Senior Officials) of the four Councils for an informal meeting in Norway to exchange information and discuss possible joint initiatives.

The unique circumpolar character of the Arctic Council must be maintained, and the co-operation between the eight Arctic states and the permanent participants strengthened. There is a clear need for reorganisation within the Arctic Council, but at the same time one has to recognize the different views within the Council and the agreement to work on the basis of consensus. Given these constraints, a pragmatic approach and small steps at a time are better than no step at all.

The funding issue is a key to creating a more efficient Arctic Council. It is very difficult to base the comprehensive work exclusively on voluntary contributions. A clear need exists for establishing a reliable and fair funding system, in particular for the activities of the working group secretariats. One proposal has been to establish a fund or an Arctic Financial Window. The financial resources could be earmarked, fully or partly, for the indigenous population. Researchers from Canada and Norway should jointly look into the funding issues. Another pressing issue is linked to the discussion of a permanent secretariat. Given the actual situation with a rotating secretariat run by the Chair there is a need to make the secretariat more of an Arctic focal point. Canada and Norway should therefore consider placing one of their own nationals as a member of the Finnish secretariat. In discussing the questions of reorganisation one should also bear in mind the political dimension. It is said from time to time that the Arctic Council is a political body run by experts. This might be an accurate description of the situation of the Council today, and this creates a worrisome situation. There is no doubt a need for a better and stronger political framework as a basis for implementation of technical activities in the future. The Arctic Council has no guarantees that it will be successful in its call for political attention if the agenda and the work of the Council is not organized with the political aspects in mind. The reorganisation which has now been initiated by the Finnish Chairmanship as a follow up of the Barrow Ministerial gives an opportunity to address obvious needs for better co-ordination between the working groups and also integration in a more comprehensive manner of the sustainable development aspects of the activities of the Council with the environmental work. The sustainable development working group, however, still has a long way to go before it has found a proper structure. The scope of its activities must also be reconsidered and natural resources related issues, among others, must be included in the deliberations. The particular Arctic

challenges must be the common denominator and the aim must be to create a basis for a new conceptual debate.

It is important that this seminar results in follow-up of joint activities by Canadian and Norwegian research communities and I have two suggestions for joint projects. First, to study a funding mechanism for the Arctic Council, and secondly to organize a conceptual circumpolar debate on key issues such as fisheries and oil and gas exploration which are not today on the agenda of the Arctic Council.

Discussion

In the discussion following these presentations, several of the problems related to the institutional structure for arctic cooperation were reiterated, including the fragmentation across a large number of regional bodies, each of them rather weak in institutional terms. It was also pointed out, however, that some of the apparent overlaps were useful because different bodies involve different national bureaucracies and sub-national actors and therefore invite supportive interplay between various northern fora. Moreover, many important problems addressed by the Arctic Council must be seen in a broader geographical context, and circumpolar institutions are not necessarily the most relevant problem solving arenas. This is for example clear with regard to many environmental issues: all the priority areas under the Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution concern contaminants that originate largely outside of the region. A major implication is that arctic institutions must forge linkages to and try to influence the working of broader regimes. Such inter-regime coordination is also prominent on the agenda of other international fora that are relevant to the Arctic, such as the recent Second Meeting on the Northern Dimension of the European Union.

Some noted that the important institutional challenges presently faced by the Arctic Council call for more applied political science research on the organisation of this body. Considerable attention was paid to the question of how the Council could be provided with more sustained financial muscle. It was suggested that a research project be organised to survey various models for an equitable funding mechanism that would also be politically feasible.

On the structure of the Council, several participants argued that the working groups are overlapping and in need of a better division of labour. It was generally noted that although improvement has occurred, the integration of the two program areas (environmental protection and sustainable development) must be further improved. Some perceived that the 'line ministries' are now less enthusiastic about their participation in the Council than in the past, perhaps out of a fear that it will assume a management role that may compete with established regimes. In response, one

representative of a line ministry argued that the Arctic Council tends to evade politically charged issues and that, for instance, it was easier to get attention to environmental questions before the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy/AEPS was merged into the broader structure of Council.

Another issue that was much discussed was the need to involve and engage northerners, including indigenous peoples, in the work of the Arctic Council. Some went so far as to state that unless the Council becomes better known among northern populations and is seen as a relevant vehicle for their aspirations, its legitimacy will be in jeopardy.

5 Coordination Among and Beyond Arctic States

Area Protection in the Arctic Marine Environment: Interplay of Arctic and Broader Processes

*By Tiina Kurvits**

Until recent years, the majority of our conservation and protection efforts focussed on the terrestrial environment. Now, however, as we begin to turn our attention to the sea, we bring with us some lessons learned from the land. Rather than creating isolated islands of protection, we are placing more emphasis on creating networks of marine protected areas, linking national networks with regional and international initiatives, and expanding conservation initiatives beyond protected area boundaries.

In Canada, three programs exist for creating protected areas in the marine environment. The Marine Protected Areas program of Fisheries and Oceans Canada focuses on the conservation and protection of living marine resources and habitats; Parks Canada has the mandate to create National Marine Conservation Areas for the protection of representative areas of Canada's marine environment; and Environment Canada can establish Marine Wildlife Areas, with an emphasis on protecting critical migratory bird habitats. Efforts are being made to coordinate the development of the three programs into a national system of marine protected areas.

The Canadian system of marine protected areas will be linked into the regional Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN) of the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) program. CPAN was established to protect important terrestrial and marine areas of the arctic environment and its biodiversity. It aims to assist arctic states by identifying significant gaps in national protected area networks, monitoring the state of protected areas, and providing a mechanism for cooperation among its members.

CPAN itself will form part of a global network of protected areas via the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA). The goal of the WCPA-Marine program is, 'to provide for the protection, restoration, wise use, understanding and enjoyment of the marine heritage of the world in perpetuity through the creation of a Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas (GRSMPA)'. One of the tasks of the recently formed WCPA-Arctic Task Force is to seek ways to implement the GRSMPA in the Arctic.

Beyond its protected areas, Fisheries and Oceans Canada has established an Integrated Management program at the national level. The program provides an on-going and collaborative planning process to effectively plan and manage human activities

* Senior Advisor, CAFF International Secretariat

occurring in or affecting the marine environment. Ideally, each Marine Protected Area will be situated within a broader Integrated Management plan.

Internationally, the 1999 Circumpolar Marine Workshop brought together people from circumpolar countries and organisations to discuss a broad range of marine issues. The workshop went beyond protected areas into the broader realm of ecological management. The workshop identified numerous common issues and needs both within and among countries with respect to protecting the arctic marine environment, and underlined the necessity of cooperative mechanisms and partnerships to address them.

Suggested further reading:

Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), World Conservation Union (IUCN), and Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME). *Circumpolar Marine Workshop: Report and Recommendations*. November 28-December 2, 1999, Montreal, Canada.

(<http://www.grida.no/prog/polar/pame.htm>)

Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF). 1996. *Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN) – Strategy and Action Plan*. Habitat Conservation Report No. 6. Directorate for Nature Management, Trondheim, Norway. (<http://www.grida.no/prog/polar/caff/cpan.htm>)

Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 1999. *National Framework for Establishing and Managing Marine Protected Areas – A Working Document*. Ottawa, Canada.

(http://www.oceansconservation.com/newenglish/htmdocs/mpas/newmpa/main_e.htm)

Kelleher, G., Chris Bleakly, Sue Wells. 1995. A Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas. Volume I. Antarctic, Arctic, Mediterranean, Northwest Atlantic, Northeast Atlantic and Baltic. Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, The World Bank, and The World Conservation Union (IUCN).

(http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/marine_protected/nrsmpa/mpa/regions.html)

Managing Arctic Fisheries: A Comparison of Canadian and Norwegian Approaches

*By Knut H. Mikalsen**

This is intended as a brief summary of some of the findings of a joint Canadian-Norwegian research project on the fisheries – spanning institutional history, management regimes and community level processes.**

* Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science, University of Tromsø.

** See R. Apostle, G. Barrett, P. Holm, S. Jentoft, L. Mazany, B. McCay and K. H. Mikalsen, *Community, State and Market on the North Atlantic Rim: Challenges to Modernity in the Fisheries*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Institutional Frameworks

As for the organisational structures of these regimes, one of the things that struck us the most was the attempt, in both systems, at striking a balance between user-group influence and government. Both regimes are characterised by a combination of centralised control and user involvement – with science and scientists at the core of management proceedings. That said there is, in both systems, a high level of central control that reflects both administrative traditions and the challenge to management posed by fish stocks that straddle the lines of extended jurisdiction.

Looking more closely at the trade-off between ‘consultation’ and ‘command’, there are, however, fairly conspicuous variations between the two management regimes. In Norway, consultation is done for almost everything; industry is represented by a peak organisation which expects to be heard before decisions are made. Relationships between industry and government are firmly institutionalised, and bargaining tends to be consensual rather than confrontational. The basic characteristic is one of power-sharing and partnership at the top – a system where privileged access and a certain amount of executive discretion is traded for legitimacy and ‘responsible’ interest group behaviour.

The Canadian system is characterised by a high degree of centralised control, where executive discretion is rooted in the constitution and underpinned by other legislation. The minister can act unilaterally – and frequently does so. The question of when, how and who to consult – and whether to act on the advice given – is largely for him or her to decide. Nevertheless, the system comprises an elaborate and intricate network of consultative committees where user groups are given the opportunity to discuss management plans. However, the sheer complexity of the system, and the lack of co-ordinated action on the part of industry (there is no peak organisation as in Norway), do not facilitate user group influence.

Management Policies: the Issue of Transferable Quotas

As for the actual management of the fisheries, vessel – or individual – quotas (IQs) have become an integral part of management policy in both Norway and Atlantic Canada. The question of transferability – of whether quotas may be freely traded or not – has, however, been handled differently in Norway and Atlantic Canada. Norway has not (yet) put in the ‘T’, while in Atlantic Canada quotas in certain fisheries have been freely transferable for some time. There is a difference of management policy here that we attempted to explore and account for. Time does not allow for details, so I shall just have to point to some of the factors that may explain this difference.

First, the magnitude of the change implied by an ITQ system could account for variations of acceptance. In Atlantic Canada, the ITQ scheme was initially developed for a

relatively small regional fishery and introduced as a limited experiment. In Norway, it was conceived as a mandatory scheme for the entire industry. Second, the ability of industry to resist (there was initial resistance in both countries) differed. In Norway, fishermen were able to coordinate their opposition through a coherent network of local and regional associations, whereas the fragmented and incomplete organisation of Canadian fishermen made it difficult to develop a consensus and mobilise opposition. Third, the sheer amount of time spent consulting and debating the merits of the proposed policy in Norway made it possible to build alliances, mobilise support and ‘force’ the issue onto the agenda of the 1991 local elections campaign. In Atlantic Canada no consultation on basic principles took place, and the institutional structure of the regime – characterised by executive discretion and the organisational fragmentation of the industry – provided few points at which government policy could be effectively challenged, let alone vetoed. In Norway, both the electoral campaign – which by the way gave the issue much wider publicity than it may otherwise have received – and the consultative process constituted ‘veto points’, opportunities for examining and overturning the proposed policy. That said, the infamous ‘T’ may have entered through the back door in Norway, as there are clear signs of unofficial and informal traffic in quotas. If this is indeed the case, the difference between Atlantic Canada and Norway as to a central ingredient of management policy may be mainly one of rhetoric and principle rather than practice.

Nuclear Dumping in the Arctic: The Interplay of Global and Regional Regimes

*By Olav Schram Stokke**

During the 1990s, protection of the arctic marine environment became a matter of intense political attention, engaging diplomats, parliamentarians, researchers as well as non-governmental organisations across the arctic rim - and even well beyond. The disclosure of Soviet dumping of radioactive waste in the Barents and Kara Seas was among the main reasons for this. International cooperation at regional and sub-regional levels – under the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP/AEPS), the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR), and bilateral Russian–Norwegian environmental commissions – has made notable contributions towards solving marine pollution problems in the Barents Sea. Efforts at the regional levels have differed from global processes by their clearer *programmatic* profile: relatively more resources, in terms of expertise and funding, have been invested in order to enhance the knowledge base and

* Research Director, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute. The presentation draws upon O. S. Stokke, ‘Sub-Regional Cooperation and Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment: The Barents Sea’, in D. Vidas (ed.), *Protecting the Polar Marine Environment: Law and Policy for Pollution Prevention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 124-48.

the administrative and technical capacity to avoid behaviour liable to threaten the marine environment. Many of the programmatic activities encouraged at other levels, for instance under the global dumping regime, have been planned, financed and organised at the sub-regional level. Comparatively less attention has been given to establishing new *regulative* norms for environmental protection from either industrial or military activity in the region – a task which tends to be left to broader fora, in this case to the London Convention on dumping which prohibits dumping of high-level radioactive waste and since 1993 low-level waste as well.

Sub-regional cooperation has served to relate environmental protection to broader foreign policy issues and has strengthened environmental networks across the Nordic–Russian divide. In turn, this has generated the financial resources and expertise necessary for assessing environmental problems in the region and enhancing the capacity to cope with them. The main reason for the higher fund-raising capacity of sub-regional processes is that geographic proximity ensures denser networks of interdependence. In the Barents Sea context, this affects the incentives of regional actors in two important ways. From a purely environmental point of view, geographic proximity highlights the self-interests of the Nordic states in financing environmental projects in Russia, especially those addressing industrial pollution from the border areas and those designed to prevent dumping of radioactive waste. This is all the more so as trouble-ridden Russia cannot be assumed to give environmental problems in the Barents Sea region the same high priority as its wealthy western neighbours do. Second, from a more general political point of view, geographic proximity ensures that environmental projects may serve broader purposes associated with national security. Thus, the willingness on the part of Norway and other Nordic states to flex their financial muscles for problem-solving purposes in the Barents Sea area is closely related to the sub-regional nature of the cooperation – which allows linkage to overarching goals such as national security and integration of Russia into the larger cooperative structure of Europe.

The Climate Change Agenda in Canada and International Implications

*By Peter G. Johnson**

The Arctic, in addition to bearing the brunt of global warming, has major feedbacks to global oceanic and atmospheric systems. In Canada the major impacts of climate change will be on the indigenous and non-indigenous populations in the North and it is imperative that climate change research on causes and impacts of change should involve 'northerners' and should be circumpolar in focus. In the post-Kyoto period the Canadian

* Professor, Department of Geography, University of Ottawa

federal government entered into intensive negotiations to develop a National Climate Change agenda. This involved 16 'Issue Tables' and the results of these deliberations were

- Canada's First National Climate Change Business Plan, October 2000
- Canada's National Implementation Strategy on Climate Change, October 2000
- Government of Canada Action Plan 2000 on Climate Change.

These documents emphasise reduction of Greenhouse Gases (GHG's) and voluntary action to address the requirements of Kyoto. There is only a limited consideration of basic research and impact research in the initiatives. Most science based federal government departments are developing their own climate change initiatives, frequently with little coordination. In the Canadian North the territorial governments have agreed to develop their own initiatives to contribute to the Kyoto targets. These are being based, like the federal initiative, on reduction of GHG's and voluntary action measures.

The science/research provisions of Canadian Climate Change Programs are small, and the focus on the North very limited. The initial Climate Change Action Fund (CCAF) provided funding of \$150m over 3 years, of which only 10% went to science and about 1% to northern topics. The second Climate Change Action Fund, \$210m over the next three years, has yet to be allocated in detail but there will be support for Canadian participation in the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) process. The government has also provided \$60m over 5 years for the Canada Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences (CFCAS), a competitive research funding source, which will provide some support for northern and arctic research. Other small programs involving climate change exist at the federal level: the Northern Ecosystem Initiative; the Northern Rivers Ecosystem Initiative; the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Network; among others.

One agency funded partly by the CCAF is the Northern Climate ExChange, a small but dynamic unit based at Yukon College which has taken the initiative on northern climate change assessment. In March 2001 they sponsored a major circumpolar climate change summit in Whitehorse.

Canada needs to promote greater scientific participation internationally and the university community is particularly interested in international collaboration.

Health, Children, Youth and Education

By Karla Jessen Williamson*

Much of the education offered to the youth and children of the circumpolar regions has for many generations been designed from the point of view of the southerners. These systems have been, in many cases, colonial infrastructures put to use without much thought to the assumptions behind them. Education systems were delivered to the circumpolar children and youth with diligence to inculcate in the mind of the learner new religion, new languages, and to introduce new forms of nationhood. Inherent in the process of schooling was the idea of replacing traditional cultures and enlightening the learner as to how to participate in another culture which deeply valued 'progress'.

In recent years much questioning has come about, as the education system has been criticised for being too Euro-centric, paternalistic and perpetuating the power holders in relation to the aboriginal populations around the circumpolar regions. Indeed the values inherently thought to be good for the circumpolar children and youth have proven themselves to be regressive in their cultural context. Today many traditional religions of shamanic origin have virtually disappeared; many indigenous languages are threatened with extinction and cultures have drastically changed.

Where the previous systems of education saw the circumpolar indigenous learners' cultures as negating social well-being, today new curricular plans for indigenous learners strive to avert negative social impact upon the young. The Nunavut curriculum document *Inuuqatigiit* argues for Inuit children to learn to appreciate both the contributions that their ancestors have made to human knowledge and those of their southern counterparts. The same philosophy has been accepted by the Dene of the Northwest Territories in their curriculum document *Dene Kede*, and also in the documents from the Inuit Circumpolar Conference. The Arctic Council, which saw these, has also approved of a similar move concerning the health of the circumpolar children and youth, as they depend upon good appreciation of bi-cultural understanding. Physical and psychological health is obviously interlinked with spiritual health, a fact that is recognised in the new educational processes of the circumpolar regions. The latter was very much the principle in ensuring the sustainability of life in the traditional circumpolar context.

Discussion

The discussion after this session touched upon all the themes from the presentations. One focus was the significance of the Arctic Council as a means for coordination or harmonisation of policies across nations within issue areas that are addressed by it.

* Executive Director, The Arctic Institute of North America.

Several contributors had found participation in working groups under the Arctic Council highly inspiring, but noted the difficulties of engaging other agencies at home when new ideas were to be put into practice.

Others emphasised that arctic fora could play a productive role in identifying particularly worthy projects in the North for which external financial sources could be mobilised. For instance, triangulation of funds from European Union, Russia and another arctic partner to finance installment and use of air quality measurement stations in Russia as part of AMAP, was seen as a promising model for other projects in the region.

The difference in focus between Norwegian and Canadian arctic social research was highlighted during the discussion, with social issues being at the center stage in Canadian research and resource related research the most central theme in Norwegian activities. However, it was pointed out that even if it is important to be aware of these differences in emphasis, there is still a substantial scope for cooperation; the comparative Norwegian-Canadian project on fisheries management was mentioned as an excellent example.

6 How can Norwegian and Canadian Scientists Together Contribute to Cooperative Processes in the North?

Introduction to Discussion

*By Kit M. Kovacs**

Cooperation between Norway and Canada regarding arctic issues is essential and 'natural'. We are two northern nations that face similar opportunities and challenges in our respective arctic regions. Three quite straightforward systems currently exist that could serve to enhance and advance our collaborative work in the social, physical and natural sciences: 1) our university system(s); 2) Research Council programmes and 3) on-going cooperative processes. Three northern university initiatives are already operational or well into the planning process. These include University Studies on Svalbard in Norway, Yukon College in Canada and the University of the Arctic. Promoting cooperation between our nations using simple vehicles such as faculty exchanges and undergraduate and graduate stipends could improve both current and future collaboration. Our respective research councils could establish a bilateral agreement with programmes dedicated to cooperative projects that include Canadian and Norwegian researchers, as recently done between Norway and the US. Our income tax authorities could also establish a bilateral agreement, such as that between Norway and the US, permitting tax-free sabbatical exchanges which encourage Norwegian and Canadian researchers to choose to be based in the reciprocal country for research leaves. Our governments could also facilitate greater linkage between our respective countries by promoting closer collaboration between our nations with respect to on-going processes within the Arctic Council such as AMAP, CAFF and ACIA as well as within broader global programmes such as IPCC, IUCN, ICES etc. This could be accomplished via travel or networking grants or government staff exchanges. The possibilities for collaboration between our countries with respect to northern issues is limited only by current financial realities within our research communities, the actual possibilities are next to infinite.

* Marine Ecology Coordinator, The Norwegian Polar Institute

The University of the Arctic: A New Context for International Cooperation in Northern Research and Education

*By Aron Senkpiel**

This is a remarkable time for those engaged in northern research and education. Never before has there been both the pressing need *and* the opportunity for northern cooperation amongst government policy and decision makers, researchers, educators, and business people that cuts across the traditional boundaries imposed by geography, discipline, and national and ethnic identity.

The University of the Arctic is one such opportunity. It has risen out of the deliberations of the Arctic Council – itself an important example of circumpolar cooperation – and its concerns about human security, cultural and economic sustainability and environmental protection. It was conceived to answer a simple but important question: how do we get the best of northern knowledge – both traditional and western – into the hands of those destined to be the circumpolar community’s new leaders?

After over two years of study and discussion there is now a consensus about the ‘idea’ of the University of the Arctic. There is agreement about the role that a coordinated network of high-latitude institutions in all eight northern nations can play in creating new education and training opportunities in the North and in establishing a new dialogue about the issues northerners consider most important. In some ways, this is not surprising; the ‘idea’ of the University of the Arctic is really not a new idea at all; rather, it’s the distillation of a lot of thought by a lot of people over a lot of years in a lot of communities. What is new is that these ideas are now being acted upon.

The release of *The Northern Dimension of Canada’s Foreign Policy* on June 8th of last year was an important development for the University of the Arctic. In addressing the question of what Canada, as a northern nation, should focus on as it works with other northern nations, it identified four priorities. One of these was ‘to help establish a University of the Arctic designed to foster academic excellence and sustainability including traditional knowledge, using distance education techniques....’ That statement, which explicitly links a domestic need with a foreign policy objective, provides the formal basis for Canada to contribute to the ongoing development of new University.

The development of the University of the Arctic and programs like its *Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies*, the *Arctic Learning Environment*, and the *Circumpolar Mobility Program* – which together comprise the University’s ‘minimum core capacity’ – will have major, positive consequences for the northern research enterprise. First, students in the University’s programs will create a substantial new ‘market’ for the products of

* Dean, Arts and Science, Yukon College

northern research – new northern knowledge. Second, it will do much to resolve the longstanding and often-noted limitations of current modes of academic communication in getting the ‘message out’ to those who need the information. Third, it will create additional impetus for interdisciplinary research that is policy- and needs-driven. Fourth, it will provide further encouragement to those who are developing new methodologies that meaningfully link western and traditional knowledge systems.

In conclusion, the University of the Arctic is not just about developing new ‘products’ – new northern research and new northern curricula – it is about using new ‘processes’ to achieve them. As Dr. Oran Young has noted, ‘the Arctic may well become an arena for important innovations in international cooperation in which states remain key players but new forms of cooperation....flourish.’

Discussion

Several proposals for enhancing research cooperation between Norwegian and Canadian scholars were laid on the table. One challenge is to raise awareness about existing means. For instance, it was pointed out that the scholarship opportunities at the University of Tromsø should be made better known; and the annual and triannual conferences organised by the Nordic Association for Canadian Studies (NACS) can serve as starting points for establishing new contacts.* NACS also has two scholarships to promote Nordic-Canadian research cooperation.

Other proposals would require new mechanisms but not necessarily very costly ones: reciprocal student exchange programmes were mentioned by several participants as an important move. It was also pointed out that the experience with bilateral arctic research agreements drawn up in the 1980s and 1990s suggests that earmarked funding for joint research programmes will often be necessary for cooperative take-off. Some argued that the development of bilateral research cooperation should not be structured by bureaucratic agencies but rather by scholars or research institutes seeing collaboration as a means to do better research on given issues. In this view, the role of research agencies in the two countries should be limited to creation of an infrastructure that can facilitate such bottom-up initiatives and - whenever project ideas are persuasive – their realisation.

The need to channel information about results from policy research and conclusions from cooperative endeavours, such as the present workshop, into the political processes and institutions in the North was emphasised by several commentators; more extensive

* See Appendix IV.

use of the internet is an obvious method here. Improving the contacts between researchers and practitioners engaged in arctic diplomacy will be important in stimulating a broader debate on how the cooperative structures in the North can be strengthened so as to promote their effectiveness in meeting arctic challenges.

Indigenous Peoples: An Emerging Voice in Arctic Cooperation

- Stuart Robinson, Department of Political Science, University of Tromsø:
Transnational Openings and Postmodern Obstructions to Cooperative Politics of the Arctic
- Alf Håkon Hoel, Department of Political Science, University of Tromsø:
Global Climate Change: Impacts on Arctic Societies
- Discussion

Programme – Tuesday 3 April

Session 4 – Cooperative Fora in the North

- Åge Mariussen, Nordregio:
Outline of the Arctic Cooperation Architecture: Strengths and Deficiencies
- Mary Simon, Canadian Ambassador to Denmark:
Arctic Council: Important Reorganisation Issues
- Jan Tore Holvik, Special Advisor on the Arctic and the Antarctic,
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs:
Arctic Council: Important Reorganisation Issues
- Discussion

Session 5 – Coordination Among and Beyond Arctic States

- Tiina Kurvits, CAFF International Secretariat:
*Area Protection in the Arctic Marine Environment:
Interplay of Arctic and Broader Processes*
- Knut Mikalsen, Department of Political Science, University of Tromsø:
*Managing Arctic Fisheries: A Comparison of Canadian and Norwegian
Approaches*
- Olav Schram Stokke, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute:
Nuclear Dumping in the Arctic: The Interplay of Global and Regional Regimes
- Peter G. Johnson, Department of Geography, University of Ottawa:
The Climate Change Agenda in Canada and International Implications
- Karla Jessen Williamson, Arctic Institute of North America:
Health, Children, Youth and Education
- Discussion

Session 6 – How can Norwegian and Canadian Scientists Together Contribute to Cooperative Processes in the North?

Kick-off introductions, including discussion of the potential of the Arctic University, followed by open discussion among seminar participants:

- Kit Kovacs, Norwegian Polar Institute:
- Aron Senkpiel, Arts and Science, Yukon College:
*The University of the Arctic: A New Context for International Cooperation in
Northern Research and Education*

Participants

Name:	Address:	E-mail, phone, fax:
Backe-Hansen, Per	Senior Advisor, The Research Council of Norway P.O. Box 2700 St. Hanshaugen N-0131 Oslo, Norway	pbh@forskningsradet.no
Bie, Karen Nossun	Assistant Director General, Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs P.O. Box 8114 Dep N-0032 Oslo, Norway	karen.bie@kuf.dep.no
Bruns, Patti	Policy Advisor, Northern Dimension and Circumpolar Affairs Canadian Mission to the EU Avenue de Tervuren, 2 1040 Brussels, Belgium	patti.bruns@dfait-maeci.gc.ca
DUNFJELD, LEIF A..	Senior Advisor, Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development P.O. Box 8112 Dep N-0032 Oslo	leif.dunfjeld@krd.dep.no
Elverhøi, Anders	Professor, Department of Geology University of Oslo P.O. Box 1047, Blindern N-0316 Oslo, Norway	anders.elverhoi@geologi.uio.no
Finkler, Harald	Director, Circumpolar, Indian Affairs – Canada Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1A 0H4 finkler@inac.gc.ca	
Fossum, John Erik	President, Nordic Association for Canadian Studies University of Oslo P.O. Box 1143 Blindern N-0317 Oslo, Norway	j.e.fossum@arena.uio.no
Hernes, Bjørn	Public Affairs Officer, Canadian Embassy Wergelandsveien 7 N-0244 Oslo, Norway	bjorn.hernes@dfait-maeci.gc.ca

Hesjedal, Olav	Director, Norwegian University Network for Lifelong Learning Pilestredet 46 B N-0167 Oslo, Norway	olavh@norgesuniversitetet.no
Hoel, Alf Håkon	Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science University of Tromsø N-9037 Tromsø, Norway	hoel@sv.uit.no
Holvik, Jan-Tore	Ambassador, Ministry of Foreign Affairs P.O. Box 8114 Dep N-0032 Oslo, Norway	jan-tore.holvik@mfa.no
Hønneland, Geir	Senior Research Fellow, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute P.O. Box 326 N-1326 Lysaker, Norway	geir.honneland@fni.no
Jernsletten, Johnny-Leo L.	Project Manager, Centre for Sámi Studies and Sámi Issues University of Tromsø Breivika N-9037 Tromsø	johnny.jernsletten@sami.uit.no
Johnson, Peter G.	Professor, Department of Geography University of Ottawa P.O. Box 450 Stn. A Ottawa, ON. K1N 6N5, Canada	peterj@aix1.uottawa.ca acuns@cyberus.ca Phone: int.+1 613 562 5800, Ext. 1061 Fax: int.+1 613 562 5145
Kadas, Robert	Senior Policy Advisor, Aboriginal and Circumpolar Affairs Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade 125 Sussex Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2, Canada	robert.kadas@dfait-maeci.gc.ca
Kovacs, Kit M.	Marine Ecology Co-ordinator, The Norwegian Polar Institute N-9296 Tromsø, Norway	kit.kovacs@npolar.no
Kurvits, Tiina	Senior Advisor, CAFF International Secretariat c/o Fisheries and Oceans Canada 200 Kent Street Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6, Canada	kurvitst@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Laberge, François J.	Councillor and Consul, Canadian Embassy Wergelandsveien 7 N-0244 Oslo, Norway	francois.laberge@dfait- maeci.gc.ca

Mariussen, Åge	Senior Research Fellow, Nordregio Holmamiralens Väg 10 Box 1658, SE 11186 Stockholm, Sweden	age.mariussen@nordregio.se
Mikalsen, Knut H.	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science University of Tromsø N-9037 Tromsø, Norway	knutm@sv.uit.no
Moe, Arild	Deputy Director, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute P.O. Box 326 N-1326 Lysaker, Norway	arild.moe@fni.no
Nåvik, Gunnbjørg	Advisor, Ministry of Environment P.O. Box 8013 Dep N-0030 Oslo, Norway	ghn@md.dep.no
Reiersen, Lars-Otto	Executive Secretary, Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) P.O. Box 8100 Dep N-0032 Oslo, Norway	lars-otto.reiersen@amap.no
Robinson, P. Stuart	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science University of Tromsø N-9037 Tromsø, Norway Visiting scholar, University of Keele, UK	irc01@intr.keele.ac.uk
Senkpiel, Aron	Dean, Arts and Science Yukon College Box 2799, Whitehorse YT, Canada Y1A 5K4	asenk@yukoncollege.yk.ca
Simon, Mary May	Canadian Ambassador to Denmark, Circumpolar Affairs Canadian Embassy, Copenhagen Kr. Bernikowsgade 1 DK-1105 Copenhagen K, Denmark	mary-may.simon@dfait- maeci.gc.ca
Stokke, Olav Schram	Research Director, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute P.O. Box 326 N-1326 Lysaker, Norway	olav.s.stokke@fni.no
Williamson, Karla Jessen	Executive Director, Arctic Institute of North America University of Calgary 2500 University Drive, NW Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4	wkjessen@ucalgary.ca

Grete	,	Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs P.O. Box 8114 Dep N-0032 Oslo, Norway	grete.odegaard@mfa.no
Østreng, Willy		Director, The Fridtjof Nansen Institute P.O. Box 326 N-1326 Lysaker, Norway	willy.ostreng@fni.no

Some Examples of Recent Canadian-Norwegian Research Cooperation on Northern Issues

The Institutional and Social Structure of Aquaculture: A Comparative Study

Running from 2000, and partly funded by SSHRC. Participants: from Canada: Richard Apostle, Dalhousie University, Gene Barrett, St. Mary's University, and John Phyne, St. Francis Xavier University; from Norway: Petter Holm, Norwegian College of Fishery Science, Svein Jentoft, University of Tromsø, Knut H. Mikalsen, University of Tromsø.

Social Movements, Citizenship and the Globalising State: A Comparative Analysis of Urban Britain and Arctic Norway

P. Stuart Robinson, University of Tromsø, with Dr. Jo-Anne Dillabough, University of Toronto, 1997-

Funding: British Council and Research Council of Norway joint research-grant: NOK 39,000, Postgraduate-student development funding, University of Tromsø: NOK 7,500.

Output (papers-in-draft): 'Social Science Research and the Marginalised: Political and Ethical Dilemmas', and 'The Globalising Politics of Identity: A Comparative Analysis

International Northern Sea Route Programme

The International Northern Sea Route Programme (INSROP) was a 6-year (1993-99) international research programme designed to create an extensive knowledge base about the shipping lanes along the coast of the Russian Arctic from Novaya Zemlya in the west to the Bering Strait in the east – the Northern Sea Route (NSR). The three principal partners in the programme were the Central Marine Research and Design Institute (CNIIMF – Russia), The Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI – Norway) and Ship & Ocean Foundation (SOF – Japan), but more than 450 researchers from 14 countries were involved in the programme, carrying out 104 sub-projects. Canadian participants included Edgar Gold, Dalhousie University (a former President of the Canadian Maritime Law Association), and Franklyn Griffiths, University of Toronto.

Research was organised in four sub-programmes: I – Natural Conditions and Ice Navigation; II – Environmental Factors; III – Trade and Commercial Shipping Aspects; IV – Political, Legal and Strategic Factors.

INSROP resulted in a total of 167 INSROP Working Papers in addition to several books and the INSROP Geographical Information System – an electronic database of the NSR.

Riding Out the Storm: Sustainable Development and Fishery Dependent Economies

Funded by the John D. and Catherine T. Mac Arthur Foundation i perioden 1992-94. Participants: from Canada: Richard Apostle, Dalhousie University, Gene Barrett, St. Mary's University, Leigh Mazany, Dalhousie University; from Norway: Petter Holm, Norwegian College of Fishery Science, Svein Jentoft, University of Tromsø, Knut H. Mikalsen, University of Tromsø; from USA: Bonnie McCay, Rutgers University.

Main publication from the project: 'Community, State and Market on the North Atlantic Rim: Challenges to Modernity in the Fisheries', Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Nordic Association for Canadian Studies

NACS was founded 1 May 1984 at the University of Aarhus, Denmark. The aim of the association is to promote Canadian studies in the five Nordic Countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Close ties have been established between NACS and the Baltic countries Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The Association is open to anyone who wants to work in that direction, whatever her or his profession or nationality. The Nordic Association for Canadian Studies is multidisciplinary.

Each of the member countries hosts at least one Canadian studies conference or seminar every year. In addition, the member countries take turns at hosting an international conference on Canadian studies every third year. The last triennial conference took place in Iceland in 1999 and the next will take place in Stockholm in 2002.

The Association is a centre for information. The members are kept informed of conferences, seminars, visiting lecturers and writers, books and publications, plus any other relevant information about activities within Canadian Studies in the Nordic Countries.

Twice a year the association publishes the *NACS Newsletter* which is sent to all members. The membership directory facilitates contact between members.

The *NACS Faculty Research Program* is designed to assist individual scholars in higher education institutions to undertake short term research about Canada. The purpose is to increase knowledge and understanding of Canada through publication abroad of pertinent articles in the scholarly press. The award assists with direct costs related to the research project, and, when a research trip to Canada is warranted, provides assistance towards international airfare and a weekly flat rate allowance. Further information and application forms are available in Adobe Acrobat format at the NACS website.

In addition, NACS provides two annual *Student Scholarship* travel grants of SEK 10,000 for masters students from the Nordic countries to enable them to collect exam-relevant material in Canada. Undergraduate students from the Nordic countries should apply before 1 January. The application (there is no specific form) should be sent to the secretary of the NACS/ANEC.

For more information, consult the NACS website (<http://www.hum.au.dk/nacs/>, which also contains a large number of links to relevant universities, embassies, and Canadian studies associations) or contact the Secretariat: NACS/ANEC, Keith Battarbee, Department of English, Turku University, 20014 Turku, Finland (E-mail: keith.battarbee@utu.fi).