

3rd Workshop of the UArctic Institute for Applied Circumpolar Policy

“Climate Change and Human Security”

September 6 – 8, 2010

University of Lapland
Rovaniemi, Finland

Final Report and Main Findings

By Pierre-Andre Forest, Lassi Heininen, Michael Sfraga,
Ross A. Virginia and Kenneth S. Yalowitz

Executive Summary and Key Findings

The 3rd Workshop of the University of the Arctic Institute for Applied Circumpolar Policy was organized at the University of Lapland in Rovaniemi, Finland, September 6–8, 2010, in conjunction with start of the academic year 2010-2011 of the University of Lapland. The workshop included 15 presentations and 35 participants from Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The main theme of the conference was *“Climate Change and Human Security.”* Among the integrated sub-themes were:

- Climate change and human security from the viewpoint of Indigenous peoples
- Climate change, oil / gas drilling and transportation, and environmental security
- Climate change and alternative energy
- Climate change in northern / arctic strategies and policies of the Arctic states
- Climate change, state sovereignty and national security
- Climate change and international law

The Workshop coincided with the inauguration of the academic year 2010-2011 at the University of Lapland. It was organized by the University of Lapland and the joint UArctic-NRF Thematic Network (TN) on Geopolitics and Security together with Dartmouth College and the University of Alaska at Fairbanks. The University of Lapland hosted the workshop, and the TN was in charge of (the planning of) the content.

The University of the Arctic Institute for Applied Circumpolar Policy was established in 2008 by Dartmouth College and the University of Alaska at Fairbanks. Two earlier conferences held in the United State by the UArctic Institute were “The Arctic Climate Change and Security Policy” in Hanover, New Hampshire, at Dartmouth College, and “Considering a Roadmap Forward: The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment” in Fairbanks, Alaska, at the University of Alaska at Fairbanks in October 2009.

The Thematic Network on Geopolitics and Security is a joint TN between the University of the Arctic (UArctic) and the Northern Research Forum (NRF), established in 2009. The two focus areas of the TN are studies on northern Geopolitics, and studies on security and security dimensions in the North. Consequently, the main aim is to combine these two areas and draw up a holistic picture on northern geopolitics and security.

Main Findings and Future Issues

I. Theme: *Defining human security and climate change in the High North*

Lassi Heininen: Climate Change and Human Security: Introduction

- State sovereignty, national security, and the military
- Climate change as a new security dimension
- Human security / safety
- New security paradigm

Timo Koivurova: Climate change, Security and International Law

- Climate change as a national / international security issue
- Limits to application and interpretation of international law;
 - Rapid pace of change and continued state sovereignty focus
 - Challenge to finding commonalities
- Needed action, new disciplinary and interdisciplinary paradigm
- Climate justice / Climate law

II. Theme: *Climate change, biopolitics and security*

Julian Reid: Biopolitics of climate change and human (in)security

- Shift from development to sustainable development
- Legitimation paradox of sustainable development
- SD goals to protect live support systems / biopolitics
- The ecologisation of the political
- Resilience, beyond security

Andrew Baldwin: The Biopolitics of environmental citizenship—complex adaptive becoming in the delivery of human security

- Environmental citizenship provides security through resilience and adaptive capacity

III. Theme: State development policies & Governance on climate change in the Arctic

Kenneth Yalowitz: Arctic climate change—security challenges and opportunities

- Current state of stability
- Comprehensive definition of security, linking environmental and economic interests
- Redefining the Arctic Council's mandate / representations
- Zone of cooperation

Lotta Numminen: Governance challenges and new cooperation in the Arctic Ocean

- Risks of confrontation and limits of “*Treaty*” option (hard law) / Arctic Council (soft law)
- Linking national / international interests to Arctic strategies
- A5 vs. A8
- Role and cooperation of NGOs

Mikhail Kalentchenko: Environmental aspects of security of the marine Arctic: the Russian law perspective

- Lack of application of rule of law;
- Environment aspect of security, motivation / interest not high on agenda
- Arctic region is of low priority
- Economic and military interests come first

IV. Case Studies: Economic development, community viability and livelihood, and human security

- Monica Tennberg: Adaptation, vulnerability and security: a discussion
- Svein Mathiesen: Reindeer husbandry, and adaptation to climate change
- Florian Stammler: Community viability in the Russian Arctic and the future of Russia's northern industrial cities
- Resource development as a Russian Arctic Strategic priority for security of nation, territory and people
 - Industrial development and demography - past and present security dimensions
 - Russian Arctic human settlement strategies: options for the future:
 - fly in / fly out
 - northern base towns
 - permanent residency
 - Viable communities as contributing to a secure Russian Arctic resource economy
 - diversity of governances and development
 - determinants of community viability in the Arctic
- Pekka Livari: Safety and security interrelated tourism safety: global changes - local implications
- Anna Stammler–Gossman: Local relevance of climate change: A matter of perception

V. Future issues: Actors, citizenship, and gaps

- Leena Suopajarvi: Why the change does not happen? A critical perspective towards knowledge-based strategies on climate change
- Annika Skoglund: Biopolitics and green governmentality: Security through Homo Clima

- Policy relevance of academic research on climate change
- Interplay between science and politics, policy development is a two-way street
- Importance of “science translators,” best practices, follow-up
- Public involvement as “environmental citizens”
- Arctic policy challenges, future role of the Arctic Council, observers
- Role of the military, and a more holistic view of human security
- Agency, gaps in representation, application and understanding of knowledge(s) at various levels (local, regional, etc.)
- Cultivating—culminating / northern role-southern drivers, north-south dialogue, global partners
- The “North” more than just an early warming system to changing climate.

Background

About the main theme: *Climate Change and Human Security*

The media has portrayed climate change as a—or the—new global phenomenon in the early-21st century, and indeed climate change is a universal and significant environmental problem globally. Further, climate change is no longer only based on scenarios, or a matter of numbers from computer models, it is a reality impacting traditional livelihoods and industry, new macro-scale livelihoods, and finally, other new knowledge- and ICT-based livelihoods. Climate change is both rapid and cumulative, and threatens peoples, societies and the environment. It has become a new kind of security issue, fostering a sense of insecurity in everyday life.

There are many ways to (re)define security as well as insecurity, and more human-oriented approaches to their interpretation. Security is not objective but complex and relative, and questions, such as “whose security are we talking about?” indicate that security can be interpreted to be socially constructed. As a result, security is seen as depending upon a particular context. A new comprehensive notion emphasizes both environmental / ecological aspects of security, and a focus on human beings as individuals and their everyday security.

Although climate change should be interpreted to be mostly a risk rather than a threat, its physical impacts, such as melting glaciers, and the uncertainty associated with change, are perceived as security matters. This is well indicated, for example, by food safety and climate security. Consequently, climate change can be defined as impacting both human and environmental securities, for example, traditional lifestyles of settlement populations are under threat. It also has implications for national security; governments are worried about state sovereignty, and national interests, such as the economy, energy and security, and the environment.

All this is very much the case in the Arctic and the entire Circumpolar North, and therefore it is timely and relevant for this Workshop to study and discuss the general impacts and influences of climate change on northern regions, peoples and societies, and human security. Consequently, the main theme of *Climate Change and Human Security* consists of several integrated sub-themes, such as “Climate change and human security from the viewpoint of Indigenous peoples,” “Climate change, resources and economics, and regional development,” “Climate change, and transportation and shipping,” “Climate change in

northern / Arctic strategies and policies of the Arctic states,” “Climate change, state sovereignty and national security,” and “Climate change and international law.”

Main aims

Among the main aims of the Workshop are to:

- 1) Highlight and disseminate general scientific information and knowledge about impacts of climate change, and discussion on human responses to climate change in the High North;
- 2) Define and discuss the real impacts of climate change to peoples and societies, and how they influence peoples’ everyday human security as well as regional development in the European North;
- 3) Define the importance of climate change and human security in the strategies and policies of the Arctic states;
- 4) Promote the interplay between science and politics through a policy-oriented dialogue on inter-relations between climate change and human security;
- 5) Disseminate a Final Report and (main) Findings; and
- 6) Serve as a platform for interaction linking representatives of the University of the Arctic Institute for Applied Circumpolar Policy, members of the TN on Geopolitics and Security, and not least researchers and (post)graduate students of the University of Lapland.

All this emphasizes the idea and importance of dialogue, and that the focus of the Workshop is to have open and lively discussion on these matters based on substantial and scientific presentations. This format comes from the two earlier conferences by the UArctic Institute in the United States (“The Arctic Climate Change and Security Policy” at Dartmouth College in Hanover, NH, December 2008, and “Considering a Roadmap Forward: The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment” at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, October 2009), and also from the design and experiences of the Open Assemblies of the Northern Research Forum (NRF), another University of the Arctic Institute.

In order to reach this goal, the Workshop provided time for open discussion in each session, particularly in the final session. This timeframe limited speaker presentations to no longer than 15-20 minutes each. Afterwards there was time for questions, general comments and open discussions among the participants.

Presentations and Discussion Notes (by Pierre-André Forest)

I. Theme: Defining human security and climate change in the High North

Lassi Heininen, “Climate Change and Human Security: Introduction”

Timo Koivurova, “Climate change, security and international law”

DISCUSSION:

- Q: Climate Change as a Security issue, inform us of what dangers Climate Change represents, as this would already seem to suggest that Climate Change is a security issues?
- A: Reference to “tipping points” as basis of IPCC, dangerous interference of natural systems, no endorsement of specific level (1 or 2 degree increase in temperature), but show that there is a point where we no longer can act, and natural Climate Change responses take over. From International Law view point, security discussions are different as they seem to work counter to mentality of current practice.
- Q: Island states have made an appeal to UN Security Council, there has been no follow-up on this. Is there any developments on this, is this not a tipping point?
- A: Basic resolutions have not been agreed on, so approach – reactions are not there. Publicity has worked, but this must continue. This is a problem!
- Q: How IL labels security issues, but how it constructs security issues? What is the nature of construct of security in IL?
- A: The construct still reflects old threats (military security), pragmatic understanding is needed, as mainstream is marginalising itself this way. Term ‘security’ carries extra baggage, should maybe not be used. Specialised disciplines are addressing this, challenging this, but in general are not.
- Q: To what extent is momentum being gained on discussions between nation states?
- A: Climate Change regime, vis-à-vis 1992 agreement, not much discussion has evolved since then. See no reflection of developments in this area, as agreements are not there. Do we need to redefine the International setting? Would regional or sector by sector approaches be better?
- Q: Role of the military, since it has played a key role in existing discussion. Should they have a role of extending the dialogue about Climate Change?
- A: They have taken such a role in the past, and will – are starting to realise that Climate Change corresponding issues affect them directly as well (civil – humanitarian aid role).
- Q: Climate Change will change “security” definition, the role of the military (e.g., NATO). Pakistan is a good example of how military – security impacts are now dwarfed - overrun by Climate Change impacts.
- Q: Climate Change can be a driver for a new role the military. Issue of dialogue has grown on a large variety of issues (communication, search – rescue, etc.). The military is being relied on to help with large scale environmental issues, and are expected to respond.
- Q: Is Canada acting against IL by saying that “Climate Change is affecting its own national security”?
- A: Single states and groups of smaller states are bringing up the issue, but nothing at the UN or International level is being raised.
- Q: Need not only to think about how the military could play a role, but what about “environmental citizenship” concerns, issues.
- Q: If IL is defined by nation state and military security, then how does this play out at the international level? Conception of what is the role of militaries is not being seriously considered. Because our existing world is a two century continuum, how quickly can our operating environment, paradigm change?

Monica Tennberg, “Adaptation, vulnerability and security: a discussion”

DISCUSSION

- Q: How would you say that Climate Change citizenship is being expressed in Finland?
- A: Climate Change awareness numbers are high (Gallup’s), involvement has become active-passive (recycle, purchase decision, etc.) but doing something about it is lacking.
- Q: Focusing back on people, needs, is fine, but going back to environmental discussion with it having its own needs...value of the natural world.
- A: Finnish view of nature is still very much as relational (serve human need, ownership, access), but only older generation seem to be able to view it in a philosophical way.
- Q: Level of analysis, what kind of local adaptation governance did you observe?
- A: Adaptation governance, people are getting prepared, they see that nature is changing, timing issues, etc. Climate Change still remains difficult for them to comprehend, as they only look at inter-linkages. They see it as everyday practice, not from an official system management approach. Their personal motivations are driven by local, cultural, livelihood, family issues. Need for mainstreaming to bring together levels of discourse and development.
- Q: People seem to be divorced from issues. Self creating practices through ethics. As a “Fouchauvian” researcher, is promoting “safety” and “security” a contradiction?
- A: There seems to be a need to divide the Climate Change discussion into regions, sectors, etc...as concepts of holistic views are seemingly too difficult to handle.
- Q: Safety and Security, in Russia there is only one word for both of these terms. How to deal with this reality? If we are to divide approaches...what is address as an issue of security, and what is addressed as issue of safety? This will certainly change on the area of application.
- Q: If there is a need to change usefulness of key terms, is not the role of science also changing because of the scale of issues being addressed?
- A: There are significant advanced and approaches taken from researchers in the natural science and those in the social sciences. The natural scientist seems to have taken greater advances in the role of “translating sciences”, becoming better “knowledge providers” in that context.

II. Theme: Climate change, biopolitics and security

Julian Reid, “Biopolitics of climate change and human (in) security”

Shift in development focus, sustainable development vs. traditional forms of development, policy that change the life support system that people depend on. Rationality of development, in the context of the rationalisation of existing economic doctrines. Reason to secure biosphere, while same time ensuring that market forms of subjectively as the means to drive this development. Legitimation that creates a paradox. Neo-liberal critic of states. Resilient = not simply to be secure, but a different property, to be able to adapt to change when it occurs. Subject of development, as opposed to a subject that can secure itself from dangers. Living in a post-human era. Swedish report = resilience is best practices of developing / using what is economically possible (a property of humanity). Double shift of neo-liberalism. How can sustainable development be wrestled from the grip of neo-liberalism. The “ecologisation” of the political.

Andrew Baldwin, Durham University, “The Biopolitics of environmental citizenship: complex adaptive becoming in the delivery of human security”

Importance of UA-Sec to produce a document that could feed into the IPCC 2013 report on Human Security. The way the issue of Climate Change is becoming an issue of national security. The concept of climate security vs. security of nation states...climate insecurity should only be used to help develop resilience capabilities. Liberal interpretation where greater human security = greater state security. Sustainable development is a pre-emptive mode of attack on environmental refugee issues (controlling the movement of uncontrolled labour). Boreal forest security, Canadian Boreal Framework (BFA - MOU) Agreement, the way the agreement codifies life as being complex – adaptive (equating economic value to that of life itself), by establishing a baseline values that are solely economic. Contrary to ecosystem based management that provides a more balanced vision of life giving quality. Resilience and adaptive capabilities...human + carbon relationship.

DISCUSSION

- Q: How are co-management developments being undertaken in Canada, and what role does TEK have for local indigenous populations? Some 1st nations groups see and have found benefit of playing the TEK, while others don't.
- Q: Where would you place Climate Change in the overall issue of sustainability?
- A: There is an environmental crisis upon which Climate Change is a part, making it difficult to separate.
- Q: Role of the “Bruntlin” commission was to rescue economic growth from environmental criticism. Some states now see that Neo-liberal policy as undermining national security.
- A: Climate change politics has made claims that developing and even under-developed states can grow in similar ways as developed countries, thus only enhancing
- Q: Dichotomy between nature and humans, but some peoples have a world view that do not separate people from nature.
- A: The dominant view is no different because how can humans separate...
- Q: Where does development aid rest in this area. Is foreign policy only and simply an extension of national economic strategy?
- Q: LASSI: Is there a bio-politics that can link resilience and environmental-citizenship?
- A: That relationship can provide or serve as a basis for a new-liberal environment-human relationship, where the “forest” is not separate from the human.
- Q: LARS: There are some in modern society that have no other idea of what other values a forest provide other than financial return.
- Q: System management, resilience based system with sub-systems can work and respond.

Ross Virginia: Day 1 Summary

Discussion: Many of the aspects of security under Climate Change don't have agency of representation, thus leading to the only option of collective action which is the only way to respond.

III. Theme: State development policies & governance on climate change in the Arctic

Hannu Halinen, “Finland’s Arctic Strategy”

Most all Arctic eight countries have developed comprehensive strategies vis-à-vis the Arctic, with Sweden and Russia to follow suit in the near future. Of particular interest will be that of Russia.

DISCUSSION

- Q: The position that the 5 coastal AC members have been meeting on their own, does this have political implications, is it problematic? In their most recent meeting there was no declaration, only a simple statement.
- A: The AC is in a good position at the moment, as it sees that all its members play an important role in dealing with the complex issues concerned. Of the six goals stated, the one which is closest to consensus is the issue of “outside” participants. Finland is not interested in being involved in coastal issues, but find that (at the start lack of transparency on coastal issues, who, why, etc., but know we know better). Momentum is needed to strengthen the AC, including by developing cooperation between EU and AC, possibly via the Euro-Barents Arctic Council.
- Q: Why is it that SF strategy looks simply at the EU north, while the Russia strategy and others look beyond their own borders. Should this not be included?
- A: This is a good point, as cooperation with Russia is high on Finland’s agenda. With many different way of defining what the Arctic is, the Barents Regions is clearly defined, and our cooperative goals are well stated there, and we want to continue cooperating. Of course Finland wants to play a role in helping the EU develop its strategy.
- Q: The text dealing with supporting indigenous peoples in the strategy is a legal text, and there are complex issue around this. What approach does this represent for dealing with the Sami?
- A: The role of permanent participants in the AC is very much attached to this issue, and there a need to find a way to bring representing indigenous groups
- Q: What are SF interests in expanding the mandate of the AC?
- A: Working methods that currently exist in the AC need to be improved. Improving the role of the six working groups is one area of importance, through which Finland can play a more active role via scientific contributions. We are reluctant to propose specifics as this could prove problematic, so SF is only seeking to allow political processes to advance, to see how this issue evolves. Finding opportunities to make use of the expertise that Finland has is of course of primary importance, and ship building is one such area that we are eager to develop (but this is not only limited to the north, as developments in other parts of the world are also of interest (Asia, etc.). National cooperation is a big challenge in all countries, and here in Finland we must be more active and visible, to make better use of our areas of expertise and knowledge. Finland is not looking to be a gateway for EU into the Arctic, but equally we don’t want to fall between gaps. We need to build a role that emphasis our areas of expertise, our domestic interests, and developments related to our role in Barents and Baltic Sea areas are important. Cross-sectional issue, not simply a political issue...our main issue is to keep the northern area tension free.

Kenneth Yalowitz, “Arctic climate change – security challenges and opportunities”

DISCUSSION

- Q: Is there any evidence of economic downturn in the Arctic?
- A: This is simply an assessment based on case-by-case analysis, with Shtokman field in Russia being the biggest example. Shipping volume and vessel usage rates are also good indicators of this.
- Q: How would you describe the relationship between USA and Canada policy?
- A: US – CDN issues are discussed extensively, and at times we agree to disagree. We recognise that we have more commonalities than difference.
- A: Hilary Clinton has played an important role in bringing Arctic issues to the mainstream political arena. The process is developing, and requires attention at the highest levels.

Lotta Numminen, “Governance challenges and new cooperation in the Arctic Ocean”

DISCUSSION

- A: Hannu Halinen: AC8+ seems to be acknowledged. UN role...we should not over politicise the issues, and there is a need to open debate and discussion. Open consultation and involvement with IMO, UN via individual countries.
- Q: How do you think the “strengthening of the Arctic Council can be done?”
- A: Adding additional meetings is a start, as two is not enough. Separate SAO and ministerial meetings (closed) are usually with open agendas, which have helped, but other formats must be investigated and approaches intensified. Decisions by governments must also be done, so that AC issues can move forward.
- Q: India, Japan, Korea, China, there are interests in expanding to include as observer, but do you think that this could work counter to making progress?
- A: Certainly issues of what parameters of inclusion must be settled first.
- Q: A treaty approach risks weakening the role and influence of indigenous people representation.
- A: Main issue is how to include indigenous participation in arriving at national consensus on relevant issues.
- Q: Observer status for outsiders, does this not risk impacting on the role of current observers?
- A: There is an expressed interest from many regions, countries from around the world, and this must be addressed. The accommodations will of course not be the same as that of nation states and of indigenous groups, but a line must be drawn to limit extent of actors involved.
- Q: How about having observer status for local communities?

Mikhail Kalentchenko, "Environmental aspects of security of the marine Arctic: the Russian law perspective"

DISCUSSION

- Q: Has Russia made any assessments of port facilities along the north-sea route?
- A: These are done by agencies that have a need for such information, and these are not coordinated, and are confidential. Much overlap occurs, but no body is monitoring the overall situation, as there is a market for information and everyone wants a piece of this market. Anonymity in regulation is necessary, as population has negative opinion on regulation. Russia’s biggest problem is that it really doesn’t know what it wants.
- Q: Recent developments in Russia are significant, particularly in maritime areas, so their role and interest should not be understated.
- A: Limited investment comes from inside Russia, which is a problem.

Theme IV. “Case Studies: Economic development, community viability and livelihood, and human security”

Svein Mathiesen, “Reindeer husbandry, and adaptation to climate change”

DISCUSSION

- “Distributing risk” making changes to herd and herd structure, as well as use of topography. There are no reindeer herders who do not do other forms of food collection (fishing, berry picking, etc.), which allows for diversity. With the “Tundra” focus, herders in the Taiga region are dying out.

- Rain on snow, how big a risk is this? Looking at similar regions where weather conditions are similar (annual mean average), to see how seasonal changes impact ways of life.
- The role of women in herding communities: This can vary from region to region and community to community, where in some her role is important, while in others it is minimal. In some areas, changes have led to women no longer being present. Although there are different impacts in different regions, for example we see more dry and warm summers, which form the greatest risks in some areas. While in other areas, warmer and wetter winters are becoming more and more common, with greater risk.

Florian Stammer, “Community viability in the Russian Arctic and the future of Russia's northern industrial cities”

DISCUSSION

Q: Are there actual labour shortages, or has the industrial output changed that allow for the population displacement?

A: Out migration has occurred mainly in the Far East and in parts of European Russia, that is why the practice of fly-in-fly-out has become quite prominent. The labour situation is a diverse one. Russia wants to make the northern regions an attractive place to work, as the older generation is phased out of the work-force and needs to be replaced. The reason and the destination of population movements is diverse, some returned to former family homes...Relocation of large groups of northern has also been attempted, with relative success. In oil and gas towns there is a pride that they that are playing a role in keeping the country moving forward. This relationship is something that is more in the past tense for mining towns. There are growth areas, and accommodation development is an important sector (houses, hotels, apartments). Poverty was not noticed as in gas and oil towns' entry in limited (controlled), but what you do find are big differences between what a labour worker earns as opposed to a town clerk, etc. State secret service plays a role in these communities, and private security services are taking control of some towns.

Pekka Iivari, Rovaniemi University of Applied Sciences, Lapland Institute for Tourism Research and Education, “Safety and security interrelated tourism safety: global changes - local implications”

DISCUSSION

Q: Are there practices in the Antarctic that can be applied to the Arctic?

A: There are possible governance practices that could be adopted, and possibly standard practices. There is a need in the North to have advocacy groups to represent operator and customer interests. New forms of regimes may be necessary, as there is a danger that safety and security becomes something that can be purchased and controlled. In tourism there are hermetic corridors that do not include local interests. Example from past workshop conclusion is noted...to learn from Antarctic frameworks (CLIA and AECO). E.g. in Antarctica icebreakers and cruise ships are required to register, and go through checks.

Q: Security paradigms from the perspective of military are not really changing, as many elements of the status-quo remain (bases, developments, etc.).Dealing with tourism and Climate Change, what if Climate Change was to become a discipline, and that recommendation to make major cuts to particular sectors, how prepared is tourism prepared to deal with this?

A: Tourism at many levels is not prepared to deal with such matters, and must be prepared to operate in a different era. There are many actors at the heart of security issues, i.e., policy,

security services, etc. Credibility of these actors is important to legitimise the impacts of change. Acknowledgement that Climate Change issues are all encompassing, with effects right across many security areas...no need to demonise the military. Their abilities to interact with populations in time of need and support is important, and seeking a more civil support role for the military needs to be considered. Best practices must be explored and discussed between public, military, industry, and other stakeholders. There is a significant need to develop cooperation in this area, as the risks and even ability of one actor are limited.

Q: If the military are sought to have an active role in the north (say for search and rescue) is this truly the most economic option?

A: There are likely to be region to region, country to country differences of practice or policy, but it is the international effort that is needed if not essential.

Anna Stammler-Gossman, "Local relevance of climate change: A matter of perception"

DISCUSSION

Q: Stable development vs. sustainable development. Can "flexibility" be seen as meaning "resilience" here? Yes, as basically the difference is driven by the differences understanding of concepts rather than terms.

Theme V: Future issues: Actors, citizenship, and gaps

Leena Suopajarvi, "Why the change does not happen? A critical perspective towards knowledge-based strategies on climate change"

DISCUSSION

Q: Climate Change is one of many issues that are around, but Climate Change is different in that many different disciplines have found ways to participate in the discourse. "Nobody knows the future" true, but resilience means improving adaptive capacities to deal with the natural variations that will occur under Climate Change. Finding and development of practical approaches must be explored, as this is possible. Progress is being made, and new norms have been established, like in Sweden for example...taxation changes, but also none monetary change (values, virtues, etc.).

Q: One of the measures of impact comes from review of citations. Also to stimulate involvement, try changing a writing style and also publishing in more public oriented journals.

Q: How to close the "Value action gap" and "knowledge action gap," this is an important issue. What are the research questions we should be asking in order to close these gaps?

A: One approach is to have a more open process of knowledge generation, expand on who the agency of research is, and that input must be sought at different stages.

Q: In Russia the approach is to include the state (political) as well as the heritage (cultural), as well as space and temporal perspectives. Also, Russian scholars look at available strategies, and focus of civil society, personal security, and human rights. Russian Federation is working at improving approach in handling indigenous and human rights issues, while keeping track of our state interests (territory, borders, etc.). The creation of an overall academic space on Arctic issues has proved advantageous.

Q: What we mainly deal with as researchers are is to distribute our results in areas that give us rating, professional development, etc.

A: Different groups have different areas of focus. Formulate a document that better translates

Annika Skoglund, Royal Institute of Technology, “Biopolitics and Green Governmentality: Security through Homo Clima”

DISCUSSION

Q: There was a discussion at a recent polar conference on proposed solutions to help understand what channels exist that translate science discourse for policy makers...media was one of these.

A: It can be problematic to focus environmental discussions simply around carbon.

For more information

For more information – please contact Lassi Heininen (e-mail: lassi.heininen@ulapland.fi) or Outi Snellman (e-mail: outi.snellman@ulapland.fi)

See also Final Reports from the two earlier conferences of the UArctic Institute:

“The Arctic Climate Change and Security Policy” in Hanover, NH December 2008.
<http://iacp.dartmouth.edu/joint-report-calls-for-environmental-security-in-the-arctic>

“Considering a Roadmap Forward: The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment” in Fairbanks, Alaska in October 2009.
<http://iacp.dartmouth.edu/experts-examine-arctic-shipping>

Appendixes

Background Material: “*Climate Change and Human Security from a Northern Viewpoint – a brief introduction*” by Lassi Heininen, University of Lapland / Trent University and Heather Nicol, Trent University (Draft Version of June 2010)

Final Program

List of Participants

Press Release

3rd Workshop of the UArctic Institute for Applied Circumpolar Policy
“Climate Change and Human Security”

Rovaniemi, Finland in September 6th - 8th of 2010

Programme and Schedule

Sunday, the 5th of September

Arrival

Monday, the 6th of September

Venue: Arktikum, Pohjoisranta 6, Aurora meeting room 1st Floor

9.30-10.00: Welcoming and opening addresses

Raimo Väyrynen, University of Lapland

- Barry Scherr, University of the Arctic
- Kenneth Yalowitz, Dartmouth College, USA
- Ross Virginia, Dartmouth College, and Michael Sfraga, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, USA, “Greetings and main findings of the UArctic Institute’s conferences in December 2008 and in October 2009”
- Introduction by the participants

10.00-13.00: 1st Session “Defining human security and climate change in the High North”

Chair: Lassi Heininen

- Lassi Heininen, University of Lapland, UArctic Thematic Network on Geopolitics and Security, “Climate Change and Human Security: Introduction”
- Timo Koivurova, PYVI, Finland, “Climate change and international law”
- Monica Tennberg, Arctic Centre, Finland, “Adaptation, vulnerability and security: a conceptual discussion”

12.45-14.15: *Lunch*

14.15-18.00: 2nd Session “Climate change, biopolitics and security”

Chair: Kenneth Yalowitz

- Julian Reid, University of Lapland, “Biopolitics of climate change and human(in) security”
- Andrew Baldwin, Durham University, UK; “The Biopolitics of environmental citizenship: complex adaptive becoming in the delivery of human security”
- Annika Skoglund, KTH, Sweden, “Biopolitics of human security and sustainable development” (draft title)
- Pekka Iivari, Rovaniemi University of Applied Sciences, Lapland Institute for Tourism Research and Education, “Safety and security interrelated tourism safety: global changes - local implications”

19.30: *Dinner*

Tuesday, the 7th of September

Venue: Arktikum, Pohjoisranta 6, Aurora meeting room 1st Floor

9.00-13.00: 3rd Session “State policies on climate change and the Arctic”

Chair: Ross Virginia

- Wrap-up of the first day by Ross Virginia
- Hannu Halinen, Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Finland’s Arctic Strategy”
- Kenneth Yalowitz, Dartmouth College, USA, “Arctic climate change – security challenges and opportunities”
- Lotta Numminen, FIIA, Finland, “Governance challenges and new cooperation in the Arctic Ocean”
- Leena Suopajarvi University of Lapland, “Why the change does not happen? A critical perspective towards knowledge-based strategies on climate change”

13.00-14.30: *Lunch*

14.30-18.00: 4th Session “Climate change, human security and Indigenous peoples”

- Anna Stammler-Gossman, Arctic Centre, “Linking Arctic natural resources, environmental changes and economies in the Barents region”
- Svein Mathiesen, EALAT Institute, Kautokeino, Norway, “Climate change and reindeer herding”
- Mikhail Kalentchenko, Russia, "Environmental aspects of security of the marine Arctic: the Russian law perspective"
- Florian Stammler, Arctic Centre, Finland, “Community viability in the Russian Arctic and the future of Russia's northern industrial cities”

19.30: *Dinner*

Wednesday, the 8th of September

Venue: Arktikum, Pohjoisranta 6, Aurora meeting room 1st Floor

9.00-9.30: Meeting with the main organizers

9.30-11.30: Final Session

- Wrap-up of the second day by Michael Sfraga
- Open and policy-oriented discussion on, and for, main findings of the Workshop

11.30-12.30: *Closing Coffee*