Views from the Arctic: Broadening International Relations beyond its prevailing assumptions

Master International Relations Thesis

Track: Global Order in Historical Perspective

Word count: 14984

Reference style: APA

Robyn Mitchell

s2204193

r.mitchell@umail.leidenuniv.nl

Supervisor: Dr. Karen Smith

Universiteit Leiden

Contents

Acronyms……..4

Chapter 1. Introduction……..……5

1. 1. Contextualisation and rationale……...……....5

1. 2. Defining the terms…….……..…6

1. 3. Problem statement……..…….…....7

1. 4. Research question…….……..……8

Chapter 2. Research Design…..…….…10

2. 1. Methodology…...……...……...……...…….…10

2. 2. Case Studies……...……..…….....11

2. 3. Data Collection……...……..……..…..12

2. 4. Limitations……...……..……...…12

Chapter 3. Literature Review……..……...…14

3. 1. Introduction……...……....…14

3. 2. The Arctic within IR……..……14

3. 3. The issue of exclusion in existing IR……...……..……15

3. 4. Arctic indigenous peoples and perspectives in Arctic international relations……..……18

3. 5. Conclusion……20

Chapter 4. Arctic Indigenous Knowledge…….……21

4. 1. Introduction……...…21

4. 2. The spiritual and cultural aspects of IK……21

4. 3. IK in relation to modern science, governance, and IR in the Arctic……..……..…22

4. 4. Conclusion……...……..…24

Chapter 5. Case Study Analysis…….……26

5. 1. Case Study 1: The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission……26

5. 1. 1. The AEWC……26

5. 1. 2. The guidance of IK in the AEWC – A challenge to IR assumptions about state-centricity, non-agency of non-state actors, and cooperation……27

5. 1. 2. i. *State-centricity and cooperation in IR*……27

5. 1. 2. ii. *IK and the AEWC's agency and cooperation*……28

5. 1. 2. iii. *The theoretical viability of IK*……30

5. 2. Case Study 2: Indigenous organisations as Permanent Participants in the Arctic Council……32

5. 2. 1. The Arctic Council and the PPs……32

5. 2. 2. IK of the PPs – A challenge to IR assumptions about territoriality……32

5. 2. 2. i. *Territoriality in IR*……33

5. 2. 2. ii. *IK and the PPs in relation to territoriality*……34

5. 2. 2. iii. *The theoretical viability of IK*……36

5. 3. Case Study 3: The Sustainable Development Working Group and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004……37

5. 3. 1. The SDWG and the ACIA……37

5. 3. 2. The incorporation of IK in the SDWG and the ACIA– A challenge to IR assumptions about modernity……38

5. 3. 2. i. *Modernity and IR*……38

5. 3. 2. ii. *IK through the SDWG and the ACIA in relation to modernity*……39

5. 3. 2. iii. *The theoretical viability of IK*……41

Chapter 6. Arctic IK in Global IR and Conclusions……43

Bibliography……48

Acronyms

ACIA – Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004

AEWC – Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission

IK – Indigenous Knowledge

IR – International Relations (theory)

IWC – International Whaling Commission

NAMMCO – North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

PP – Permanent Participant (the status of indigenous organisations at the Arctic Council)

SDWG – Sustainable Development Working Group

UNCLOS – United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

UNFCCC – United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Chapter 1. Introduction

1. 1. Contextualisation and rationale

The Arctic is often perceived to be a vast empty space, the world's inhospitable and politically unimportant hinterland. Increasingly at the forefront of the global climate change precipice, the attention the Arctic receives predominantly reflects a passive region that serves as a dire warning of the environmental degradation to come. In reality however, the Arctic is home to over 500,000 indigenous peoples whose heritages reflect thousands of years of subsistence living and adaption to the region's environment. Furthermore, the Arctic is a politically innovative and collaborative space. It consists of intergovernmental institutions and commissions, transnational indigenous organisations, and regional conservation, climate change adaptation and environmental monitoring projects that are managed between state and non-state actors. Considering the extreme physical changes occurring in the Arctic – including temperatures warming twice as fast as global rates, retreating sea ice, habitat loss, altering ecosystems, and accumulating toxic chemicals (Furgal & Prowse, 2008, 277; Williams, 2012, 4) – environmental protection and sustainable development are central to political cooperation in the region.

The Arctic indigenous groups have gained political agency via autonomous regions through land claims, indigenous organisations, collaboration with scientific monitoring, and policy proposals and implementations. As a result, the knowledge and perspectives of indigenous peoples are important components for understanding Arctic international relations and developments. However, International Relations (IR) analysis has insufficiently addressed this reality and the mainstream assumptions are unequipped to accurately explain such political occurrences or perspectives. This places Arctic indigenous knowledge (IK) within the broader issues related to changes in international relations outpacing changes in IR (Neuman, 1998, 1). The issues are linked to enduring practices in IR scholarship of applying a narrow epistemology onto globally diverse ontologies. This neglects attention towards the motivations and perspectives that originate from diverse knowledge systems. Scholars' concerns about IR's prevailing assumptions that are uncorroborated or based solely on Western experiences have warranted assertions of the need for reflexivity and consciousness of underlying presuppositions in theorising as well as to broaden IR's foundations to include non-Western experiences and perspectives (Acharya, 2011, 626; Crawford, 2016, 265; Neufeld, 1995, 40-41). It is therefore important to acknowledge and explore how IK can aid in understanding the

contributions of indigenous peoples to the unique international political space of the Arctic in ways that mainstream IR theories and perspectives fail to fully explain. As such, it is important to outline how IK challenges underlying assumptions in IR.

1. 2. Defining the terms

The Arctic generally refers to the lands, seas and ice that rest above the Arctic Circle, the line of latitude 66° 34' north of the equator (National Snow & Ice, 2019). However, definitions of the Arctic vary depending on climatic, botanical, marine, and political categorisations (Grønnestad, 2016). Politically, the eight Arctic states are those with land north of the Arctic Circle: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States. They are members of the Arctic Council, which is the intergovernmental forum that promotes "cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic states, with the involvement of the Arctic indigenous communities" particularly in areas of sustainable development and environmental protection (Arctic Council, 1996, Art. 1. A.). Indigenous peoples are those who have retained social, cultural, economic, and political characteristics from pre-colonial times that are different from the dominant society and have strong links to their ancestral environments (UNPFI, 2018). The identities of indigenous peoples are politicised because the nations and communities to which their identities are linked are in contention with the dominant colonial state. Indigenous peoples of the Arctic are culturally and ethnically diverse, consisting of over 40 different ethnicities (Arctic Centre, 2019).

IK, also frequently referred to as traditional knowledge, is a local and cultural knowledge unique to a population. It is often transmitted orally and it is regularly defined as the "cumulative body of knowledge, practice, and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission, about the relationship of living beings including humans with one another and with the environment." (Berkes et al., 2000, 1252; Herrmann, 2017, 20; McPherson et al, 2016, 24; Simonds & Christopher, 2013, 2185). In 2015 indigenous groups of the Arctic Council broadened the definition to emphasise its adaptive and living nature as a body of knowledge that "has been developed and verified over millennia and is still developing in a living process, including knowledge acquired today and in the future, and it is passed on from generation to generation." (Arctic Council, 2015a). Arctic indigenous peoples' historic and contemporary experiences of interacting with the environment, both spiritually and practically, form the basis of IK and informs indigenous peoples' perspectives. IK has been integrated into multilevel regional governance processes. It

has been appreciated for its valuable understandings of the interconnected nature of Arctic ecosystems and the ethical importance it places on environmental protection, which are both essential for successful resource regulation and sustainability, climate change adaptation, and foresight of the ecological knock-on effects from development (Ellis, 2005, 67; Fondahl, Filippova & Mack, 2015, 20; Huntington, 2000, 1270; Johnson, 1992, 68).

1. 3. Problem Statement

The significance of IK and the perspectives of Arctic indigenous peoples have been largely overlooked in the increasing focus that the Arctic has received in IR. Undeniably, the effects of climate change have brought drastic changes to the environment which has shifted the dynamics of interstate relations. In 2018 the Arctic experienced the second-warmest air temperatures ever recorded and the second-lowest overall sea-ice coverage (NOAA, 2018). The retreating and thinning ice cover opens up access for fossil fuel exploitation and shorter international shipping routes, which has led to a new found focus by the Arctic states on reasserting state sovereignty in the region. Consequently, IR analysis is overwhelmingly security-oriented and state-centric, emphasising the strategic importance of the Arctic in ways that overlook the multifaceted political dynamics. This level of analysis does not sufficiently recognise indigenous perspectives and participation in the state of affairs, nor does it consider the survival of the Arctic and of the planet, while an indigenous view does. Indeed, some scholars have analysed the politicisation of indigenous groups and their attainment of autonomous and resource rights. However, the focus remains primarily on how states are pressured by indigenous political actions to grant certain rights or comply with international environmental standards.

In reality, IK plays an important role in Arctic relations at local, national and regional levels. For example, the importance of IK and indigenous participation in decision-making has been enshrined by the Arctic Council.[1] Indigenous peoples have created alternative forms of political representation, and contribute to transnational collaboration. Furthermore, the

[1] The Ottawa Declaration that established the Arctic Council highlights the importance of IK and indigenous participation in decision-making: "The Arctic Council is established as a high-level forum to provide a means for promoting cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic states, with the involvement of the Arctic indigenous communities and other Arctic inhabitants on common Arctic issues.", it recognises the importance of "traditional knowledge" to the "collective understanding" the Arctic and "The category of Permanent Participation is created to provide for active participation and full consultation with the Arctic indigenous representatives within the Arctic Council".

immediate effects of climate change and the highly collaborative governance systems and collective responsibility approaches to environmental protection require new approaches of analysis that do not rely so heavily on traditional designs of IR theory. Therefore, IK warrants investigation in IR in order to better understand the Arctic's international space.

Finally, IK often challenges, or offers new perspectives on, prevailing assumptions in mainstream IR. These assumptions include state-centrism and non-agency of non-state actors, an anarchical international system, cooperation, sovereignty, territoriality, nationalism, and modernity. The extent to which these assumptions can be applied, without ignoring indigenous peoples' presence, contributions and perspectives, is limited. This is also the case for many indigenous peoples around the world whose agency challenges the state's ultimate authority and highlights the colonial foundation of the modern state international system (Corntassel & Woons, 2018). The general similarities in spiritual holistic thinking among indigenous groups set a foundation of overlap between indigenous worldviews and establishes that there are many contexts where IK similarly offers alternative perspectives in IR. Therefore, including insights from Arctic IK has a broader value for understanding IR in a more inclusive and global sense.

1. 4. Research question

The research question of this thesis is: How do Arctic indigenous peoples' knowledge and perspectives pose a challenge to prevailing IR assumptions?

In order to answer this question, this thesis explores the nature of IK as a perspective for understanding indigenous peoples' subsistence living and resource management, political and social arrangements, and interaction with sustainable development and modern science in environmental protection in an extreme and drastically changing environment. The secondary line of enquiry is to understand the implications that IK and indigenous views in the Arctic have for creating a more globally representative IR discipline and for raising much needed attention to designs of balanced human-environment relations that are critical in these times of global climate crisis.

Is it sufficient to analyse the indigenous political role in environmental protection and sustainable development as one of a non-state influence, pressuring states to make environmentally conscious decisions in their policies? Are indigenous political and social arrangements in the Arctic merely an anomaly formation of significant authority within the regular framework of state interactions? Or perhaps more discerningly, do the variety of indigenous beliefs, worldviews, and IK provide a more apt framework for IR to analyse

indigenous peoples' involvement in Arctic international relations? The basis of IK and indigenous traditions predate the imperial imposition of state borders and provide insights into the politically innovative and collaborative global space of the Arctic.

This thesis accepts the assumption that IK and indigenous perspectives contribute to indigenous political approaches which offer new perspectives for understanding the nature of Arctic international relations. The promotion, inclusion in decision-making and governance, and value acknowledgement of IK is formally evident in the declarations, websites, and documents that come from Arctic transnational indigenous organisations, and regional cooperative structures such as the Arctic Council and the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC). Therefore, IK is a highly respected source of knowledge and is afforded contributory and influential positions in the Arctic. The ways in which IK interrelates with indigenous peoples' cultures, histories, spiritual beliefs, and ways of life influence how they interact with each other, their immediate environments, and other state and non-state actors. This can be assessed through their presence and participation at different levels of the Arctic's collaborative, environmentally conscious, and region-focused political landscape.

Chapter 2. Research Design

This thesis research is primarily a qualitative, explorative study. The research study involves broadening understandings in IR by focusing on previously overlooked viewpoints and explanations. Exploratory research leads to unveiling plausible connections and functions by asking different questions and expanding the empirical terrain (Reiter, 2013, 1 & 8). The main purpose of this thesis is to shed light on the ways in which IK and indigenous views in the Arctic challenge prevailing IR assumptions. This involves exploring how understandings of IK can enhance understandings in IR.

To fulfil this qualitative, explorative research objective the study has four sections. First, the literature review establishes that IR attention excludes IK and indigenous views, which creates incomplete accounts of the Arctic's global space. Second, the study explains and contextualises IK by exploring its historical, spiritual, and cultural dimensions, how it intertwines with modern science and governance, and its importance to IR. Third, a collective case study analysis focuses on three cases that shed light on the ways in which IK perspectives and worldviews challenge prevailing IR assumptions and offer an alternative lens of focus. Finally, the study situates Arctic IK within the wider discussions on creating a more globally representative IR and highlights IK's similarities with other knowledge systems in IR. The implications of incorporating IK into IR relate to broadening the prevailing assumptions and including other ways of understanding reality. This leads to a probing of the theoretical issues regarding the climate crisis and a suggestion that IK offers insights for IR that are well placed to explain the all-embracing, global, and multigenerational nature of climate change.

2. 1. Methodology

The qualitative, explorative research is carried out through three case studies. A case study refers to a defined aspect of a historical happening chosen for analysis (Bennett, 2004, 21). Instrumental case studies provide insight into an issue and facilitate understanding of something else (Stake, 1994, 137). A collective case study involves an instrumental study extended to several cases that are chosen to investigate a phenomenon or general condition and which lead to a better understanding or theorising about a larger collection of cases (Stake, 1994, 138). Case studies usually entail identifying the influences of an independent variable on a dependent variable in order to generate new hypotheses to advance theory-building (Mitchell & Bernauer, 2004, 98; Sprinz & Wolinsky-Nahmi, 2004, 4).

However, this study is not confirmatory research conducted through comparing case studies and it does not seek to operationalise the concept of IK. It uses the "exploratory research approach" to better understand the causal mechanisms at work in Arctic IR (Reiter, 2013, 13-14). This method is not beholden to variable measurement but is more concerned with ways of thinking and proposes innovative ways of understanding and interpreting reality. Furthermore, by focusing on IK, which is regularly ignored in IR, it is a form of "conceptual innovation" which allows for the development of more focused concepts in IR (Bennett & Elman, 2007, 178).

The study focus is on the applicability of IK and its conceptual perspectives to IR and to understanding Arctic indigenous peoples' participation in international relations. This is done through the collective case study approach, guided by explorative research with an imperative to broaden the epistemological basis of IR. This varied methodological approach fulfils the research objective to present a better understanding of indigenous perspectives within IR. Therefore, the case studies chosen are those that are representative of novel forms (for IR) of political interaction and being, through the incorporation of IK, at the international, regional, and local levels in the Arctic.

Furthermore, this study adopts a mixed methodology by incorporating aspects of triangulation. Triangulation is the use of more than one method, source of data or research strategy. It entails using "unobtrusive methods" to strengthen the study's findings (Webb et al., 1966, 174). It is useful in qualitative studies as a form of cross-checking findings, such as ethnographers who check their observations with interview questions (Bryman, 2012, 392). In order to ensure representative depictions of the dynamics of Arctic relations, this study has benefited from receiving resources from, and through communication with, relevant organisations: the Arctic Council Secretariat, the Executive Secretary of the Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat, and the National Museum of Ethnology (Leiden, the Netherlands).

2. 2. Case Studies

The case studies chosen for the study are: 1) the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission; 2) Indigenous organisations as Permanent Participants in the Arctic Council; and 3) the Sustainable Development Working Group and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004. Through these case studies, IK can be clearly seen to challenge IR assumptions. The first case study focuses on how IK has influenced the creation of commissions to protect indigenous subsistence hunting in resistance to international encroachments, which challenges IR

assumptions of state centrism, non-agency of non-state actors, and cooperation. The second case analysis centres on aspects of IK that are apparent from indigenous organisations, which challenge IR assumptions on territoriality. The third case study focuses on IK's perspectives and contributions to an Arctic modernity that contrasts with IR's prevailing modern Western framework, with particular attention on the role of history, culture, and spirituality to envision the future as well as the intertwining of IK and modern science.

The case studies highlight that refocusing IR in order to integrate the perspectives of IK at the international, regional, and local levels enhances understandings of indigenous peoples' worldviews, positions, and interactions in the Arctic. The objectives and interests of the study, based on the research question, afford relevance to the three intentionally chosen case studies as they are clear examples where indigenous views and IK provide explanations for indigenous peoples' interactions in international relations. Therefore, they highlight the theoretical viability of IK, meaning the importance and value of including indigenous perspectives, beliefs, and worldviews into IR enquiry.

The case study findings show that the premises of IR frameworks are limited in their applicability to the perspectives of Arctic indigenous peoples. The implications of the findings are contextualised in debates about broadening the knowledge basis of IR and support the calls for the incorporation of perspectives that can be generalised from different knowledge systems.

2. 3. Data Collection

The data collected and analysed to answer the research question include primary sources, such as the websites and official documents of governments, organisations, and forums that are discussed in the case studies, and secondary literature from different disciplines, including IR, History, Anthropology, and Political Science, that relate to the discussion on indigenous peoples in the Arctic, IK, and IR. The analysis of the primary documents focuses on the participation of indigenous peoples and the contribution of their perspectives and IK. The guiding questions are: Have indigenous perspectives been included? Was the contribution of IK disaggregated in the document? Did indigenous voices actively contribute to policy formulation? In what ways do the approaches established in the documents conflict with prevailing IR assumptions? As for the secondary literature, the analysis focuses on gaining understandings of local-specific and shared views and IK of Arctic indigenous peoples.

2. 4. Limitations

The difficulties of this study mainly relate to a lack of data and sources about the case studies. However, through request to the Arctic Council, more relevant policy material and recommendations for further avenues of research were received. In order to narrow the obvious limitations relating to understanding different cultures and politics of the Arctic, deeper knowledge and understandings have been acquired through wide reading on the subject matter.

Chapter 3. Literature Review

3. 1. Introduction

The literature review is divided between assessing how the Arctic has been considered in IR scholarship, explaining the issues of exclusion in IR, and outlining the attention given to indigenous peoples in Arctic international relations. This is necessary for three reasons: first, to demonstrate that the predominant understandings of Arctic political relations are rooted in state-centric and security-oriented premises that do not sufficiently account for indigenous participation or address indigenous peoples' views and IK; second, to discern the reasons for and problems associated with mainstream IR's neglect of Arctic IK; and third, to show that the attention that has been given to indigenous peoples has largely been confined to focus on their presence either as an influence over states or simply as an aspect of the innovative forms of governance and political structures that exist in the Arctic. Therefore, the literature review establishes that IK has been absent from IR enquiry on the Arctic, which is what this thesis addresses.

3. 2. The Arctic within IR

The predominant IR analyses of Arctic developments originate from a security perspective. The focus is primarily on the strategic importance of the region for states as the guiding factor in geopolitical interactions.

Johnston (2012, 14) emphasises the strategic importance of the Arctic region to surrounding states due to the fast diminishing ice-cover. This line of thinking is also apparent in Zellen's (2010, 57) assertion that the "historic promise of unlocking [the Arctic's] full potential" is now within reach due to accelerated climate change and seasonal ice melts, which have caused increased maritime and commercial activity. The developments in the Arctic that receive the most focus in IR scholarship are in relation to states' actions to secure and assert offshore resource and mining rights.

Some scholars have argued that as the ice continues to melt, there will be conflict between the Arctic states as they compete to extend their sovereign control. One such scholar is Borgerson (2008, 71) who believes that states are following "narrowly defined national interests" and that the Arctic constitutes a "legal no man's land". In this sense, the impacts of climate change are framed to create state conflicts in an arena of international competition. Conversely, many scholars such as Brosnan, Leschine and Miles (2011, 175) and Stokke

(2007) highlight that issues over sovereignty or conflicts are mitigated through the overarching legal framework of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which allows for states to cooperate in governance. Similarly, Stokke (2011, 848) deems the Arctic politically stable and cooperative and environmental security to be "satisfactory" on account of state participation in institutions. Jakobson and Melvin (2016, 182) solely focus on the Arctic states as central actors by arguing that the high levels of cooperation have rested on a shared motivation to progress national interests and to strengthen sovereignty claims. Furthermore, Vigni (2014, 226) stratifies the regulating levels of environmental protection into international, regional and domestic mechanisms but she similarly maintains the state sovereignty framework of analysis through UNCLOS. Analysis from Moe (2017, 19) focuses on the growing "normalization" of the Arctic that is increasingly integrated into world affairs through oil resource exploration and as non-Arctic states become interested in industrial development and shipping. Rottem (2017, 198) argues that operational conditions have not been altered as a result of binding agreements that emphasise cooperation and coordination between Arctic states. Security issues and contrasting interests and military capabilities between Arctic states as well as the capacity for bi-lateral Arctic state agreements and outside institutional actors, such as the EU and NATO, to manage security challenges are also key areas of analysis (Bailes, 2016, 37-39; Bergh & Klimenko, 2016, 74).

Despite the differing points of departure for understanding the geopolitics of the Arctic, it remains clear that overwhelmingly IR scholars maintain the traditional conceptual frameworks, premised on security oriented and state-centric perspectives, in their analysis of the political and environmental governance of the Arctic. As a result, the role of indigenous groups and perspectives of IK are overlooked, excluded, and implicitly considered unimportant to IR.

3. 3. The issues of exclusion in existing IR

Evidently, there has been little attempt to shift research on the Arctic away from an overarching mainstream IR framework. Before the 1980s, IR was largely understood in terms of power politics among states in a competitive, violent and anarchic world system defined by territorial division, which was reflected in the methodological predominance of realism and rationalism approaches (Ferguson & Mansbach, 2007, 530). Subsequently, however, the discipline has remained linked to Political Science, which Rosenberg (2016, 2) claims, confines IR "within a borrowed ontology". Agnew (2003, 51; 2009, 97) deems the state-centred account of spatiality

of power a "territorial trap" and that there are in fact "regimes of sovereignty" whereby states vary in their forms and capacities of central state authority and political territoriality. Furthermore, Crawford (2016, 265) is of the belief that IR would benefit from "broader conceptions of ontology, epistemology, and method".

The issues remain linked to IR's insularity. Despite a theoretical broadening and a wider attention given to different actors (for example through Liberal Institutionalism, The English School, Constructivism and Postmodernism), IR has maintained the hegemonic basis of Political Science which has rendered IR unequipped to cohesively explain the transformations of the 21st century (Buzan & Little, 2001, 21; Dalby, 2011, 144; Miller, 2010). Alternatively, Blaney and Tickner (2017, 74) argue that the issue stems from IR's rootedness in a "prison of colonial modernity" that categorises human differences across the world into temporal differences in terms of stages of development which reduces multiplicity to a series of absences. Furthermore, in the discipline of IR "Western conceptions of modernity" define political time and space and this hegemonic system of knowledge persists through dichotomous ideas of the civilised/barbarian, modern/traditional, advanced/backward in the geo-political and cultural organisation of international politics (Capan, 2017, 3).

Focusing on Western discourse about development, Escobar (1995, 5-7) argues that certain representations have become dominant and shape how social reality is conceptualised and perceived, what he terms "colonization of reality". Monolithic understandings of reality and prioritisation of certain knowledge bases is symptomatic of the wider global hegemonic power structure. Quijano (2000, 533-539) terms it a model which presupposes an element of coloniality, accounting for the persistence of Eurocentric knowledge, racial hierarchies, and unequal distributions of resources due to capitalism. Consequently, a "coloniality of knowledge" has created a hegemony of modern scientific knowledge, which dominates the epistemological canon and subordinates the importance of other ways of knowing (Quijano, 2000; Santos & Meneses, 2007; Tucker, 2018, 5). Furthermore, Santos and Meneses (2007, xxxix) argue that knowledges are situated and therefore, the dominance of scientific knowledge is a "globalised localism" that shapes a monoculture of knowledge and perpetuates colonial inequality.

It is important to note that this has also led to assumptions that knowledges are inherently different which overlooks the intertwining of knowledges that occurs on account of historic migrations, colonialism, and globalisation. For example, what is called "Eskimo spirituality"

in Alaska is a mixture of Christianity and Shamanism, which was created from 1890 to 1961 when Iñupiat people began to fear their shamans, because of influences from whalers and missionaries, at the same time as maintaining the healing work that the shamans used to perform (Turner, 1993, 99). Each knowledge system arises from the values, beliefs or worldview/philosophy that a culture considers important (Turner & Spalding, 2013, 32). After Europe's 18th century Enlightenment period, the development of positivist-reductionist science was linked to industrialisation and capitalist as well as communist economic theories, leading to the commodification of land and resources through technological domination and the notion of freeing individual enterprise from the Earth or other humans (Berkes, 2012, 266). This perspective contrasts with Arctic IK which informs how to adjust to rather than dominate nature and respects the notion of an interconnected and holistic cosmos, such as the Sami reindeer herders who are focused on "constant adaptation to changing conditions" (Mathiesen et al., 2018, 203). The Western scientific/philosophical tradition is one of many social experiences in the world, and Western rationality's dominance for the last 200 years results from concealing epistemic diversity and discrediting other knowledges (Santos, 2004, 158). Arctic IK has been overshadowed in this tradition and consequently, despite its actual incorporation into various levels of governance and intertwining with Western values and knowledges, has not been considered a justifiable perspective for widening IR understandings of the Arctic.

Dunn (2001) has shown the marginalisation of political formations in Africa in IR. In mainstream IR, the commonality amongst principal theories such as neorealism, classical realism, neo-liberalism and structuralism is the focus on the power of hegemonic states as determinants of the world system. A relative situation is apparent with regard to political formations in the Arctic. Mainstream IR and particularly theories of institutionalism, realism and classical geopolitics have predominantly been the frameworks of analysis (Østerud & Hønneland, 2014, 157). Indigenous groups, whose heritages in the Arctic predate the imposition of state borders, have contributed to the global political space through different forms of political action that cannot be fully explained by the aforementioned IR theories. Consequently, the views and IK of Arctic indigenous peoples have not been sufficiently acknowledged as a means to understanding transnational interactions.

Hansen-Magnusson (2019) claims that an ethical understanding of responsibility is apparent in Arctic approaches to sustainable development, influenced by the indiscriminate effects of climate change. This could be built upon by analysing the apparent responsibility

approach from the perspectives of IK. The political frameworks of the Arctic's environmental governance have been influenced not simply by state interactions but also indigenous views and IK. Thinking of indigenous peoples' political roles and uses of acquired political agency solely in terms of an influence over state relations simplifies the situation. It accepts a sole epistemology as the basis of a universally applicable IR. That being said, some academics have focused on Arctic indigenous groups and their influential roles in Arctic politics.

3. 4. Arctic indigenous peoples and perspectives in Arctic international relations

A number of scholars have drawn attention to the agency of Arctic indigenous groups and how they have created novel forms of transnational political organisations and have significant influence in environmental protection and governance. However, IK and the views of indigenous peoples have rarely been incorporated into the discussions on their positions.

The influential political role of indigenous peoples in decision-making and the immediate unprecedented effects (in human history) of climate change to the Arctic ecosystems have provided analytical points of discussion. Koivurova (2012, 141) highlights that the Arctic Council benefits from IK and views of environmental protection. However, he simultaneously argues that, since under international law all land and most waters in the Arctic are under sovereign jurisdiction, environmental protection efforts are determined by the Arctic states and are an "extension" of existing international environmental, political and economic systems (Koivurova, 2012, 132). Rowe (2018, 118) highlights how Arctic indigenous groups' participation in multilateral governmental institutions has served as a powerful platform to hold state representatives to account when environmental standards and indigenous resource rights are threatened through "on-the-record naming and shaming". Therefore, she expresses the idea that the indigenous groups possess a novel degree of authority to balance the power of the Arctic states' policy decision-making and project planning. Moving beyond the superficial analyses of indigenous roles that primarily emphasise an influence over states, evoking the idea of a "check and balance" to states' environmentally degrading activities, Huntington (2000, 1272) argues that indigenous peoples' organisations have gained political authority and decolonised relations of power by using their ecological IK from close interaction with Arctic ecosystems.

Building upon this, other scholars focus on the innovative forms of political space indigenous peoples have created and their involvement and influence in shaping the collaborative and participatory political landscape in the Arctic. Zellen (2017, 37-39) develops

a borderland theory to explain the peaceful, inclusive political culture and collaborative cross-border interactions of the Western Arctic borderland. He emphasises that the alternate historical narrative defined by "reconciliation of tribe and state" through indigenous land and cultural rights restoration, an absence of strong state institutions or border fortification, and indigenous participation in international relations at the regional level have created collaborative management and constructive transboundary relationships in which the modern Arctic states overlap with underlying indigenous cross-border networks. Shadian (2010, 486-490) abstracts sovereignty from its static Westphalian constraints and builds upon the concept to include the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) – a political entity that, like the traditional notion of the state, represents a shared history and has rights to territory and resources (through local land claims), yet it does not strive for territorial ownership or statehood. Wilson (2007, 66-70) has brought attention to the ways in which the Inuit have collectively created new political spaces in the Arctic via the ICC and exerted their political agency to fulfil their perspectives and objectives first through the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) and subsequently the Arctic Council. However, the discussion does not extend to what these objectives or perspectives are, or to how IK has informed their perspectives. Similarly, Holroyd and Coates (2017, 24-30) acknowledge that indigenous leaders were amongst those who spearheaded the process, since the 1960/70s, of creating an extensively collaborative Arctic, deeming it one of the most "interactive and cross-cultural governance eco-systems in the world" and a "unique zone" due to the new forms of governance, influence-making, and community engagement, which largely lead to a focus on Arctic-issues rather than a focus on state borders. However, their analysis, like Zellen's, Shadian's, and Wilson's, of the roles of Arctic indigenous peoples does not extend beyond appreciation of the novel forms of interaction, governance, and agency that they have been an integral part of creating. Thus, indigenous views and IK are inadvertently not considered worthy points of inclusion for reconceptualising indigenous influences on Arctic international relations.

The influences of IK on indigenous political positions have been more clearly addressed by Tennberg and Nuttall. Tennberg (2010, 265) holds that on account of changing power relations, Arctic indigenous peoples' agency and indigenous organisations are at the forefront on the worldwide indigenous political movement in creating national and international political structures. She argues that IK is inseparable from indigenous peoples as it reflects their worldview, and its inclusion in the AEPS (the precursor to the Arctic Council) constitutes a demand that "the power base be shared" (Tennberg, 1996, 27). Furthermore, the inclusion of

IK is a matter of self-determination as it means that indigenous peoples' groups participate in institutional decision-making and cooperation (Tennberg, 2000, 77). Therefore, according to Tennberg, the importance of IK is primarily focused on its evocation as a means for indigenous political participation. Additionally, Nuttall goes further to discuss indigenous participation in environmental cooperation and briefly disaggregates IK whereby certain aspects of indigenous views can be seen to clearly challenge predominant IR assumptions. Indigenous peoples' organisations challenge state authority and question the processes of modernity and development (Nuttall, 1998, 18). Furthermore, indigenous perspectives on human-environment relationships have legitimised their oppositions to certain development policies (Nuttall, 2000, 406-407).

3. 5. Conclusion

Existing IR conceptions of sovereignty, state authority and security have remained the predominant starting points of analysis and focus when considering governance, relations and environmental cooperation in the Arctic, which invariably lead to neglecting to examine the perspectives and IK of indigenous groups. Indigenous traditional cultures, beliefs, and knowledge are connected to the Arctic's ecosystem, and are intertwined with the immediate effects of climate change. This reality has been an influential factor in indigenous political participation which has contributed to the Arctic's unique cross-cultural and political system, which has strong aspects of collectivity, integration with the ecosystem, and responsibility, rather than simply state security and power. The literature review establishes that there has not been an attempt to examine the influences of IK on the contributions of indigenous peoples in Arctic international relations or to incorporate IK into IR theorising. Therefore, this research establishes the importance of including IK in efforts to understand Arctic indigenous peoples' contributions and in order to gain a more accurate and representative picture in IR.

Chapter 4. Arctic Indigenous Knowledge

4. 1. Introduction

Arctic IK is a multidimensional concept that covers the knowledges, spiritual belief systems, and local ecological expertise of indigenous peoples across the region. It is derived from the lived experiences and inherited cultures of subsistence off the land and adaptation to changing physical conditions; the close human-environment relationship forms the guiding ethical norms and worldviews of indigenous peoples. This chapter explains what IK is, its relationship to governance and environmental protection, its benefit for understanding the multi-layered nature of international relations in the Arctic, and argues that IK's inclusion in IR is important and beneficial.

4. 2. The spiritual and cultural aspects of IK

Many indigenous peoples of the Arctic, particularly those who follow traditional subsistence lifestyles, have distinct histories, economies, and social organisation formations. However, common to the indigenous worldviews across the polar region are the spiritual underpinnings to understanding the natural world. From this perspective, humans are not unique but emanate from the same spiritual source as other natural phenomena such as animals (conceptualised as non-human persons), lakes, rivers, the sun, the moon etc. (Nuttall, 2000, 392). Therefore, natural phenomena are not commodified but considered sacred. To offend an animal and hunt with disrespect could entice vindictive spirits which is linked to communities facing risks of famine, illness, bad weather or poor hunting (Nuttall, 2000, 392). Consequently, the reciprocal and holistic perspectives of indigenous peoples are linked to an understanding of human responsibility for maintaining balance between the different avenues of spirit. Furthermore, the practices of sharing wide and the full use of the products of a hunt, as well as local hunting and herding regulations and strict hunting rituals reflect the social relatedness indigenous peoples feel towards each other and towards the Arctic environment, which is spiritually, culturally and socially important beyond its source of sustenance (Nuttall, 1998, 3; Nuttall, 2000, 394-5).

These views, practices and knowledges are both contemporary through practice and multigenerational through stories. The "oral habit" of Arctic IK means that the spiritual values are passed down through generations (Herrmann, 2017, 20). The values often reflect a sense of respect for the natural world and an acceptance of responsibility for environmental changes. For example, in indigenous spiritual understandings about glaciers, there is emphasis on human agency, choice, responsibility, as well as the consequence of human behaviours (Cruikshank,

2001, 391). Through practical reliance on understanding wildlife and weather conditions for cultural, spiritual and nutritional needs, Arctic indigenous peoples are "observers of the environment" and their IK is holistic, qualitative and based on adaptation (Merculieff et al., 2017, 11-12). There is a clear view in IK that humans have a reciprocal relationship to other natural beings and objects. Therefore, from this perspective human behaviours are integrated into the Earth's ecosystems in a way that is in balance with nature.

4. 3. IK in relation to modern science, governance, and IR in the Arctic

There are clear differences but also similarities between IK and modern science. The quantitative and structured methodologies of modern science differ from the holistic orientation of IK, however they do not necessarily belong to two distinct camps. Argawal (1995, 427) emphasises the importance of not conflating all non-Western knowledge and of accepting the differences within the predominant categories and the similarities across knowledges. Similarly, Usher (2000, 185-187) emphasises that IK and modern science are essentially similar in their observation of natural phenomena but that IK involves received truths and sensory perception whereas science combines values with systems of knowing based on empirical observation, rationality, and logic. He differentiates IK into four categories: factual knowledge about the environment; factual knowledge about uses of the environment; cultural values about the environment; and a culturally based cosmology underlying the knowledge system (Usher, 2000, 186). Therefore, IK includes cultural worldviews or perceptions, knowledge through subsisting within the immediate ecosystem, and environmental observations of natural phenomena.

IK's incorporation into Arctic governance and environmental protection plans is a clear indication of the complementary nature of the two approaches. For example, lived experiences of climate change through rising temperatures on local communities, factual accounts of cannibalism observed in polar bears because of food scarcity, Saami herders' extensive knowledge about the impacts of changing snow conditions on their caribou herds, and Inuit contributions to beluga whale monitoring in the Eastern Beaufort Sea enhance scientific research, environmental collaboration, and effectiveness of project implementations (Beckford et al., 2010, 247; "Eastern Beaufort Sea Beluga Whales", 2000, 6; Mathiesen et al., 2018, 203). Evidently, IK as a knowledge system is inherently linked to cultures of subsistence and its multigenerational manner combines perceptions of change over time and the ranges of variability over time (Turner & Spalding, 2013, 31; Zellen, 2010, 58). Therefore, diversity of

knowledge, in terms of understandings and expertise in environmental knowledge, is linked to diversity of geographic place.

The importance and value of IK contributions have been recognised in the Arctic and IK is incorporated into governance and scientific research structures. Indigenous groups have ensured community oversight of environmental projects and research. They have also established regional policies for the use of IK, for example, the Inuit Tapirisat in Canada created the "Principles for Negotiating Research Relationships in the North" (Mauro & Hardison, 2000, 1266). However, the extent to which IK has been authentically incorporated into Arctic governance is contested by some. Issues about the authenticity of IK arise through its categorisation and incorporation as ecological factual data. Cruikshank (2005, 256) highlights the misappropriation of IK when it is "systematized and incorporated into Western management schemes". Similarly, Tester and Irniq (2008, 48-50) emphasise that solely focusing on environmental knowledge as a data source disassociates Inuit IK from its social and spiritual dimensions and its "seamless" nature, stemming from the Inuktitut concept of *avaluqanngittuq* – "that which has no circle or border around it". The historic marginalisation of voices, perspectives, and values from those with less power, particularly indigenous voices within colonial states, make it no surprise that certain aspects of these knowledges, such as Arctic environmental knowledge, are more visibly incorporated than others, albeit often in a transformed way, into international governance structures.[2]

Similarly, in IR the locus of knowledge remains rooted in the North/West whereby the principal schools of thought constitute the fundamental structures and narratives that maintain existing power structures and determine how to "solve" the "problems" facing the non-Western world (Nayak & Selbin, 2010, 7). This orientation can pose difficulties in formulating how best to include IK within IR. Accepting the multifaceted nature of Arctic IK and the interconnected social, cultural, spiritual, and environmental views that indigenous peoples have highlights that there are obvious contrasts with the dominant and monolithic epistemological basis of IR. This

[2] This situation is suggestive of Bhabha's (1994, 85) arguments that mimicry can materialise as "one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power". Values from IK intertwine with those of the dominant culture of the nation state, which certainly constitutes one contribution to the fact that IK approaches are not always "radically different" from Western approaches (Bilgin, 2008, 6). However, as a means to gain more political power, the environmental aspects of IK can possibly be appropriated (by indigenous and non-indigenous peoples) to legitimise actions, such as economic developments framed as sustainable and non-harmful to the environment, even if they contradict other aspects of IK that are not economically incentivising.

contrast stems from the rational thought of modernity and understandings of reality in a disaggregated manner that reflects the categorised structures of modern science. This is not to say that IK is inherently different or unique from other ways of knowing. On the contrary, rather than considering IK, particularly its spiritual undertones, as mythical, supernatural, irreconcilable with modern science, and irrelevant to IR, it is in fact composed of situated – historically, culturally, and geographically – perceptions or understandings of real occurrences.

All understandings of the world are filtered through one's immediate environment and can therefore be considered, as Santos and Meneses (2007) state in relation to knowledge systems, situated. Yet, despite the situated understandings and knowledges and, as Mqotsi (2002, 158) notes, behind the differences in human behaviour around the world, there is an essential unity of humankind. It is the predominance of one method of reaching these understandings of reality, many of which may ultimately be shared or similar, which creates the challenges that IK poses to mainstream IR. In order to gain insights into the behaviours and motivations of state and non-state actors in the multi-level global political space, IR would be better positioned as an explanatory tool by incorporating the perceptions of relevant knowledge systems that are situated in a particular social, political, and historical environment (such as the influences of IK values in Arctic indigenous peoples' creations of transnational political organisations in response to being within states). This also means that discerning the challenges that IK poses to existing IR assumptions includes considering the differences, similarities, and interrelations of values and knowledges, an interrelation which is particularly clear in the area of Arctic environmental monitoring and development. This highlights that the collaborative and innovative political systems and space in Arctic international relations bring into question the relevance and applicability of a monolithic knowledge basis of IR.

4. 4. Conclusion

IK is a broad-reaching term that includes the historical, social, cultural, spiritual, ecological, and adaptive aspects of Arctic indigenous peoples' worldviews. IK continues to grow and adjust in relation to the physical and socio-political changes that occur in the immediate environment. This chapter explained IK, its spiritual and cultural underpinnings, and has emphasised how IK intertwines with modern science and governance in the Arctic. It has also highlighted the importance of acknowledging the values and perspectives from the people in regions to which IR analysis is applied, and of recognising that knowledge systems interrelate in international relations creating innovative political organisations and actions (such as

indigenous organisations and the actions of the AEWC). Therefore, it is important to explore the ways in which the incorporation of IK into international relations, in terms of informing indigenous peoples' perspectives, challenges some of IR's core assumptions.

Chapter 5. Case Study Analysis

This chapter focuses on three case studies where IK is discernible in the approaches of indigenous peoples to subsistence living and resource management, political and social representational arrangements, environmental protection, and sustainable development. In each case, aspects of IK are analysed with respect to how they relate to particular IR assumptions and how they offer avenues for theorising in IR. The case studies are: 1) The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission; 2) Indigenous organisations as Permanent Participants in the Arctic Council; and 3) the Sustainable Development Working Group and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004.

5. 1. Case Study 1: The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission

This case study focuses on the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC). The analysis addresses how IK has influenced the creation of the AEWC, which challenges IR's state-centric perspectives that assume non-state actors possess inconsequential power and assumptions relating to cooperation. A brief explanation of the AEWC within the wider context of international marine hunting regulations is given before focusing on the analysis.

5. 1. 1. The AEWC

Whale hunting has been an integral component of the spiritual traditions, culture, and history of Arctic communities. This has been the case since prehistoric times and there is evidence to suggest that people in Greenland survived off seals and whales since 4500 BC (Hardy, 2006, 183). However, in 1977 the International Whaling Commission (IWC) extended its ban on whale hunting to include indigenous subsistence hunters. After having their proposals to redress the situation overturned, Iñupiat (Alaskan Inuit) whalers established the AEWC in order to self-regulate hunting in direct response and challenge to the IWC decision, which they called "culturally genocidal" (Huntington, 1992, 120-121). Following determined lobbying by the AEWC towards the US government, the IWC eventually recognised the important role whale products play in the nutritional and cultural life of indigenous peoples in Greenland, northern Russia, and Alaska and drew a clear distinction between these activities and commercial whaling. The AEWC navigates the international political arena to protect local indigenous subsistence hunting and to minimise the adverse environmental effects from the nearby offshore oil and gas operators. It has achieved control and authority in co-management with

the US government to regulate independently the international quotas. It also cooperates with the IWC, the regional North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO), and other Arctic indigenous organisations that protect subsistence hunting and IK.

5. 1. 2. The guidance of IK in the AEWC – A challenge to IR assumptions about state-centricity, non-agency of non-state actors, and cooperation

The resolve and persistent endeavour of marine hunting indigenous communities in Alaska to protect their traditional subsistence heritage and to ensure the survival of their IK through the multigenerational and communal experiences of whale hunting forms the motivational basis of the AEWC. The culture and IK that it seeks to protect also offer insights into how the AEWC itself operates and organises in the political space. This is particularly the case since the AEWC members are whaling captains and crew from the eleven Alaskan whaling communities that are reliant on subsistence hunting for survival (AEWC, 2019). For them, their mission to safeguard the bowhead whale and its habitat is not in contention with, but dependent upon, their mission to defend their subsistence whaling rights. The cultural and spiritual underpinnings of their IK has contributed to the AEWC's highly cooperative cross-indigenous structure, and motivated participation with national, regional, and international bodies in order to reassert indigenous self-regulation in hunting. The ways in which the AEWC operates and the motivations behind its actions challenge some of IR's core assumptions of state-centricity and cooperation. Before exploring the challenges that the AEWC poses, these assumptions within IR are clarified.

5. 1. 2. i. State-centricity and cooperation in IR

The state remains the dominant point of departure for understanding international relations and the traditional modes of theorising world politics in IR follow lines of thought that conceptualise an international system as one comprised of independent political states. As a result, the focuses on cooperation are through the prism of interstate relations and understandings of the roles of non-state actors are in relation to the perceived essential authority of the state. The dominant Realist and Liberal schools of IR theories have cemented this focus. These schools developed from the ideas of scholars including Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Kant. Machiavelli asserts that the state, working in its public's interests, has supreme control of its foreign affairs in which it seeks to aggrandise itself, and so positive foreign relations are a limited possibility (Leung, 2000, 14). Hobbes describes an inherently anarchic state of nature and conflictual international order between states (Russett, 2013, 95-96). Kant understands that

solely self-interested driven cooperation from states can ensure peaceful relations (Hurrell, 1990, 183).

Principal conventional IR scholars maintain this state-centric focus on cooperation and agency in the international global space. Mann (1984, 196), in line with the anarchy/order dichotomous thinking, analyses the state as the sole purveyor of order which justifies its authoritative nature. The survival and then power of states as predominantly guiding national interests are considered characteristic of the international system (Morgenthau, 1948; Waltz, 1979). According to Axelrod and Keohane (1993, 226), anarchy is overcome by institutions that can implement interstate agreements. This line of thinking also guides intergovernmentalist thought which maintains that cooperation through international governance institutions is primarily dictated by the material interests of powerful states (Roche, 2011). Other theories that acknowledge the ideational factors that form interests such as constructivism (Wendt, 1999) and the English School (Bull, 1977) maintain a central focus on states in international relations. As such, there is a principal and enduring assumption in IR that international legal or Westphalian sovereignty constitutes the undivided authority of the state, which creates a distinction between the "inside" state and the "outside" international system (Krasner, 1999, 11; Tickner, 2003, 309).

Undoubtedly, this overlooks Arctic indigenous peoples' histories and contemporary forms of agency within the state and in international relations. It assumes that uncooperative "anarchy" naturally applies to all places that are not restrained by the authority of a state, and that anarchy naturally leads to power politics and hegemonic domination. Furthermore, its focus on international cooperation refers to interstate cooperation, which is assumed to be particularly motivated by self-interest and does not veer too far from the power-politics origin framework. As seen through the AEWC, IK and indigenous actions challenge the appropriateness of such assumptions to understanding the dynamics of Arctic relations.

5. 1. 2. ii. IK and the AEWC's agency and cooperation

In essence, the causes of the AEWC's establishment and actions come from Iñupiat (Alaskan Inuit) whalers defying the legitimacy of international regulations and state-controlled oversight on their activities. The initial attempt to challenge the IWC embargo at the American courts represents their assertions of having the rightful claim and authority to hunt whales and to self-regulate such practices. This is linked to the historic and contemporary centrality of subsistence whale hunting to all aspects of their culture. The experiences of hunting are considered just as

important as the whale meat from the catch. In fact, hunting traditions (*Anuniagniq*) account for one of the twelve Iñupiat core values (Nielsen, 2000, 154).[3] As discussed in the IK chapter, many spiritual beliefs and ancient stories contribute to the enduring importance of respectful and responsible hunting. For example, beliefs relating to whales include that the spirits of deceased Elders or prominent members of the community enter into whales and stories include those about shamans who could see the ways of the whales and know that they only offer themselves up to respectful and trained hunters (Hess, 2003; Snively, 2016, 129).

The cultural and spiritual importance of whaling and the IK of resource regulation can be attributed to the impetus of the whaling captains to use the political tools at their disposal in order to challenge the authority of the IWC's regulations and the federal government's oversight. Since 1981 they have independently monitored the number of "landed and stuck-but-lost" whales, which they then report to the federal government (Huntington, 1992, 120). Furthermore, the AEWC is a member of the IWC and has the ability to negotiate its yearly quota since it is, in part, based on "cultural and subsistence needs" (NOAA, 2008). Therefore, the AEWC has acquired rights to self-regulating responsibilities and local community-based governance in conjunction with access to the planning of international whaling legislation through the IWC. Taken together, this constitutes a degree of sovereign control over their local resources at the international level in a manner that bypasses the state. This challenges the assumption in IR that international legal sovereignty signifies the sole authority of the state and its resources.

Furthermore, Iñupiat values of respect for nature and cooperation, as well as the cultural importance of whaling, explain the motivations of the AEWC to go further than to protect their own contemporary interests of self-regulation and hunting opportunities. Interests in the future survival and wellbeing of the Arctic can also account for the collaboration with regional actors, such as NAMMCO in its ecosystem-based approaches to marine management, in order to foster balanced human-environment relations beyond the AEWC's immediate communities. Even on a localised level, this concern-based motivation to cooperate challenges the orientation of IR's predominant assumptions that cooperation pertains to the actions of powerful actors attempting to expand their material interests. Furthermore, in collaboration with scientists and the

[3] The four Iñupiat values most relevant to this discussion are: Respect for nature (*Qiksiksrautiqagniq Inuuniagvigmun*), Cooperation (*Paammaagiinniq*), Sharing (*Signatainniq*), and Hunting traditions (*Anuniagniq*) (Nielsen, 2000, 154).

municipality's Department of Wildlife Management, the AEWC's Oceans Stewardship campaign protects the marine ecosystem as a whole and advocates responsible conduct from the multinational offshore oil rigs (AEWC, 2019). This is a feat which the Iñupiat have demonstrated possible in conjunction with subsistence lifestyles.[4] The region's intertwining of the cultural values from IK with regional socio-political dynamics sheds further light on how strong values from IK such as responsible resource use and ecosystem protection have incentivised cooperation with surrounding actors.

5. 1. 2. iii. The theoretical viability of IK

It has been demonstrated that IK contributed to the motivational basis of the AEWC that compelled indigenous agency and political authority over whale resources in ways that challenge assumptions of state-centricity and cooperation in IR. Beyond this, what is most important, in a general sense, is the insight that the AEWC provides into how ancient central IK tenets of subsistence groups translate into contemporary transnational conduct between indigenous peoples. These relations are cooperative and generous and although may not necessarily materialise from a trans-Arctic indigenous identity, do entail a clear sense of solidarity based on similar subsistence histories and contemporary struggles to preserve Arctic IK and subsistence traditions. Sharing and cooperation are necessary values for survival of subsistence Inuit societies in the extreme environmental conditions of the Arctic. Bodenhorn (2000, 28) highlights the importance and complexity of sharing in Inuit societies as a moral value that extends further than hunting to include the social interactions that bring well-being and are about reciprocity.

These values, that are evident for example in the cooperative practice of catching, distributing, and celebrating the hunt of a whale, have been transferred to the international political realm and cemented in contemporary social conduct. Following the AEWC's success, the Alaskan Inuit whalers assisted indigenous peoples in Chukotka (Russia) to document their IK and restore their hunting traditions by establishing the Association of Traditional Marine Mammal Hunters of Chukotka, which also participates in the IWC and NAMMCO (Kalland,

[4] The Alaska Native Claims Settlements Act in 1972 afforded the Inuit rights over the North Slope's petroleum deposits, the money from which, in addition to funding from the State of Alaska, sustained the AEWC and facilitated its programmes to ensure efficient hunting procedures with modern technologies and meant they could organise directly for IWC members to visit the communities during whaling season (Freeman, 1989, 142 & 145; Shadian, 2013, 398; NAMMCO 2015, 19 & 26).

2011, 202). The AEWC hunters also helped separate hunting communities to establish the Eskimo Walrus Commission in 1978 (Langdon, 1989, 168). There are also instances of different whaling communities in Alaska transferring or sharing whale shooting "strikes" (which are set by the IWC quota and divided amongst the communities by the AEWC) to other communities if the whales have migrated from their areas before they have exhausted their own strikes. At other gatherings, that are sometimes organised by the AEWC, whale meat, including from the captains' most prized parts, is shared with people from communities who were less successful in hunting (Braund, 2018, 23 & 27). The extensions of generosity in these instances attest to an unimportance of distinctions between the Russian (Yup'ik) and Alaskan (Iñupiat) indigenous groups as well as between the different communities of Alaskan indigenous hunters. This reflects a strong sense of human commonality. Despite the local variations of IK, there is a shared belief in the integrity of spiritual connection between all beings and therefore an ingrained importance of sharing. These values are also reflected in the guiding principles of the Inuit self-government of Nunavut, Canada. *Aajiiqatigiinniq* means decision making through discussion and consensus, *Tunnganarniq* means fostering good spirit by being inclusive, and *Piliriqatigiinniq* means working together for a common cause (Government of Nunavut, 2013, 4).

In summary, the interconnected, cooperative, and peaceful relations between different indigenous communities originate from core societal values and spiritual beliefs of reciprocity, which are cultivated through experiences, such as whale hunting. These IK values continue to shape the perspectives of indigenous peoples at the same time as IK evolves in tandem with socio-political changes, such as through the use of modern technologies and by whaling captains adopting international political roles through the AEWC. It is therefore important to include IK in IR studies in the Arctic, particularly when analysing cooperation so as to be open to looking beyond the order/anarchy framework which overlooks that indigenous groups can be international and cooperate without being state-centred thus highlighting the agency of IK through cooperation between indigenous groups and between indigenous groups and national, regional, and international organisations. As this case study has demonstrated, IK influences indigenous peoples' interactions in the international sphere in ways that mainstream IR does not account for. Therefore, it is a viable aspect for consideration in IR.

5. 2. Case Study 2: Indigenous organisations as Permanent Participants in the Arctic Council

This case study focuses on the Permanent Participants (PPs) of the Arctic Council. The analysis centres on the indigenous perspectives and aspects of IK that are apparent from the PPs, which challenge IR assumptions on territoriality. A brief explanation of the PPs within the context of the Arctic Council is given before focusing on the analysis.

5. 2. 1. The Arctic Council and the PPs

The Arctic Council is the principal intergovernmental forum of the Arctic. Environmental cooperation and sustainable development are the focus areas for consultation, planning, and cooperation. The Council consists of the eight Arctic states and seven PPs that are indigenous organisations representing indigenous peoples who live across the Arctic states.[5] Although not afforded voting rights, the PPs can present proposals for cooperative activities and have close to a *de facto* power of veto in final decisions, which can only be made with their "full consultation" (Arctic Council, 1996; Dumas, 2017; Koivurova & Heinämäki, 2006, 104). There are also actors with observer status which include non-Arctic states (including France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom), NGOs, scientific bodies, and international organisations. They do not take part in the decision-making process but they can participate in Working Group meetings and projects.

5. 2. 2. IK of the PPs – A challenge to IR assumptions about territoriality

Indigenous perspectives on territory are reflected in the organisations represented by the PPs and contrast with IR assumptions about political territoriality. The PPs of the Arctic Council represent indigenous groups that share a common identity but are not defined by set borders and live in different nation states, some across various autonomous regions.[6] The indigenous organisations that are represented as PPs in the Arctic Council reflect perceptions that differ

[5] The seven indigenous organisations with PP status are: the Aleut International Association (AIA), the Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC), the Gwich'in Council International (GCI), the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC), the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), and the Saami Council (SC) (Arctic Council, 2015b).

[6] With the exception of RAIPON which represents 41 indigenous groups who live only within Russian territorial borders (Arctic Council, 2016).

from IR assumptions of the political, cultural, and social importance and meanings of territory. Before exploring these challenges, IR assumptions related to territoriality are clarified.

5. 2. 2. i. Territoriality in IR

As discussed in the literature review, IR attention on the Arctic predominantly focuses on interstate relations. As such, non-state politically representative entities of distinct groups within a nation state i.e. indigenous organisations, are often overlooked. One of the reasons for this is that they do not fit into the template of the dominant concept of the territorial nation state. Consequently, their political legitimacy, the sources of which do not include defined boundaries, is considered minor in comparison to territorially defined nation states on the global scale. This is indicative of a lack of attention in IR to the variety of ways that territory is interrelated to international relations.

Mainstream IR writers, including Morgenthau (1948) and Spruyt (1994), largely accept that the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia initiated an international system of sovereign territorial nation states. Despite the historical inaccuracies and neglect of geographical and socio-political realities around the world, this accepted basis to a modern system of states remains the dominant framework for analysis in IR (Agnew, 2009; Bull, 1997, 245; Nayak & Selbin, 2010, 23; Ruggie, 1983, 263-266). The idea that states apply sovereignty within a defined territorial area leads to overlooking the contributions of peoples' spiritual, cultural, and political connections to space and how this can materialises in the global sphere in terms of collective identities and socio-political arrangements. Since territory is considered to be a geographic area that is controlled and defined and lends political sovereignty to a nation state, its usefulness is limited in understanding and explaining the Arctic indigenous peoples' transnational political organisations as well as their IK and views of the space around them.

In deconstructing assumptions in IR, political territoriality has been considered an exertion of control over a certain geographic area and therefore reflects ownership and management of land (Nayak & Selbin, 2010, 32; Sack, 1986, 19). As such, its predominant acceptance in IR can serve to legitimise all territorial states on an equal basis and to erase other forms of political authority. However, this is a narrow categorisation of political territoriality, the meanings of which are constructed and context specific. Political legitimacy can be derived from territory in ways that do not include control or ownership of land, as is reflected in the PPs. Furthermore, the PPs, which do not have "Westphalian" origins but exist within an overarching governance system that favours the political legitimacy of Arctic territorial states,

use elements from their IK at the same time as staking claim to the territory around them in order to advance their political legitimacy and sovereignty.

Political territoriality is predominantly only considered to be the legal principle of territoriality of sovereign states (Vollaard, 2009, 688). This also implies that sovereignty in IR only stems from a state securing its territorial borders. Moreover, mainstream IR theories are underpinned with a measurable and fixed conception of territory which reinforces an absolute view of global space (Connon & Simpson, 2017, 11). This is reflected for example in conventional maps, which only present one system of organisation and one representation of global space. These existing assumptions of territoriality in IR i.e. that politically it only relates to sovereign states and that it is fixed and provides an absolute picture of global space, are challenged by IK and indigenous perspectives.

5. 2. 2. ii. IK and the PPs in relation to territoriality

The PPs political relationship to territory stems from historical and contemporary interaction with, rather than ownership of, the space around them. Beyond the IR assumption of territorialisation as a precondition for political and social being, indigenous peoples' organisations derive political legitimacy in the international sphere through PP status in part by virtue of having lived in the area prior to states (Hansen-Magnusson, 2019, 149; Stojanovic, 2017, 114). In Arctic history, clearly plotted boundaries were not common and territory is understood to be flexible and identified by historical use and occupation, harvesting patterns, and agreements with neighbours (Holroyd & Coates, 2017, 26). The contrasts in perceptions of territory between IK and IR assumptions of ownership and management become particularly clear from indigenous practices of place-naming. Rather than considering landscape in solely geographical terms and as an avenue for domination or control, the names of places are multidimensional, reflecting resource use, religious beliefs, community history, and human values (Nuttall, 2000, 394; Nuttall, 1998, 88).

The arbitrariness of set borders and thus inapplicability of fixed conceptions of territory to understanding the PPs is exemplified by the Gwich'in. The Gwich'in subsist off porcupine caribou[7] herds which migrate in the traditional Yukon and Northwest Territories that happen to cross the Alaskan-Canadian border (Coates & Holroyd, 2017, 30). However, the unimportance of defined borders does not diminish the group's political legitimacy or sense of

[7] The porcupine caribou is a variety of Alaskan reindeer.

collective national identity. Through their PP status, the Gwich'in Council International represents the Gwich'in "as one nation, on the international stage" (GCI, 2018). Political territoriality in this sense does not relate to a defined, controlled, and bordered space but is derived from a dependence on a lack of secured borders along a migratory route.

Indigenous understandings of space and territory are broad in what they refer to and in how they encompass indigenous groups across states. For example, the term *Inuit Nunangat* represents all Inuit territories across the Arctic and comprises of all space including the land, sea, and ice (Rodon, 2014, 19). The cultural and social relations to territory in an unfixed manner form political territoriality and collective identities that do not pertain to states. This also contrasts with IR's conception of global space whereby people's identities are assumed to be fulfilled by, and most strongly related to, a territorial nation state (Paasi, 1999, 69). In the Arctic, the identities of the peoples represented by the PPs are certainly connected to the immediate territory but many identities are acknowledged and co-dependently interlinked in this sense: the spiritual, religious, national, cultural, often linguistic, and ethnic.[8] The political sovereignty of the PPs derives from all of these aspects, which reflects that rather than through territorial integrity, "sovereignty exists as the process by which being political is possible" (Shadian, 2010, 502).

Much like in place-naming, traditional Inuit maps reflect ideas about space in a manner that does not delineate states or owned areas. They are usually drawn in the air or snow, often memorised by features like *sastrugi* (snow ridges) with route distances measured by days of travel (Olson, 1994, 216). They were also extremely accurate representations of the landscape as sensually perceived. Moreover, IK through mapping skills, information, and geographical knowledge were paramount to the accuracy of the maps produced during Western expeditions (Rundstrom, 1990, 155-159). The state-delineated map of the Arctic erases the IK that was crucial to its creation and reflects the hierarchical structures of levels of analysis through predominant IR notions which focus on political territoriality in terms of state sovereignty. The lack of spatial recognition of IK and indigenous groups' alternative social and political

[8] For instance, the land provides spiritual nourishment and defines cultures: Saami reindeer herders in the Kautokeino area of northern Norway have 318 noun stems to describe different types of snow, and Shamanism's spiritual depictions and understandings of the frozen landscape intertwine with Christian religious understandings (Mathiesen et al., 2018, 203; Nuttall, 1998, 3; Turner, 1993, 99).

organisations and identities is reflected in the lack of focus in IR of the PPs' perspectives and political interactions at the international level in the Arctic.

5. 2. 2. iii. The theoretical viability of IK

The existence of the PP status and its position as politically more powerful than that of observer status and close to that of Arctic State, represents a fluidity and innovation in international governance that differs from the more stringent conceptions of international space that focus on a political order of states. The southern border of the Arctic Ocean is essentially circular from which sovereign nations radiate: Russia, USA, Canada, Greenland (Denmark), Iceland, Norway, Finland, and Sweden. Each nation claims exploitation rights that radiate far into the Arctic Ocean. Indigenous peoples are superimposed onto this model but their areas of influence and organisations representing different indigenous groups are cross-cutting and follow the circumference of the Arctic Ocean.[9] Consequently the activities of indigenous peoples and any policies impacting on them involve IR covering multiple states.

Taken together, the PPs represent the circumpolar spatially arranged indigenous groups whose identities and traditional ways of life are linked to the Arctic's natural environment. Their IK, through spatial understandings, flexible ideas of territory, and interlinking cultural, spiritual, ethnic, and territorial aspects of their identities, inherently places much importance not just on the immediate territory but on the Arctic. Neither the nation state, nor the PP organisation can independently fulfil one's identity and a supposed exercise of sovereignty within a defined territory does not confine a sovereign indigenous group. IK, across all PPs, grasps the joining necessity of protecting the Arctic's environment as a whole for the survival of the individual's cultural, spiritual, and national affiliations and identities.

The Arctic Council is "unique as an international forum" because of the cooperation between states and indigenous peoples (Arctic Council, 2018). The extensive collaboration centred on a northern problem-solving approach and the regional focus on collective responsibility for the environment beyond borders have been acknowledged to offset preoccupations with territorial borders (Nicol & Lackenbauer, 2017, iv; Zellen, 2017, 39). From indigenous perspectives and IK holistic thinking, understandings of territory encompass

[9] The arbitrariness of state borders in relation to indigenous groups' spatial arrangements which reflect the Arctic Ocean's circumference is visually represented well on this map: Dallmann, W. (2015). Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic countries. *Norwegian Polar Institute*. Accessed 25/04/2019 at: https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/learn-more/maps

broader aspects of space and are not opposed to changes, such as in relation to migrating caribou. These understandings, incorporated into the Arctic Council through the PPs, relate to the collective responsibility and Arctic-focused approaches that inform the Council's work through the projects of the Working Groups. Therefore, IK is viable and necessary for IR analysis to accurately understand the Arctic's multi-governance structures as well as the human and environmental effects of climate change that do not heed state borders.

5. 3. Case Study 3: The Sustainable Development Working Group and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004

This case study focuses on IK perspectives through the Arctic Council's Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment 2004 (ACIA). The analysis centres on how IK relates to IR's underlying framework of modernity. A brief explanation of the SDWG and the ACIA are provided before focusing on the analysis.

5. 3. 1. The SDWG and the ACIA

The Council's six Working Groups execute the projects mandated by the Council decisions.[10] Each Working Group's management board has representatives from the PPs and identifies indigenous engagement as an important and integral component for their projects (Arctic Council, 2015c). Therefore, they offer an avenue for meaningful articulation of IK. The SDWG focuses on human-health and well-being, environmentally-friendly economic activities in relation to community prosperity, education and cultural heritage, management of natural resources, adaptation to climate change, and infrastructure development (Arctic Council, 2019).

The ACIA is an extremely detailed assessment of the causes and broad reaching effects of climate change that was conducted over five years. IK is integrated throughout and two of the eighteen chapters are solely dedicated to indigenous perspectives and resource uses. The assessment was called for by the Arctic Council and was led by the Arctic Monitoring and

[10] The Arctic Council's six working groups are: Arctic Contaminants Action Program (ACAP), Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (EPPR), Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME), and Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG).

Assessment Programme (AMAP), the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), and the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) (ACIA, 2004, iii).

5. 3. 2. The incorporation of IK in the SDWG and the ACIA– A challenge to IR assumptions about modernity

In the SDWG, IK and indigenous perspectives are highly respected and considered essential for the successful formulation and implementation of all its projects. This has been the case since its founding instruction to "take special note of proposals which reflect the importance of traditional and indigenous knowledge and the perspectives of indigenous communities in developing a sustainable future for the Arctic." (Arctic Council, 1998, 5). Similarly, IK holds an influential position in the ACIA and frames an overall inclusion of social science and natural science components to evaluate climate change impacts on socio-economic conditions. Furthermore, the ACIA results improved understandings of climate change in the Arctic at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (ACIA, 2019). Consequently, IK's interlinking of past, present, and future as well as its spiritually informed understandings of the social, economic, and cultural aspects of life offer perspectives to reconceptualise future international conduct in the Arctic and globally. In this sense, IK informs modernity in the Arctic in ways that challenge and reorient IR's dominant modernity framework. Before exploring these challenges, the influences of modernity on IR are clarified.

5. 3. 2. i. Modernity and IR

Modernity conventionally encapsulates beliefs in universal human emancipation from the past or authority, the rational purpose and progress of knowledge, and the autonomy of humanity and its capabilities to transform the present and shape the future. As established in the literature review, the dominant schools of thought in IR are linked to Western understandings of modernity that emerged from the 18th century European Enlightenment period.

Modern thought framed the future to be universal, distinct from its history, and moulded by human ideas. For example, Kant's *Idea for a Universal History* prophesises a "great political body of the future, without precedent in the past" and argues that all humanity is developing towards "the highest purpose of nature, a universal cosmopolitan existence" (Reiss, 1991, 51). The pursuit of this higher existence entails a trust in the supremacy of human rational enquiry to interpret the mysteries of the universe, which took the form of scientific enquiry (Eisenstadt, 2010, 4). According to Weber, in tandem with the predominance of modern science comes a

secularisation of society in which religion is relegated to the private sphere, viewed as irrational, and assigned a certain mysticism (Gerth & Mills, 1946, 143 & 351). These secular and individualistic cultural aspects of Western modernity are linked to the contemporary prevailing orientation and mainstream approaches of IR. IR's linchpin is to explain and understand the world which entails applying rational knowledge to reach universal meanings and principles that do not necessarily have universal historical basis or cultural support, but capture the idea that humans consciously shape the future.

Undoubtedly, this causes representational issues and erasures in IR, which Blaney and Tickner (2017, 74) render a colonial modernity because difference is considered from within a framework of settled binaries – governed/ungoverned, state/international. It has also led to focuses in IR on power politics and a lust for power to be understood as an intrinsic human characteristic which overlooks the structural transformations that take place within modernity (Hurrell, 2016, 3, 12). In actual fact, modernisation and modernity around the world do not necessarily follow Europe's model. Even if similar in regard to institution formations including economic organisation, industrialisation, and urbanisation, great variation has developed between different modern societies (Eisenstadt, 2003, 675). Modernity can also be considered as a "future oriented condition" whereby societies take into consideration ideas that are termed modern in their pursuit of transformation (Delanty, 2015, 427). Despite the pluralisation of modes of modernity, there is a universalism in terms of it entailing change on account of human agency.

5. 3. 2. ii. IK through the SDWG and the ACIA in relation to modernity

Arctic IK can be seen to challenge and embrace aspects of modernity on its own terms, which contrasts with IR's more uniform underlying framework of modernity. Particularly on account of climate change, IK envisions structural transformation which is informed from understandings of the temporally interlinked nature of all aspects of life. It is therefore transformational in a modern sense through human agency without "freeing" itself from its tradition or history. Furthermore, the categorisation of autonomous spheres and rational enquiry through modern science and the belief that this could fully reveal objective truths of reality, particularly of nature, are challenged by IK's methods of enquiry that are relationally perceived, and spiritually and culturally informed.

IK offers perspectives on climate change that explain the broad-reaching effects, which enhance modern science, but also go beyond it by cohesively representing the dependence on

environmental maintenance of indigenous groups' cultures and historical traditions. One example of this comes from *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* (IQ) – the IK of the largest indigenous group in the Arctic, the Inuit. In Inuktitut (the language of the Inuit in Eastern Canada) *Silatuniq* means "wisdom" and it is fostered from experiencing and observing hunting practices (Watt-Cloutier, 2015, ix). Similarly, in many Arctic indigenous groups the term *Sila* means "weather," "air," and "breath" with an ingrained notion of wisdom (Hulan, 2018, 72). It is a spiritual force that gives life or movement to all things and it encompasses the interconnection between life and the natural environment. In the words of Inuit Shaman Najagneq, *Sila* is a "strong spirit, the upholder of the universe, of the weather, in fact all life on earth", which is suggestive of the idea that climate change could be the world's ethical response to humanity's inappropriate behaviours (Leduc, 2007, 241-242). *Sila* captures more than climate change's effects on the weather but also the social, cultural, political, and economic effects that it has on indigenous communities.[11] Unlike Zellen's (2010, 58) assertion that the Inuit live in "fourth world" conditions – supposedly the least well-off peoples due to limited infrastructure, extreme climate, and isolation – on the contrary *Sila* captures indigenous ideational agencies and an understanding and foresight of the ecological destruction and environmental degradation that can occur when reality is categorised into "autonomous spheres" or institutional formations that are believed to be regulated by their "own logic" (Eisenstadt, 2010, 1).

Therefore, *Sila* accentuates the human causes and human effects of climate change in a multidimensional manner. This understanding sheds light on the importance that indigenous peoples place on cultural protection in tandem with environmental protection. This is evident from their input into the SDGW, the ACIA, and more broadly from their perspectives of modernity. As the ACIA (2004, 65) makes clear, judging the "accuracy" of IK by comparing it to scientific knowledge is not objective since its value is connected to the culture in which it was developed. This in itself gives insights into environmental changes, for instance, *Ullivinirkallak* means a place that was once used to store walrus meat but its different

[11] It is important to note that understandings around the world about managing the global commons and the limits of the Earth's carrying capacity are greatly improving. However, IR's main schools of thought are dominantly influenced by Western understandings of modernity and the European Enlightenment. This period constructed notions of a political order that is premised on unchecked growth and ignores the ecological implications of the laws of thermodynamics (the relationship between all energy) (Ophuls, 1997, 8-10). On the other hand, *Sila* suggests that Arctic IK has always had the wisdom and understanding of the interconnection of spirit and energy between all natural phenomena, and thus the importance of balance between them.

contemporary use indicates changes in permafrost (ACIA, 2004, 66). Through the ACIA, the dichotomous notions of modern science and IK are blurred and their complementary values can be appreciated.

IK also explains the rationale and ideational factors behind indigenous peoples' decisions and what they hold important. According to Jutta Wark, the former international chair of the SDWG, the preservation of subsistence lifestyles is a main objective of PPs and as such their perspectives on the ways in which economic development occurs is highly focused on environmental impacts (Coote, 2016, 37). As such, the incorporation of IK makes the environmental protection strategies "culturally appropriate" (Arctic Council, 2017, 6-15). For example, the SDWG project *ÉALAT: Reindeer herding, traditional knowledge and adaptation to climate change and loss of grazing land* uses IK from the Gwich'in, Saami, and Nenets to "restore and develop" reindeer husbandry and traditional livelihoods and to advance Arctic "sustainable development" (Arctic Council, 2006, 32; 2009, 9). The pursuit and compilation of knowledge is linked to the preservation and advancement of traditional herding practices as a component of climate change adaptation strategies. In this respect, IK includes the interconnected social, economic, cultural, spiritual, and environmental, the past and future aspects of Arctic life into its designs of future progress.

5. 3. 2. iii. The theoretical viability of IK

The evolving nature of IK and its intertwining with modern science structurally transforms IR inquiry beyond the modern state institutional formation to a more relevant, useful, and global understanding of the Arctic and the comprehensive effects of climate change (reflected particularly well through the concept of *Sila*). Therefore IK's contributions through the SDWG and the ACIA represent a "future oriented condition" that justifiably contributes to modernity. IK's inclusion challenges the notion that modern science is the ultimate method for human enquiry or understanding. Rather than excluded, considered irrational, or minor in comparison to modern science, IK is integrated into the global sphere and informs the character of political, environmental, and development projects. Progress in this light represents a broader vitality of the interlinked social, economic, and cultural aspects of life, which are consciously understood to depend primarily upon the surrounding local environment.

Furthermore, IK's interlinked spiritual, ecological, and cultural ethos and non-linear temporal organisation has and can further contribute to modernisation in the Arctic. It simultaneously challenges the bases of the precise modern notions of supreme rational thought,

human emancipation, and autonomy that are understood to be separate from (as well as creating the categorisation of) nature, which form the essential disposition that has largely caused current climate change. Modernity does not have a "governing center or master-narratives", it is global and multiple, entails discourses that interrogate the present, and includes non-Western "hybrid modernities" (Gaonkar, 2001, 14). This means that rather than Enlightenment universalism, which homogenises all space and time, IK has a place within pluralistic universalism, which allows for multiple foundations (Acharya, 2014, 649). The Arctic represents its own modernity that is similar to others in many ways, like envisioning sustainable futures, in which IK plays a vital part and offers new perspectives that reorient the modern framework of IR. This is seen in IK's role of redressing unequal colonial power relations, its spiritual, cultural, and ecological contributions to and influences on climate scientific enquiry, governance and project planning, and the conscious environmental centrality to all relations and ways of life.

Chapter 6. Arctic IK in Global IR and Conclusions

The findings from the collective case study analysis confirm the importance of including the perspectives and knowledges of indigenous peoples to more accurately overcome erasures in mainstream IR and to understand the various levels of international relations in the Arctic. Scholars have called for a broadening of IR's methods of enquiry and foundations that extend beyond assumptions that are unsupported or based exclusively on Western experiences (Crawford, 2016, 265; Neuman, 1998, 1-2). Acharya (2011, 626) contends that IR needs to identify sources of theorising that include non-Western voices and experiences. This collective case study analysis demonstrates that some of IR's prevailing core assumptions are inadequate when applied to the Arctic and therefore emphasises the importance of adopting IK as a lens of analysis for better understanding by drawing attention to cultures, spiritual beliefs, worldviews, forms of agency, and changing environmental realities.

The first case study analysis centres on how IK of Iñupiat whalers in Alaska, in relation to subsistence societal practices, and spiritual and cultural values, motivated and influenced their agency locally, regionally, and internationally through the AEWC, which challenges prevailing IR assumptions of state-centricity, non-agency of non-state actors, and cooperation. More broadly and with reference to a number of instances within the international sphere, it illustrates how the highly cooperative and generous relations between various indigenous groups are connected to a sense of solidarity based on similar subsistence histories, contemporary struggles to preserve indigenous cultures, and spiritual beliefs about reciprocity. The second case study demonstrates that through IK, global space and identities entail broader concepts of territoriality. The identities and sovereignties of the PPs in the Arctic Council derive from flexible territorial arrangements and understandings, which are intertwined with spiritual, religious, national, cultural, linguistic, and ethnic affiliations and identities. The narrow spatial recognition in IR overlooks indigenous social and political arrangements and the aspects that contribute to them. The final case study focuses on modernity in the Arctic. As evidenced through the SDWG and the ACIA, IK contributes to an evolving Arctic modernity, in a spiritual, cultural, social, economic, and ecological sense that envisions an environmentally balanced future. The complementary values of IK and modern science are particularly clear, which challenge the conventional modern assumptions in IR that supreme scientific enquiry is superior to and irreconcilable with spirituality and tradition.

The case study analysis clearly addresses and answers the research question: How do Arctic indigenous peoples' knowledge and perspectives pose a challenge to prevailing IR assumptions? Concerning the sub-questions, it would be inaccurate to consider the indigenous political role as only one of a non-state influence on states and reductive to consider indigenous political and social arrangements as merely an anomaly formation of significant authority within the regular framework of state interactions. A more useful assertion than to disregard "anomalies" is to reassess the methods of IR and the prevailing assumptions they rest upon. Broadening the epistemological basis of IR enhances its theories' capacities and leads to better explanations of the diversities around the world. One such way is to include IK insights in IR enquiry.

IK presents new perspectives for approaching IR that consist of knowledge that is alternatively situated to the dominant IR worldview framework in terms of spatiality, sovereignty, modernity, temporality, spirituality, human connection, and ecology. Since it has been demonstrated that IK tenets and ways of relating to each other are apparent across different indigenous groups in the Arctic, the empirical power of incorporating the perspectives and experiences of indigenous peoples does not reduce the theoretical viability of an approach in IR that incorporates IK. If anything, it enhances understandings of the complex multilevel governance structures and co-dependent local, regional, and international institutional dynamics that exist in the Arctic. It is also one of many other contexts where views and knowledges from the Global South, IK, various socio-political layers, and indigenous communities make the situation more multifaceted than mainstream IR depictions would indicate.

As Tickner (2003, 296) notes, the vital dismissals of "universal knowledge" in IR must correspond with incorporating the many "competing know-hows" around the world. Furthermore, Global IR's pluralistic universalism is open to multiple foundations, and adaptations of existing concepts form contributions to the discipline (Acharya, 2014, 649; Smith, 2018, 89). Arctic indigenous voices and knowledges point to "know-hows" that contrast with and adapt prevailing IR assumptions as well as adapt, or share similarities with, IR from knowledge systems around the world. Tieku's (2012, 41) theory on collectivist world view on Africa interstate politics links the solidarity evident between African countries to collectivist norms at local levels in societies in which the spirit of solidarity preferences the group over the individual. The significance of collective rights and duties in the local and international spheres is also uniquely recognised in international law through the African Charter on Human and

Peoples' Rights (1981, Art. 18-24). Similarly, as explored in the first case study, the centrality of sharing as a complex moral value in indigenous societies is linked to reciprocal spiritual beliefs and subsistence histories and it has influenced generous and cooperative transnational relations between indigenous groups and organisations. This is evident from the AEWC and potentially could be linked, accompanied by solidarity from shared experiences of colonialism, to the PPs collaboration in decision-making at the Arctic Council.

The implications of the case study analysis include viable offerings to reorient IR's framework so that IK and indigenous voices and histories are included. For instance, it was explained that shared amongst Arctic IK worldviews is a belief that all natural things emanate from the same spiritual source and that humans have responsibilities in maintaining spiritual balances and peace (with other humans, animals, and the environment) in order to avoid vindictive spirits causing harm on their communities. Furthermore, IK's flexible ideas about territoriality include being shaped on account of ecological changes and arrangements with neighbours. Taken together, this enhances understandings of the importance placed on cooperative, generous, and peaceful relations. Contrary to the assumptions that anarchy begets disorder or hegemony, it can be considered conducive to peaceful, cooperative international relations. This is also reflected in the enduring IK values of sharing, adaptation, consensus decision-making, and inclusivity.

In similar ways, other indigenous communities and IK from around the world challenge prevailing IR assumptions and suggest that IR can be understood from alternative perspectives. For instance, the Lakota indigenous people of North America express their existence in circular rather than linear terms that is linked to a cosmology of "intrinsic relatedness", and which Beier (2002, 104-105) notes is inconsistent with warfare and is reflected politically in collective decision-making structures. Furthermore, the Guarani and Kaiowa indigenous peoples in Brazil offer an alternative model of international politics through the concept of *Tekoha*. It represents a notion of geographic territorial space that is defined by members' shared ethical principles in which freedoms are not conceded to a central institution and there is free circulation for people from other *Tekoha*, creating a "great network" (Urt, 2016, 868-869). There are similarities between indigenous worldviews, particularly in relation to the interconnected forms of sovereignty, territoriality, and spirituality, which collectively add valuable insights for understanding and reorienting IR.

This thesis has emphasised areas where Arctic IK challenges prevailing IR assumptions and in doing so sheds light on aspects of IK worldviews that are theoretically viable for IR. There is much room and need for further research on the beliefs, perspectives, and concepts of IK that have been touched upon here, how they compare with other indigenous communities' worldviews, and can be further theorised in IR in ways that provide deeper and more inclusive explanations for IR in the Arctic and IR in general.

Finally, IK enhances understandings of human relations with the Earth and can aid IR to address the all-embracing, global, and multigenerational nature of climate change. "The study of IR means different things in different regions" (Acharya, 2011, 631), and in the Arctic dealing with and adapting to climate change is a crucial concern which constitutes a crucial subject that has been inadequately addressed in IR. As Dunn (2001, 3) notes in relation to Africa, by adjusting the focus in IR, regions that are traditionally considered marginal often occupy central positions in overlooked paradigms and discourses. Undoubtedly, the Arctic is increasingly at the forefront of the global climate change precipice.[12] However, the region's active transnational cooperation and environmental consciousness provide a potential model for effective ecosystem protection and adaptation strategies.

IK perspectives overcome many of the shortcomings and blind spots of the traditional IR discipline when it comes to climate change. There is a "theoretical ineptitude" and an institutional incompetence regarding climate change, particularly its intergenerational aspect (Gardiner, 2011, 407). The state-centric approaches in IR and through the UNFCCC can also serve to undermine the extent of climate change impacts on indigenous groups who live across nation states as well as their agency in shaping adequate responses (Connon & Simpson, 2019). Although historical adaptive efforts are less effective due to the extent of climate and socioeconomic changes taking place, integrating IK into adaptation research can make policy more effective with evidence-based support for locally and culturally suitable adaptation strategies (Pearce et al. 2015, 234).

IK informs globally decisive adaptation and environmental monitoring projects conducted through innovative transnational organisations. In relation to environmental and

[12] The Arctic is warming faster than anywhere else in the world. This has caused an unprecedented over 100 wildfires to burn in the Arctic in June 2019 (WMO, 2019). Recent scientific research sets out the alarming implications on global climate change of the increasingly disappearing Arctic summer sea ice and the unlikeliness of global warming to remain below the Paris Agreement's 2°C limit (Olson et al., 2019).

social sustainability, Watt-Cloutier (2002) argues that “the Inuit can enlighten the world”. Indeed, Arctic IK has a clear understanding of the environment to be central to the vitality of all aspects of life, rather than its protection to be considered as one of seventeen equal components of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The concept of *Sila* captures the idea of interconnected spirit of all life on Earth and the transnational and overlapping impacts of climate change. The IK-informed approaches to regulating the global commons in balance with the environment place importance on the planet’s future survival for future generations. Therefore, the ancient and evolving tenets of IK are well-equipped to enhance IR’s representations of the Arctic’s international space and of global climate change.

Bibliography

Acharya, A. (2011). Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West. *Journal of International Studies*, 39(3), 619-637.

Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies*. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58, 647-659.

ACHPR. (1981). *African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights*. Accessed 02/08/2019 at: https://au.int/en/treaties/african-charter-human-and-peoples-rights

ACIA. (2004). *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Accessed 15/07/2019 at: https://www.amap.no/documents/doc/arctic-arctic-climate-impact-assessment/796

ACIA. (2019). Home Page. *Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme*. Accessed 21/07/2019 at: https://www.amap.no/arctic-climate-impact-assessment-acia

AEWC. (2019). *Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission*. Accessed 18/07/2019 at: www.aewc-alaska.com

Agnew, J. (2003). *Geopolitics: Revisioning World Politics* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Agnew, J. (2009). *Globalization and Sovereignty*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change*, 26(3), 413-439.

Arctic Centre. (2019). *Arctic Indigenous Peoples*. University of Lapland. Accessed 02/06/2019 at: https://www.arcticcentre.org/EN/arcticregion/Arctic-Indigenous-Peoples

Arctic Council. (1996). *Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council*, Ottawa, Canada. Accessed 16/04/2019 at: https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/85

Arctic Council. (1998). *Report of Senior Arctic Officials to the Arctic Council*, Iqaluit. Accessed 08/07/2019 at: https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/2050

Arctic Council. (2006). *Report of Senior Arctic Officials to Ministers at the fifth Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting*, Salekhard. Accessed on 10/07/2019 at: http://library.arcticportal.org/287/1/SAO-REPORTTO_MINISTERS.pdf

Arctic Council. (2009). *Report of Senior Arctic Officials to Arctic Council Ministers*, Tromsø. Accessed 10/07/2019 at: https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/1555

Arctic Council. (2015a). *Ottawa Traditional Knowledge Principles*. Accessed 08/06/2019 at: http://www.saamicouncil.net/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/Eara_dokumeanttat/Ottawa_TK_Principles.pdf

Arctic Council. (2015b). *Permanent Participants*. Accessed 10/07/2019 at: https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/permanent-participants

Arctic Council. (2015c). *Working Groups*. Accessed 15/04/2019 at: https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/working-groups

Arctic Council. (2016). *Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North*. Accessed 10/07/2019 at: https://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/permanent-participants/raipon

Arctic Council. (2017). Sustainable Development Working Group: The Human Face of the Arctic. Accessed 04/08/2019 at: https://www.sdwg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/SDWG-Framework-2017-Final-Print-version.pdf

Arctic Council. (2018). *Arctic Council addresses meteorological cooperation and connectivity during week of events in Finland*. Accessed 11/07/2019 at: https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/our-work2/8-news-and-events/486-sao-levi-2018-02

Arctic Council. (2019). *Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG).* Accessed 10/07/2019 at: https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/working-groups/sdwg

Axelrod, R. & Keohane, R. (1993). Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions. In: D. Baldwin (Ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (pp. 85-115). New York: Columbia University Press.

Bailes, A. (2016). Security in the Arctic: definitions, challenges and solutions. In: L. Jakobson & N. Melvin (Eds.), *The New Arctic Governance* (pp. 13-40). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beckford, C., Jacobs, C., Williams, N. & Nahdee, R. (2010) Aboriginal Environmental Wisdom, Stewardship, and Sustainability: Lessons From the Walpole Island First Nations, Ontario, Canada. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 41(4), 239-248.

Beier, J. (2002). Beyond hegemonic state(ment)s of nature: indigenous knowledge and non-state possibilities in international relations. In G. Chowdhry & S. Nair (Eds.), *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class* (pp. 82-114). London: Routledge.

Bennett, A. & Elman, C. (2007). Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield. *Comparative Political Studies*, (40)2, 170-195.

Bennett, A. (2004). Case Study Methods: Design, Use, and Comparative. In: D. Sprinz & Y Wolinsky-Nahmi (Eds.), *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations* (pp. 19-56). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bergh, K. & Klimenko (2016). Understanding national approaches to security in the Arctic. In: L. Jakobson & N. Melvin (Eds.), *The New Arctic Governance* (pp. 41-75). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berkes, F. (2012). Sacred Ecology (3rd ed.) New York: Routledge.

Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C. (2000). Rediscovery of traditional ecological knowledge as adaptive management. *Ecological Applications*, 10, 1251-1262.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking past 'Western' IR? *Third World Quarterly*, 29(1), 5-23.

Blaney, D. & Tickner, A. (2017). International Relations in the prison of colonial modernity. *International Relations*, 31(1), 71-75.

Bodenhorn, B. (2000). It's Good to Know Who Your Relatives Are but We Were Taught to Share with Everybody: Shares and Sharing among Inupiaq Households. *Senri Ethnological Studies*, 53, 27-60.

Borgerson, S. (2008). Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming. *Foreign Affairs*, 87(2), 63-77.

Braund, S. (2018). Description of Alaskan Eskimo Bowhead Whale Subsistence Sharing Practices. Anchorage: Final Report to the AEWC. Accessed 19/07/2019 at: http://www.north-slope.org/assets/images/uploads/Braund_AEWC16_Bowhead_Sharing_Report_5-23-18.pdf

Brosnan, I., Leschine, T., & Miles, E. (2011). Cooperation or Conflict in a Changing Arctic? *Ocean Development & International Law*, 42(1-2), 173-210.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.), New York: Oxford University Press.

Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Buzan, B. & Little, R. (2001). Why International Relations Has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to do About it. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 30(1), 19-39.

Capan, Z. (2017). Decolonising International Relations? *Third World Quarterly*, 38(1), 1-15.

Connon, I. & Simpson, A. (2019). Student Feature – Theory in Action: Critical Geography and Inuit Views. *E-International Relations Students*. Accessed 26/07/2019 at: https://www.e-ir.info/2019/07/22/student-feature-theory-in-action-critical-geography-and-inuit-views-of-space/

Connon, I., & Simpson, A. (2017). Critical Geography: An Introduction. In: S. McGlinchey, R. Walters & C. Scheinpflug (Eds.), *International Relations Theory*, (pp. 110-117). Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing.

Coote, M. (2016). Environmental Decision-Making in the Arctic Council: What is the Role of Indigenous Peoples? *Arctic Yearbook*, 30-47. Accessed 25/06/2019 at: https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic-yearbook/2016/2016-scholarly-papers/166-environmental-decision-making-in-the-arctic-council-what-is-the-role-of-indigenous-peoples

Corntassel, J. & Woons, M. (2018). Indigenous Perspectives on International Relations Theory. *E-International Relations*. Accessed 05/08/2019 at: https://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/23/indigenous-perspectives-on-international-relations-theory/

Crawford, N. (2016). Studying World Politics as a Complex Adaptive System. In: K. Booth & T. Erskine (Eds.) *International Relations Theory Today* (pp. 263-267). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cruikshank, J. (2001). Glaciers and climate change: perspectives from oral tradition. *Arctic*, 54(4), 377-393.

Cruikshank, J. (2005). *Do glaciers listen? Local knowledge, colonial encounters & social imagination*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dalby, S. (2011). Geographies of the International System: Globalization, Empire and the Anthropocene. In: P. Aalto, V. Harle & S. Moisio (Eds.), *International Studies .Interdisciplinary Approaches* (pp. 125-148). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dallmann, W. (2015). Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic countries. *Norwegian Polar Institute*. Accessed 25/04/2019 at: https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/learn-more/maps

Delanty, G. (2015). Europe in world regional perspective: formations of modernity and major historical transformations. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(3), 420-440.

Dumas, M. (2017). Breaking the Ice for Indigenous Voices on the World Stage. *The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies*. Accessed 14/04/2019 at: https://jsis.washington.edu/news/breaking-ice-indigenous-voices-world-stage/

Dunn, K. (2001). Introduction: Africa and International Relations Theory. In: K. Dunn K. & T. Shaw (Eds.) *Africa's Challenge to International Relations Theory* (pp. 1-8). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eastern Beaufort Sea Beluga Whales: Stock Status Report E5-38 (2000). Central and Arctic Region, *DFO Science*. Accessed 15/06/2019 at: http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas/Csas/status/2000/E5-38e.pdf

Eisenstadt, S. (2003). *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities*. Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S. (2010). Modernity and modernization. *Sociopedia.isa.* Accessed 20/07/2019 at: www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/Modernity.pdf

Ellis, S. (2005). Meaningful Consideration? A Review of Traditional Knowledge in Environmental Decision Making. *Arctic*, 58(1), 66-77. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.542.4606&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ferguson, Y. & Mansbach, R. (2007). Post-internationalism and IR Theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 35(3), 529-549. https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298070350031001

Fondahl, G., Filippova, V. & Mack, L. (2015). Indigenous Peoples in the New Arctic. In: B. Evengård, J. Larsen & Ø. Paasche (Eds.), *The New Arctic* (pp. 7-22). London: Springer International Publishing.

Freeman, M. (1989). The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission: Successful Co-Management under Extreme Conditions. In: E. Pinkerton (Ed.) *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management of Community Development* (pp. 137-153). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Furgal, C. & Prowse, T. (2008). Northern Canada. In: D. Lemmen, F. Warren, J. Lemmen & E. Bush (Eds.), *From Impacts to Adaptation: Canada in a Changing Climate 2007* (pp. 57-118). Natural Resources Canada, Ottawa.

Gambell, R. (1993). International management of whales and whaling: an historical review of the regulation of commercial and aboriginal subsistence whaling. *Arctic*, 46(2), 97-107.

Gaonkar, D. (2001). On Alternative Modernities. In: D. Gaonkar (Ed.), *Alternative Modernities* (pp. 1-23). London: Duke University Press.

Gardiner, S. (2011). *A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GCI. (2018). *Gwich'in Council International*, Annual Report. Accessed 20/07/2019 at: https://gwichincouncil.com/sites/default/files/2017-2018%20GCI%20Annual%20Report%20_PDF_0.pdf

Gerth, H. & Mills, C. (Eds. & Trans.) (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Government of Nunavut. (2013). Incorporating Inuit Societal Values. *Government of Nunavut, Implementation of Inuit Societal Values Report*. Accessed 10/03/2019 at: https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/2015-04-22-incorporating_inuit_societal_values_report.pdf

Grønnestad, K. (2016). *What is the Arctic?* Barents Watch. Accessed 02/05/2019 at: https://www.barentswatch.no/en/articles/Hva-er-Arktis/

Hansen-Magnusson, H. (2019). The web of responsibility in and for the Arctic. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 32(2), 132-158.

Hardy, B. (2006). A Regional Approach to Whaling: How the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission is Shifting the Tides for Whale Management. *Duke Journal of Comparative & International Law*, 17(169), 169-198. Accessed 01/07/2019 at: https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://en.wikipedia.org/&httpsredir=1&article=1096&context=djcil

Herrmann, V. (2017). Layered Landscapes, Layered Identities. Historic Narratives, Arctic Aesthetics, and Indigenous Agency in Canada's Anthropocene. In: P. Lackenbauer & H. Nicol (Eds.), *The Networked North: Borders and Borderlands in the Canadian Arctic Region* (pp. 2-24). Victoria, Canada: Borders in Globalization and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism.

Hess, B. (1999). *Gift of the Whale: The Inupiat Bowhead Hunt, a Sacred Tradition*. Seattle, WA: Sasquatch Books.

Holroyd, CC. & Coates, K. (2017). Re-Bordering the North: Governance, Northern Alliances and the Evolution of the Circumpolar World. In: P. Lackenbauer & H. Nicol (Eds.), *The Networked North: Borders and Borderlands in the Canadian Arctic Region* (pp. 24-34). Victoria, Canada: Borders in Globalization and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism.

Hulan, R. (2018). *Climate Change and Writing the Canadian Arctic*. Cham, Switzerland: Plagrave Macmillan.

Huntington, H. (1992). The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and other cooperative marine mammal management organizations in northern Alaska. *Polar Record*, 28(165), 119-126.

Huntington, H. (2000). Using Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Science: Methods and Applications. *Ecological Applications*, 10(5), 1270-1274.

Hurrell, A (1990). Kant and the Kantian Paradigm in International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, 16(3), 183-205.

Hurrell, A. (2016). Towards the Global Study of International Relations. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 59(2), 1-18.

Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat, the Arctic Council. (2018). *We are the Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic.* Accessed 03/06/2019 at: https://www.arcticpeoples.com/#intro

Jakobson, L. & Melvin, N. (2016). Conclusions. In: L. Jakobson & N. Melvin (Eds.), *The New Arctic Governance* (pp. 181-189). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, M. (1992). *LORE: Capturing traditional environmental knowledge*. Ottawa: Dene Cultural Institute and the International Development Research Centre.

Johnston, P. (2012). Arctic Energy Resources: Security and Environmental Implications. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 5(3), 13-32.

Kalland, A. (2011). *Unveiling the Whale: Discourses on Whales and Whaling*. New York: Berghan Books.

Koivurova T. & Heinämäki L. (2006). The Participation of Indigenous Peoples in international Norm-Making in the Arctic. *Polar Record*, 42(221), 101-109.

Koivurova, T. (2012). The Arctic Council: A Testing Ground for New International Environmental Governance. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 19(1), 131-144.

Krasner, S. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lackenbauer, P. & Nicol, H. (2017). Regionalization, Globalization and Arctic Borders: An Interpretive Framework. In: P. Lackenbauer & H. Nicol (Eds.), *The Networked North: Borders and Borderlands in the Canadian Arctic Region* (pp. iii-vi). Victoria, Canada: Borders in Globalization and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism.

Leduc, T. (2007). Sila dialogues on climate change: Inuit wisdom for a cross-cultural interdisciplinarity. *Climate Change*, 85, 237-250.

Leung, J. (2000). Machiavelli and International Relations. *Glendon Journal of International Studies*, 1, 3-13.

Mann, M. (1984). The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results. *European Journal of Sociology*, 25(2), 185-213.

Mathiesen, S., Bongo, M., Burgess, P., Corell, R., Degteva, A., Eira, I. & Vikhamar-Schuler, D. (2018). Indigenous Reindeer Herding and Adaptation to New Hazards in the Arctic. In D. Nakashima, I. Krupnik, & J. Rubis (Eds.), *Indigenous Knowledge for Climate Change Assessment and Adaptation* (pp. 198-213). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781316481066.015

Mauro, F. & Hardison, P. (2000). Traditional Knowledge of Indigenous and Local Communities: International Debate and Policy Initiatives. *Ecological Applications*, 10(5), 1263-1269.

McPherson, J., Sammy, J., Sheppard, D., Mason, J., Brichieri-Colombi, T. & Moehrenschlager, A. (2016). Integrating traditional knowledge when it appears to conflict with conservation: lessons from the discovery and protection of sitatunga in Ghana. *Ecology and Society*, 21(1), 24-42.

Merculieff, I., Abel, P., Allen, Chief J., Beaumier, M., Bélanger, V., Burelle, M., Dickson Jr., T., Ebert, M., Henri, D., Legat, A., Larocque, B., Netro, L., & Zoe-Chocolate, C. (2017). Arctic Traditional Knowledge and Wisdom: Changes in the North American Arctic, Perspectives from Arctic Athabascan Council, Aleut International Association, Gwich'in Council International, and published accounts. *Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna International Secretariat*, Akureyri, Iceland. ISBN 978-9935-431-61-5.

Miller, R. (2010). Interdisciplinarity: Its Meaning and Consequences. In: R. Denemark & R. Marlin-Bennett (Eds.), *International Studies Encyclopedia*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mitchell, R. & Bernauer, T. (2004). Beyond Story-Telling: Designing Case Study Research in International Environmental Policy. In: D. Sprinz & Y Wolinsky-Nahmi (Eds.), *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations* (pp. 56-81). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Moe, A. (2017). The Dynamics of Arctic Development. In: S. Rottem & I. Soltvedt (Eds.), *Arctic Governance, Volume 1: Law and Politics* (pp. 9-22). New York: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Mqotsi, L. (2002). Science, magic and religion as trajectories of the psychology of projection. In C. A. Odora Hoppers (Ed.), *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation* (pp. 158-172). Claremont, RSA: New Africa Books.

NAMMCO. (2015). *Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Assessing Time to Death Data from the Large Whale Hunts*. Copenhagen, Denmark. Assessed 10/07/2019 at:

https://nammco.no/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/report-of-expert-group-meeting-on-ttd-data-for-large-whales.pdf

National Snow & Ice Data Center. (2019). *What is the Arctic?* Accessed 02/05/2019 at: https://nsidc.org/cryosphere/arctic-meteorology/arctic.html

Nayak, M. & Selbin, E. (2010). *Decentering International Relations*. London: Zed Books.

Neufeld, M. (1995). *The Restructuring of International Relations Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neuman, S. (1998). International Relations Theory and the Third World: An Oxymoron? In: S. Neuman (Ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World* (pp. 1-30). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Nielsen, J. (2000). Inuit socio-cultural values across the Arctic. *Études Inuit Studies*, 24(1), 149-158.

NOAA. (2008). *Whaling Provision: Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Quotas Petition by the Department of Commerce*. The Federal Register, 73(81). Accessed 19/07/2019 at: http://www.north-slope.org/assets/images/uploads/4.25%20AEWC%20Whaling%20Quota.pdf

NOAA. (2018). *Warming, sea-ice loss: Arctic Report Card tracks region's environmental changes: Annual update improves understanding of changing climate, wildlife impacts*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Science Daily. Accessed 19/07/2019 at: www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181211121107.htm

Nuttall, M. (1998). *Protecting the Arctic: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Survival*. Philadelphia, PA: Gordon & Breach.

Nuttall, M. (2000). Indigenous Peoples, Self-determination and the Arctic Environment. In: M. Nuttall & T. Callaghan (Eds.), *The Arctic: Environment, People, Policy* (pp. 77-409). Amsterdam: Overseas Publishers Association.

Olson, D. (1994). *The World on Paper: The Conceptual and Cognitive Implications of Writing and Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, R., An, S., Fan, Y., Chang, W., Evans, J. & Lee, J. (2019). A novel method to test non-exclusive hypotheses applied to Arctic ice projections from dependent models. *Nature*

Communications, 10(3016), 1-10. Accessed 01/08/2019 at: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-019-10561-x

Ophuls, W. (1997). *Requiem for Modern Politics: The Tragedy of the Enlightenment and the Challenge of the New Millennium*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Østerud, Ø. and Hønneland, G. (2014). Geopolitics and International Governance in the Arctic. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics*, 5(2), 156–176.

Paasi, A. (1999). Boundaries as Social Processes: Territoriality in a World of Flows. *Geopolitics*, 3(1), 69-88.

Pearce, T., Ford, J., Willox, A. & Smit, B. (2015). Inuit Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), Subsistence Hunting and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Canadian Arctic. *Arctic*, 68(2), 233-245.

Pereira, J. (2017). The limitations of IR theory regarding the environment: lessons from the Anthropocene. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 60(1), 1-22. www.scielo.br/pdf/rbpi/v60n1/1983-3121-rbpi-0034-73292017001019.pdf

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533-580.

Reiss, H. (Ed.) (1991). *Kant: Political Writings* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought.

Reiter, B. (2013). *The Dialectics of Citizenship: Exploring Privilege, Exclusion, and Racialization*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press.

Roche, J. (2011). Intergovernmentalism. In: D. Berg-Schlosser and B. Badie (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* (pp. 421-425). California: SAGE Publications.

Rodon, T. (2014). Inuit Diplomacy: Reframing the Arctic Spaces and Narratives. In: UNDRIP, *The Internationalization of Indigenous Rights* (pp. 17-23). Centre for International Governance Innovation.

Rosenberg, J. (2016). International Relations in the Prison of Political Science. *International Relations*, 30(2), 127-53.

Rottem, S. (2017). The Arctic Council Between National and International Governance. In: S. Rottem & I. Soltvedt (Eds.), *Arctic Governance: Volume 1, Law and Politics* (pp. 181-204). New York: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Rowe, E. (2018). *Arctic governance. Power in cross-border cooperation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ruggie, J. (1983). Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis Theory of International Politics. *World Politics*, 35(2), 261-285.

Rundstrom, R. (1990). A Cultural Interpretation of Inuit Map Accuracy. *Geographical Review*, 80(2), 155-68.

Russett, B. (2013). Liberalism. In: T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith (Eds.), *International Relations Theories* [3rd Ed.] (pp. 94-113). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sack, R. (1986). *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Santos, B. (2004). A Critique of Lazy Reason: Against the Waste of Experience. In: I. Wallerstein (Ed.), *Modern World-System in the Longue Durée* (pp. 157-199). London: Routledge.

Santos, B., Nunes, J. & Meneses, M. (2007). Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference. In: B. de Sousa Santos (Eds.), *Another Knowledge in Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies* (pp. xix-lxii). London: Verso.

Shadian, J. (2010). From states to polities: Reconceptualizing sovereignty through Inuit governance. *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(3), 485-510.

Shadian, J. (2013). Of whales and oil: Inuit resource governance and the Arctic Council. *Polar Record*, 49(251), 392-405.

Simonds, V. & Christopher, S. (2013). Adapting Western Research Methods to Indigenous Ways of Knowing. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(12), 2185-2192.

Smith, K. (2018). Reshaping International Relations: Theoretical Innovations from Africa*. *All Azimuth*, 7(2), 81-92.

Snively, G. (2016). When Uncles Become Killer Whales: Bridging Indigenous Science, Western Science and Worldviews. In: G. Snively & W. Williams (Eds.), *Knowing Home:*

Braiding Indigenous Science with Western Science (pp. 129-146). Victoria, BA: University of Victoria.

Sprinz, D. & Wolinsky-Nahmi, Y. (2004). *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Spruyt, H. (1994). *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press

Stake, R. (1994). Case Studies. In: N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stojanovic, D. (2017). Space, Territory and Sovereignty: Critical Analysis of Concepts. *Nagoya University Journal of Law and Politics*, 275, 111-185.

Stokke, O. (2007). A Legal Regime for the Arctic? Interplay with the Law of the Sea Convention. *Marine Policy*, 31(4), 402-408.

Stokke, O. (2011). Environmental Security in the Arctic: The Case for Multilevel Governance. *International Journal*, 66(4), 835-848.

Tennberg, M. (1996). Indigenous peoples' involvement in the Arctic Council. *Northern Notes*, (4), 21-32.

Tennberg, M. (2000). *Arctic Environmental Cooperation: A Study in Governmentality*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Tester, F. & Irniq, P. (2008). Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit: Social History, Politics and the Practice of Resistance. *Arctic*, 61(1), 48-61.

Tickner, A. (2003). Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, (32)2, 295-324.

Tieku, T. (2012). Collectivist World View: Its Challenge to International Relations. In: S. Cornelissen, F. Cheru, & T. Shaw (Eds.), *Africa and International Relations in the 21st Century* (pp. 36-50). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Tucker, K. (2018). Unraveling coloniality in international relations: Knowledge, relationality, and strategies for engagement. *International Political Sociology*, 12(3), 215-232.

Turner, E. (1993). American Eskimos Celebrate the Whale: Structural Dichotomies and Spirit Identities among the Inupiat of Alaska. *The MIT Press*, 37(1), 98-114.

Turner, N. & Spalding, P. (2013). “We might go back to this”; drawing on the past to meet the future in northwestern North American indigenous communities. *Ecology and Society*, 18(4), 29-40.

UNPFII. (2018). Factsheet: *Who are indigenous peoples?* United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. Accessed 20/01/2019 at: https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf

Urt, J. (2016). How Western Sovereignty Occludes Indigenous Governance: the Guarani and Kaiowa Peoples in Brazil. *Contexto Internacional*, 38(3), 865-886.

Usher, P. (2000). Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Environmental Assessment and Management. *Arctic*, 53(2), 183-193.

Vigni, P. (2014) Chapter 13: The Governance of the Arctic Environment: The EU and US Contribution. In: Bakker, C., Francioni, F. (Eds.) *The EU, the US and Global Climate Governance*. Dorchester: Ashgate.

Vollaard, H. (2009). The Logic of Political Territoriality. *Geopolitics*, 14(4), 687-706.

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing.

Watt-Cloutier, S. (2002) *Speech at the ICC Ninth General Assembly*. Kuujjuaq, Nunavik, Quebec. Accessed 08/07/2019 at: http://inuitcircumpolar.indelta.ca/index.php?ID=89&Lang=En

Watt-Cloutier, Sheila. (2015). *The Right to Be Cold: One Woman’s Story of Protecting her Culture, the Arctic, and the Whole Planet*. Toronto: Allen Lane.

Webb, E., Campbell, D., Schwartz, R. & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Measures in the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, T. (2012). The Arctic: Environmental Issues. *Library of Parliament*, Canada, 4(E), 1-9.

Wilson, G. (2007). Inuit diplomacy in the circumpolar north. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, 13(3), 65-80.

WMO. (2019). *Unprecedented wildfires in the Arctic*. World Meteorological Organization. Accessed 01/08/2019 at: https://public.wmo.int/en/media/news/unprecedented-wildfires-arctic

Zellen, B. (2010). The Inuit, the State, and the Battle for the Arctic. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 6(1), 57-64.

Zellen, B. (2017). Crossborder Indigenous Collaboration and the Western Arctic Borderland. In: P. Lackenbauer & H. Nicol (Eds.), *The Networked North: Borders and Borderlands in the Canadian Arctic Region* (pp. 34-47). Victoria, Canada: Borders in Globalization and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism.