

# The Spirit of Murmansk

## How an Image of Cooperation shapes the Arctic



by Jannes Friedrig Pittermann

Picture Rights: Tapson, Natalie. *Polar Bear in the Sea Ice*. 9 June 2014. Photograph. Svalbard, Norway. Accessed 8 August 2020  
<https://www.flickr.com/photos/40325561@N04/15261017363>.



Utrecht University  
Faculty of Humanities  
Master's Programme International Relations in Historical  
Perspective

MA Research Thesis

The Spirit of Murmansk:  
How an Image of Cooperation shapes the Arctic

Presented by

Jannes Friedrig Pittermann  
Student number: 6891292  
E-Mail: [j.f.pittermann@students.uu.nl](mailto:j.f.pittermann@students.uu.nl)

Supervisor

Dr. Frank Gerits

Number of Words

25.330

Submission Date

8.8.2020

### Abstract

When Mikhail Gorbachev proclaimed the Arctic as a zone of peace in 1987, many did not know what consequences this image of the Arctic would have in the future. The Arctic was imagined as a plain place, where the superpowers of the Cold War had their standoff with U-Boats and secret nuclear facilities. Gorbachev's speech in Murmansk turned this image into something that can be understood through one word: cooperation. The Arctic became a region in which nation-states worked together to create international organizations, like the Arctic Council, to face common issues such as environmental protection and sustainable development. However, International Relations has not paid much attention to images and their impact in the international sphere. In the case of the Arctic, images had never been interpreted as a part of the international achievement contributing to the essence of what the region is today. Images have agency and are affecting the processes that shape the Arctic. The theory of *Imagery* explains how images become actors, as *region-builders* that take part in the discourse and shape the social world. Nation-states orient themselves at these images and have to interact with them to shape their own national identity in the international sphere. One region that displays this process is the Arctic and the Arctic nation-states. From 1989 to 2019, the image of Arctic cooperation heavily influenced the International Relations of the Arctic regarding that nation-states engaged with it. Nation-states took Arctic cooperation as a part of their own identity until the mid-2000, when this exact image was contested by the same states.

Keywords: Arctic, Discourse analysis, Foucault, Image, Region-Building, Agency

## Content

Abbreviations .....	4
<b>Introduction – Let the North of the Globe, the Arctic, become a Zone of Peace .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>I. Chapter – The Image Constructs Our World .....</b>	<b>16</b>
1.1 Imagency .....	16
1.2 Imagology.....	19
1.3 Orientalism .....	23
1.5 The Arctic and its Role in the Identity of a Nation-State.....	29
1.6 Evolving the Arctic International Relations.....	33
<b>II. Chapter – The Spirit of Murmansk.....</b>	<b>36</b>
2.1 The Arctic Cooperation becomes a Region-builder.....	37
2.2 Gorbachev’s Image of the Arctic: A Zone of Peace .....	38
2.3 The Murmansk Speech.....	42
2.4 The Murmansk Speech and its Value for Arctic International Relations.....	46
<b>III. Chapter: The Image of the Circumpolar Arctic Cooperation .....</b>	<b>48</b>
3.1 From Gorbachev’s Mythical Zone of Peace to the Arctic Council: At the beginning - The Rovaniemi Process.....	49
3.2 The Implementation of Arctic Cooperation – The Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy.....	55
3.3 Canadian Initiative, Indigenous Communities and the establishment of the Arctic Council .....	59
3.5 The Circumpolar Arctic Cooperation Contested – Abolishment of an Image.....	69
3.6 Russia’s North as Gate to Old Glory.....	71
3.7 The Danish Initiative – Challenging the Arctic Eight.....	72
3.8 Stewards of the Arctic Ocean.....	76
3.9 Abolishing the Arctic Cooperation?.....	79
<b>Conclusion – The Arctic Cooperation and its Future.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>88</b>

Abbreviations

AEPS	Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy
Arctic Eight	Group of states that consist of Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, United States of America
Arctic Five	Group of states that consist of Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia, United States of America
ASRA	Agreement on Cooperation on Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue in the Arctic, 2011
CLCS	Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf. Body that implements the regulations for territory set by the UNCLOS
ICC	Inuit Circumpolar Conference
SU	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UNCLOS	United Nations Charter of the Law of the Sea
US	United States of America

## **Introduction – Let the North of the Globe, the Arctic, become a Zone of Peace**

The Arctic is a mystical place for those who dare to imagine it. Its classical representation suggests a place that no one wants to live in, where one faces endless white plains, never-ending darkness, untamed wilderness and encounters temperatures that freeze to death everything that does not have the will to survive.

Nowadays, this classical image has been replaced. The new image of the Arctic can be described with one word: cooperation. In the last years of the Cold War, regarded as having been the hottest years, a new trend was established in the North. The Soviet Union (SU) started to open up to the world through its new foreign policy. Now, interdependence played a more important role than deterrence. In 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev proclaimed his vision of the Arctic in an official ceremony in Murmansk with the following quote: “Let the North of the globe, the Arctic, become a zone of peace.”<sup>1</sup> Following, many people were suspicious. Even statesmen were doubting the interest of the SU to build this new zone of peace. Nevertheless, a new image of the Arctic had emerged and took the world by storm. In the following years, many nation-states were deeply influenced by Gorbachev’s *Murmansk Speech* and different processes that changed the Arctic from one of the most militarized regions into a place where states work together to face global challenges were initiated. Environmental pollution, climate change and indigenous people rights for self-determination are issues that are crucial for the Arctic. The nation-states have since addressed all of these in a cooperative way, a working method that is unusual in world politics. This development raises a question for the thoughtful observer:

---

<sup>1</sup> Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev, *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987* (Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1987), 4, [https://www.barentsinfo.fi/docs/Gorbachev\\_speech.pdf](https://www.barentsinfo.fi/docs/Gorbachev_speech.pdf).

*How could this image of Arctic cooperation succeed in an environment where conflict was still present in the political discourse and context of the Cold War? And how did this image affect the relations among the Arctic states during the years between 1989 and 2019?*

Further, this implicates the sub question on *what role Gorbachev's speech in Murmansk 1987 played in the creation of the image of Arctic cooperation* and inquires *how an image could gain agency and take part in the international relations of the Arctic.*

Many scholars of International Relations<sup>2</sup> had devoted themselves to the phenomenon of the Arctic. Especially one specific question has risen frequently since the 1980's: Is there rather conflict or cooperation in the Arctic? This question is hard to answer, as world events suggested a tendency towards conflict in the Arctic, considering the context of the Cold War, the rising quarrel over oil and gas reserves in the Arctic, or the increasingly critical issue of climate change. Simultaneously, the persisting discourse between nation-states in the Arctic generated more and more cooperative institutions like the Arctic Council, the Barents-European Council, and the Northern Forum. The scholars' own positionality in the Arctic also strongly affects how this question could be answered, especially when considering whether they are researching in North America or in Europe. In North America, the positivist approaches of liberalism and realism seem dominant, while in the European Arctic states<sup>3</sup> scholars are applying post-positivist approaches, like constructivism and post-structuralism. Scholars are also simultaneously focusing on the different nation-states in which they are positioned as Finland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway have very different approaches towards the Arctic.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this thesis the capitalized International Relations references to the academic discipline and its debates. The lower-case international relations relates to a more general term in reference to world politics.

<sup>3</sup> Arctic states refer to the nation-states that are through their territory associated with the Arctic: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States of America

The first scholar who raised the question of “cooperation or conflict in the Arctic” was Oran R. Young. In the 1980s, United States (US) scholar Young sparked the interest of International Relations over the Arctic with his article “The Age of the Arctic”.<sup>4</sup> Written during the time of the Cold War deterrence, the article provides a new perspective on the region. Following his approach, the Arctic was now capable of being a region of open conflict through technological developments in the weaponry of both superpowers, the US and SU, whilst at the same time providing safe access to energy resources. In the following years, he published several monographs, articles, and edited volumes that observed the Arctic with the help of the regime theory.<sup>5</sup> In the 1990s, he developed his theory of environmental regimes considering that environmental protection became a more relevant issue in the Arctic.<sup>6</sup> He developed the approach to such an extent that he himself became a leading scholar of regime theory. Later in his career, his focus was on the Arctic cooperation because regimes transformed into institutions like the Arctic Council which was acting like an intergovernmental body dominating the International Relations of the Arctic and providing a forum for scientific exchange in the 2000s. This body gained more popularity with the scholars as it transitioned into a policy forum in 2010. At the same time, scholars of the realist discipline became more popular in the US due to the acknowledgment of the impacts of climate change in the Arctic. The realist Scott G. Borgerson, member of the highly influential think tank *Council of Foreign Affairs* and former member of the US coast guard, is a major contributor to this debate and has published articles on the dangers that climate change poses on the political stability of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Oran R. Young, ‘The Age of the Arctic’, *Foreign Policy*, no. 61 (1985): 160–79, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1148707>.

<sup>5</sup> Oran R. Young and Gail Osherenko, eds., *Polar Politics: Creating International Environmental Regimes*, Cornell Studies in Political Economy (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); Oran R. Young, *International Governance: Protecting the Environment in a Stateless Society*, Cornell Studies in Political Economy (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); Oran R. Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998), <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1814592&site=ehost-live>; Oran R. Young, *Arctic Politics Conflict and Cooperation in the Circumpolar North* (Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2000); Oran R. Young, ‘Whither the Arctic? Conflict or Cooperation in the Circumpolar North’, *Polar Record* 45, no. 1 (January 2009): 73–82, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247408007791>.

<sup>6</sup> Young, *International Governance*; Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*.



Arctic.<sup>7</sup> Borgerson took a clear position, with supporting a new approach of US foreign policy, by taking climate change into the national security consideration.<sup>8</sup> Especially, his rhetoric addressing a new race for resources in the Arctic became a reappearing theme for Arctic International Relations.

In Canada, the scholarship includes three dominant approaches: realist, liberalist and constructivist. The Canadian scholar Robert Huebert made an essential impact within the scholarship early on and gained much attention through his realist analysis of Canadian foreign policy in the Arctic. Both he and Young share a positivist outlook on the Arctic, but—since the 1990s—Huebert rather foresaw the Arctic as a region of power politics.<sup>9</sup> He follows the tradition of realist scholars, considering that his theory is based on the power interest of specific states, which influences how he perceives the dealing of different states. With the pressing issue of claiming sovereignty over scarce resources in the Arctic, which are the result of climate change, Huebert focuses on the Canadian foreign policy and the danger ensuing from Russia.<sup>10</sup> In opposition to Huebert, the Canadian politician and scholar Michael Byers developed an liberalist approach on how to deal with the issue of claiming sovereignty in the Arctic. Michael Byers analyses the Arctic from two perspectives: from a legal level and from the angle of International Relations that focuses on the role of Canada in the Arctic. Since 2008, he was acting as a politician in Canada who advocated against militarization of the Arctic and addressed climate change. In his academic work, he connects the issue of claiming sovereignty in the Arctic with handling norms and rules of international law,<sup>11</sup> and with the help of

---

<sup>7</sup> Huffpost, 'Contributor - Scott G. Borgerson', accessed 16 July 2020, <https://www.huffpost.com/author/scott-g-borgerson>.

<sup>8</sup> Scott Borgerson, 'Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming', *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 2 (2008): 77.

<sup>9</sup> Robert Huebert, 'A Northern Foreign Policy: The Politics of Ad Hocery', in *Diplomatic Departures: The Conservative Era in Canadian Foreign Policy, 1984-1993*, ed. Nelson Michaud and Kim Richard Nossal (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1994).

<sup>10</sup> Robert Huebert, 'The Newly Emerging Arctic Security Environment' (Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2010), [https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/cdfai/pages/41/attachments/original/1413661956/The\\_Newly\\_Emerging\\_Arctic\\_Security\\_Environment.pdf?1413661956](https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/cdfai/pages/41/attachments/original/1413661956/The_Newly_Emerging_Arctic_Security_Environment.pdf?1413661956).

<sup>11</sup> Michael Byers, *International Law and the Arctic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107337442>.

interdependence theory explains the ongoing cooperation during crises in the Arctic.<sup>12</sup> P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Franklyn Griffiths can be considered supporters of the more constructivist approach. On the one hand, Lackenbauer, a historian and student of Huebner,<sup>13</sup> considers normative values in relation to how Arctic states interact with each other in conflict or cooperation. His work on the historical development of the Arctic and its relation to security brought forward a new perspective on the region. He strongly advocates for the theory of *securitization*<sup>14</sup> and evaluates how the Canadian government securitizes the Arctic.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, Griffiths strongly contributed to the scholarship with his analysis of Soviet, and later Russian, politics in the international relations and cooperation between the Arctic states in the region. His approach is based on the idea that states should agree on basic principles of Arctic International Relations to uphold cooperation.<sup>16</sup> Griffiths and Lackenbauer can both be considered close to the International Relations scholars in Europe.

Arctic International Relations in Europe are dependent on the positionality of the researchers. Thus, approaches can be divided into the Finnish, Norwegian, Swedish and Danish tradition. The Finnish tradition comes closest to the scholarship in North America, including scholars like Monica Tennberg and Timo Koivurova who are based in the University of Lapland. When the Finnish initiative launched at the end of the Cold War in 1989 its main issue was to guarantee environmental protection in the Arctic. This approach heavily influenced the Finnish scholarship, which can be observed in Monica Tennberg's publication with the title "Arctic Environmental Cooperation: A Study in Governmentality" combining Oran R. Young's

---

<sup>12</sup> Michael Byers, 'Crises and International Cooperation: An Arctic Case Study', *International Relations* 31, no. 4 (26 October 2017): 375–402, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117817735680>.

<sup>13</sup> Franklyn Griffiths, P. Whitney Lackenbauer, and Robert N. Huebert, *Canada and the Changing Arctic: Sovereignty, Security, and Stewardship* (Waterloo, Ont: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2011), 3, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=452724&site=ehost-live>.

<sup>14</sup> Securitization is an International Relations theory developed by Ole Wæver that describes the process of political actors that transform a subject into a matter of security. Turning a subject into a security issue enables those actors to apply extraordinary means on the subject.

<sup>15</sup> Griffiths, Lackenbauer, and Huebert, *Canada and the Changing Arctic: Sovereignty, Security, and Stewardship*, 7.

<sup>16</sup> Griffiths, Lackenbauer, and Huebert, 7.

regime theory with Foucault's concept of *Governmentality*<sup>17</sup> and aiming to understand the cooperation of states during actions of environmental protection.<sup>18</sup> Finnish scholar Timo Koivurova is a specialist on the field of Arctic and environmental law and aims at combining his expertise with the political inquiry of governments by studying the legal development of the Arctic cooperation since the late-1990s. In 1999, Koivurova was one of the first scholars who studied the implications of soft law<sup>19</sup> within the Arctic International Relations and marked the scholarship in the following years.<sup>20</sup> His focus is on the concepts of international law and politics of the Arctic, as well as mapping out how they influence stakeholders in perceiving the contemporary Arctic. Here, a rhetoric of "conflict" is persistent while the states themselves are cooperating.<sup>21</sup> The scholar Malgorzata Smieszek, a researcher at the Arctic Center of the University of Lapland and student of Oran R. Young, manages to fuse the North American and Finnish approach. She advances the regime theory of Young with an approach of informal regimes that explains the development of the Arctic Council and its soft law practices.<sup>22</sup> This illuminates the Arctic Council in opposition to other international organizations and highlights its special identity in the regime theory on the basis of the practices of soft law.

The Norwegian tradition became more influential in the mid-1990s, a time when specific bodies such as the Arctic Council and the Barents-European Council were created and politically redefined the Arctic. Iver B. Neumann, an Oxford taught scholar and current director of the Norwegian *Fridtjof Nansen Institute*,<sup>23</sup> draws from a post-structuralist approach, relating

---

<sup>17</sup> Governmentality is the study of practices that organize subjects with the objective to govern those.

<sup>18</sup> Monica Tennberg, *Arctic Environmental Cooperation: A Study in Governmentality* (Aldershot ; Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2000).

<sup>19</sup> 'Hard Law / Soft Law', European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights, accessed 5 August 2020, <https://www.ecchr.eu/en/glossary/hard-law-soft-law/>. Soft Law describes agreements, declarations, and principles that are not legally binding.

<sup>20</sup> University of Lapland, 'Timo Koivurova - Research Output', 6 March 2020, [https://lacris.ulapland.fi/en/persons/timo-koivurova\(258e5c53-7a1c-4db3-9cf7-e7bee8ce40e3\)/publications.html](https://lacris.ulapland.fi/en/persons/timo-koivurova(258e5c53-7a1c-4db3-9cf7-e7bee8ce40e3)/publications.html).

<sup>21</sup> Timo Koivurova, 'Analysis: The Arctic Conflict - Truth, Fantasy or a Little Bit of Both?', *High North News*, 18 November 2016, <https://www.highnorthnews.com/en/analysis-arctic-conflict-truth-fantasy-or-little-bit-both>.

<sup>22</sup> Malgorzata Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council' (Doctoral Thesis, University of Lapland, 2019), <https://lauda.ulapland.fi/handle/10024/64024>.

<sup>23</sup> The Fridthof Nansen Institute is an independent research foundation that is based in Norway and is specialized on topics that are concerning the Arctic like environmental governance, law of the sea, energy politics, Russian foreign policy and more. It is one of the highest acclaimed research institutions in Norway.

back to Foucault as well as a historical analysis in the tradition of the English School, to study the interaction of history and power generating the Arctic region. He analyses how specific territorial and political units come together and build a region through a discursive approach that translates the *nation-building*<sup>24</sup> approach on the regional level into *region-building*.<sup>25</sup> This approach set a new focus in direction of identity construction in connection to territory. The approach was then applied by his fellow Norwegian scholar Geir Hønneland. Hønneland, a previous director of the *Fridtjof Nansen Institute*, mainly published on the topics of East-West relations in the Arctic and governance of the Arctic Ocean. He connected region building with the creation of specific identities and their role in Arctic International Relations.<sup>26</sup> This opened up the scholarship to understand on a larger scale the relation of identity and alterity, especially for Europe: Europe is in need of Russia to describe its own identity and vice versa. This could be a reason for the interactions between the actors in the Barents Sea. The Swedish tradition continued the idea of discursive created regions and connected it with environmental issues as already presented by the Swedish scholar Carina Keskitalo.<sup>27</sup> Keskitalo, a political science scholar at the Geography Department of Umeå University,<sup>28</sup> connects the region of the Arctic with the phenomena of climate change and its implications on Arctic policy. She links the environmental politics and their impact on creating the region of the Arctic. An outstanding characteristic of the Swedish scholarship is the scrutiny of knowledge production in the Arctic that can be found in the work of scholars of the *KTH Royal Institute of Technology*. One of these scholars is Annika E. Nilsson, who focuses on the politics of Arctic change in connection with the interplay of science-policy and governance. She makes use of *Science and Technology*

---

<sup>24</sup> *Nation-building* refers in Neumann's perspective to the ontological foundation of a nation that came into being by political actors who decide what similarities are relevant for its existence, see Iver B. Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe', *Review of International Studies* 20, no. 1 (1994): 58.

<sup>25</sup> Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe'.

<sup>26</sup> Geir Hønneland, 'Identity Formation in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region', *Cooperation and Conflict* 33, no. 3 (1998): 277–97.

<sup>27</sup> E. Carina Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building: Development of the Arctic as an International Region', *Cooperation and Conflict* 42, no. 2 (June 2007): 187–205, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836707076689>.

<sup>28</sup> Umeå University, 'Carina Keskitalo', accessed 27 July 2020, <https://www.umu.se/en/staff/carina-keskitalo/>.

*studies*<sup>29</sup> bringing a turn and including non-human entities and their actions within the politics of the Arctic.<sup>30</sup> The Danish tradition is foremost concerned with the issues of Greenland and its ambiguous relation to Denmark. Generally speaking, the scholarship could split up into Greenland politics and the heritage of the colonial past (internal), as well as Arctic politics (international). One of the most prominent scholars of the former category is Robert Petersen,<sup>31</sup> a Greenlandic scholar, who wrote about the relationship of Denmark and Greenland and about the position of people living in the Northern periphery towards the Southern centre, Denmark.<sup>32</sup> Arctic politics are mostly intertwined with the connection between security and cooperation. Following, Marc Jacobsen mainly focuses on the importance of Greenland for the foreign politics of Denmark. He reflects on the contemporary development of the Danish scholarship when he connects the domestic issues of Denmark and its sovereignty claims with its security interest in international relations.<sup>33</sup> Within this thought process, Jeppe Strandsbjerg provides the geopolitical research within the Danish scholarship. He connects sustainability with the idea of space in the Arctic and opens up the, previously rather considered as being positivist, understanding of geopolitics of the Arctic and merges it into a more constructivist understanding. In 2017, Marc Jacobsen and Jeppe Strandsbjerg refined Ole Wæver's *securitization theory* in the Arctic due to rising security issues with a glance towards the developments of the Arctic, for example with the *Ilulissat Declaration* in the mid-2000s.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Science and Technology studies are concerned with the impacts by society, politics and culture on scientific developments and how these scientific developments influence those in return.

<sup>30</sup> Annika E. Nilsson, *A Changing Arctic Climate: Science and Policy in the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 386 (Linköping: Linköping Univ., Dep. of Water and Environmental Studies, 2007).

<sup>31</sup> Robert Petersen, 'On Ethnic Identity in Greenland', *Études/Inuit/Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (2001): 319.

<sup>32</sup> Robert Petersen, 'Colonialism as Seen from a Former Colonized Area', *Arctic Anthropology* 32, no. 2 (1995): 118–26.

<sup>33</sup> Marc Jacobsen, 'Arctic Identity Interactions: Reconfiguring Dependency in Greenland's and Denmark's Foreign Policies.' (Doctoral Thesis, Copenhagen, University of Copenhagen, 2019).

<sup>34</sup> Marc Jacobsen and Jeppe Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy: Geopolitics, Law and Sovereign Rights in the Arctic', *Politik* 20, no. 3 (2 October 2017), <https://doi.org/10.7146/politik.v20i3.97151>.

Since the beginning, International Relations of the Arctic have been developed in different intellectual traditions and are often in conflict with each other. They question cooperation in the Arctic while sharing a common ground: perceiving the Speech of Murmansk as an essential part of the international relations of Arctic states.<sup>35</sup> While the scholarship did pay attention to the event itself, the speech was left as a blind spot and its impact was not questioned outside of the context of the Cold War. The Speech of Murmansk was not perceived as having a special agency or impact within the region even after Gorbachev left the international political stage. Thus, the speech was mostly associated with Gorbachev or the SU at the time of the Cold War.

This thesis argues that the *Murmansk Speech* had a much longer lasting and crucial impact on the Arctic cooperation through the years from 1989 until 2019 and was not dependent on Gorbachev or the SU as shapers of the Arctic cooperation. It created an image of what Arctic cooperation is and should be, had its own agency and was an actual actor with whom the Arctic nation-states had to interact to shape the Arctic in their interests. This approach differs from previous Arctic International Relation schools as it reflects on the role of the image itself and does not view it as a reflection of different protagonists, but rather as an actor. This opens up a new level of analysis, where the researcher does not have to decide between the formation of identity and the practices of actors but can analyse both, as they are connected through their interaction with an image.

This argument will be supported by three theories that constitute an approach paying attention to the imagination, perception and their respective power in the discourse to shape social realities.<sup>36</sup> First, it will be argued that the image is a *region-builder* that has the agency

---

<sup>35</sup> See Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building', 194; Nilsson, *A Changing Arctic Climate*, 81; Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council', 46; Tennberg, *Arctic Environmental Cooperation*, 1; Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 32,54.

<sup>36</sup> Social reality is a construct that is built upon the interaction of members of a society that generate uniformities of the observed that is considered as a truth in the respective society. The social reality is separated from a natural reality.

to formulate how a specific political entity will be shaped and is an entity that other actors have to engage with. This idea is supported by the *region-building* approach. Second, to explain how an image is created, the theory of *Imagology* will be used. *Imagology* will thereby explain how specific stereotypes are formed by the perception of the *Other* in relation to the *Self* on an international level creating images that international actors interact with. Third, the approach of *Orientalism* by Edward Said will be used to understand how images translate from the discourse into social realities. Attention will be paid to the power of images and their impact on the social world.<sup>37</sup> Overall, the approach can be brought down to the following: an image can be considered as an actor on the international level, because nation-states have to engage with the social realities established by an overall consensus between nation-states on a specific perception.

The methodology that will be applied is a textual oriented discourse analysis based on the understanding of Foucault.<sup>38</sup> The Foucauldian analysis combines practices, text and discourse with an historical investigation in relation to power that is embedded in those.<sup>39</sup> In this logic, documents that are produced are connected to social practices. Imagination as a practice can therefore be traced within documents. This thesis will approach a new working method of how to conduct a discourse analysis. The primary source used will become an actor itself and will be followed throughout the discourse analysis of the thesis. The source itself will thereby have its own agency, which will also reflect in the methodology of the research. The *Murmansk Speech* will be focused upon as the main source for the analysis of the image as an actor. An in-depth analysis of the *Murmansk Speech* will define the image of the Arctic cooperation and show how it became the image accepted by most nation-states. This image of

---

<sup>37</sup> Social world is a world that is separate from a natural world and dependent on the observer, see note 35 above

<sup>38</sup> Sara Mills, *Discourse*, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 2004), 15–16, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203487136>.

<sup>39</sup> Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 2nd Vintage Books ed (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).

the “Arctic [as a zone] of peace”<sup>40</sup> will thereby be seen as one of the images of the Arctic and shaping the Arctic cooperation. Following, the analysis will look into how this image developed and interacted with the nation-states in the Arctic over the years. The priority of this discourse analysis is to see if nation-states interacted with this image and if they adapted to it or changed it. Documents, institutions, and international treaties will be analysed, as these are results of the interactions between the nation-states and the image and built social realities. These social realities will show the agency of an image, as they will influence the actions of nation-states following the idea of Foucault. In Foucault’s logic, power lays in practices because power is dispersed through social relations that restrict or enable specific forms of behaviours.<sup>41</sup> A focus will be laid on the images that nation-states generate over the Arctic cooperation, their own national interest in the Arctic, and how the international image developed. The primary sources are based on official documents by the Arctic Council and its archive, and official documents of nation-states and their archives. These documents pose turning points in the development of the Arctic cooperation: the 1989 *Rovaniemi Process*, the 1991 *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* (AEPS), the 1996 *Ottawa Declaration*, the 2007 *Arktika Incident*, the 2008 *Ilulissat Declaration*, the 2011 *Arctic Search and Rescue Agreement*, and the 2019 Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Rovaniemi. These events have been chosen because they symbolize specific characteristics that are associated with the contemporary Arctic cooperation.

This thesis will be structured in four parts. In the first chapter, the theoretical understanding of the image as a *region-builder* in the Arctic will be explained. The second chapter will explain the empirical case study and clarify how this thesis tries to prove its underlying theoretical concept. In the third chapter, the case of the Arctic cooperation in the years from 1989 to 2019 will be analysed. The last chapter builds a conclusion to the findings and a last discussion.

---

<sup>40</sup> Gorbachev, *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987*, 4.

<sup>41</sup> Mills, *Discourse*, 17.



## I. Chapter – The Image Constructs Our World

This chapter will touch upon the theoretical approach of *Imagery*<sup>42</sup> and analyse how it contributes to the study of the Arctic International Relations. With the theory of *Imagery*, it will be tried to answer the question of how an image could gain agency and take part in the international relations of the Arctic. By highlighting the fundament of the theory of *Imagery*, namely the *region-building* process, the concept involving images as actors can be further explained. Additionally, this chapter will show the theoretical foundation of *region-building*, as well as its deficiencies within the study of the Arctic region. However, a solution to this shortcoming will be presented in the use of the theories of *Imagology* and *Orientalism*. Both of these theories and how they can fill the theoretical blind spot of images as actors, whilst keeping in mind their crucial roles in the construct of a region, will be focused upon. In the last part of this chapter, *Imagery* will be compared to three distinct approaches in studying the International Relations of the Arctic to prove how its contribution is relevant to the scholarship and provides resolutions in a way that other approaches could not.

### 1.1 Imagery

*Imagery* delineates what role images take in the constitutional process of a region and thus considers them actors on the basis of their participation in the discursive struggle. In this process, the image itself takes an active role by influencing what will later be defined as the Arctic independent of the natural world, but rather brought down to the social world. The image creates social facts<sup>43</sup> by influencing the discourse that constitutes the Arctic as a textual

---

<sup>42</sup> This thesis employs the term *Imagery* as name for the theoretical approach because it combines the words image and agency. This emphasizes the role of image as an actor, but also highlights that the image can act independently from other entities.

<sup>43</sup> Social facts are set norms, values and social structures that influence the behaviour or perception of individual members of a society.

construct. It is thereby not merely a projection of political actors but has an agency on its own that is bound to previous discursive struggles. The image is itself also a social fact and acts similar to a political actor. This argument is based upon three theories: *region-building*, *Imagology*, and *Orientalism*.

The approach of how regions are created can be related to Iver B. Neumann's theory on *region-building*. *Region-building* is an approach that is concerned with the definition and redefinition of a region by its members.<sup>44</sup> It "focuses on the constructed [...] nature of regions and the role of knowledge in this construction"<sup>45</sup> and shows how people and regions are imagined as a unit based on definitions founded on certain characteristics. The region is thereby a textual construct that is defined by those actors through language and must be understood as a political act with a historical development. In this approach, discourse plays an important role in the *region-building* because regions are constituted through text. The creation of a region is only possible through the effort of different actors working together to build an *imagined community*.<sup>46</sup> Within the discourse, specific actors speak about certain aspects to make them look normal and try to obscure other things. This notion goes back to the Foucauldian discourse analyses investigation of how the manipulation of knowledge and power is achieved through a power unbalance that lets one actor appear closer to a territory than another.<sup>47</sup> Actors that create a region are not considered sovereign actors that just decide how a region is defined, but they can be found everywhere "on the ground" and engage in discursive struggles over what a region really is.<sup>48</sup> Iver B. Neumann perceives that *region-building* is "nothing more than the application of a *Self/Other* perspective to the problematique of the literature on regions."<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe', 53.

<sup>45</sup> Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building', 188.

<sup>46</sup> Keskitalo, 188.

<sup>47</sup> Iver B. Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach', in *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader*, ed. Fredrik Söderbaum and Timothy M Shaw (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 160.

<sup>48</sup> Neumann, 160.

<sup>49</sup> Neumann, 160.

Actors that create a region through discourse can be handled as *region-builders*. *Region-builders* are actors that exist previously and independent of a region itself and are “political actors who, as part of some political project, see it in their interest to imagine a certain spatial and chronological identity for a region, and to disseminate this imagination to a maximum number of other people.”<sup>50</sup> Here *Imagery* interferes. Defining who the *region-builders* actually are, can be considered too restrictive in the *region-building* process of the Arctic. The Arctic region is caught in different images that have been historically developed, are long lasting and can hardly be traced to specific actors.<sup>51</sup> What the Arctic is imagined as is thereby created by actors that are already under the influence of a specific perception of their environment, namely the Arctic, that potentially is not part of a political project aiming at creating the region. *Imagery* observes the creation of a region as not only being bound to how the region is presented, but also how the image itself and people’s perception of the image has an impact on the region.

In Neumann’s theory, the image is considered as only being a projection of what actors want to create. This theory does not recognize that once an image is out there in the discourse actors lose control over it, or as he would say, are no longer the “sovereign authors” who can decide what the image includes.<sup>52</sup> Images of the region that are external and pre-existing to a specific creational process of the region itself can have an impact on how the region is defined. *Imagined communities* are thereby not only bound to the images they create, but also have to acknowledge the influence external images have on their own images in the process. The aspect of comparing the *Self* and the *Other* is a restricted process in the *region-building* approach that occurs within the region but does not attribute to the processes external of a certain region. Societies outside of a community can create images of these communities with whom they have

---

<sup>50</sup> Neumann, 161.

<sup>51</sup> For the different historical developments in the Arctic, see Charles Emmerson, *The Future History of the Arctic: How Climate, Resources and Geopolitics Are Reshaping the North, and Why It Matters to the World*, 2011.

<sup>52</sup> Neumann, ‘A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe’, 57.

to engage with. In the case of the Arctic, neglecting the importance of *Imagery* can be fatal for the understanding of its creation as a region. The Arctic is often treated as the *Other*, the foreign and different one, even by nation-states that consider themselves as part of the Arctic. This has to be acknowledged because it shows how different nation-states, which are building the image of the region with the process of *Othering*<sup>53</sup> are also a subject of *Othering* themselves through external actors. With recognizing the processes these actors are embedded in, it must be questioned if these processes are intertwined with practices of power that give agency to the image. This agency will be investigated by applying two theories: *Imagology* and *Orientalism*.

## 1.2 Imagology

*Imagology*, or the study of images, has had its origin in the literature departments of continental Europe since the 1950s. Marius-François Guyard, one of the most prominent scholars of French comparative literature science and *Imagology*, defined it as *l'étranger tel qu'on le voit*.<sup>54</sup> *Imagology* focus on the textual existence of nation-states and their inscribed clichés and stereotypes. In the contemporary scholarship, the Dutch cultural historian and comparatist Joep Leerssen<sup>55</sup> and the anthropologist Jan Nederveen Pieterse<sup>56</sup> make use of this approach and are

---

<sup>53</sup> *Othering* is defined broadly as the process of comparison by a *Self*, the observer, to the *Other*, the observed, that has implications on the identity and alterity of both.

<sup>54</sup> Translation: The foreigner/Other such as we perceive him

<sup>55</sup> The Dutch Research Council (NWO), 'Prof. J.Th. (Joep) Leerssen', NWO, accessed 7 July 2020, <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/programmes/spinoza+prize/spinoza+laureates/overview+in+alphabetical+order/joep+leerssen>; See Joep Leerssen, 'Echoes and Images: Reflections upon Foreign Space.', in *Alterity, Identity, Image: Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, ed. Joep Leerssen and Raymond Corbey (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991); Joep Leerssen, 'The Rhetoric of National Character: A Programmatic Survey', *Poetics Today* 21, no. 2 (1 June 2000): 267–92, <https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-21-2-267>; Joep Leerssen, 'Imagology: On Using Ethnicity to Make Sense of the World', *Iberic@l. Revue d'études Ibériques et Ibéro-Américaines* 10 (2016): 13–31.

<sup>56</sup> Jan Nederveen Pieterse, 'Jan Nederveen Pieterse', accessed 7 July 2020, <https://jannederveenpieterse.com>.

applying its concepts of identity/alterity,<sup>57</sup> implications of power in images,<sup>58</sup> and the notion of textual representation on nation-states.<sup>59</sup>

The focus of this theory is on the nation-state and how it is perceived by different observers that then reproduces this perception with images of the *Self* and the *Other*. The theory of *Imagology* is concerned with two constructs: the auto-image and hetero-image. The auto-image can be understood as the presentation of the *Self*, while the hetero-image is the presentation of the *Other*. Thus, the image is an intercultural confrontation in which the domestic background of the text encounters the *otherness* of the *foreigner* that is described by and in the text.<sup>60</sup> Imagologists do not look at the transhistorical durable objective entity that builds a specific country, but rather at a set of changeable images of a hypothetical and historically variable nation-state.<sup>61</sup> Images are investigated as a textual property rather than an objective reality because they are studied in their discursive environment. Looking at Oran R. Young's article *The Age of the Arctic* from 1985 with the lenses of *Imagology*,<sup>62</sup> the article must be perceived and understood in terms of Young as an American and the sentiments of the Cold-War. What he writes about the SU, namely its military capabilities and its economic facilities in the Arctic, has to be understood as the hetero-image, whilst his comments on the US, criticising its policies or commenting on its inactivity, have to be understood as the auto-image. Neither represent an objective reality of the SU or the US as they are given an image that is constructed by Young. This image does not only represent the view of Young himself, but also contains implications of underlying power structures.

The interplay between power and image takes its shape by questioning *otherness*, which can be exposed through an analysis of Western literature and descriptions of non-western

---

<sup>57</sup> See Leerssen, 'Echoes and Images: Reflections upon Foreign Space.'

<sup>58</sup> See Jan Nederveen Pieterse, 'Image and Power', in *Alterity, Identity, Image: Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, ed. Joep Leerssen and Raymond Corbey (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991).

<sup>59</sup> See Leerssen, 'The Rhetoric of National Character'.

<sup>60</sup> Leerssen, 'Echoes and Images: Reflections upon Foreign Space.', 129.

<sup>61</sup> Leerssen, 129.

<sup>62</sup> Young, 'The Age of the Arctic'.

worlds.<sup>63</sup> The analysis of representation of *otherness* is historically and culturally determined and already contains certain implications. Analysing this representation reflects a more inclusive collective awareness. However, it is not unusual for it to create new stereotypes, considering that scholars use simplifications and clichés produced in their own community.<sup>64</sup> *Imagology*, therefore, has to question several characteristics of *otherness* in the case of the Arctic. This thesis will focus on three specific characteristics.

First, the image and its oppositional pairs, i.e. the *Self* and the *Other*, have a historical meaning and are changing over time. The Arctic has developed through different ages and continues to be imagined by different actors. In order to understand the development of the image, one has to look at how the Arctic was perceived with a different historical background. Therefore, it is crucial to distinguish time and space in order to see through the variety of images that create the Arctic. In the SU, after the Second World War, the Arctic was one part of the communist driven politics aimed at preventing the division of the state into Proletarian periphery and Borghese centrum. The Arctic was taken as an exemplary achievement of the communist ideology by equally including the “backwards” Arctic communities into the SU.<sup>65</sup> At the same time, the US started the administrative and legislative changes to incorporate the territory of Alaska as a new state in their Union. Admitting Alaska was seen as one step of Alaskian, or Arctic, independence in the United States based on actors that were thriving for self-government.<sup>66</sup> While these processes were happening rather simultaneous, the Arctic implied different meanings in different communities.

Second, it has to be acknowledged that images are not just ideas. Images are constituted in the social world between social relations and interests. In the Arctic, these social relations

---

<sup>63</sup> Pieterse, ‘Image and Power’, 192.

<sup>64</sup> Pieterse, 193.

<sup>65</sup> Emmerson, *The Future History of the Arctic*, 45.

<sup>66</sup> Ernest Gruening, ‘Let Us Now End American Colonialism’ (Speech, Fairbanks, 9 November 1955), <https://www.alaska.edu/creatingalaska/constitutional-convention/speeches-to-the-conventio/opening-session-speeches/gruening/>.

are created between different political actors of nation-states and indigenous communities. The relations are thereby structured through the interests of actors. Indigenous communities living in the Arctic experience events that display their subjugated position whilst a part of the nation-states whose interests are in taking the Arctic into their own state territory.<sup>67</sup> Residential schools of the US and Canada tried to assimilate the indigenous community through physical and psychological violence into the national community.<sup>68</sup> This discrimination, based on a racist ideology, imagined and displayed the Arctic inhabitants as unnatural in contrast to the natural inhabitant of the nation-state, the citizen. This method is consistent in the Arctic, considering that the SU tried to assimilate the Arctic communities of the Chukchi<sup>69</sup> through Soviet schools.<sup>70</sup>

Third, it will be looked at how cognitive patterns cannot be explained by other cognitive patterns. An image does not have the power to explain another image. This means that—by comparing two images to each other—an opposition is generated in which one image would take the other as its contrast and reproduce its implications instead of having explanatory value. The question of power and images sets the study into a historical comparative approach. Historical, because the images shift and change over time, and comparative, because the diversity of different perceptions is bound to the different cultural contexts that have their own power structures.<sup>71</sup> This diversity and change can be connected in an analytical perspective with the hegemonical power structures that dominate regions throughout time. The different historical events in the Arctic mentioned above must therefore not be understood in a

---

<sup>67</sup> Emmerson, *The Future History of the Arctic*, 99.

<sup>68</sup> Emmerson, 99; Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, ed., *Canada's Residential Schools: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, McGill-Queen's Native and Northern Series 80, <82-86> (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015).

<sup>69</sup> The Chukchi People are an indigenous community that is living on the Chukchi Peninsula between the Chukchi Sea and Bering Sea. The Chukchi People suffered under repression by the Communist Party to be assimilated into the ideology of the Leninist idea of progress.

<sup>70</sup> Bathsheba Demuth, 'When the Soviet Union Freed the Arctic from Capitalist Slavery', *The New Yorker*, 15 August 2019, <https://www.newyorker.com/news/dispatch/when-the-soviet-union-freed-the-arctic-from-capitalist-slavery>.

<sup>71</sup> Pieterse, 'Image and Power', 196.

contemporary way but have to be dismantled through the structures that built the image in its time and place. This means that Young's idea of what the SU is cannot just be explained in his terms, but the scholars have to set them in a historical context, connecting the cognitive pattern with the power structures of Youngs surrounding.<sup>72</sup>

*Imagology* implies the process of creating an image and uncovering how it relates to the nation-state. Images play a crucial part in the interactions between the nation-states and in the perception of who they are. It also clarifies that images take part in the social world by acknowledging that they are constituted in the interactions between actors and thus influencing future encounters. Images are historical developed entities. *Imagology* helps to unveil these entities and show their power in discursive struggles of international relations between nation-states. With the upcoming question of *otherness* and its role in perceiving non-western actors, *Orientalism* offers a solution to understand this process and its connection to the Arctic region.

### 1.3 Orientalism

*Orientalism* refers to Edward Said's "Orientalism" based on the idea of connecting production of knowledge with social facts.<sup>73</sup> This thesis draws mainly from his idea of imaginative geography that is presented in two arguments. First, how observers define a specific region through their own perception creates an image. This specific image is based upon a mystified, exotic understanding of a subject. Second, these images are having an impact on the social world because social realities are constituting the region. Especially, Said's work on the construction of the mental image of a region will be of great use in constructing the theory of this thesis. This thesis argues that, if *Orientalism* is applied to the Arctic region, it will show that the act of locating the Arctic and the production of knowledge around it is connected to the

---

<sup>72</sup> Pieterse, 194.

<sup>73</sup> Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, Reprinted with a new preface, Penguin Modern Classics (London: Penguin Books, 2003).



notion of creating a national identity for specific nation-states through images. These images are based on a subjugation of the North by the South and create social facts in the social world.

The Orient, as perceived by Said, is a real, existing region with real people living in it. However, the representation of these people is a creation originating in the European culture that enables the discursive powerful to legitimize their domination over the subjugated and conquered.<sup>74</sup> This representation is created through “ideological suppositions, images, and fantasies [...] about the world called Orient.”<sup>75</sup> This process also takes place when looking into the Arctic and perceiving it as a fantasised, non-modern and natural region where only people that behave like “wild animals” live.<sup>76</sup> The separation between regions, in this case between the *We* of western Nation-states and the *Other* regions of the world, is not a natural event but a product of human making—something Said calls “imaginative geography.”<sup>77</sup> This imaginative geography is neither fictional nor unchanging but is based on facts that are produced by human beings and therefore provide a fundamental part of the social world.<sup>78</sup> The imaginative geography categorizes the distance between the Arctic and the West in the perception of the world. Through contrasting images, that lead to a perception of the Arctic as more primitive and not as civilized as the West, the Arctic appears to be situated far away, at a great distance and not sharing a reality with the West. For the Western nation-state, the Arctic becomes the *Other*.

Locating the North pole and producing knowledge of the Arctic, based on its geography and people, is a process that is connected to the notion of national identity creation for respective nation-states. The acquired knowledge is then compared to their own context, thus

---

<sup>74</sup> Michał Buchowski, ‘Social Thought & Commentary: The Specter of Orientalism in Europe: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother’, *Anthropological Quarterly* 79, no. 3 (2006): 463.

<sup>75</sup> Edward W. Said, ‘Orientalism Reconsidered’, *Cultural Critique*, no. 1 (1985): 90, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1354282>.

<sup>76</sup> Wendy Mercer, ‘Representations of the Arctic in Nineteenth-Century French Prose Fiction’, in *Arctic Discourses*, ed. Anka Ryall, Henning Howlid Waerp, and Johan Schimanski (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 186–87, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=523986&site=ehost-live>.

<sup>77</sup> Said, ‘Orientalism Reconsidered’, 90.

<sup>78</sup> Said, 90.

implying that the *Self* takes a dominant position over the *Other*, the Arctic. This can be traced to the notion of subjugation of the North through European explorers.<sup>79</sup> For Said, it is as crucial to include the person or subject studying the same matter as to include the region itself in their analysis. The person active in this process is a part of the social world that builds the *Orientalism* and therefore is also a part of the investigation itself.<sup>80</sup> The people involved, called Orientalists, are analysing the *Other*. The *Other* is created in relation to the West as being a distinct region: for Said it is the Orient, and for this study it will be the Arctic. *Orientalism* was considered a scientific movement “whose analogue in the world of empirical politics was the Orient's colonial accumulation and acquisition by Europe.”<sup>81</sup> The Orient as an object was thereby denied partaking in the exchange of knowledge and was not considered to be an equal to Europe. Instead of being Europe’s interlocutor, it was the silent *Other*.<sup>82</sup> This representation was crafted through texts and visual representation that presented the Orient as a mystical and exotic place that had no agency over itself.<sup>83</sup> Polar exploration was similar to the science enacted in the Orient. Polar scientists put themselves into a, what was for them, foreign space. They wrote down the knowledge they acquired, without considering the context of the societies living in the Arctic and only considering their own Western context. The Arctic was seen as a region that has to be conquered. To craft this image, Orientalists and Arctic explorers were not only studying the *Other* but also creating the *Other*. They did so through binary oppositional pairs: a modern and regular West and a backward and abnormal Arctic.<sup>84</sup> This oppositional contrast is fundamental to construct the discourse of *Orientalism*.<sup>85</sup> The construction of the

---

<sup>79</sup> Mercer, ‘Representations of the Arctic in Nineteenth-Century French Prose Fiction’, 185–86; Anka Ryall, Johan Schimanski, and Henning Howlid Wærp, ‘Arctic Discourses: An Introduction’, in *Arctic Discourses* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Pub, 2010), x.

<sup>80</sup> Said, ‘Orientalism Reconsidered’, 90.

<sup>81</sup> Said, 93.

<sup>82</sup> Said, 93.

<sup>83</sup> Corey Johnson and Amanda Coleman, ‘The Internal Other: Exploring the Dialectical Relationship Between Regional Exclusion and the Construction of National Identity’, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102, no. 4 (2012): 867.

<sup>84</sup> Ryall, Schimanski, and Wærp, ‘Arctic Discourses: An Introduction’, x.

<sup>85</sup> Johnson and Coleman, ‘The Internal Other: Exploring the Dialectical Relationship Between Regional Exclusion and the Construction of National Identity’, 867.

Arctic as the weak oppositional is the manifestation of European power and enabled Europeans to exert that power over the Arctic in material ways. Said considers the historical process of *Othering* as predating the colonialism, while its peak may have been during this time.<sup>86</sup>

Orientalism adds another level of analysis to Young's article *The Age of the Arctic*. The focus shifts from the nation-states of the SU and the US to the Arctic region and the Western science. Instead of investigating what representation really is Young has to be put under scrutiny for his own *Westernness*. Young sees the Arctic as having vast natural resources and being overburdened by its strategical importance. In his eyes, the Arctic is a region that has to be acted upon to not only help control the resources but to save it from external danger, such as the dominance of the SU. Young and the US thereby take the status of the *We* and have agency inscribed, thus enabling them to behave like the proactive part in the West/Arctic relationship, meanwhile the Arctic itself is constituted as the foreign *Other* that has to be saved and loses its agency to external domination. This creation of *otherness* is also constructed by the scientific movement of International Relations scholars, many of whom investigate the area of the Arctic by constructing an image of the subjugated and silent *Other* as being home in the void Arctic and subsequently perceiving it to be in need of the white, male explorer—or in this case the soldiers of the US Army—to be tamed.

#### 1.4 Self-Othering

*Imagology* and *Orientalism* engage with the process of *Othering* and highlight different aspects of comparison while acknowledging the impact on a region. Combining the understanding of power structures in *Imagology*, which looks at images and their power in the cross perception of nation-states, and the recognition of how they impact the region with *Orientalism*, which

---

<sup>86</sup> Johnson and Coleman, 867.

discusses the domination of the *Self* in the centre over the *Other* in the periphery through imagination, helps to understand the agency of the image. Both approaches are connected in their concept of a world divided into regions by imagination. Their combination emerges from the construct of the *Self-Othering*, when parts of the foreign/different are transformed into being a part of the *Self*. Within this process one can encounter the agency of the image that contributes to the constitution of the Arctic. This agency is created through the interaction of nation-states with the image of the Arctic, thus allowing it to create its own national identity. *Self-Othering* implies that the image of the *Other* can be a part of the self-image of a nation-state, not in comparison, but as an internal part of expressing one's own identity. This means that the Arctic can be an *external-Other* and an *internal-Other* at the same time. These *Others* are influencing each other as well as the *Self*, i.e. the national identity of a state. Both theories have different subjects that they investigate. However, these can be brought together to express the construct of the *Self-Othering*.

*Orientalism* and *Imagology* can be brought together with the idea of the mental map and their focus on the connection between the image and the region. *Imagology* builds upon the importance of perception and creation that the national images have.<sup>87</sup> The image is the central focus of the investigation, and is based on texts that constitute nations or cultures as textual constructs.<sup>88</sup> The image does not have a negative perception per se and can even contain positive implications.<sup>89</sup> It is constructed in a cultural cocreative process that all textual sources take part in, such as in scientific articles and official documents, as well as textual works of art including pop-literature, media and more.<sup>90</sup> The image itself is a part of the nation-state while also creating images of other nation-states. This fabricates the mental map.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Leerssen, 'Echoes and Images: Reflections upon Foreign Space.', 133.

<sup>88</sup> Leerssen, 128.

<sup>89</sup> Waldemar Zacharasiewicz, 'National Stereotypes in Literature in the English Language: A Review of Research', in *Imagology Revisited*, *Studia Imagologica* 17 (Amsterdam ; New York: Rodopi, 2010), 46.

<sup>90</sup> Leerssen, 'Echoes and Images: Reflections upon Foreign Space.', 126.

<sup>91</sup> Leerssen, 133.

While *Othering* is based on differences, Imagologists deem it unessential that images of two distinct nations have to be far away from each other on the mental map. Images, while they are created through difference, can also overlap and mix with each other. However, *Orientalism* differs from this view. The mental geography is an outcome of different images made by human beings, which have implications on people that live in specific imagined regions.<sup>92</sup> Through the process of *Othering*, the image creates a mental distance between the *We* and the *Other* while also implying a domination of the *We* over the *Other*.<sup>93</sup> The image of the *Other* is therefore far away on the mental map from the *Self*-image, thus separating both in the social world through a hierarchy. In *Orientalism*, knowledge creates the social world through power,<sup>94</sup> while for Imagologists, the power is related to the image.<sup>95</sup> Merging these ideas creates the unique process of *Self-Othering*. Their difference can be used to describe their own *otherness* and create the image of the *Other* as a part of their own identity.<sup>96</sup> In this logic, nation-states do not only have access to a specific set of stereotypes but can take on *otherness* and incorporate it as a part of their own national identity. The nation-states, therefore, can perceive the Arctic as the *Other* while also incorporating it into their own national identity as Arctic states. The nation-states have to engage with the images they created in the *Othering* process as they are parts of the social world. Said's notions of power within the *Othering* process contribute to the understanding of what consequences this implies: *Self-Othering* also has the goal to dominate specific parts of the world and the national territory in order to demonstrate authority of the centre over the periphery, as well as to support the national-identity that justifies the existence of the state itself. This notion adds another layer to the discursive struggle in which nation-

---

<sup>92</sup> Said, 'Orientalism Reconsidered', 90.

<sup>93</sup> Bernd Thum, 'Orientalism', in *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: A Critical Study*, ed. Joep Leerssen and Manfred Beller (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 390.

<sup>94</sup> Said, 'Orientalism Reconsidered', 91.

<sup>95</sup> Pieterse, 'Image and Power', 201.

<sup>96</sup> Vedrana Veličković, 'Balkanisms Old and New: The Discourse of Balkanism and Self-Othering in Vesna Goldsworthy's Chernobyl Strawberries and Inventing Ruritania', in *Facing the East in the West: Images of Eastern Europe in British Literature, Film and Culture*, ed. Barbara Korte, Eva Ulrike Pirker, and Sissy Helff (Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 2011), 192–93.

states have to put resources into the process of domination of *Others* in order to create the *Self*. Incorporating the image of the *Other* involves a created image and resources that have to be mobilized to dominate this image. The image is therefore a fundamental part of creating the nation-states and creating national identities, while the image themselves have to be acknowledge as separate actors in the discursive struggle.

### 1.5 The Arctic and its Role in the Identity of a Nation-State

The relation between the Arctic and the nation-states that define themselves as Arctic is based on the *Self-Othering* process. *Self-Othering*, meaning that these nation-states regard the Arctic as a different region independent from rest of the state, while also claiming it as a part of the national identity. The process of identity formation plays a crucial role in the produced image of the Arctic. The identity of the nation-state is the foundation for the agency of the image that the nation-state has to interact with. The Arctic cooperation is one of the images the nation-states have to engage with to create their own national identity. The Arctic cooperation is one image of the Arctic. The interaction of a nation-state and its identity with the image of the Arctic cooperation gives the image its agency. Through its discursive power the image generates an agency that hinders practices of the nation-states and, thus, actors in the discursive struggle. To put it in contrast to the words of Said and his imaginative geography, the Arctic is not similar to the Orient, far away and distant, but it is rather close and far away at the same time for the nation-states. This means, that the Arctic is seen as an *Other* space while being part of the *normal* state territory.

The Arctic builds the region as an *Other* space that is in contrast to the nation-state and seen as the discursive extern. For Arctic states, this *Other* space is a part of the nation itself. The *external-Other* therefore has to be made into an *internal-Other* to not only show the possession of it as a territory, but also to build a national identity through showing the

domination of the *internal-Self* above the *internal-Other*. The *otherness* of the Arctic is incorporated into the state to show the capabilities of the nation itself of conquering this region of the North so that the nation can be perceived as an Arctic state. The regions of the nation-state that are seen as the Arctic part of the “Arctic” states are used to self-identify the “normal” parts of the country through an opposition.<sup>97</sup> To elaborate on this problem, this thesis will look into the case of the Arctic state of Norway.

Norway describes its northmost region Finnmark, which lays in the Arctic, as the non-modern, natural region that is experienced in a different level of lifestyle of enjoying nature—known as *friluftsliv*—that is part of the national heritage.<sup>98</sup> It is a key region of Norway for the indigenous community of the Sami, who constitute a big part of the population of the Finnmark and earn their livelihood there. The Finnmark plays an important part in the construction of Norway as it does not only categorize the country in the modern South and the rural, distant North, but it also builds the identity of a state through being the region that shows the capabilities of the Southern centre in making the Northern periphery available for its people. This availability was created through the *Finnmark Act* in 2005 that made 95% of the Finnmark common land.<sup>99</sup> For the tourist and inhabitants of the South this is seen as allowing everyone to have access to everything in the Finnmark whilst ignoring the socially set up using-rights of the local communities of Sami and non-Sami inhabitants.<sup>100</sup> The Finnmark is a part of the national identity and part of the state territory. However, it is also considered as the distant North that has to be made accessible by the South.

Critical observers could now point out that this example does not differ from the notion of colonialism of imperial powers because colonialism in the Orient was also a part of the

---

<sup>97</sup> Johnson and Coleman, ‘The Internal Other: Exploring the Dialectical Relationship Between Regional Exclusion and the Construction of National Identity’, 866–67.

<sup>98</sup> Gro Birgit Ween and Marianne Lien, ‘Decolonialisation in the Arctic? Nature Practices and Land Rights in Sub-Arctic Norway’, *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 7, no. 1 (2012): 98.

<sup>99</sup> Ween and Lien, 102–3.

<sup>100</sup> Ween and Lien, 99.

national identity of Great Britain or France, but the notion of this statement is utterly different. While these colonial powers in the Orient would argue that the domination of the West over the East shows a superiority of the white, western civilization,<sup>101</sup> the Northern Western states take the Arctic as an essential part of their identity. States like Canada rely on the image of the Arctic to build their own identity.<sup>102</sup> For Canada, the wild Arctic is tamed by the state itself and shows the strong, independent community of Canadians that appropriate the Arctic. This includes positive images, such as the exploration of the North-West passage, but also sinister ones, such as the boarding schools that tried to Westernize indigenous communities. For the Arctic states, the Arctic still represents a case for foreign policy and domestic policy. This means that the *Other* is hereby the foreign and, at the same time, a direct part of the *Self*.

The question of what constitutes the images of the Arctic is intertwined with the notion of power and images.<sup>103</sup> Hereby, the power is inscribed in the idea of domination of the peripheral North by the South, considered as being the centre, and generated by the practices of different actors through the imagination of the Arctic. The image takes the role of its own position within this struggle. While nation-states want to dominate their own periphery,<sup>104</sup> they have to interact with the already established image of the Arctic and try to shift this image into a place that is fitting to the national identity of those states. This shift strips their own Arctic from its discursive mobility, as the region is caught in perceptions that pretend it is dependent on the Southern centre to become “civilized”. Thus, the Arctic experiences imaginative colonialism, which—similar to textual practices—has a performative effect on the region.<sup>105</sup> The imagination of the Arctic is thereby a discursive strategy that makes the Arctic a region

---

<sup>101</sup> Thum, ‘Orientalism’, 392.

<sup>102</sup> Martin Seifert, ‘Canada’, in *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters. a Critical Survey.*, ed. Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen (Leiden: BRILL, 2007), 113–16, <https://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=5598394>.

<sup>103</sup> See Pieterse, ‘Image and Power’.

<sup>104</sup> Johnson and Coleman, ‘The Internal Other: Exploring the Dialectical Relationship Between Regional Exclusion and the Construction of National Identity’, 867–68.

<sup>105</sup> For a more detailed explanation of this performative effect, see Veličković, ‘Balkanisms Old and New: The Discourse of Balkanism and Self-Othering in Vesna Goldsworthy’s Chernobyl Strawberries and Inventing Ruritania’, 189.



that has to be conquered by the white, male explorer.<sup>106</sup> At the same time, it has to be opened up for the domination of the national state that wants to incorporate the Arctic into the national identity as the silenced *Other*.<sup>107</sup> The imagination takes part in the subjugation of the Arctic, while the images of the Arctic have a hindering effect on the discursive power that nation-states can perform upon the region.

An image is constructed through the interplay of the *internal-Other* and the *external-Other*, generating an auto and hetero image of the region. The performative effect of the hetero image influences how the nation-states constitute their auto image of the region. The images that are textually created, take part in how a region is perceived and play an active part in it. To illustrate this argument, this thesis will apply this perspective on Young's work *The Age of the Arctic*.<sup>108</sup> Young, as a scientist from the US, takes the positionality of the West. The Arctic is thereby considered as the oppositional *Other* and seen as a silent and static region. Young analyses the construct of the Arctic, which is seen as an empty and static place. This image contradicts the US interest of dominating the Northern periphery of Alaska, considering that the empty region shows no sign of being important for the centre. Young vocalizes the perception that the Arctic is a changing place that has the potential to be "owned",<sup>109</sup> and thus to open up Alaska for domination by the South. The image of a region as rich in natural resources and that shows a strategic interest for the security of the country creates a counter-discourse that makes the Arctic seem like something to be acted upon. Consequently, the Arctic today is represented through two images. On the one side, it is perceived as the empty, static place that has no reason to be conquered and, on the other side, it is perceived as a region rich in resources and showing strategic importance. Two images that are conflicting with each other: one is the Arctic as image by the West and the other is the Arctic as a part of the national identity

---

<sup>106</sup> Ryall, Schimanski, and Wærp, 'Arctic Discourses: An Introduction' p. x.

<sup>107</sup> Johnson and Coleman, 'The Internal Other: Exploring the Dialectical Relationship Between Regional Exclusion and the Construction of National Identity', 864.

<sup>108</sup> Young, 'The Age of the Arctic'.

<sup>109</sup> Young, 176.

of the United States. Young has to take the image of the exotic Arctic seriously and interact with it in order to make his own point about constructing the Arctic as a part of the *Other* within the national identity.

### 1.6 Evolving the Arctic International Relations

The approach of *Imagery* opens up a new dimension of how International Relations scholars can analyse the Arctic as a region. Through the connection of the discursive power of actors and the agency of historical developed social realities, the images can be understood in its unique position. The constructed *Other* is still part of the nation-state and takes active part in their domestic politics and international relations.

*Imagery* adds a crucial layer to the analysis of the *region-building* approach by Iver B. Neumann. It acknowledges the importance of the image in the case of the Arctic. In Neumann's perspective, human actors are the dominant *region-builders*. The region itself was always imagined by different actors that created a distinct narrative of the essence of the Arctic in our Western world.<sup>110</sup> This has an impact on how the Arctic is created, as the political actors that shape the region are doing it in regard to an already preconceived image of the Arctic. *Imagery* questions the independence of these political actors considering that their practices are bound to these images, as they interpret and perceive international relations through images. Images therefore can be *region-builders* themselves in the case of the Arctic because they are taking part in the domestic politics of the Arctic nation-states that want to incorporate the image into their own national identity. This stands in contrast to the other schools of International Relations studying the Arctic through a new way of thinking, perceiving the Arctic as a foreign different actor and, at the same time, as a part of the constitution of the nation-state.

---

<sup>110</sup> See note 46 above

While the positivist approaches represented by Young and Huebert give an explanation of what is happening in the Arctic, the theories that are based on liberalism and realism are lacking in order to understand the motivations behind the taken actions. These actions are taken out of the context of the practitioners and are filled into a space where they fit the ontological understanding of what the Arctic is through the lens of a positivist: a region that has to be secured by military means. Thus, Young interprets that the actions taken are strictly coupled with the power interests of nation-states, because the actions of the US in the Arctic are a reaction to the presence of the SU in the Arctic.<sup>111</sup> The same goes for Huebert who relates Canadian foreign policy to power interests of other Arctic states.<sup>112</sup> *Imagency* offers a solution to this blind spot. It acknowledges the different processes of foreign policy by analysing the practices of actors. For example, by looking at the creational process of the Arctic as a region with a focus on foreign policy, one can analyse the documents that were drafted between the Arctic states to constitute the Arctic council. Further, it embeds these practices into a structure that has been developed over time and space. These structures are the images actors use, and they show what influence the perception of events in the Arctic have, considering that actors interpret the events by the images they use.

Scholars of the post-positivist entrenchment of International Relations studying the Arctic also address the question of how structures are formed over a longer historical context. The post-positivist school is foremost interested in power within practices of human actors.<sup>113</sup> These practices are forming the Arctic as a fluid body over a period of time.<sup>114</sup> The post-positivists do not acknowledge that practices construct, besides structures, new social realities. These social realities partake in the social world and, in return, the political actors have to engage with those. This engagement gives the social realities an agency that influences the

---

<sup>111</sup> Young, 'The Age of the Arctic'.

<sup>112</sup> Huebert, 'The Newly Emerging Arctic Security Environment'.

<sup>113</sup> See Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy', 17.

<sup>114</sup> See Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building'; Hønneland, 'Identity Formation in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region'; Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach'.

practices of political actors. Connecting the interpretations of the Arctic, for example, through images is neglected. *Imagery* includes this image into the theory by showing that the textual construct practiced over years has results in a social reality that is beyond a passive understanding of structures and rather actively involved in shaping the Arctic. Besides the structures, *Imagery* analyses the narratives that have been built over the years and created their own agency.

*Imagery* goes further than the analysis based on *science and technology studies*,<sup>115</sup> *critical theory*,<sup>116</sup> and their interpretation of narratives that are constructed by the interests of specific actors. *Imagery* questions those interpretations with the concept of the historical domination by the centres in the South over the periphery in the North. With this concept, *Imagery* shows how Eurocentric narratives built specific images that make the Arctic a oppositional *Other* to the West. *Imagery* is thereby not based on Western assumptions but questions the underlying tools of power that could overcome the Arctic in its own agency and domesticizes its *otherness*.

*Imagery* introduces a new angle to the scholarship and, by welcoming the knowledge of the other approaches towards the Arctic, International Relations are taken into consideration to form a new argument: images are individual actors in the Arctic that—besides the interests of nation-states, narratives that have been historically developed and other non-human entities—participate in the Arctic international relations.

---

<sup>115</sup> See Justiina M.I. Dahl, 'Assessments, Models and International Politics of the Arctic: Why the "New North" Narrative Includes Only Bomber, Polar Bear, Oil, and Gas Deposit Models, and No Original Parts or an Assembly Manual', *The Polar Journal* 5, no. 1 (2 January 2015): 35–58, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2154896X.2015.1025491>.

<sup>116</sup> See Koivurova, 'Analysis: The Arctic Conflict - Truth, Fantasy or a Little Bit of Both?'

## II. Chapter – The Spirit of Murmansk

The goal of this chapter is to create a framework that outlines the image of the Arctic cooperation to better understand how it could develop its agency. Further, it will give an answer to the question of what role Gorbachev's speech in Murmansk 1987 played in the creation of the image of Arctic cooperation and, consequently, how this image of Arctic cooperation could succeed in an environment where conflict was still present in the political discourse and context of the Cold War. The idea of this chapter is to theoretically prepare a case study that will be applied in Chapter III. The speech made by Gorbachev in Murmansk will be analysed in its individual parts and embedded into the historical circumstances that created the powerful image of the Arctic cooperation. Following, this research will list individual parts of the speech that give the image its characteristics: mutual security, economic interests, scientific exploration and environmental protection. These objectives will be analysed and isolated so that they can be applied as indicators for the case study in Chapter III.

The *Murmansk Speech* started as a process of cooperation between the nation-states in the Arctic. The Arctic cooperation has many facets and it has developed in different directions during the last decades, both regionally and ideologically. Therefore, it is hard to pinpoint how these developments are connected to each other. This raises the question of where the image of the Arctic cooperation originated from. Especially when considering the fact that this cooperation is presumably *international* as states work together, it seems difficult to emphasize one particular image of Arctic cooperation. To be able to isolate the *international* one must find a point in history that shows power relations more blatantly, and it must be universally accepted as a turning point in the development of Arctic cooperation. This thesis argues that the image created by Gorbachev in Murmansk can be considered, based off of the historical and political circumstances, as the generally accepted origin of the image of the contemporary Arctic cooperation and as a *region-builder*. This argument will be supported by an analysis of the

Speech of Mikhail Gorbachev held in Murmansk in 1987.<sup>117</sup> Further, the embedded meaning in the document as well as its content will be analysed.

## 2.1 The Arctic Cooperation becomes a Region-builder

The *Murmansk Speech* is famous for the particular image of the Arctic Gorbachev formulated in the last words of his speech: “forming [in the Arctic] a genuine zone of peace and fruitful cooperation.”<sup>118</sup> This clear vision, voiced by the highest ranking official of one of the two superpowers of the Cold War, was a novelty for approaching one of the most militarized regions of this time. In the period of the Cold War, the region itself was unique as it was geographically the closest link between the US and the SU. Through the years of the Cold War, the Arctic merged into a strategic important position, especially during nuclear deterrence when distance was crucial for the effectiveness of missiles with nuclear warheads. Addressing the Arctic was crucial for the international politics of the Cold War, and its image was determined by the two powers. Gorbachev, the representative of the SU, already had an influential position in the discourse of the Arctic. During the time of the Cold War, and even before, there were already initiatives for cooperation in this region. Especially the following two: the 1973 *Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears* and the *Svalbard treaty* of 1920. Both treaties were signed by the two superpowers and different Arctic states.<sup>119</sup> But both were not breaking the respective status quo in the Arctic and did not initiate, what today is seen as, the Arctic cooperation. It must be asked: Why did Gorbachev’s image bring this change? And how did Gorbachev explain this vision of the Arctic to create the powerful image?

---

<sup>117</sup> Gorbachev, *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987*.

<sup>118</sup> Gorbachev, 6.

<sup>119</sup> Elana Wilson Rowe, *Arctic Governance: Power in Cross-Border Cooperation* (Manchester University Press, 2018), 28.

## 2.2 Gorbachev's Image of the Arctic: A Zone of Peace

Gorbachev saw the Arctic as a potential future zone of peace, where states cooperated for the common good of the region and for the advantage of two superpowers. Gorbachev's speech was voiced in Murmansk in order to reach the states across the Iron Curtain. He wanted to make the Northern states interested in the new foreign policy of the SU.

The speech of Gorbachev was addressed at the Western states, especially the Northern European states. Ideological political units, such as the NATO, were playing a major role as contestants in the region.<sup>120</sup> Gorbachev saw nation-states as the main actors of the Arctic cooperation. Foremost, the states that are geographically associated with the Arctic. This also includes the two superpowers, the US and the SU, while the Northern European states are seen as inbetweeners, even if they are NATO members. Their position is powerful, as they are in the opposing military encampment, but they were interested in the ideas by Gorbachev: "And this is probably why the public climate in [Northern European] countries is more receptive to the new political thinking."<sup>121</sup> Gorbachev criticizes the rhetoric of his enemies. While he does not condemn the US as a state, he criticizes how sole political actors have interests to halt the cooperation in the North.<sup>122</sup> His speech includes indigenous people and people living in the North, but they are seen as problems that have to be acted upon. In Gorbachev's interpretation, they do not have their own agency and are rather subjects that need to be handled as objects of anthropological investigation, meanwhile accessing knowledge about them is essential to support "the interests of indigenous population of the North".<sup>123</sup>

The Arctic itself should not be interpreted as a geographical place outside the North, but as a political space where specific actors come together. It is a region of importance, on the one

---

<sup>120</sup> Gorbachev, *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987*, 3–4.

<sup>121</sup> Gorbachev, 3.

<sup>122</sup> Gorbachev, 2.

<sup>123</sup> Gorbachev, 5.

side, because of the potential of a conflict that “risks the political climate of the entire world”<sup>124</sup> and, on the other side, because of its function for the climate of the world: “ [...] to influence the climate in Europe, the USA and Canada, and even South Asia and Africa.”<sup>125</sup> This combination of “political” and “environmental” climate gives the impression that both of these climates are connected to each other in the Arctic. In this aspect, both have to be upheld individually, because if one fails, the other will too. The state, therefore, has a particularly important position in the Arctic, considering that the state defends it and decides what the Arctic is or will be.

Gorbachev acknowledges that this region is oscillating in a time marked by change: the political system of the world is in flux,<sup>126</sup> and the planet itself as well.<sup>127</sup> Gorbachev declares: “A new, democratic philosophy of international relations, of world politics is breaking through” where the interest of “human, universal criteria and values is penetrating diverse strata.”<sup>128</sup> This displays how the old politics of mutual distrust and conflict during the Cold War is coming to an end. While Gorbachev is afraid of resistance and political change, especially through the “military-industrial complex [of the US]”,<sup>129</sup> he wants to stop the negative impacts of the environmental pollution.<sup>130</sup>

In sum, Gorbachev’s view of the Arctic is based on the fundament of three realities: states are the main actors, the Arctic is a political sphere with impact on the whole world and it provides a geographical and historical turning point for world politics. The Arctic is positioned in a prime location for the success of a new world that goes beyond old rivalries and fades into a place where universal values are respected. Gorbachev sees an urgency to demonstrate unity and proposes a solution to the world, imploring the SU to contribute to improve the situation.

---

<sup>124</sup> Gorbachev, 4.

<sup>125</sup> Gorbachev, 3.

<sup>126</sup> Gorbachev, 2.

<sup>127</sup> Gorbachev, 6.

<sup>128</sup> Gorbachev, 1.

<sup>129</sup> Gorbachev, 2.

<sup>130</sup> Gorbachev, 5–6.



These contributions can be found in the four objectives he suggests. With these objectives, he aims at achieving to transform the Arctic into a “zone of peace.”<sup>131</sup>

Gorbachev proposes several objectives and lists them in a hierarchical order. These objectives overlap and build four recurring themes that have different priorities. The highest priority for Gorbachev was the mutual security, followed by economic interests, scientific exploration and the environmental protection. The listing is the result of the main objective, namely relaxing the tense military situation in the Arctic through the practices of economic interdependence and scientific cooperation.

The first objective and priority of Gorbachev is clear: denuclearization and disarmament of the Arctic. This is the highest priority, as the *Murmansk Speech* was after the Reykjavík summit<sup>132</sup> held in 1986 and the 1986 Chernobyl disaster which put the SU in the spotlight for radiation safety. He addresses this topic, as he sees the Northern countries supportive of this idea, and wants to provide a “symbol of hope that nuclear weapons are not eternal evil and that mankind is not doomed to live under that sword of Damocles.”<sup>133</sup> He directly addresses the main strategic tool and a symbol of the Cold War in the Arctic: submarines with ballistic missiles commanded by the Soviet fleet. His objective is that these submarines should finally be removed. Further, he wants to restrict naval activity in the seas reaching the shores of Northern Europe. Both alliances of NATO and the Warsaw Pact should restrict their presence to build up confidence between themselves.<sup>134</sup> All these ideas should be realized through establishing mutual agreements between the US and the SU. This is connected to the overall political ambition of denuclearization, while the Arctic is mainly concerned with the security

---

<sup>131</sup> Gorbachev, 6.

<sup>132</sup> The Reykjavík Summit was a meeting between the US President Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev. While the summit failed to produce a result for denuclearization, it paved the way for the later *Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty* in 1987, a turning point in the relations between the US and the SU.

<sup>133</sup> Gorbachev, *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987*, 3.

<sup>134</sup> Gorbachev, 4–5.

issue of submarines, nuclear missiles and naval presence. Overall, Gorbachev's image is about establishing a mutual security system and naval treaties.

The second objective is linked to economic interest. This includes the idea of harvesting natural resources, creating joint operations and establishing the North Sea route. Following his logic, the Arctic is a resourceful region that only needs an advanced technology to harvest its resources. Gorbachev therefore proposes to cooperate and exchange knowledge while creating joint enterprises with Canada and Norway to harvest fossil resources. Further, he wants to establish an energy program in the Arctic.<sup>135</sup> His lowest priority, but connected to the establishment of economic cooperation, is the North Sea route, whilst giving hints that it is the shortest route connecting Europe to the Pacific and the "Far East".<sup>136</sup> The SU would have to provide access to these routes, and Gorbachev's offer is proposing a possibility, if there is to be progress in the other objectives first.

For Gorbachev, scientific exploration is his third objective and implies the need for cooperation, as it is "[important] for the whole of mankind".<sup>137</sup> He wants to establish an "Arctic Research Council" and a conference in 1988 to coordinate Arctic research with sub-Arctic states. He emphasizes that the SU already has a vast knowledge of the region and wants to share it with other states. He underlines that such a program is already in place with Canada, in order to show the possibility, and the SU's willingness to cooperate. Further, he locates the issue of indigenous communities in the field of scientific research. Gorbachev's image holds a presentation of institutionalized Arctic research, joint programs and knowledge production over the inhabitants of the North.<sup>138</sup>

His last objective sees the environmental protection as being of "special importance to the cooperation of the northern countries [...]".<sup>139</sup> He mentions the responsibility the Northern

---

<sup>135</sup> Gorbachev, 5.

<sup>136</sup> Gorbachev, 6.

<sup>137</sup> Gorbachev, 5.

<sup>138</sup> Gorbachev, 5.

<sup>139</sup> Gorbachev, 5.

states have towards the marine environment. Gorbachev wants to establish joint measures that cover the whole Arctic seabed. Hereby, it is important that the SU wants to propose a comprehensive plan for the protection of the environment that other Northern state could follow. This plan intends to establish a joint agreement for instituting a monitor process for environment and radiation safety. He also mentions the importance of the forests in the Arctic, which occupy a big part of the SU territory in the North. Gorbachev sees a joint agreement in monitoring and keeping up the objective of protecting the sea and land environment. While environmental protection is one part of the objective, its priority is below the commercial interest and stands in contrast to it. Here, the harvesting of natural resources will take a negative impact on the environment, as opening the Northern Sea route for commercial shipping is only possible if the ice of the Arctic melts due to the climate change.

The *Murmansk Speech's* image implies, besides the rhetoric of urgency, a strict hierarchy of what has to be established first. The objectives stand in contrast to each other. First, security; second, the economic interests; third, scientific exploration; and fourth, environmental protection. The four categories build the framework for analysing the image of the Arctic cooperation.

### 2.3 The Murmansk Speech

Two historical developments, that changed the international practices in the Arctic, have to be considered in order to be able to understand the underlying power structure behind the creation of the image of Arctic cooperation. First, the change of Cold War foreign policy caused by Gorbachev's policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika*,<sup>140</sup> and second, the urgency of global cooperation in the face of the climate change.

---

<sup>140</sup> *Glasnost* was a term that Gorbachev used to show a new transparency and openness of the government of the SU. *Perestroika* was used to refer to a new economic restructuring drive in the SU.

During the 1980s, the tension of the Cold War was reaching a high, having in mind the invasion of Afghanistan and the politics of Ronald Reagan as president of the US. At the same time, Gorbachev, who was the general secretary of the Communist Party of the SU, started to reform the political and economic system of the SU. This reform was led by the ideas of a more open society and a more open approach towards the capitalist market system.<sup>141</sup> Both approaches were also influential for the international relations of the SU: from then on its global contestant, the US, was approached on a different ground than by the previous general secretaries.<sup>142</sup> This implies that Gorbachev was a central figure during this period. His policies were foremost aimed at domestic changes, but he also acknowledged the dangers of nuclear warfare and pressure, triggered by the arms race and deterrence that was put on the domestic policies.<sup>143</sup> The reforms of the SU could therefore not only be considered as being domestic. For Gorbachev, the SU had also to be reformed in its foreign policy to succeed in its domestic politics. Unfortunately, until 1987, this approach bore no fruits.<sup>144</sup>

The *Murmansk Speech* is part of a series of speeches that Gorbachev held in the late 1980s. The following three speeches display Gorbachev's commitment towards the new policy of the SU: *Gorbachev's Speech in Vladivostok* aimed at the Asian-Pacific region in 1986,<sup>145</sup> the *Murmansk Speech* of 1987 that aimed at the Arctic region and, later, the 1988 *Belgrad Speech* which addressed the Mediterranean.<sup>146</sup> These speeches were connected in their aim to cease tensions between the superpowers in the specific regions and improve foreign relations. All three are considered to be a part of Gorbachev's objective of the *new political thinking* that would serve to change the foreign policy of the SU through abolishing class thinking and setting

---

<sup>141</sup> Peter Zwick, 'New Thinking and New Foreign Policy under Gorbachev', *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22, no. 2 (June 1989): 221, <https://doi.org/10.2307/419599>.

<sup>142</sup> Zwick, 215.

<sup>143</sup> Ramnath Narayanswamy, 'End of Gorbachev Era?', *Economic and Political Weekly* 26, no. 31/32 (1991): 1848.

<sup>144</sup> Narayanswamy, 1847.

<sup>145</sup> Zwick, 'New Thinking and New Foreign Policy under Gorbachev', 219.

<sup>146</sup> Geoffrey Howe, 'Soviet Foreign Policy under Gorbachev', *The World Today* 45, no. 3 (1989): 43.

universal human interests in the centre of the ideological approach.<sup>147</sup> Two approaches were thereby essential: increasing interdependence of the world and creating a mutual security system that preferred political tools over military tools.<sup>148</sup> The *Murmansk Speech* stands out of this series of speeches for its embedment in a political situation at the time that was much more intense than the others, as well as the fact that its failure would have had much graver consequences. Implementing these approaches would have included changes to the national territory of the SU, its national security, as well as brought a high risk of failure if the leader across the Atlantic, the president of the US, would not share Gorbachev's objectives. The first progress of this new thinking was made in 1986 when Reagan and Gorbachev met in Reykjavík and surprisingly Gorbachev agreed to on-site inspections of the SU nuclear facilities.<sup>149</sup> This process gave more publicity to Gorbachev's foreign policy ambitions and signalled to other countries the possibility of a cooperation for mutual security between the two superpowers. This symbol was especially important for Western states, whom now realised that the SU could comply to a joint goal of security, economic development and environmental protection.<sup>150</sup> Besides the SU, all other seven Arctic states were Western states and NATO members, which made this progress crucial: the SU aimed at achieving Gorbachev's objective to accomplish the *glasnost* and *perestroika* through a more cooperative foreign policy that would help the SU to gain economic prosperity. Besides the attempt of reforming the SU, the SU also had to handle another growing global issue: environmental pollution.

Environmental vulnerability became a more important issue for international relations in the late-1980s.<sup>151</sup> A consensus on the discussion on climate change was emerging and was put on the agenda of the international state society. Especially the 1985 *Vienna Convention for*

---

<sup>147</sup> Robert V. Daniels, 'Gorbachev and the Reversal of History', in *The Rise and Fall of Communism in Russia* (Yale University Press, 2007), 365, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1nppv1.35](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1nppv1.35).

<sup>148</sup> Howe, 'Soviet Foreign Policy under Gorbachev', 41–42.

<sup>149</sup> John English, 'The Emergence of an Arctic Council', in *Governing the North American Arctic*, ed. Dawn Alexandra Berry, Nigel Bowles, and Halbert Jones (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2016), 219, [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137493910\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137493910_11).

<sup>150</sup> Howe, 'Soviet Foreign Policy under Gorbachev', 44.

<sup>151</sup> Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building', 194.

*the Protection of the Ozon Layer* and 1987 *Montreal Protocol*<sup>152</sup> were the first signs of international unity on the issue of climate change and urged states to work together. Particularly the high amount of participating states, as the *Vienna Convention* is ratification by all UN member states and the *Montreal Protocol*, the fast-found political consensus on environmental protection, was signed only 14 years after the scientific discovery was made, highlighted the amount of resources states put into this pressing issue of climate change.<sup>153</sup> During the same and the following years, several catastrophes showed the importance of environmental protection in the Arctic: the 1986 Chernobyl disaster and its radioactive fallout that reached the Arctic, the sulphur spilling of Soviet nickel smelters in the late 1980s, the oil spill from the *Exxon Valdez* in Alaska 1989 and the sinking of the SU *Komsomolets* submarine in the Arctic Ocean in 1989.<sup>154</sup> All of these events were happening in the Arctic or had an impact on its environment. With the emerging importance of environmental vulnerability, the nation-states that were acting in the region were put under new responsibilities. The SU under Gorbachev came under pressure especially for their responsibility in the Chernobyl disaster of 1986.<sup>155</sup> While taking place on the soil of the SU, the impacts of the radioactive contamination that was dangerous for flora, fauna and humans made a cross border issue out of it that also concerned the Arctic. Dealing with environmental issues became a part of the Gorbachev's foreign policy, as he had to deal with the political fallout of Chernobyl.<sup>156</sup> The *Murmansk Speech* is referring to this environmental protection with the aspect of radiation safety. In the following two years, the concerns of Gorbachev were reaffirmed when related to the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill followed by the *Komsomolets* submarine in 1989. The joining together of the higher priority of

---

<sup>152</sup> The *Montreal Protocol* is the first universally ratified treaty of the UN with 196 states and the EU agreeing upon protecting the ozone layer by controlling and dispense of substances that deplete the ozone layer.

<sup>153</sup> USA International Business Publications, *International Conventions on Atmosphere Handbook: Strategic Information and Agreements*, 2017, 23.

<sup>154</sup> Wilson Rowe, *Arctic Governance: Power in Cross-Border Cooperation*, 32.

<sup>155</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 54.

<sup>156</sup> Markku Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day* (University of Lapland, 2019), 33, <https://lauda.ulapland.fi/handle/10024/63651>.

environmental vulnerability on the global agenda and the disasters happening in the Arctic created an urgency to counter the environmental pollution and change.

Both these historical developments provided the fertile ground to let the image, proposed by Gorbachev in Murmansk, grow as the generally accepted image of Arctic cooperation by the Arctic nation-states. On the one side, the change of the structure of the international system was immanent after the peak in the conflict and a general need of the SU to come closer to its opponents to achieve reformation of its domestic system. On the other side, also, states showed a never preceded unity in the issue of climate change and environmental pollution that was created through an urgency to act in the consideration of previous disasters and prospect of new crises in a changing environment. The states across the Iron Curtain showed a new mobility of cooperation, making it possible to let the Arctic be perceived as a stage of mutual goodwill. This structural change enabled Gorbachev to create an image that today is understood as Arctic cooperation. Thereby, the Arctic is drawn in contrast to South East Asia and the Mediterranean, the other issues mentioned in speeches held by Gorbachev, as a symbolic character: the close proximity and its militarization create an image of imminent threat. Now, with upcoming structural changes, the region is becoming a beacon of hope, where dangers of the past can be overcome with a new approach in international relations. This new image of the Arctic was therefore accepted by the international community who wanted to enter the discourse and to provide an identity of a cooperating Arctic state for themselves.

#### 2.4 The Murmansk Speech and its Value for Arctic International Relations

The Speech of Murmansk is often only mentioned as a side note in the Arctic International Relations. There is a consensus that the speech has contributed to the Arctic cooperation, but its role is connected to Gorbachev or the SU and not the Arctic cooperation as an image or actor itself. This is especially true for the positivist approaches. For regime theorist, the speech is the

historical starting point for the Arctic cooperation that resulted in a formation of different intergovernmental forums in the Arctic.<sup>157</sup> The *Murmansk Speech* is seen as a part of the regime building process, where the SU as an actor is participating in the international system.<sup>158</sup> The speech itself is a document that is interpreted in the relation to the SU and its goals in the international system. This thesis provides a counter argument: while the *Murmansk Speech* was held as a part of the SU foreign policy, its content is the crucial part that makes the speech powerful. While it is important to acknowledge the historical circumstances that gave the speech its audience of other nation-states, the content of the speech is determinantal to forming the future Arctic cooperation. Giving the Arctic cooperation a specific image, which later states could coordinate and in whom they could reflect themselves in, the Arctic cooperation is more far-reaching than an action by the SU. The image itself is interacting with the states. This argument can also be applied to the understanding of the post-positivist approach of Iver B. Neumann. Neumann sees *region-builders* as important political actors.<sup>159</sup> The *region-builder* who wants to construct a specific region is Gorbachev.<sup>160</sup> Therefore, the speech is not important, but the actor that engages in the speech. The agency is with Gorbachev. *Imagency* is looking at the further development of the image Gorbachev gave and recognises that the Arctic as a region was influenced by the content of the speech, even due to the historical circumstances and international relations at the time. The characteristics, themes and objectives are picked up by other states that do not need Gorbachev to interact with it. The Murmansk Speech's image of Arctic cooperation becomes a *region-builder*, as its impact is detached from Gorbachev.

---

<sup>157</sup> Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council', 32; Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 32.

<sup>158</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 54.

<sup>159</sup> Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe', 58.

<sup>160</sup> Neumann, 66; Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building', 194.



### III. Chapter: The Image of the Circumpolar Arctic Cooperation

In Chapter III, the framework established by the objectives from the *Murmansk Speech* will be applied on the nation-states to answer the question: how did this image affect the relations among the Arctic states during the years between 1989 and 2019? To see how the nation-states interact with images as actors, the research will look at the objectives of the *Murmansk Speech* and evaluate whether they changed during the establishment of treaties, declarations and events that are constitutional for the Arctic cooperation from 1989 to 2019. The interaction with an image is based on the states interest in the objectives set by the *Murmansk Speech*, namely an image of Arctic cooperation. This thesis will look at documents that portray a certain image connected to the Arctic cooperation. The goal is to investigate how the vision of Gorbachev's Arctic, the image of the *Murmansk Speech*, is still contributing to the representation of the region today, even if Gorbachev is not a part of it anymore. The image will be put under scrutiny to investigate whether it still holds agency throughout the years and is influencing the practices of human *region-builders*.

After the Speech of Gorbachev, several "Olympics" of cooperation emerged in the Arctic.<sup>161</sup> International cooperation had different developments that concerned different subregions or disputes. The speech of Gorbachev created a special trend that started with initiating *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* that development into the cooperation between the eight Arctic states and its intergovernmental body, the Arctic Council.

Chapter III analyses two discursive developments that cover turning points in the discursive struggle of the Arctic cooperation. First, the discursive struggle of establishing the Arctic cooperation with a focus on the *Rovaniemi Process*, the AEPS and the closely related *Ottawa Declaration*. The second discursive development will look at the abolishment of the

---

<sup>161</sup> Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council', 46.

Arctic cooperation and closer consideration of the *Arktika Incident*, the resulting *Ilulissat Declaration* in connection with the first binding treaty of the Arctic Council in 2011 and the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting 2019 in Rovaniemi. These turning points have a historical interconnectedness and uncover power relations that shape the imagination of nation-states and their cooperation and struggle against the *Murmansk Speech's* image, the Arctic cooperation, depending on whether it contradicts or supports their national identity.

### 3.1 From Gorbachev's Mythical Zone of Peace to the Arctic Council: At the beginning - The Rovaniemi Process

Beginning in the year 1989, two years have passed since Gorbachev held his speech in Murmansk. The dust has settled around the new foreign policy of the SU.<sup>162</sup> The image created in Murmansk did not yet disappear on the international stage. The adjoining nation-states had two years to process this image and orientate themselves towards the objectives introduced in the *Murmansk Speech*. The presented image of Arctic cooperation was slowly introduced into the international level and acted as a *region-builder*. The first treaty to be introduced was the environmental protection treaty between Norway and the SU in 1988, a bilateral and not circumpolar treaty that resulted from the environmental objectives of Gorbachev.<sup>163</sup> Slowly, the SU lost its interest in the Arctic cooperation,<sup>164</sup> but the image never really left the discourse. During these two years, the Finnish government started to recognize the image created by the *Murmansk Speech*, and saw an opportunity to incorporate this image into their own nation-state. The Finnish initiative started the *Rovaniemi Process*: a diplomatic preparation of the AEPS and

---

<sup>162</sup> Zwick, 'New Thinking and New Foreign Policy under Gorbachev', 215.

<sup>163</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 55.

<sup>164</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 34.

the first aspiration to achieve the image of Arctic cooperation. The Finnish officials coined this process the “Spirit of Rovaniemi”.<sup>165</sup>

In the image of the *Murmansk Speech*, Finland saw the opportunity to gain an identity they were trying to achieve since the mid 1980s: to be an Arctic state. However, the Finnish statesmen were facing two hardships when trying to achieve this vision. Finland was not in possession of a coast with the Arctic Ocean and, more detrimentally, the US and the SU were not perceiving Finland as an Arctic state.<sup>166</sup> Finland pushed for domestic policies to gain the new status as Arctic state and embarked into international relations by spearheading multilateral Arctic projects. Domestically, Finland started to heavily invest into the promotion of Lapland, their most Northern region, to present it as a Nordic “destination of interest to Europeans”.<sup>167</sup> This region was supposed to resemble the untouched wilderness of the Arctic. However, the process of crafting the Finnish national identity was threatened. Finnish Arctic flora and fauna was endangered, due to the sulphur emission from nickel smelter emerging from the Kola peninsula related to enterprises of the SU.<sup>168</sup> This generated the urge for action: Finland needed to uphold the image of a Northern state towards the European citizen by protecting an untouched Arctic environment. Nevertheless, the environmental pollution was opening up the doors to gain the identity of an Arctic state with a cross-border issue caused by the SU. Finland had an eligible reason to initiate an international conference to settle the issue and could gain the status of being Arctic through their proactive position of being a supporter of Arctic environmental protection. Now Finland had the possibility to present itself as an Arctic state while engaging with one of the objectives set by the *Murmansk Speech*: environmental protection of the Arctic.

---

<sup>165</sup> Heikkilä, 34.

<sup>166</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 57.

<sup>167</sup> Young, 57.

<sup>168</sup> Tor Norseth, ‘Environmental Pollution around Nickel Smelters in the Kola Peninsula (Russia)’, *Science of The Total Environment* 148, no. 2–3 (June 1994): 108, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-9697\(94\)90389-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-9697(94)90389-1); Juha-Pekka Tuovinen et al., ‘Impact of the Sulphur Dioxide Sources in the Kola Peninsula on Air Quality in Northernmost Europe’, *Atmospheric Environment. Part A. General Topics* 27, no. 9 (June 1993): 1379, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686\(93\)90124-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686(93)90124-H).

The *Murmansk Speech* defined environmental protection as an urging issue in the Arctic. In regard to the interest of Finland in incorporating the Arctic into their state identity, they pinpointed their interests at the environmental objectives from the *Murmansk Speech* as it seemed to be the most promising and achievable objective from a political standpoint.<sup>169</sup> This would allow them to gain the Arctic status without the risk of delegitimizing their claim through the interest of other states. For this reason, the previous approach through the objectives of security or scientific exploration had been unsuccessful, as states did not want to change those.<sup>170</sup> The interests of Finland were mainly directed at the environmental protection, which opened the door for an Arctic identity. By looking for identity and cooperation, they incidentally pushed forward the process of constructing the *Arctic Eight*,<sup>171</sup> a constellation of states that today can be understood as the Arctic as such.<sup>172</sup>

Perceiving the *Arctic Eight* as the key actors of Arctic cooperation and the Arctic region cannot be considered a natural course of events.<sup>173</sup> The *Arctic Eight* was a social construct rising with the initiative of Finland. Gorbachev's speech did not specify which states should be seen as Arctic but left open the question of stakeholders in the region. While mostly the US and the SU were seen as the key actors in the region, Gorbachev also attributed Northern European states as actors with influence. Still, actors outside this description, like Iceland or Greenland, were side-lined. When defining the actors, the *Murmansk Speech* only offered the possibility to see the SU, US and the North European states as actors, and not the *Arctic Eight*. Finland had to contest the image of the *Murmansk Speech*, aiming at adapting it to fit the description of being an Arctic actor themselves. By opening up the discussion, Finland was able to change the prevailing view of the SU and US as the two main actors of the Arctic to gain and create access

---

<sup>169</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 33.

<sup>170</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 63.

<sup>171</sup> The states that are defined as the *Arctic Eight* are: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States

<sup>172</sup> Arctic Council, 'The Arctic Council - About', Arctic Council, accessed 26 March 2020, <https://arctic-council.org/en/about/>.

<sup>173</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 70.

for different actors in the Arctic. The foreign minister of Finland, Kalevi Sorsa, conveyed the letter of invitation that, besides the two superpowers, specifically invited the Arctic coastal states and the Scandinavian states. He started the discussion based on the assumption that eight key actors in the Arctic would provide environmental protection, thus he invited Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, the SU and the US to a summit hosted by Finland.

The *Rovaniemi Process* put weight on the urge of environmental protection and had three implications. First, building the identity of Finland to be an Arctic state through incorporating the image of the Arctic cooperation. Second, defining the *Arctic Eight* as key actors, and third, specifying the objective of environmental protection created by the *Murmansk Speech*. The environmental protection was used as a vehicle to shape the identity of Finland. The *Murmansk Speech* offered a broad concept on environmental protection and impacted more states than the SU, US and the Arctic coastal states. Environmental protection as an objective was not clearly defined by the *Murmansk Speech* itself, but it gave Finland freedom to alter the image while complying to it.<sup>174</sup> The Finnish initiative could thus also be called an environmental initiative. It did not change the Murmansk image but specified its content and objectives.

These implications were not carried out without resistance. Especially the discursive construct of the *Arctic Eight* was against the image that the US and the SU created over the Arctic.<sup>175</sup> First and foremost, the Arctic was still a place where both were considered as key actors and the major Arctic states. While the SU was more open to support the Finnish initiative, considering it could contribute to meeting their own national image of a European nation cooperating in the North,<sup>176</sup> the US was more hesitant when moving towards the initiative. The US became more drawn to the proposal of Finland mainly based on the fact that environmental

---

<sup>174</sup> In contrast, this was not possible in the issue of security or economic cooperation, as Gorbachev defined here the distinct actors, the US and SU, and what these had to do to accomplish his objective.

<sup>175</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 70.

<sup>176</sup> Young, 81.

pollution in the Arctic strongly gained publicity in the US. The disaster of the 1989 *Exxon Valdez* oil spill in Alaskan waters made it clear to the US public that environmental pollution was strongly affecting the US coast. This made it hard for the US government to oppose an international initiative to protect the environment.<sup>177</sup> Further, Canada also started to support the initiative and, following Finland, engaged in initiating a document that specified Arctic cooperation.<sup>178</sup> In connection with the growing participation of Norway in the environmental protection, through proposing a monitoring process for the Arctic region and the momentum it gained, it was hard to uphold the image of only two Arctic states, even with the support of the US superpower.<sup>179</sup> The image displayed during the *Murmansk Speech*, which was mostly upheld by the US and the SU as status quo, had to adapt in the turn of events, and the actors had to acknowledge fellow actors wanting to get access into the Arctic cooperation.

Young argues that the Finnish initiative put environmental protection on the international agenda based on national interests.<sup>180</sup> Foremost, he saw that a common interest was pushed by a specific actor to create a regime. The main driving force was thereby the interest of the Finnish policymakers to defuse Gorbachev and his Speech.<sup>181</sup> Finland was therefore trying to set the agenda with its interest of transboundary pollution to convince other actors like Canada and the US to establish a cooperation.<sup>182</sup> Keskitalo views this engagement of Finland as a *region-building* process. Finland's decision was based on the need to get closer to the Western nation-states.<sup>183</sup> Both approaches, regime theory and the *region-building* approach, dismiss that the *Murmansk Speech* was not only something that Finland chose to engage with but had to. The image presented by Gorbachev was defining a specific Arctic cooperation and, considering that Finland wanted to express its own specific role, it needed to

---

<sup>177</sup> Young, 78.

<sup>178</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 104.

<sup>179</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 74.

<sup>180</sup> Young, 57.

<sup>181</sup> Young, 58.

<sup>182</sup> Young, 62.

<sup>183</sup> Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building', 197.

engage with the image to gain an identity. The connection between identity and the Finnish interest becomes only clear when looking at the image: their interests are based on the identity of Finland, of which they chose to use environmental protection as a vehicle to reform the image, thus they had to engage with the *Murmansk Speech* to set the image of the Arctic cooperation with objectives of environmental protection.

The hierarchy of objectives set by the *Murmansk Speech* was affected by Finland and its interest to identify as an Arctic state. Environmental protection was now a top priority, while the other three objectives of mutual security, economic interest and scientific exploration were adjusting in relation to it. This change in hierarchy was possible through the effort to incorporate other states into the vision of Arctic cooperation, such as Canada, and states that pushed for an environmental protection themselves, such as Norway. There was a need for states to face environmental pollution, resulting from events such as the *Exxon Valdez* oil spilling in 1989. Environmental protection topped the image of Arctic cooperation and changed the priorities of the objectives. The Finnish foreign minister offered a stage to open up a dialogue in which Finland could manoeuvre freely inside the vision set by the *Murmansk Speech* without facing resistance, as the environmental cooperation was not defined precisely, and Finland could fulfil its own objectives while being perceived as an Arctic state. By gaining agency and being a part of the battle against environmental change in the Arctic, Finland gained the status of an Arctic state and changed the actors on stage of the Arctic cooperation from two key actors, the SU and US, to the *Arctic Eight*, a social construct that is still present in international relations of the Arctic today. Over the next few years, the *Arctic Eight* would craft, what today is known as, the AEPS.

### 3.2 The Implementation of Arctic Cooperation – The Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy

The image of the Arctic cooperation had its first impact on the Arctic as a *region-builder*, as the vision of the *Murmansk Speech* was forming a new agreement between the Arctic states: the AEPS, a program dictating how Arctic states should perform environmental protection. This document translated the image into an official document, drafted together by states, containing a common goal orientated towards the *Murmansk Speech*. The AEPS is considered an institutionalization of the *Arctic Eight*, with indigenous communities as partners and a body of arctic environmental protection that targets specific issues in the Arctic. The process—beginning with initiating the discussion about environmental protection by the Finnish foreign minister to its final result, the AEPS—took two years. In 1991, the AEPS was published in the form of a 45 pages long document that addressed, besides environmental concerns, solutions and a plan on how to apply these. The document contains the first implementation, based on the vision of the *Murmansk Speech*, and is a fleshed-out proposal that includes the objectives of Gorbachev. Still, it did challenge the hierarchy of the objectives, catapulting environmental concerns at the top and changing the meaning of security and scientific exploration. The result was a document that created the new status-quo of Arctic cooperation and set its structure.<sup>184</sup>

Different from the *Murmansk Speech*, the AEPS contradicted Gorbachev's vision on the future of the Arctic, in which environmental protection and economic interest would go hand in hand. In the AEPS, economic interest and environmental protection were standing in contrast to each other and the first was endangering the later. This document formed a new and, in Murmansk's point of view, deviating hierarchy. Environmental protection was at its top. Previous disasters and pollutions were finally addressed, and environmental issues could be

---

<sup>184</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 104.



handled in different ways. Oil pollution, heavy metals in the ground, radioactivity and acidification were issues that had their origins in tragedies of previous years and were addressed in the document.<sup>185</sup> Security issues, economic practices and scientific explorations were now adapted to address these changes in hierarchy and to those events. A whole chapter of the AEPS tackles the issue of Security,<sup>186</sup> and stands in relation to environmental hazards and emergencies similar in their nature to Chernobyl disaster or the *Exxon Valdez* oil spilling. Further, economic practices were seen as an issue that could threaten the environmental cooperation, especially commercial shipping or long-time economic projects.<sup>187</sup> From then onwards, scientific exploration was rather seen as part of the cooperation between states, such as assessing climate change and tackling pollution of the environment. It was especially vital to highlight the need of scientific skills to establish the *Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program* (AMAP) for the participation of Norway in the AEPS. Furthermore, the position of indigenous people shifted. They were no longer perceived as study subjects, as introduced by Gorbachev, but rather as partners in acquiring knowledge. All in all, they were given a more active status in the AEPS, as anticipated by the Finnish initiative and the *Murmansk Speech*. This shift was related to the active participation of Canada as a driving force.<sup>188</sup>

Besides Finland, two states were enacting the initiative of the AEPS: Sweden and Canada. While Sweden had the same problem of not being a coastal Arctic state, and not being perceived as an Arctic power by the US and SU, the interests of Canada were much more complicated and connected to its domestic policies and the general interest to craft a new image of the Canadian nation, in which the Arctic played a big part. In the beginning of the *Rovaniemi process* Canada did not show any initiative. Later, in the drafting process of the AEPS, Canada

---

<sup>185</sup> 'Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment' (Rovaniemi, Finland, 14 June 1991), 5, Arctic Portal Library, [http://library.arcticportal.org/1542/1/artic\\_environment.pdf](http://library.arcticportal.org/1542/1/artic_environment.pdf); 'Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment', 17.

<sup>186</sup> 'Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment', 35.

<sup>187</sup> 'Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment', 7; 'Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment', 38.

<sup>188</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 103.

proved that it could engage with the set image of an Arctic state being negotiated between the nation-states and the image of Murmansk. Canada engaged with that image to change its own national identity that was built on the historic relation between the Canadian North and South. Canada, being a settler colony, had a history of violence and inequality towards the indigenous communities that lived in the territory claimed by Canada. The assimilation of indigenous communities was connected to managing the Canadian North, the Arctic, and focusing on how it worked both subjects into one branch of the government.<sup>189</sup> Since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, indigenous people were forcefully assimilated into the Canadian nation-state. While this practice had its peak in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Canada changed its political stance in subsequent years leading to the legal abolishment of the forceful assimilation. From the mid 1980s until the late 1990s, Canada started to reconsider the social position of indigenous people in Canada and opened up to be a more socially inclusive society, bowing to domestic public pressure.<sup>190</sup> In 1985, Canada amended the Indian Act,<sup>191</sup> a turning point in the relation of the nation-state with the indigenous people living within its borders. This interest in reconciliation also brought Canada to lobby for indigenous people in the Arctic cooperation, as well as change its national interest and become the main supporter of indigenous rights.<sup>192</sup> The drafting of the AEPS was a process aimed towards accomplishing this goal and reshaping the relationship of Canada with its own Arctic image.

Canada, Finland and Sweden had a bigger impact on the drafting of the document, not only because of their interest, but also because they took the administrative responsibility to organize the group of nation-states. The three nations interested in changing the image introduced by the *Murmansk Speech* were the main driving forces in organizing the preparatory

---

<sup>189</sup> Government of Canada, 'History of Indigenous Peoples, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada and the Treaty Relationship', 6 May 2020, <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1338907166262/1338907208830>.

<sup>190</sup> Government of Canada, 'First Nations in Canada', 6 May 2020, <https://www.rcaanc-cirmac.gc.ca/eng/1307460755710/1536862806124#chp5>.

<sup>191</sup> The Indian Act is a legal document that defines the relation between the Government of Canada and the indigenous communities that live in its territory. A document that was historical based on a racist ideology, it is still in force with amendments that change its content gravely.

<sup>192</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 104.

meetings during which the content of the AEPS was crafted. These preparatory meetings were held in 1990 in Yellowknife, Canada and in 1991 in Kiruna, Sweden. What was most important, thereby, was the joint proposal created by those three nation-states that would impact the Arctic for a long time. Therefore, environmental meetings that were held regularly should be required and, besides the Arctic states, other nations and indigenous people could participate as observers.<sup>193</sup> The AEPS was created by states, but it has substantial content linking the proposed solutions with its cooperation with the indigenous people living in the Arctic: “[...] recognizing the special relationship of the indigenous peoples and local populations to the Arctic and their unique contribution to the protection of the Arctic Environment.”<sup>194</sup>

The AEPS, reflecting a new cooperation in the Arctic, was adopted by the *Arctic Eight* in June 1991. While the Arctic cooperation was still an image presented in Murmansk by Gorbachev, it now had its first impact on the Arctic as a social reality, created by states in an interactive process: a document that expresses the image whilst implementing a program and working groups that would be established.<sup>195</sup> The working groups that would be established were representing specific bodies defined in the AEPS with the goal of fighting environmental change through Arctic cooperation. These working groups were, besides the AMAP, the *Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna*, the *Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment* and the *Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response*. The offices were positioned within the nation-states, for example, the AMAP in Trømsø, Norway. Thus, the first intergovernmental cooperation in the Arctic was born, during which exchange of knowledge and resources played a major role. The Arctic cooperation included a new social component, which was created through its discourse over the interests of specific nation-states, namely Finland, with an Arctic environment in need of protection, as well as Canada, who wanted to establish a more inclusive

---

<sup>193</sup> Heikkilä, 104.

<sup>194</sup> ‘Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment’, 3.

<sup>195</sup> Evan T. Bloom, ‘Establishment of the Arctic Council’, *The American Journal of International Law* 93, no. 3 (1999): 719, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2555272>.

Arctic related to its past. Over two years, the 1991 AEPS signalled the beginning of a process that has had an impact through to today, whilst building on the image and vision of the Arctic cooperation.

Malgorzata Smieszek analysed that the AEPS was rather a declaration instead of a binding treaty because of the goal to show the political ambition for circumpolar collaboration between the *Arctic Eight*.<sup>196</sup> For Smieszek, the AEPS displays the beginning of an informal international regime, based on mutual cooperation instead of legally binding agreements or treaties.<sup>197</sup> While it did not include legally binding norms, it established common goals of states and impacted its environment and actors. In conclusion, Smieszek reflects on issues that are also addressed in the approach of *Imagery*: regulative practices that are constituted by the actors themselves. *Imagery* goes further by realizing that previously established social realities created by the actors, such as the AEPS, have to be engaged with. This idea is similar to Smieszek's understanding of informal practices that are not legally binding but have been historically developed and established as documents that nation-states orient themselves toward.

Overall, the AEPS kept the image of the *Murmansk Speech*, but modified its objectives. The greatest change can be found in the position of the indigenous community, related to the interest of Canada wanting to adjust its imagination of the Arctic with its domestic policies

### 3.3 Canadian Initiative, Indigenous Communities and the establishment of the Arctic Council

After the year 1991, when the AEPS was presented in Rovaniemi, Finland gradually slowed down its Arctic initiative. They concluded that Rovaniemi was “a good start for international

---

<sup>196</sup> Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council', 48.

<sup>197</sup> Smieszek, 83.

Arctic Cooperation.”<sup>198</sup> The operations of the AEPS continued, but the interest of states like Norway and Finland on contributing slowed down. Besides Finland, Norway was more invested in the Barents-European Arctic region and its negotiations with Russia.<sup>199</sup> Canada still kept working on the idea of establishing a more extensive body for Arctic cooperation, the Arctic Council.<sup>200</sup> Canada became the main force behind institutionalizing the Arctic cooperation into an intergovernmental body through its image of the domestic Canadian Arctic.<sup>201</sup> The Canadian image of the Arctic cooperation embodied a region where indigenous communities can act as partners in deciding over their future, while respecting the environmental protection.<sup>202</sup> This was related to domestic politics reshaping the relation between the Canadian Northern periphery and its Southern centres.<sup>203</sup> Gorbachev’s image of the Arctic cooperation was used to help Canada shape its own, new identity but also impacted the Arctic cooperation in return.

The *Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council* of 1996,<sup>204</sup> better known as the *Ottawa Declaration*, is the original document forming the Arctic Council. Canada deepened the already established image of the *Murmansk Speech*, and seemed to influence it with its own image to underline its commitment in domestic politics. In the process of drafting the *Ottawa Declaration*, it became clear that the hierarchy of issues established by the AEPS was not touched but rather reaffirmed under the aspect of an Arctic cooperation that incorporated more actors than the *Arctic Eight*. Already in the second paragraph of the *Ottawa Declaration*, this adaption of the Canadian influence on the image of Arctic cooperation becomes clear: “the well-being of the inhabitants of the Arctic, including recognition of the special relationship and unique contributions to the Arctic of indigenous people and their

---

<sup>198</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland’s Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 105.

<sup>199</sup> Keskitalo, ‘International Region-Building’, 197.

<sup>200</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland’s Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 105.

<sup>201</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 158.

<sup>202</sup> Smieszek, ‘Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council’, 48.

<sup>203</sup> Keskitalo, ‘International Region-Building’, 197.

<sup>204</sup> Arctic Council, ‘Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council’ (Ottawa, Canada, 19 September 1996), Declarations and SAO reports of the Arctic Council, Arctic Council, <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/85>.

communities.”<sup>205</sup> While it still represents the *Arctic Eight* as key actors, some of its content is dedicated to indigenous people and seen as a vital part for circumpolar cooperation, considering it ensures “full consultation with and the full involvement of indigenous people and their communities.”<sup>206</sup> This results in recognising three main indigenous transborder conferences.<sup>207</sup>

It seems crucial to acknowledge the structure of the Arctic cooperation that is defined by a hierarchy. This hierarchy is based on a tripartite layering: first, the *Arctic Eight* as members of the Arctic Council; second, the indigenous communities as permanent members; and on the lowest level, observers that include non-Arctic states or non-governmental organizations.<sup>208</sup> Considering that indigenous communities stand above the non-Arctic countries and NGO’s in this hierarchy, Canada’s goal seems reaffirmed: it wants to implement the Arctic Council in a way that benefits nation-state and prevents states outside the Arctic to gain too much power. This gave little space for negotiations between the states that wanted the AEPS to be institutionalized into an intergovernmental body, as well as the actors that wanted to open up the Arctic to external actors with no geographical relation. During these negotiations, indigenous communities made the effort to archive a position of power in the Arctic cooperation that is bound to the geography of the Arctic and not refined to a specific nation-state. The goal was to achieve independent political entities focused on their own heritage.<sup>209</sup>

Alongside the establishment of the Arctic Council, a general decolonization struggle of indigenous people took place.<sup>210</sup> This struggle led to an opposition between the Arctic Council and the previous AEPS in relation to economic interests and environmental protection. The involvement of indigenous people in the process of the Arctic Council created a new definition

---

<sup>205</sup> Arctic Council, 2.

<sup>206</sup> Arctic Council, 2.

<sup>207</sup> Those conferences are the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Saami Council and the Association of Indigenous Minorities of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation.

<sup>208</sup> Piotr Graczyk and Timo Koivurova, ‘A New Era in the Arctic Council’s External Relations? Broader Consequences of the Nuuk Observer Rules for Arctic Governance’, *Polar Record* 50, no. 3 (2014): 228, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247412000824>.

<sup>209</sup> English, ‘The Emergence of an Arctic Council’, 226.

<sup>210</sup> English, 224.

that, in the framework of Arctic cooperation, had not been applied before: sustainable development. The *Ottawa Declaration* did mention sustainable development, but it did not define it. Defining sustainable development was one of the first tasks of the Arctic Council during its constitution.<sup>211</sup> Foremost, the Arctic Council was expected to create a sustainable development program which links economic development and environmental protection in regard to inhabitants of the Arctic. This new reality of the Arctic was closer to the image that Gorbachev presented in the *Murmansk Speech*, considering that environmental protection and economic development did not stand in contrast but rather contributed to each other.

Canada was the driving force behind the *Ottawa Declaration*. Canada was interested in including indigenous communities as substantial actors for the Arctic cooperation. This was related to the constant confrontation between indigenous communities and the Canadian government, a struggle that was going on since the AEPS. The result of this process was a shift of Canada's relation towards indigenous communities living in Canada and, thus, its Arctic North and its national identity as an Arctic state. The domestic North-South relation of Canada was introduced into a new era. Previously, the hierarchical position of the Southern centres towards the Northern periphery was clear and manifested itself through a legal framework. This legal framework was now partly abolished through social justice reforms in Canada, and the country was confronted with a new identity based on accepting the self-rule of indigenous people. Its result was indigenous communities contesting the Southern centres in the pursuit of self-rule.<sup>212</sup> For Canada, the Arctic is about domestic policy and, at the same time, foreign policy.<sup>213</sup> Cutting the colonial ties between the South and the North changed the identity of Canada itself. This created a cascade within its domestic politics, changing the national perception of the North, resulting in a variation in foreign policy. While this process was already

---

<sup>211</sup> Arctic Council, 'Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council', 3.

<sup>212</sup> E. Carina Kesitalo, 'Setting the Agenda on the Arctic: Whose Policy Frames the Region?', *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 19, no. 1 (2012): 158.

<sup>213</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 36.

occurring in the AEPS, Canada tried to manifest its new identity in a more powerful body, drawing back to the process of reconciliation with the past and commitment to a new Canadian North. This commitment should be considered as the establishment of the Arctic Council under the perception of the Arctic cooperation by Canada.<sup>214</sup> This perception entailed that the Arctic Council was to be a place for environmental protection, where states—in cooperation with indigenous communities—built up a region of peace. For Canada, the *Murmansk Speech's* image of the North, and its resulting image of the Arctic as zone of peace, was seen as an opportunity to implement their own domestic interests and reshaping their own North-South relations.<sup>215</sup>

Until 1993, establishing an intergovernmental body in the Arctic seemed like a distant future. International incidents—like the end of the SU, the distrust of the US during this process, and the domestic political agenda of Canada exhausting its resources—had hindered Canada in the effort towards building up the foundation of the Arctic Council.<sup>216</sup> Only when the domestic politics of Canada started to change could Canada transform its national Arctic identity into a reality, thus contesting the *Murmansk Speech's* image with their involvement in establishing the Arctic Council. This discursive commitment was happening during the process of institutionalizing the Arctic cooperation into an intergovernmental body. Canadian politicians called for a circumpolar organization that went beyond the scope of the AEPS.<sup>217</sup> Thereby, they had two struggles to cover. First, they had to start asserting their commitment during the *Rovaniemi process* to include indigenous voices in the Arctic cooperation on the national level. Second, they had to contest the image of Arctic cooperation with the Canadian interest of including indigenous communities in the cooperation. As a result, Canada started to put resources into the process of contesting the image of an exclusive region for the *Arctic Eight*

---

<sup>214</sup> Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building', 197–98.

<sup>215</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 37.

<sup>216</sup> English, 'The Emergence of an Arctic Council', 218.

<sup>217</sup> English, 217.



with the Canadian perception of an inclusive North. This reshaped the position of indigenous people in the Arctic and contested the image of indigenous people as solely being subjects of states and not sovereign political actors that was depicted in the *Murmansk Speech*.

One of the resources invested by Canada was aimed at restructuring its government and channelling political expertise into Northern affairs. In 1993, the Canadian government established an ambassador for circumpolar affairs with the mandate to bring forward the wish to establish an Arctic Council.<sup>218</sup> The first minister holding this office was Mary Simon, a Canadian Inuit leader of the *Inuit Circumpolar Council* (ICC) that was active in the international movement for indigenous rights in the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>219</sup> This cannot be considered a coincidence, seeing that the indigenous communities' commitment to the *Rovaniemi process* was constantly rising during the ongoing process and their leaders participating in the negotiations were respected by the Arctic states. Especially, Canada relied on leaders of indigenous communities to contribute in the meetings while structuring the AEPS. Canada relied on the momentum of the AEPS and had trust in the influence of participating indigenous communities.<sup>220</sup> With the support of indigenous people living in Canada to contest the *Murmansk Speech's* image, an Arctic Council was developed with the aim to not just copy and institutionalize the AEPS, but also to generate a new forum where cooperating actors are partly states and partly the people living in the Arctic. With the presence of leaders of indigenous communities in several official bodies, like Mary Simon in the ICC, it was proven that the Arctic Council could be a body in which indigenous leaders had an impact.<sup>221</sup> The *Murmansk Speech's* objective to comprehend indigenous people as subject of knowledge-production was faced with perceiving politically active indigenous people as shaping the international relations by themselves.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>218</sup> English, 218.

<sup>219</sup> English, 214.

<sup>220</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 38.

<sup>221</sup> English, 'The Emergence of an Arctic Council', 226–27.

<sup>222</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 38–39.

A constant objector towards the establishment of the Arctic Council and to the efforts of Canada was the US. The US's perception of the Arctic as a place of national defence was one major hinderance against the image of Canada's institutionalization. Bill Clinton's presidency heavily criticized the creation of the Arctic Council as an intergovernmental body that could interfere with the national security or defence policy of the US.<sup>223</sup> The US would pursue its own interests by denying the creation of the Arctic Council as an international organization and by pushing forward the establishment of a council without legal personality.<sup>224</sup> Nevertheless, the US holds onto its perception of the Arctic as an important region where cooperation with the other Arctic nation-states is essential.<sup>225</sup> During the presidency of Bill Clinton the US preferred informal international cooperative structures.<sup>226</sup> One cannot deny that the US put effort into stabilizing the image of Arctic cooperation by the AEPS, even after all of its objections. Through founding and sharing its expertise on specific issues and putting political effort into the region, the US took a big step into Arctic cooperation.<sup>227</sup> Further, the US supported the environmental protection proposed by the AEPS, acting against other nations of the *Arctic Eight* and taking its aim seriously.<sup>228</sup> With US participation during the process of drafting the *Ottawa Declaration*, the emphasis was on how the structures given by the AEPS should be maintained in its four working groups. The US even dropped its objection of using the term sustainable development, which previously would have been seen as a term that could open the door to unforeseeable events.<sup>229</sup> This process enabled the *Ottawa Declaration* to mark a shift from environmental protection to sustainable development, now covering the economic as well as the environmental aspects of the Arctic. In the interplay of the Canadian imagination with the Arctic and the political work of indigenous leaders, the Arctic Council was reflecting

---

<sup>223</sup> English, 'The Emergence of an Arctic Council', 226; Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 41.

<sup>224</sup> Bloom, 'Establishment of the Arctic Council', 714.

<sup>225</sup> Heikkilä, *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*, 38.

<sup>226</sup> Bloom, 'Establishment of the Arctic Council', 722.

<sup>227</sup> Bloom, 721.

<sup>228</sup> Bloom, 719–20.

<sup>229</sup> Young, *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*, 63.

the *Murmansk Speech* and forced the previous interests of the AEPS into a subjugated position. While Gorbachev's imagination of a zone of peace in the shape of Arctic cooperation could not be performed completely, his objective of environmental protection and economic development could succeed. With international efforts of different groups of indigenous people in support of Canada, the harmful image of indigenous people could be abolished.

In the end, the Arctic Council was mostly reaffirming the structures of the AEPS. These structures were put in a rather streamlined proposal setting: the first practices of Arctic cooperation putting into place biannual meetings of the ministers of the *Arctic Eight* and the permanent participants. However, the Arctic Council also entailed a new direction: it was leading the Arctic cooperation into sustainable development. Following, the subsequent goals for institutionalizing the image implied defining the term of sustainable development and setting *Rules of Procedure*. This would take two years and happen under the first Chairmanship of the Arctic Council, hosted by Canada, resulting in the 1998 *Iqaluit Declaration*.

### 3.4 Putting the Images into Practice – Rules of Procedure

After setting in place the fundamentals of the Arctic Council, it was as of then an intergovernmental body hosting the individual objectives of Gorbachev's speech in the form of working groups. These groups followed their own norms and rules, which made it difficult to bundle their activities. From 1996 to 1998, the first chair of the Arctic Council, Canada, had set its goal to streamline these groups and create practices defining how the Arctic Council should conduct its work. The first two years of the Arctic Council were therefore crucial to translate the given image into practices. Canada's initiative and its position as first chair were essential for implementing a vision during the procedures that could still be applied in the work of the Arctic cooperation following. The main documents containing these norms and rules were

released in the 1998 *Iqaluit Declaration*. These rules were applied and kept up during the first decade of the existence of the Arctic cooperation embodied by the Arctic Council.

The *Ottawa Declaration* is a rather short document compared to what the *Iqaluit Declaration* entailed. The first two years of the new council enacted many documents that set the future of the Arctic Council. The Arctic cooperation became more and more efficient and bureaucratic. While the Arctic Council itself was not a legally binding body, the informal rules of the council influenced how Arctic cooperation is performed nowadays.<sup>230</sup> The substantive work of the Arctic Council is produced during regular meetings between *Senior Arctic Officials*, in which the procedures of the working groups are delegated and prepared so that they can be negotiated later in the biannual ministerial conferences drafting a multilateral declaration between the *Arctic Eight*. The rules of the Arctic Council set the *Arctic Eight* into a continuum of official meetings hosting state officials that represent their cooperation in the Arctic and establish work meetings where substantial work takes place.<sup>231</sup> This created a vicious circle of reproducing and advancing the pre-set image of Arctic cooperation with shrinking chance to contest it. If someone contested the image, it seldomly leaked to the outside of the meeting halls considering that only joint declarations were presented at the end of a ministerial meeting. Nation-states that previously tried to contest the image of Arctic cooperation were now in a tougher position in which establishing their own interests was more difficult. If they wanted to impact the image, it was often only possible by gaining the chairmanship through the rotating system that made each of the *Arctic Eight* eligible for it.<sup>232</sup> These chairmanships last for two years and are initiated by a process during which the nation-state reflects on its perception of what the Arctic cooperation should look like at the end of its period. The chairmanship became a crucial position to be able to influence the image of Arctic cooperation. Nowadays it is

---

<sup>230</sup> Arctic Council, 'Annex 1 - SAO Report to Ministers. Rules of Procedure', September 1998, 5, 02. Ministerial meeting in Barrow, USA, October 12 2000, <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1783>.

<sup>231</sup> Arctic Council, 4–5.

<sup>232</sup> Arctic Council, 4.

seldomly possible for single states to impact the agenda, but more and more nation-states impact the work of the Arctic Council through enforcing rules of the Arctic Council in their own interpretation.

Monica Tennberg reflected on the AEPS in connection with the later Arctic Council perceiving it as a consistent process of governmentality. Governmentality is thereby based on Foucault's understanding that identities and roles of actors are defined by regimes and the power structures within those.<sup>233</sup> Tennberg argues that the AEPS reaffirmed the rules and practices that created the possibility for nation-states to act as "acquiring roles and positions is an issue of institutionalizing the sites of discourse."<sup>234</sup> Especially with the idea of introducing the indigenous communities as permanent participants, and non-arctic states and NGOs as observers, the Arctic Council seems to be more of a reinstatement of the hierarchical higher positions of the nation-state. These positions are reaffirmed in practices of participation, which can be found in the *Rules of Procedure* in the Arctic Council. It regulates who is allowed to speak, wherefrom it can take place and what position objects in the discourse hold. In creating different categories of participation, the actors get limited in their ability to act by criteria that were established in the Arctic Council.<sup>235</sup> Therefore, there are restrictions in the access of specific actors, like indigenous communities and other non-state actors.<sup>236</sup> This is also true for Tennberg who questions the hold of sovereignty over the issues in the Arctic.<sup>237</sup> In this sense, *Imagency* contributes to this study as it elucidates practices and roles through finding a common actor, in this case the image. This thesis highlights the image nation-states have followed to establish the Arctic Council. With outlining the image, underlying practices that are based on restrictions towards different actors, like indigenous communities or nation-states, are revealed. The analysis of the *Murmansk Speech* thereby exposed that investigating who the participants

---

<sup>233</sup> Tennberg, *Arctic Environmental Cooperation*, 105.

<sup>234</sup> Tennberg, 105.

<sup>235</sup> Arctic Council, 'Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council', 2–3.

<sup>236</sup> Tennberg, *Arctic Environmental Cooperation*, 111.

<sup>237</sup> For further explanation of Tennberg's perspective on sovereignty, see Tennberg, 129.

are, which objects in the discourse have a higher priority and how the Arctic Council has established its sovereignty in the case of the Arctic Council is essential. *Imagery* provides explanations to abstract concepts that, similar to the approach of Tennberg, are looking at the actions of participants and their motivation, based on the interests to create their own national identity. This study fills a blind spot by providing knowledge on a link between the structure and the actors that move within.

The *Rules of Procedure* were a crucial step in determining who is part of the Arctic Council and what position participants hold. The Arctic cooperation established a hierarchy of practices that had to be followed by the nation-states, only allowing them to be recognized as an Arctic state in their respective national identity. A rejection of Arctic cooperation from within the Arctic Council itself was now almost impossible. The Arctic cooperation manifested itself as an intergovernmental body with working group offices that were located in different nation-states with its own set of norms and rules. Throughout the years, the image of the Arctic cooperation influenced the practices of nation-states. It took another ten years until this manifested image was contested again. Not from the inside of the Arctic Council, but through a new cooperation between the *Arctic Five*.<sup>238</sup>

### 3.5 The Circumpolar Arctic Cooperation Contested – Abolishment of an Image

For the first decade of the Arctic Council's existence it was considered rather as a science forum than a policy forum.<sup>239</sup> The image of Arctic cooperation had been commonly accepted as the status quo, with adjustments made by key actors that helped to uphold it.<sup>240</sup> The top issues were

---

<sup>238</sup> The *Arctic Five* are the states with a coast to the Arctic Ocean: Denmark with Greenland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the US. Iceland also possess a coast to the Arctic Ocean but is excluded.

<sup>239</sup> Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council', 50.

<sup>240</sup> Malgorzata Smieszek and Timo Koivurova, 'The Arctic Council: Between Continuity and Change', in *The Arctic Council and Circumpolar Governance*, ed. Paul Whitney Lackenbauer, Heather Nicol, and Wilfried Greavers (Ottawa, Waterloo: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2017), 2.

now sustainable development in cooperation with indigenous communities. However, this international image was contested: after ten years on the side-lines of global affairs, the Arctic re-appeared on the global agenda.<sup>241</sup> The *Ilulissat Declaration* was one of the major turning points in the Arctic as it pushed the limits of the Murmansk image through contesting it with different counter-images of Arctic cooperation. An alliance of Arctic states, that was rather known as the *Arctic Five*, turned the Arctic into a geopolitical stage that was able to create an image on their own, providing the basis of cooperation and stability in the Arctic region.

In 2004, the *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*, a mission by the Arctic council that was analysing the interplay of human development and environmental change,<sup>242</sup> spurred new global interest for the region. It predicted that the Arctic was a primal place for the impact of global warming and experienced its effects twice as fast as the rest of the world.<sup>243</sup> This prediction generated public attention, both with positive and negative effects. Environmental change was now presumed to be immanent and nation-states felt the urgency to react. This also drew the interest of actors that were previously only sporadically engaged in the Arctic. The rising attention was also based on the assumption that environmental change could implicate economic opportunities. The melting ice, resulting from global warming, spurred the imagination of new commercial sea travel, tourism and exploitation of natural resources in a not so distant future.<sup>244</sup>

One event that became infamous is symbolic for this development. In the year 2007 a Russian submarine with the name *Arktika* planted a Russian flag in the seabed under the North pole.<sup>245</sup> This action, known as the *Arktika Incident*, had its consequences during the

---

<sup>241</sup> Smieszek and Koivurova, 1–2.

<sup>242</sup> Jim Berner et al., eds., *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment* (Cambridge ; New York, N.Y: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

<sup>243</sup> Susan Joy Hassol, *Impacts of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment* (Cambridge, UK ; New York, N.Y: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 8; Smieszek, 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council', 50.

<sup>244</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy', 20.

<sup>245</sup> BBC News, 'Russia Plants Flag under N Pole', *BBC News*, 2 August 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6927395.stm>.

implementation of the *Ilulissat Declaration* one year later,<sup>246</sup> a document that challenged the position of the Arctic Council. The Arctic cooperation was now contested by different power politics, resource allocation and environmental change. All of these were drawing back to the identity politics of Russia constructing an identity as a leading nation of the world, as well as Denmark's initiative to define new principles in the Arctic region that reassured its position as an Arctic power.

### 3.6 Russia's North as Gate to Old Glory

Russia saw its North as a region able to regain power within itself after the turmoil of the dissolution of the SU. Russia needed to show a unique position that distinguished it from other nations and that provided a hierarchical dominant position. In the mid-2000s, this new image was highlighted by politics focusing on new capacities and revealing Russia as an “energy superpower”<sup>247</sup> while aiming at reviving its status of being a great power with military might.<sup>248</sup> These politics were carried out mostly in the Arctic and Sub-Arctic parts of Russia, where Russia saw its status threatened by a contestation of the Euro-Atlantic community, mostly other members of the Arctic Council.<sup>249</sup> In these years, Russia perceived the Arctic as a crucial part for shaping its image through contesting territorial claims.<sup>250</sup> The *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea* (UNCLOS),<sup>251</sup> an international treaty that regulates the territorial claims between Arctic states claiming the Arctic Ocean ratified by Russia in 1997, was used as a vehicle to raise these claims in the Arctic themselves.

---

<sup>246</sup> ‘The Ilulissat Declaration’, *International Legal Materials* 48, no. 2 (2009): 382–83.

<sup>247</sup> Energy superpower refers to Russia's access to valuable natural resources in the Arctic that other nation-states are dependent upon.

<sup>248</sup> Ekaterina Klimenko, ‘Russia's Arctic Aspirations’, *Russia's Arctic Security Policy* (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2016), 5, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/resrep19179.7](http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep19179.7).

<sup>249</sup> Klimenko, 5.

<sup>250</sup> Geir Hønneland, *Russia and the Arctic : Environment, Identity and Foreign Policy* (London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Company, Limited, 2020), 155–56, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=6120968>.

<sup>251</sup> Un.org, ‘United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982’ (United Nations, Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, 12 October 1982).



Shaping the image of Russia as an Arctic power peaked with the *Arktika polar expedition* in 2007. The Russian polar researcher and member of the Russian parliament Artur Chilingarov planted, with the help of a U-boat, a Russian flag on the seabed beneath the North Pole.<sup>252</sup> Chilingarov's exploration was supposed to gather scientific information to support a shell extension claim, filed in 2001 by Russia, before the *Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf* (CLCS).<sup>253</sup> If Russia was to succeed with its claim, it would gain the Lomonosov and Mendeleev ridges adding to its continental Siberian shelf, increasing it to of 1.2 million square kilometres in the Arctic Ocean.<sup>254</sup> Russia was perceived to act against the goals of sustainable development and the rules set in place by the Arctic Council. This was due to the general attention on global warming in the Arctic and more so because of the discovery made by the *United States Geological Survey* in 2008 that massive oil and gas reserves, an estimated 30 percent of all undiscovered reserves worldwide, were stored in the Arctic.<sup>255</sup> The coincidence of these issues made it seem that Russia was expanding its Arctic territory with the interest on natural resources in this region. This behaviour of Russia was at odds with the previous set Arctic cooperation.

The status quo held by the previous image of Arctic cooperation turned the other Arctic states and non-state actor's attention to this presumable treason of Arctic cooperation and initiated them to defend it or, in the case of the *Ilulissat Declaration*, to change the Arctic cooperation pleasing their own perception.

### 3.7 The Danish Initiative – Challenging the Arctic Eight

Denmark saw the international reaction over the Russian issue as an opportunity to reform the image of the Arctic cooperation while upholding its own ambitions. The Russian ambition

---

<sup>252</sup> Klimenko, 'Russia's Arctic Aspirations', 5.

<sup>253</sup> The CLCS is a body of the UNCLOS that reviews the claims made by the states under the UNCLOS.

<sup>254</sup> Klimenko, 'Russia's Arctic Aspirations', 11.

<sup>255</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy', 20.

should be challenged with the image of Arctic cooperation of Murmansk with Denmark taking the role of a guiding spirit.<sup>256</sup> For Denmark, this defence of the *Murmansk Speech* image adjusted the Arctic cooperation to a new principle governing the Arctic. This new principle should be a specific forum negotiating crucial problems, e.g. the struggles over the Arctic Ocean, between multiple nation-states. Denmark wanted to uphold the status quo in addition to acknowledging Arctic coastal states as main driving forces for peace in the region.<sup>257</sup> This initiative set up by Denmark was the result of its own perception of how the Arctic states should handle conflicts in regard to the Arctic Ocean: it should be a matter only concerning the coastal states using international law.<sup>258</sup> In addition, it reflects on the relation of the Northern periphery gaining power in the discursive struggle of the images in Arctic politics against its Southern centres. Denmark still wanted to uphold the regional order in the Arctic, while maintaining a positive relation towards Greenland considering it was dependant on its support to even be considered as an Arctic state.<sup>259</sup> What Denmark did not anticipate was, that instead of reaffirming the *Murmansk Speech*, it generated a direct contest to the image of Arctic cooperation when enacting the *Ilulissat Declaration*.

To understand Denmark's commitment in contesting the image of Arctic cooperation, this paper has to look at the position of Denmark during the negotiations. Denmark was concurring with Norway over becoming the driving force solving the *Arktika incident*. During the *Arktika incident*, Norway was holding the chair of the Arctic Council and would have normally been the head during negotiations. However, both parties had the objective to prove a functioning order and initiated separate initiatives.<sup>260</sup> Denmark saw the *Arctic Five* more fit than the Arctic Council to discuss the matter. In the concept of Denmark, a high-level meeting

---

<sup>256</sup> Jon Rahbek-Clemmensen and Gry Thomasen, 'Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08', Learning from the Ilulissat Initiative (Centre for Military Studies, 2018), 18, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17010.9](http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17010.9).

<sup>257</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 16.

<sup>258</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy', 22–23; Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 'Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08', 19.

<sup>259</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 'Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08', 17.

<sup>260</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 16.

would be a faster responding body than the Arctic Council and more in the sense of the Arctic cooperation. This was the result from experiences of coastal states working together before and producing joint treaties like the *Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears*.<sup>261</sup> Also, it appeared logical for the Danish government to discuss issues of continental Arctic shelves between the states that had the local sovereignty. This approach was stripping specific nation-states of their status as Arctic states only acquired under discursive struggles 20 years ago, namely Sweden and Finland. In the end, the Ilulissat format provided three advantageous positions for pursuing leadership during negotiations to Denmark: first, they could circumvent Norway and its modus operandi, the Arctic Council. Second, this would implicate that all non-state Actors of the Arctic Council were now excluded from the negotiations which made it easier to manoeuvre for Denmark. Lastly, Denmark could rearrange the hierarchy of key actors in the Arctic by positioning itself between Russia and the US and excluding other Arctic states like Finland, Sweden and, under vocal criticism, Iceland.<sup>262</sup>

This leadership would give Denmark the opportunity to contest the image of Arctic cooperation to its advantage. Denmark's diplomats moved quickly ahead as it became clear that the Norwegian initiative could impair the Danish one, and together with the *Home Rule government of Greenland* drafted a joint invitation. After some hesitation by the other coastal states, the nation-states realized that the meeting in Ilulissat would strengthen their own position as key actors of Arctic cooperation. It also provided a platform to those states to solve the issues between themselves in accordance to international law.<sup>263</sup> It first seemed that this proposal would foster the Murmansk image. Especially considering that Greenland was involved in the invitation process and was hosting the meeting, it seemed that also indigenous people and their anatomy was respected. However, the image that the *Ilulissat Declaration* generated was critical towards the Arctic Council and, in conclusion, the Arctic cooperation.

---

<sup>261</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy', 19.

<sup>262</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 'Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08', 16.

<sup>263</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 16-17.

While Norway was participating in the meeting of Ilulissat, it still had to hold the chairmanship of the Arctic Council and act as bridge between the interests of the *Arctic Five* and the left out Arctic states with their support of non-state actors, and essentially the people living in the Arctic. Especially Iceland, a state with an open coast towards the Arctic Ocean, dealt out harsh criticism in regard to the practice of the Ilulissat meeting. Iceland advocated that the case should be addressed in the Arctic Council, being the forum of negotiation, considering that the selection process of the *Ilulissat Declaration* was excluding not only states, but also the transboundary associations of indigenous people.<sup>264</sup> The permanent participants also followed with a harsh critique on being left out of the process, having in mind that the subject negotiated is essential to their way of living. Ilulissat casted an image that was invested in the process of separation as states were tending to follow their economic and security interests instead of finding a solution fit for all participants.<sup>265</sup> Denmark wanted to create a new image, as well as changing the Arctic cooperation, and was criticized on factors in opposition to the initial image of Murmansk: the key was cooperative development and the interest of single states was not in focus, but rather the Arctic between them.

While the *Arctic Five* perceived Ilulissat as a fruitful meeting,<sup>266</sup> it should not be considered as part of the Arctic cooperation but rather a contestant. Denmark could not enforce its interest outside of the Ilulissat meeting and was criticized for its practices. Nevertheless, it also implied an important movement inside the Arctic: the process of imposing sovereignty of territories over Arctic cooperation, a goal that the *Arctic Five* aim achieving with drafting specific legislation. Such legislation can be found in the matters of “search and rescue [...] around the Arctic Ocean” that implies an urgency to protect people in the Arctic.<sup>267</sup> The *Arctic Five* filled in this crucial position when defining themselves as “stewards” of the Arctic Ocean

---

<sup>264</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 19.

<sup>265</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, ‘Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy’, 23–24.

<sup>266</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, ‘Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08’, 18.

<sup>267</sup> ‘The Ilulissat Declaration’, 1.

within the *Ilulissat Declaration*.<sup>268</sup> This identity was important to implement interests of the *Arctic Five* during the drafting process of the Arctic Council's first binding agreement.

### 3.8 Stewards of the Arctic Ocean

The *Agreement on Cooperation on Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue in the Arctic* (ASRA) from 2011 emphasized the responsibility of states within their own territory.<sup>269</sup> The *Arctic Eight* signed an agreement and made it the first binding treaty by the Arctic Council. In particular, the *Arctic Five* took a leading role in drafting the ASRA as the treaty was framed as an Arctic Ocean issue, and Denmark took the chairmanship of the Arctic Council during the process.<sup>270</sup> The identity of nation-states bound to the coast of the Arctic Ocean became more important in this time of Arctic cooperation. Its image now faced the struggle on which interests could prevail: rather a zone of peace introduced by Gorbachev or the sovereign interests of the *Arctic Five*.

The main ambition of the Danish chair was to prepare the Arctic Council for the future challenges of climate change. This responds to Denmark's self-image in the Arctic: to be a champion in reducing the impacts of climate change.<sup>271</sup> Denmark positioned itself in its chairmanship program with the aspect, that the *Ilulissat Declaration* would support cooperation and help to tackle future challenges.<sup>272</sup> This involved a framework able to respond to emergencies caused by the challenges resulting from higher human activity in the region. Fulfilling the ASRA is a main objective of the Danish chair, who wants to implement it on the foundation of already existing international law treaties.<sup>273</sup>

---

<sup>268</sup> 'The Ilulissat Declaration', 1.

<sup>269</sup> Arctic Council, 'The Agreement On Cooperation on Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue in the Arctic' (Nuuk, Greenland, 5 December 2011), Arctic Council, <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/531>.

<sup>270</sup> Danish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council, 'The Danish Chairmanship Programme' (Tromsø, Norway, 29 April 2009), 6, 06. Ministerial Meeting in Tromsø, Norway. April 29 2009., <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1565>.

<sup>271</sup> Rahbek-Clemmensen and Thomasen, 'Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08', 17.

<sup>272</sup> Danish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council, 'The Danish Chairmanship Programme', 6.

<sup>273</sup> Danish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council, 7.

At first glance, this seems like a reasonable decision. The mid-2000s showed that the Arctic is a place where climate change will have a grave impact. Further, human activity in the region is not to deny, and having in mind the rich resources of the Arctic, it can be expected to grow.<sup>274</sup> The use of international law treaties already signed by the *Arctic Eight* also seem like a positive ambition, as it reduces time for negotiations and drafting processes. As a result, one essential treaty for the Arctic coastal states will be taken as legal basis for sovereignty claims in the Arctic: the UNCLOS. The UNCLOS, as basis of the ASRA, offers a platform where Arctic coastal states are seen as stakeholders, considering that it is written as a document that concerns mostly coastal states. Further, the UNCLOS would only address nation-states and would support the territory claims made by nation-states. The ASRA therefore implied the same procedures as the *Ilulissat Declaration*: circumventing the international Arctic cooperation through international law that supported the positions of the coastal states.

In 2011, when the chairmanship of Denmark ended and the ASRA was published, it took place as predicted. The ASRA was based on the legal definitions of different international treaties, inter alia, the UNCLOS. After naming the parties of the treaty, it first aims at “taking into account the relevant provisions of the 1982 United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea.”<sup>275</sup> The legal treaties clarify the positions of sovereignty over different parts in the Arctic, while the treaty itself holds detailed information: an annex lists delimitations of the agreement, implying responsibilities of states to exercise their state power for search and rescue operations.<sup>276</sup>

Under the impression of helping the Arctic Council facing challenges of the future, Denmark used its chairmanship position and relations towards the *Arctic Five* to draft a document that reinforces the interests decided upon by the states in Ilulissat opposing the initial

---

<sup>274</sup> Scott Borgerson, ‘The Coming Arctic Boom: As the Ice Melts, the Region Heats Up’, *Foreign Affairs* 92, no. 4 (2013): 80.

<sup>275</sup> Arctic Council, ‘The Agreement On Cooperation on Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue in the Arctic’, 3.

<sup>276</sup> Arctic Council, 11–16.

image of Arctic cooperation, the Arctic Council. Embedded in the Arctic Council, the interest of sovereignty is now put in connection to Arctic cooperation to defend the Arctic itself. Denmark managed to reduce conflict in the Arctic region through cooperation. However, this cooperation was not based on the image of Murmansk, which perceived the Arctic as a zone of peace with different stakeholders, but as an image where the Arctic Ocean and the sovereign territories of states are the highest priority. The image of Arctic cooperation could no longer uphold the objectives set by Murmansk. Even more so, the objectives of the *Murmansk Speech* tackling environmental protection and sustainable development were used to create a framework helping the interests of specific nation-states. Reaffirming their images of the Arctic, these nation-states successfully contested the Arctic cooperation.

The scholars Marc Jacobsen and Jeppe Strandsbjerg have analysed this shift towards a sovereignty-based perspective that is supported by the use of international law as a pre-emptive move to stop the militarization of the Arctic. This analysis is possible by applying the *securitization theory* in which the understanding of threats is a discursive statement that turns security into a language-game through speech acts.<sup>277</sup> The initiative of Denmark is based on the hardening rhetoric of the Arctic, drawing back to the flag planting of Russia in 2007. The *Ilulissat Declaration* is seen as a document that de-escalates and stops the militarization of the Arctic.<sup>278</sup> It shifts the focus from the initial idea, that the Arctic is involved in an arms race for resources, into a political discourse that is based on the UNCLOS and continental shelves. All claims expressed by states are regulated by this document of international law as well as the geoscientific analysis of the continental shelves of states. They argue that the Arctic has to be addressed with jurisdictional and not military claims. Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg also acknowledge new problems, as the shift away from security only changes how a problem is dealt with. This generates new problems considering that sovereignty over the Arctic Ocean is

---

<sup>277</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy', 17.

<sup>278</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 21.

a subject contesting the rights of indigenous communities in the Arctic.<sup>279</sup> The realist Scott G. Borgerson especially sees a threat of Arctic security in the resource richness of the Arctic and the rising activity of Russia.<sup>280</sup> Against his first predictions of a possible conflict, he reflects on the *Ilulissat Declaration* as being a positive outcome of cooperation in the Arctic that made use of international law.<sup>281</sup> Both approaches consider the *Ilulissat Declaration* as a part of the Arctic cooperation and not a shift away from it. This perspective comes from their designation of key actors. For Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, the *Arctic Five* are the major actors during the *Arktika incident*. The same is valid for Borgerson, who sees the Arctic coastal states as relevant actors. Both approaches, constructivist and realist, are ignoring pre-set characteristics of times when the *Arctic Eight* were seen as major contributors for cooperation. Only when acknowledging the historical development of the designation of actors in the Arctic, the full scope of the *Ilulissat Declaration* can be understood. Analysing the *Ilulissat Declaration* with the lens of the *Murmansk Speech*'s image has therefore revealed underlying practices: a shift of the Arctic cooperation away from the *Arctic Eight* to the *Arctic Five* as key players.

### 3.9 Abolishing the Arctic Cooperation?

With the *Arctic Five* redefining the image of Arctic cooperation, it seemed obvious that the image of the *Murmansk Speech* as a *region-builder* lost some of its impact in the region and, it could be argued, that it is at present deteriorating. Currently it seems that the image is predominantly contested, and this can be observed through the media output in the years after *Ilulissat*. A growing number of articles on the conflict in the Arctic were written,<sup>282</sup> and nation-states took hold of an ideology to expand their own territories in the Arctic. A peak in these

---

<sup>279</sup> Jacobsen and Strandsbjerg, 25.

<sup>280</sup> Borgerson, 'Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming', 63.

<sup>281</sup> Borgerson, 'The Coming Arctic Boom: As the Ice Melts, the Region Heats Up', 79.

<sup>282</sup> Sebastian Knecht, 'Die Mär Vom Kalten Krieg: Wie Geopolitische Paradigmen in Den Internationalen Beziehungen Im Arktisraum (Re)Produziert Werden', *Sicherheit Und Frieden (S+F) / Security and Peace* 33, no. 3 (2015): 122.



new kinds of politics was reached with the request of the US to buy Greenland from Denmark.<sup>283</sup> Following this development in 2019, the biannual ministerial meeting of the Arctic Council was held in Rovaniemi. This ministerial meeting has generated much public attention for one specific reason: it was the first ministerial meeting of the Arctic Council to not create a joint declaration.<sup>284</sup> With starting Arctic cooperation in Rovaniemi, it seemed possible that the exact same place could also put an end to the image's role as a *region-builder*.

The overall image of the Arctic as a place of cooperation, with objectives to stop the environmental change and to promote sustainable development, has not changed significantly since the 2010s. However, the position of one of the *Arctic Eight* did change drastically in the mid-2010s. The US foreign policy under the Trump administration has turned its focus away from climate change.<sup>285</sup> In some regard, one could imagine that representatives of the US even look forward to it.<sup>286</sup> Further, the foreign policy under the Trump administration is instead confronting rising powers such as China, the EU and Russia. While Russia was already a member of the *Arctic Eight* previously, and the EU is still pending as an observer, China started to engage in a more aggressive arctic policy.<sup>287</sup>

---

<sup>283</sup> Peter Baker and Maggie Haberman, 'Trump's Interest in Buying Greenland Seemed Like a Joke. Then It Got Ugly.', *The New York Times*, 21 August 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/21/us/politics/trump-greenland-prime-minister.html>.

<sup>284</sup> Martin Breum, 'For the First Time Ever, an Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting Has Ended without a Joint Declaration', *Arctic Today*, 7 May 2019, <https://www.arctictoday.com/for-the-first-time-ever-an-arctic-council-ministerial-meeting-has-ended-without-a-joint-declaration/>.

<sup>285</sup> For previous engagements of the US Government and climate change in the Arctic see: United States Chairmanship 1998-2000, 'Memo on U.S. Chairmanship Priorities, 1998-2000' (Arctic Council, 30 November 1998), 2, 1.2 USA Chairmanship I (Sep 1998 - Oct 2000), <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1890>; United States Chairmanship 2015-2017, 'Proposed U.S. Arctic Council Chairmanship Program 2015-2017. February 2015. "One Arctic: Shared Opportunities, Challenges, and Responsibilities".' (Arctic Council, March 2015), 35, <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1433>; United States Department of State, 'U.S. Chairmanship of the Arctic Council Midterm Update' (Arctic Council, March 2016), 1, 2.2 USA Chairmanship II (April 2015 - 2017), <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/2043>.

<sup>286</sup> Michael R. Pompeo, 'Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus' (U.S. Department of State, 6 May 2019), <https://www.state.gov/looking-north-sharpening-americas-arctic-focus/>.

<sup>287</sup> The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, 'China's Arctic Policy' (The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, 26 January 2018), [http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white\\_paper/2018/01/26/content\\_281476026660336.htm](http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white_paper/2018/01/26/content_281476026660336.htm).

Currently, China holds an observer status in the Arctic Council.<sup>288</sup> For the US, this generates a threat to its security, as Secretary of State Michael Pompeo acknowledged.<sup>289</sup> The Arctic cooperation is now rather focused on the economic developments of enterprises where the states have to work together to keep non-arctic states from profiting. The rhetoric of China, of being a near-Arctic state,<sup>290</sup> generated an urgency to react for the US as it could implicate a loss of commercial opportunities in the Arctic. While the discussion on the purchase of Greenland was rather considered as a joke,<sup>291</sup> it was significantly meaningful to how the US imagined the Arctic and its position in this image of Arctic cooperation. The Thule Air Base in Greenland is the US's northmost base and has a strategic position for national security.<sup>292</sup> China started to develop foreign relations with Greenland through commercial enterprises, which threatened the identity of the US as the sole superpower in the region. The foreign relations of China with Greenland were halted by the Danish government,<sup>293</sup> but with relations deteriorating between the NATO allies in the Arctic, the image of Arctic cooperation was already about to be threatened.<sup>294</sup> The threat of purchasing Greenland was therefore a sign that the US no longer believed in cooperation between Arctic states and the image created during the *Murmansk Speech*.

Previous to the 2019 *Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Rovaniemi*, one could already foresee the limits of the *Murmansk Speech*. One had to realise that there was a possibility of not having a joint declaration after the meeting, even considering the efforts by

---

<sup>288</sup> Arctic Council, 'Observers', 11 June 2020, <https://arctic-council.org/en/about/observers/>.

<sup>289</sup> Pompeo, 'Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus'.

<sup>290</sup> The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, 'China's Arctic Policy'.

<sup>291</sup> Baker and Haberman, 'Trump's Interest in Buying Greenland Seemed Like a Joke. Then It Got Ugly.'

<sup>292</sup> The *Balistic Missile Early Warning System* installed at Thule was and is protecting the US from intercontinental ballistic missiles, a threat that is seen coming from Russia.

<sup>293</sup> Jacob Gronholt-Pedersen, 'China Withdraws Bid for Greenland Airport Projects: Sermitsiaq Newspaper', *Reuters*, 4 June 2019, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-silkroad-greenland/china-withdraws-bid-for-greenland-airport-projects-sermitsiaq-newspaper-idUSKCN1T5191>.

<sup>294</sup> Rick Noack, John Wagner, and Felicia Sonmez, 'Trump Calls Denmark Leader's Comments "Nasty"', *The Washington Post*, 21 August 2019, Gale OneFile: News, <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A597061535/STND?u=utrecht&sid=STND&xid=6b542965>.

the Finnish delegation holding the chair at that moment.<sup>295</sup> The US argued to exclude every mention of climate change in the joint declaration.<sup>296</sup> A statement that the other *Arctic Eight* were not willing to support, as the Arctic Council was initially created with the aim to protect the environment. Further, in his speech at the meeting in Rovaniemi, Michael Pompeo targeted China and presented it as one of the greatest dangers to the Arctic and its people. Further, Russia was criticized for its destabilizing activities in the Arctic.<sup>297</sup> The speech of Pompeo did not mention climate change, but still portrayed the US as at the forefront of combating environmental change. The new interests of the US were breaking away from the previously set image of Arctic cooperation and diverged to such an extent that it was no longer possible to have a joint declaration in the end. To show a sign of cooperation, a joint ministerial statement was signed by all of the *Arctic Eight*. This document has a less formal significance but is nevertheless seen as a sign of goodwill by the Arctic states in working together.

The new interests of the US subverted the initial image of Arctic cooperation. The Murmansk image could no longer force the US to sign the joint declaration nor to prevent its aggressive speech against other members of the Arctic Council. The Arctic Council succumbed to the US interests. The end of the ministerial meeting can be seen as a new low for the *region-building* capacities of the Arctic cooperation, but it could also be interpreted as its own abolishment. The Arctic slowly translates into a region where the image of Arctic cooperation, the spirit of Murmansk, fades away and gives space to new images that perceive a new vision of the Arctic.

---

<sup>295</sup> Breum, 'For the First Time Ever, an Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting Has Ended without a Joint Declaration'.

<sup>296</sup> Breum.

<sup>297</sup> Pompeo, 'Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus'.

## Conclusion – The Arctic Cooperation and its Future

The *Murmansk Speech* created an image of Arctic cooperation located in a region of looming conflict and strategic thinking in the 1980s. The image succeeded in this hostile environment between two superpowers for two reasons. The policy change in the domestic politics of the SU brought forward by Gorbachev, namely the *perestroika* and *glasnost*, translated into a new thinking of foreign policy and changed the dynamics of the Arctic region. The SU was moving towards the US and expressed a new way of thinking based on humanist socialism, deeming humanist values a priority. This new identity of the SU implicated that interdependence towards other nation-states could provide security for the nation. Deterrence politics of the Cold War were to be exchanged with a security net of cooperation, which meant demilitarizing the Arctic, a region relevant for both superpowers, keeping in mind that it was the closest link between them. Although not everyone was convinced by the good intentions of the SU in cooperating, a new global struggle was on the rise while the Cold War was slowly coming to a close. Environmental protection started to gain traction in the Arctic region as the environmental pollution in the Arctic was severe in the 1980s. Further, new scientific findings realized that climate change was having a harsher impact on the Arctic than anywhere else on the planet, which in result would cause great trouble all over the world due to the importance of the Arctic environment for the world's ecology. This global threat gave the nation-states a reason to cooperate for the protection of the Arctic in their own interest. For the first time, a “zone of peace”<sup>298</sup> was a possibility in the glance of these global developments as Gorbachev gave a solution for the future in his *Murmansk Speech*. The objectives of the *Murmansk Speech* were convincing because of the two circumstances explained above, as well as because an image of cooperation was created in the hostile environment of international relations in the Arctic that showed a solution.

---

<sup>298</sup> Gorbachev, *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987*, 4.

After Gorbachev's speech in 1987, the image of the *Murmansk Speech* was still impacting the region. Nation-states had to interact with the image because the *Murmansk Speech* was recognized by specific nation-states and resulted in different practices that states engaged in. Those practices were based on the image of the Arctic as a zone of peace. The image now had an agency of its own, as states oriented themselves at it and had to calculate their own interests regarding it. The image of the Arctic cooperation was contributing as an actor and created intergovernmental bodies, such as the Arctic Council, and official documents, such as the AEPS and the ASRA. The *Murmansk Speech* was accepted as the general perception of the Arctic and many states tried to contest or collaborate with it in order to be able to change or support their own Arctic identity. The Arctic cooperation was shaping the region through its confrontation with different initiatives by Arctic nation-states that were interacting with the image and shaped besides their national identities also the relations among those states.

While International Relations scholars touched upon the phenomena of cooperation and conflict in the Arctic, they often let slide the implications and power that images contribute to the practices of states in specific regions. The scholarship of International Relations on the Arctic lacked the tools to understand these images. On the one side, when liberalist theorists looked into the Arctic to research how specific bodies like the Arctic Council have been established,<sup>299</sup> they often ignored how these constitutional processes had supported power relations that allowed them to occur in the first place. On the other side, the realist perspective emphasized power relations but neglected that states have specific images they follow and that they are bound to those images in forming their respective identities and creating space to maneuver within the Arctic.<sup>300</sup> Furthermore, post-positivist scholars studying the Arctic have

---

<sup>299</sup> Young, *International Governance*.

<sup>300</sup> For a better understanding on the problematic of power in the Arctic, see Robert Huebert, 'Polar Vision or Tunnel Vision the Making of Canadian Arctic Waters Policy', *Marine Policy* 19, no. 4 (July 1995): 343–63, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-597X\(95\)00011-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-597X(95)00011-T); Huebert, 'A Northern Foreign Policy: The Politics of Ad Hocery'; Griffiths, Lackenbauer, and Huebert, *Canada and the Changing Arctic: Sovereignty, Security, and Stewardship*.

downplayed the relevance of images. While they might look at ideas and actors and analyse how they are co-constituting the Arctic region as a social reality, they neglect a step in-between.<sup>301</sup> This step is the image, which is necessary to give actors meaning in the creation process of their ideas and interests that form their identity.

This thesis showed that it is crucial to understand how images underline the practices of nation-states to find out why they conduct cooperation in the Arctic. It gave reason to question why images were not seen as actors before and why they were given no agency. Especially in the case of the Arctic after the Cold War, images contributed vastly to the new Arctic cooperation. Further, this thesis wanted to showcase how international relations have been constituted based on the perceptions of nation-states in relation to their own identity, images of themselves and *Others* since the end of the Cold War. The interaction with the image created during the *Murmansk Speech* funded a region that is nowadays mostly known for its cooperation. The approach of *Imagery* showed the interplay of the image and the nation-states through the *Othering process*. This interplay of nation-states and an image they created gave agency to it. While recognizing this image, one has to acknowledge that practices are bound to it, in the sense that they express what can be seen as doable and non-doable. One of these images that restricts practices of nation-states is known as the Arctic cooperation.

The research on images, their interaction with nation-states and their power in constituting the Arctic region has not reached its end. Future research has to analyze on what role images play in the interests of non-arctic states and their rising participation in the Arctic Council since the 2010s. Examples of these states, that were historically and politically

---

<sup>301</sup> See Neumann, 'A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe'; Hønneland, 'Identity Formation in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region'; Keskitalo, 'International Region-Building'.

connected to the Arctic, are the United Kingdom,<sup>302</sup> the Netherlands<sup>303</sup> and Germany,<sup>304</sup> all of whom now show a new interest in the Arctic region. Especially the interest of states connected by scientific exploration, climate change and economic opportunities have to be put under scrutiny. Further, an analysis of their relation towards the history of images of the Arctic and how those relate to the image of the *Murmansk Speech* have to be carried out. Also, the Arctic is considered interesting for International Relations addressing European integration, as for several years the European Union tried vehemently to join the Arctic Council without succeeding. The interests of the European Union in engaging with the image of the Arctic cooperation has to be investigated and its reasons for wanting to participate even if its member states—Denmark, Finland and Sweden—are already major contributors to the Arctic Council. Another issue that needs critical observation, also because of its potential in contesting the image of the *Murmansk Speech*, is the acting of the People’s Republic of China and its ways of changing the image of the observer states in the Arctic Council. With its newly crafted identity as a “near Arctic state”, stated as such in a policy paper of 2018,<sup>305</sup> the interests of the Chinese Government have started to contest previously set images of the Arctic. In addition, the rising interest of cooperation between the Home Rule Government of Greenland and the People’s Republic of China and the interference of Denmark has to be looked into in order to understand a new, post-colonial image of Arctic cooperation.

The theoretical goal of this research was to shift the focus on the question of conflict or cooperation in the Arctic towards a more critical framework that connects the history of images and their power to the region itself. Cooperation in the Arctic should thereby not be seen as something that was deployed by a few powerful statespersons, but rather as an image states

---

<sup>302</sup> Dick Zandee, Kimberley Kruijver, and Adája Stoetman, ‘Arctic Actors’, *The Future of Arctic Security* (Clingendael Institute, 2020), 37, JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/resrep24676.6>.

<sup>303</sup> Dick Zandee, Kimberley Kruijver, and Adája Stoetman, ‘The Netherlands and Arctic Security’, *The Future of Arctic Security* (Clingendael Institute, 2020), JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/resrep24676.8>.

<sup>304</sup> Federal Foreign Office, ‘Germany’s Arctic Policy Guidelines - Assuming Responsibility, Creating Trust, Shaping the Future’ (Federal Foreign Office, August 2019), <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/blob/2240002/eb0b681be9415118ca87bc8e215c0cf4/arktisleitlinien-data.pdf>.

<sup>305</sup> The State Council Information Office of the People’s Republic of China, ‘China’s Arctic Policy’.

have to deal with to express their own interest and identity in the Arctic. The *Murmansk Speech*'s image of Arctic cooperation is a secluded actor that had to express its own power to remain relevant in today's international relations of the Arctic. This provides a new point of view of the Arctic, where the history of power is related to the images created around it. This thesis only focused on one of the many images that surround the Arctic. Ultimately, this means that Arctic cooperation is coexisting with other images, such as the image that focuses on conflict. The question, therefore, shifts from "conflict or cooperation?" to how images influence each other and how nation-states are pursuing their interests between and within them.

Specific images, and the Arctic as a region, have an intertwined development that makes them dependent on the observer, on what the Arctic means as a part of their identity and on the interests that are followed in order to interact with an image. Researching these connections will reveal parts of the Arctic that International Relations did not acknowledge before. Different actors imagine the Arctic differently, but are still connecting it back to one place, which underlines the importance of putting actors and their perception under scrutiny. For the researcher himself, this new method will open new ways of understanding the Arctic and its international relations. The Arctic is a mystical place for those who dare to imagine it, but for those who question its image, it is a place of many differing histories.



## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- Arctic Council. 'Annex 1 - SAO Report to Ministers. Rules of Procedure', September 1998. 02. Ministerial meeting in Barrow, USA, October 12 2000. <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1783>.
- . 'Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council'. Ottawa, Canada, 19 September 1996. Declarations and SAO reports of the Arctic Council. Arctic Council. <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/85>.
- . 'The Agreement On Cooperation on Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue in the Arctic'. Nuuk, Greenland, 5 December 2011. Arctic Council. <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/531>.
- Danish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council. 'The Danish Chairmanship Programme'. Tromsø, Norway, 29 April 2009. 06. Ministerial Meeting in Tromsø, Norway. April 29 2009. <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1565>.
- 'Declaration on the Protection of the Arctic Environment'. Rovaniemi, Finland, 14 June 1991. Arctic Portal Library. [http://library.arcticportal.org/1542/1/artic\\_environment.pdf](http://library.arcticportal.org/1542/1/artic_environment.pdf).
- Federal Foreign Office. 'Germany's Arctic Policy Guidelines - Assuming Responsibility, Creating Trust, Shaping the Future'. Federal Foreign Office, August 2019. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/blob/2240002/eb0b681be9415118ca87bc8e215c0cf4/arktisleitlinien-data.pdf>.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeevich. *The Speech in Murmansk: At the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the City of Murmansk, October 1, 1987*. Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1987. [https://www.barentsinfo.fi/docs/Gorbachev\\_speech.pdf](https://www.barentsinfo.fi/docs/Gorbachev_speech.pdf).
- Gruening, Ernest. 'Let Us Now End American Colonialism'. Speech, Fairbanks, 9 November 1955. <https://www.alaska.edu/creatingalaska/constitutional-convention/speeches-to-the-conventio/opening-session-speeches/gruening/>.
- Pompeo, Michael R. 'Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus'. U.S. Department of State, 6 May 2019. <https://www.state.gov/looking-north-sharpening-americas-arctic-focus/>.
- 'The Ilulissat Declaration'. *International Legal Materials* 48, no. 2 (2009): 382–83.
- The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China. 'China's Arctic Policy'. The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, 26 January 2018. [http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white\\_paper/2018/01/26/content\\_281476026660336.htm](http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/white_paper/2018/01/26/content_281476026660336.htm).

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, ed. *Canada's Residential Schools: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. McGill-Queen's Native and Northern Series 80, <82-86>. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015.

United States Department of State. 'U.S. Chairmanship of the Arctic Council Midterm Update'. Arctic Council, March 2016. 2.2 USA Chairmanship II (April 2015 - 2017). <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/2043>.

Un.org. 'United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982'. United Nations, Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, 12 October 1982.

United States Chairmanship 1998-2000. 'Memo on U.S. Chairmanship Priorities, 1998-2000'. Arctic Council, 30 November 1998. 1.2 USA Chairmanship I (Sep 1998 - Oct 2000). <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1890>.

United States Chairmanship 2015-2017. 'Proposed U.S. Arctic Council Chairmanship Program 2015-2017. February 2015. "One Arctic: Shared Opportunities, Challenges, and Responsibilities"'. Arctic Council, March 2015. <http://hdl.handle.net/11374/1433>.

### Newspaper Sources

Baker, Peter, and Maggie Haberman. 'Trump's Interest in Buying Greenland Seemed Like a Joke. Then It Got Ugly.' *The New York Times*. 21 August 2019. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/21/us/politics/trump-greenland-prime-minister.html>.

BBC News. 'Russia Plants Flag under N Pole'. *BBC News*, 2 August 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6927395.stm>.

Breum, Martin. 'For the First Time Ever, an Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting Has Ended without a Joint Declaration'. *Arctic Today*, 7 May 2019. <https://www.arctictoday.com/for-the-first-time-ever-an-arctic-council-ministerial-meeting-has-ended-without-a-joint-declaration/>.

Gronholt-Pedersen, Jacob. 'China Withdraws Bid for Greenland Airport Projects: Sermitsiaq Newspaper'. *Reuters*, 4 June 2019. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-silkroad-greenland/china-withdraws-bid-for-greenland-airport-projects-sermitsiaq-newspaper-idUSKCN1T5191>.

Noack, Rick, John Wagner, and Felicia Sonmez. 'Trump Calls Denmark Leader's Comments "Nasty"'. *The Washington Post*, 21 August 2019. Gale OneFile: News. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A597061535/STND?u=utrecht&sid=STND&xid=6b542965>.

### Secondary Sources

Arctic Council. 'Observers', 11 June 2020. <https://arctic-council.org/en/about/observers/>.

- . ‘The Arctic Council - About’. Arctic Council. Accessed 26 March 2020. <https://arctic-council.org/en/about/>.
- Berner, Jim, Carolyn Symon, Lelani Arris, O. W. Heal, Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, National Science Foundation (U.S.), and United States, eds. *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Cambridge ; New York, N.Y: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Bloom, Evan T. ‘Establishment of the Arctic Council’. *The American Journal of International Law* 93, no. 3 (1999): 712–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2555272>.
- Borgerson, Scott. ‘Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming’. *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 2 (2008): 63–77.
- . ‘The Coming Arctic Boom: As the Ice Melts, the Region Heats Up’. *Foreign Affairs* 92, no. 4 (2013): 76–89.
- Buchowski, Michał. ‘Social Thought & Commentary: The Specter of Orientalism in Europe: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother’. *Anthropological Quarterly* 79, no. 3 (2006): 463–82.
- Byers, Michael. ‘Crises and International Cooperation: An Arctic Case Study’. *International Relations* 31, no. 4 (26 October 2017): 375–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117817735680>.
- . *International Law and the Arctic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107337442>.
- Dahl, Justiina M.I. ‘Assessments, Models and International Politics of the Arctic: Why the “New North” Narrative Includes Only Bomber, Polar Bear, Oil, and Gas Deposit Models, and No Original Parts or an Assembly Manual’. *The Polar Journal* 5, no. 1 (2 January 2015): 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2154896X.2015.1025491>.
- Daniels, Robert V. ‘Gorbachev and the Reversal of History’. In *The Rise and Fall of Communism in Russia*, 361–71. Yale University Press, 2007. [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1npv1.35](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1npv1.35).
- Demuth, Bathsheba. ‘When the Soviet Union Freed the Arctic from Capitalist Slavery’. *The New Yorker*, 15 August 2019. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/dispatch/when-the-soviet-union-freed-the-arctic-from-capitalist-slavery>.
- Emmerson, Charles. *The Future History of the Arctic: How Climate, Resources and Geopolitics Are Reshaping the North, and Why It Matters to the World*, 2011.
- English, John. ‘The Emergence of an Arctic Council’. In *Governing the North American Arctic*, edited by Dawn Alexandra Berry, Nigel Bowles, and Halbert Jones, 217–30. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2016. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137493910\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137493910_11).
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Government of Canada. 'First Nations in Canada', 6 May 2020. <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1307460755710/1536862806124#chp5>.

———. 'History of Indigenous Peoples, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada and the Treaty Relationship', 6 May 2020. <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1338907166262/1338907208830>.

Graczyk, Piotr, and Timo Koivurova. 'A New Era in the Arctic Council's External Relations? Broader Consequences of the Nuuk Observer Rules for Arctic Governance'. *Polar Record* 50, no. 3 (2014): 225–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247412000824>.

Griffiths, Franklyn, P. Whitney Lackenbauer, and Robert N. Huebert. *Canada and the Changing Arctic: Sovereignty, Security, and Stewardship*. Waterloo, Ont: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2011. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=452724&site=ehost-live>.

European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights. 'Hard Law / Soft Law'. Accessed 5 August 2020. <https://www.echr.eu/en/glossary/hard-law-soft-law/>.

Hassol, Susan Joy. *Impacts of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Cambridge, UK ; New York, N.Y: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Heikkilä, Markku. *If We Lose the Arctic: Finland's Arctic Thinking from the 1980s to Present Day*. University of Lapland, 2019. <https://lauda.ulapland.fi/handle/10024/63651>.

Hønneland, Geir. 'Identity Formation in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 33, no. 3 (1998): 277–97.

———. *Russia and the Arctic : Environment, Identity and Foreign Policy*. London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Company, Limited, 2020. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=6120968>.

Howe, Geoffrey. 'Soviet Foreign Policy under Gorbachev'. *The World Today* 45, no. 3 (1989): 40–45.

Huebert, Robert. 'A Northern Foreign Policy: The Politics of Ad Hocery'. In *Diplomatic Departures: The Conservative Era in Canadian Foreign Policy, 1984-1993*, edited by Nelson Michaud and Kim Richard Nossal. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1994.

———. 'Polar Vision or Tunnel Vision the Making of Canadian Arctic Waters Policy'. *Marine Policy* 19, no. 4 (July 1995): 343–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-597X\(95\)00011-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-597X(95)00011-T).

———. 'The Newly Emerging Arctic Security Environment'. Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2010. [https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/cdfai/pages/41/attachments/original/1413661956/The\\_Newly\\_Emerging\\_Arctic\\_Security\\_Environment.pdf?1413661956](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/cdfai/pages/41/attachments/original/1413661956/The_Newly_Emerging_Arctic_Security_Environment.pdf?1413661956).

- Huffpost. 'Contributor - Scott G. Borgerson'. Accessed 16 July 2020.  
<https://www.huffpost.com/author/scott-g-borgerson>.
- International Business Publications, USA. *International Conventions on Atmosphere Handbook: Strategic Information and Agreements*, 2017.
- Jacobsen, Marc. 'Arctic Identity Interactions: Reconfiguring Dependency in Greenland's and Denmark's Foreign Policies.' Doctoral Thesis, University of Copenhagen, 2019.
- Jacobsen, Marc, and Jeppe Strandsbjerg. 'Desecuritization as Displacement of Controversy: Geopolitics, Law and Sovereign Rights in the Arctic'. *Politik* 20, no. 3 (2 October 2017). <https://doi.org/10.7146/politik.v20i3.97151>.
- Johnson, Corey, and Amanda Coleman. 'The Internal Other: Exploring the Dialectical Relationship Between Regional Exclusion and the Construction of National Identity'. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102, no. 4 (2012): 863–80.
- Keskitalo, E. Carina. 'International Region-Building: Development of the Arctic as an International Region'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 42, no. 2 (June 2007): 187–205.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836707076689>.
- . 'Setting the Agenda on the Arctic: Whose Policy Frames the Region?' *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 19, no. 1 (2012): 155–64.
- Klimenko, Ekaterina. 'Russia's Arctic Aspirations'. Russia's Arctic Security Policy. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2016. JSTOR.  
[www.jstor.org/stable/resrep19179.7](http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep19179.7).
- Knecht, Sebastian. 'Die Mär Vom Kalten Krieg: Wie Geopolitische Paradigmen in Den Internationalen Beziehungen Im Arktisraum (Re)Produziert Werden'. *Sicherheit Und Frieden (S+F) / Security and Peace* 33, no. 3 (2015): 121–26.
- Koivurova, Timo. 'Analysis: The Arctic Conflict - Truth, Fantasy or a Little Bit of Both?' *High North News*, 18 November 2016. <https://www.highnorthnews.com/en/analysis-arctic-conflict-truth-fantasy-or-little-bit-both>.
- Leerssen, Joep. 'Echoes and Images: Reflections upon Foreign Space.' In *Alterity, Identity, Image: Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, edited by Joep Leerssen and Raymond Corbey. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991.
- . 'Imagology: On Using Ethnicity to Make Sense of the World'. *Iberic@l. Revue d'études Ibériques et Ibéro-Américaines* 10 (2016): 13–31.
- . 'The Rhetoric of National Character: A Programmatic Survey'. *Poetics Today* 21, no. 2 (1 June 2000): 267–92. <https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-21-2-267>.
- Mercer, Wendy. 'Representations of the Arctic in Nineteenth-Century French Prose Fiction'. In *Arctic Discourses*, edited by Anka Ryall, Henning Howlid Waerp, and Johan Schimanski, 179–98. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.  
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=523986&site=ehost-live>.

- Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. 2nd ed. Routledge, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203487136>.
- Narayanswamy, Ramnath. 'End of Gorbachev Era?' *Economic and Political Weekly* 26, no. 31/32 (1991): 1846–49.
- Neumann, Iver B. 'A Region-Building Approach'. In *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader*, edited by Fredrik Söderbaum and Timothy M Shaw, 160–78. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- . 'A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe'. *Review of International Studies* 20, no. 1 (1994): 53–74.
- Nilsson, Annika E. *A Changing Arctic Climate: Science and Policy in the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 386. Linköping: Linköping Univ., Dep. of Water and Environmental Studies, 2007.
- Norseth, Tor. 'Environmental Pollution around Nickel Smelters in the Kola Peninsula (Russia)'. *Science of The Total Environment* 148, no. 2–3 (June 1994): 103–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-9697\(94\)90389-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-9697(94)90389-1).
- Petersen, Robert. 'Colonialism as Seen from a Former Colonized Area'. *Arctic Anthropology* 32, no. 2 (1995): 118–26.
- . 'On Ethnic Identity in Greenland'. *Études/Inuit/Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (2001): 319–28.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 'Image and Power'. In *Alterity, Identity, Image: Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, edited by Joep Leerssen and Raymond Corbey. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991.
- . 'Jan Nederveen Pieterse'. Accessed 7 July 2020. <https://jannederveenpieterse.com>.
- Rahbek-Clemmensen, Jon, and Gry Thomasen. 'Getting to Ilulissat, 2007-08'. Learning from the Ilulissat Initiative. Centre for Military Studies, 2018. JSTOR. [www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17010.9](http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17010.9).
- Ryall, Anka, Johan Schimanski, and Henning Howlid Wærp. 'Arctic Discourses: An Introduction'. In *Arctic Discourses*, IX–XXII. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Pub, 2010.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Reprinted with a new preface. Penguin Modern Classics. London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- . 'Orientalism Reconsidered'. *Cultural Critique*, no. 1 (1985): 89–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1354282>.
- Seifert, Martin. 'Canada'. In *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters. a Critical Survey.*, edited by Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen, 113–16. Leiden: BRILL, 2007. <https://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=5598394>.

- Smieszek, Malgorzata. 'Informal International Regimes: A Case Study of the Arctic Council'. Doctoral Thesis, University of Lapland, 2019. <https://lauda.ulapland.fi/handle/10024/64024>.
- Smieszek, Malgorzata, and Timo Koivurova. 'The Arctic Council: Between Continuity and Change'. In *The Arctic Council and Circumpolar Governance.*, edited by Paul Whitney Lackenbauer, Heather Nicol, and Wilfried Greavers, 1–26. Ottawa, Waterloo: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2017.
- Tennberg, Monica. *Arctic Environmental Cooperation: A Study in Governmentality*. Aldershot ; Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2000.
- The Dutch Research Council (NWO). 'Prof. J.Th. (Joep) Leerssen'. NWO. Accessed 7 July 2020. <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/programmes/spinoza+prize/spinoza+laureates/overview+in+alphabetical+order /joep+leerssen>.
- Thum, Bernd. 'Orientalism'. In *Imagology : The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters : A Critical Study*, edited by Joep Leerssen and Manfred Beller. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.
- Tuovinen, Juha-Pekka, Tuomas Laurila, Heikki Lättilä, Alexey Ryaboshapko, Petr Brukhanov, and Sergey Korolev. 'Impact of the Sulphur Dioxide Sources in the Kola Peninsula on Air Quality in Northernmost Europe'. *Atmospheric Environment. Part A. General Topics* 27, no. 9 (June 1993): 1379–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686\(93\)90124-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686(93)90124-H).
- Umeå University. 'Carina Keskitalo'. Accessed 27 July 2020. <https://www.umu.se/en/staff/carina-keskitalo/>.
- University of Lapland. 'Timo Koivurova - Research Output', 6 March 2020. [https://lacris.ulapland.fi/en/persons/timo-koivurova\(258e5c53-7a1c-4db3-9cf7-e7bee8ce40e3\)/publications.html](https://lacris.ulapland.fi/en/persons/timo-koivurova(258e5c53-7a1c-4db3-9cf7-e7bee8ce40e3)/publications.html)
- Veličković, Vedrana. 'Balkanisms Old and New: The Discourse of Balkanism and Self-Othering in Vesna Goldsworthy's Chernobyl Strawberries and Inventing Ruritania'. In *Facing the East in the West: Images of Eastern Europe in British Literature, Film and Culture*, edited by Barbara Korte, Eva Ulrike Pirker, and Sissy Helff, 185–203. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 2011.
- Ween, Gro Birgit, and Marianne Lien. 'Decolonisation in the Arctic? Nature Practices and Land Rights in Sub-Arctic Norway'. *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 7, no. 1 (2012): 93–109.
- Wilson Rowe, Elana. *Arctic Governance: Power in Cross-Border Cooperation*. Manchester University Press, 2018.
- Young, Oran R. *Arctic Politics Conflict and Cooperation in the Circumpolar North*. Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2000.

- . *Creating Regimes: Arctic Accords and International Governance*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998.  
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1814592&site=ehost-live>.
- . *International Governance: Protecting the Environment in a Stateless Society*. Cornell Studies in Political Economy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- . ‘The Age of the Arctic’. *Foreign Policy*, no. 61 (1985): 160–79.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1148707>.
- . ‘Whither the Arctic? Conflict or Cooperation in the Circumpolar North’. *Polar Record* 45, no. 1 (January 2009): 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247408007791>.
- Young, Oran R., and Gail Osherenko, eds. *Polar Politics: Creating International Environmental Regimes*. Cornell Studies in Political Economy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Zacharasiewicz, Waldemar. ‘National Stereotypes in Literature in the English Language: A Review of Research’. In *Imagology Revisited*, 21–63. *Studia Imagologica* 17. Amsterdam ; New York: Rodopi, 2010.
- Zandee, Dick, Kimberley Kruijver, and Adája Stoetman. ‘Arctic Actors’. *The Future of Arctic Security*. Clingendael Institute, 2020. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/resrep24676.6>.
- . ‘The Netherlands and Arctic Security’. *The Future of Arctic Security*. Clingendael Institute, 2020. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/resrep24676.8>.
- Zwick, Peter. ‘New Thinking and New Foreign Policy under Gorbachev’. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22, no. 2 (June 1989): 215. <https://doi.org/10.2307/419599>.





## PLAGIARISM RULES AWARENESS STATEMENT

### **Fraud and Plagiarism**

Scientific integrity is the foundation of academic life. Utrecht University considers any form of scientific deception to be an extremely serious infraction. Utrecht University therefore expects every student to be aware of, and to abide by, the norms and values regarding scientific integrity.

The most important forms of deception that affect this integrity are fraud and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the copying of another person's work without proper acknowledgement, and it is a form of fraud. The following is a detailed explanation of what is considered to be fraud and plagiarism, with a few concrete examples. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list!

If fraud or plagiarism is detected, the study programme's Examination Committee may decide to impose sanctions. The most serious sanction that the committee can impose is to submit a request to the Executive Board of the University to expel the student from the study programme.

### **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the copying of another person's documents, ideas or lines of thought and presenting it as one's own work. You must always accurately indicate from whom you obtained ideas and insights, and you must constantly be aware of the difference between citing, paraphrasing and plagiarising. Students and staff must be very careful in citing sources; this concerns not only printed sources, but also information obtained from the Internet.

The following issues will always be considered to be plagiarism:

- cutting and pasting text from digital sources, such as an encyclopaedia or digital periodicals, without quotation marks and footnotes;
- cutting and pasting text from the Internet without quotation marks and footnotes;
- copying printed materials, such as books, magazines or encyclopaedias, without quotation marks or footnotes;
- including a translation of one of the sources named above without quotation marks or footnotes;
- paraphrasing (parts of) the texts listed above without proper references: paraphrasing must be marked as such, by expressly mentioning the original author in the text or in a footnote, so that you do not give the impression that it is your own idea;
- copying sound, video or test materials from others without references, and presenting it as one's own work;
- submitting work done previously by the student without reference to the original paper, and presenting it as original work done in the context of the course, without the express permission of the course lecturer;
- copying the work of another student and presenting it as one's own work. If this is done with the consent of the other student, then he or she is also complicit in the plagiarism;
- when one of the authors of a group paper commits plagiarism, then the other co-authors are also complicit in plagiarism if they could or should have known that the person was committing plagiarism;
- submitting papers acquired from a commercial institution, such as an Internet site with summaries or papers, that were written by another person, whether or not that other person received payment for the work.

The rules for plagiarism also apply to rough drafts of papers or (parts of) theses sent to a lecturer for feedback, to the extent that submitting rough drafts for feedback is mentioned in the course handbook or the thesis regulations.

The Education and Examination Regulations (Article 5.15) describe the formal procedure in case of suspicion of fraud and/or plagiarism, and the sanctions that can be imposed.

Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse. Each individual is responsible for their own behaviour. Utrecht University assumes that each student or staff member knows what fraud and plagiarism



entail. For its part, Utrecht University works to ensure that students are informed of the principles of scientific practice, which are taught as early as possible in the curriculum, and that students are informed of the institution's criteria for fraud and plagiarism, so that every student knows which norms they must abide by.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the above.

Name: Jannes Friedrig Pittermann

Student number: 6891292

Date and signature:

08.08.2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Pittermann', written over a horizontal line.

Submit this form to your supervisor when you begin writing your Bachelor's final paper or your Master's thesis.

Failure to submit or sign this form does not mean that no sanctions can be imposed if it appears that plagiarism has been committed in the paper.