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Abstract

This dissertation addresses the emergence of the Arctic as a distinct world region and actor in international geopolitics and what this means for the field of area studies. I ask how the Arctic fits into the established field of area studies and how the unique characteristics of the region – as defined by Arctic Indigenous peoples – challenge Western understandings of what constitutes a global region including how we understand territory, sovereignty, and the relationship between space and social justice. To answer this question I analyze how the Arctic region maps onto the preexisting geographies of sovereignty as held by the U.S. Title VI program. In the United States the field of area studies has been significantly influenced by the Department of Defense and later the Department of Education via the Title VI grant program. Title VI provides grants to support area and international studies and foreign languages at colleges and universities across the country. The program has traditionally defined world regions based on the nation-state model, and it identifies important areas of the world as those critical to U.S. interests. In order to answer how the particular characteristics of the Arctic, specifically Indigenous worldviews, challenge and broaden current understandings of area studies I first seek to understand the Arctic from a northern perspective. How do the Inuit in Canada and internationally define their homeland, and what is the relevance of Inuit Nunangat (Inuit territory in Canada) and Inuit Nunaat (Inuit homeland internationally) to domestic and international relations? Next, I explore how Inuit concepts of territory further the voice and self-determination of the Inuit. Finally, I conduct an analytic autoethnography of the Arctic studies initiative at the University of Washington culminating in the inclusion of the Arctic as a distinct world region in the Canadian Studies Center's 2014 Title VI grant proposal. I argue that understanding the Arctic as a global actor – via the lens of new thinking in international relations theory, theories of social justice, and Inuit
concepts of space – has the potential to reconfigure area studies in higher education to more effectively address 21st century global challenges.
Preface

This dissertation is original and independent work by the author. Chapter Four was previously published as "Inuit Political Involvement in the Arctic," in the Arctic Yearbook 2012, edited by L. Heininen and published by the Northern Research Forum (Akureyri, Iceland) in 2012. Chapter Five has been accepted for publication in L. C. Jensen and G. Hønneland's edited book, Handbook of the Politics of the Arctic to be published by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Edward Elgar Publishing (Lysaker, Norway). It is scheduled for publication in September 2015. The research for these chapters was undertaken to understand how the Inuit in Canada and internationally are engaging in remapping and renaming territory to foreground Inuit concepts of space; and in policy development to further social justice and self-determination. As the sole author of these works in print and in press, I made minor modifications to the texts for better incorporation into this dissertation.
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Glossary

**Arctic:** The Arctic, as defined by the *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment: Impacts of a Warming Arctic* (2004), includes the region north of the tree line and the 50°F isotherm as well as the sub-Arctic region as it is "integral to the functioning of the arctic system" (p. 4).

**Arctic Council:** The Arctic Council as a "high level intergovernmental forum to provide a means for promoting cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic States, with the involvement of the Arctic Indigenous communities and other Arctic inhabitants on common Arctic issues, in particular issues of sustainable development and environmental protection in the Arctic" (Arctic Council, 2014-15a, para. 1).

**Area Studies:** The areas studies is the study of a geographic or political region including its history, geography, language, political system and culture.

**Circumpolar World:** The circumpolar world refers to the northern regions of the Arctic nations and the territory of the Arctic Indigenous peoples.

**Climate Change:** Climate change is "a long-term change in the Earth's climate, or of a region on Earth" (National Aeronautics and Space Act, n.d., para. 8).

**Global Warming:** Global warming is "the increase in Earth's average surface temperature due to rising levels of greenhouse gases" (National Aeronautics and Space Act, n.d., para. 7).

**Inuit:** The Inuit are an Arctic Indigenous people whose traditional land is north of the tree line. Inuit live in Greenland, Alaska, Canada and Chukotka, Russia. There are approximately 160,000 Inuit in the world today.

**Inuit Circumpolar Conference:** The Inuit Circumpolar Conference, founded in 1977, is the international organization representing the Inuit internationally.

**Inuit Circumpolar Council:** In 2006, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference changed the name of
the organization to Inuit Circumpolar Council. In this dissertation, I use one or the other name (Conference or Council) depending on the time period of the activity in question.

**Inuit Nunaat:** In the first declaration drafted by the Inuit Circumpolar Council, *Inuit Nunaat* is defined as comprising the circumpolar home of the Inuit including in Greenland, Alaska, Canada and Chukotka, Russia (Inuit Circumpolar Council, 2009, Article 1.2).

**Inuit Nunangat:** *Inuit Nunangat* is a Canadian Inuktitut word that means "land, sea and ice." The Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami named the four Inuit regions in Canada, *Inuit Nunangat* in 2009.

**International and Foreign Language Education:** "The International and Foreign Language Education (IFLE) office provides institutional and fellowship grant funding to strengthen the capability and performance of American education in foreign languages and in area and international studies" (Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 2015, para. 1). There are 14 programs authorized under Title VI of the Higher Education Act including the National Resource Center and Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships programs.

**Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami:** "Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), formerly Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, is the national voice of 55,000 Inuit living in 53 communities across the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Northwest Territories), Nunavut, Nunavik (Northern Québec), and Nunatsiavut (Northern Labrador), land claims regions" (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, n.d.-a, para. 1).

**Inuktitut:** "Inuktitut is the traditional oral language of Inuit in the Arctic. Spoken in Canada and Greenland, as well as in Alaska, Inuktitut and its many dialects are used by peoples from region to region, with some variations" (Canada, Library and Archives Canada, n.d., para. 1).
**Inuvialuit:** Inuvialuit is the Inuit region in Canada's Western Arctic. The Inuvialuit Final Agreement was signed on June 5, 1984, between the Government of Canada and the Inuvialuit. (Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, 2007). There are about 4,160 Inuit living in the Northwest Territories (Statistics Canada, 2006).

**National Resource Center:** "The program provides grants to establish, strengthen, and operate language and area or international studies centers that will be national resources for teaching any modern foreign language" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 1).

**Nunatsiavut:** Nunatsiavut is the Inuit region in Newfoundland and Labrador. The Inuit in Nunatsiavut formed the first ethnic or self-government in Canada in 2005 (Nunatsiavut Government, n.d.). There are approximately 4,700 Inuit in Nunatsiavut representing six communities (Statistics Canada, 2006).

**Nunavik:** Nunavik comprises the northern third of Québec and is home to the Nunivimmiut or the Inuit of Nunavik. There are approximately 10,950 Inuit in Québec (Statistics Canada, 2006).

**Nunavut:** Nunavut is the largest Inuit region in Canada and the newest territory formed on April 1, 1999. There are approximately 24,635 Nunavummiut living in Nunavut (Statistics Canada, 2006).

**Permanent Participants:** "Out of a total of 4 million inhabitants of the Arctic, approximately 500,000 belong to indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples' organizations have been granted Permanent Participants status in the Arctic Council. The Permanent Participants have full consultation rights in connection with the Council's negotiations and decisions" (Arctic Council, 2014-15b, para. 1).
**Title III Program:** "The program helps eligible IHEs [Institutions of Higher Education] to become self-sufficient and expand their capacity to serve low-income students by providing funds to improve and strengthen the academic quality, institutional management, and fiscal stability of eligible institutions" (U.S. Department of Education, Title III Part A Programs, 2014, para. 1).

**Title VI Program:** The "U.S. Department of Education … Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs form the vital infrastructure of the Federal government's investment in the international service pipeline. These programs' support for foreign language, area, and international studies infrastructure-building at U.S. colleges and universities ensures a steady supply of graduates with expertise in less commonly taught languages … world areas, and transnational trends. Title VI primarily provides domestically-based language and area training, research, and outreach while Fulbright-Hays supports on-site opportunities to develop these skills" (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, International Education Programs Service, 2011, para. 1).

**Tree Line:** The Arctic tree line is "the northern limit of tree growth; the sinuous boundary between tundra and boreal forest; taken by many to delineate the actual southern boundary of the arctic zone" (National Snow and Ice Data Center, 2015, para. 1).
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**Chapter One: Introduction**

This research project addresses the emergence of the Arctic as a distinct world region and actor in international geopolitics and what this means for the field of area studies. I ask how the Arctic fits into the established field of area studies and how the unique characteristics of the region – as defined by Arctic Indigenous peoples – challenge Western understandings of what constitutes a global region including how we understand territory, sovereignty, and the relationship between space and social justice. To answer this question I analyze how the Arctic region maps onto the preexisting geographies of sovereignty as long held by the U.S. Title VI program. In the United States the field of area studies has been significantly influenced by the Department of Defense and later the Department of Education via the Title VI grant program. Title VI provides grants to support area and international studies and foreign languages at colleges and universities across the country. The program has traditionally defined world regions based on the nation-state model, and it identifies important areas of the world as those critical to U.S. interests. In order to answer how the particular characteristics of the Arctic, specifically Indigenous worldviews, challenge and broaden current understandings of area studies I first seek to understand the Arctic from a northern perspective. How do the Inuit in Canada and internationally define their homeland, and what is the relevance of *Inuit Nunangat* (land, sea and ice) and *Inuit Nunaat* (Inuit homeland) to domestic and international relations? (I used the term *Inuit Nunaat* in the title of this research project rather than *Inuit Nunangat*. Although *Inuit Nunangat* includes sea and ice as well as land in defining territory, *Inuit Nunaat* is the term used by the Inuit Circumpolar Council to define the international Inuit homeland.) Next, I explore how the Inuit concepts of territory further the voice and self-determination of the Inuit. Finally, I conduct an analytic autoethnography of the Arctic studies initiative at the University of
Washington that culminated in the inclusion of the Arctic as a distinct world region in the Canadian Studies Center's 2014 Title VI grant proposal. I argue that understanding the Arctic as a global actor – via the lens of new thinking in international relations theory, theories of social justice, and Inuit concepts of space – has the potential to reconfigure and reinvigorate area studies in higher education to more effectively address global challenges in the 21st century.

The Arctic is emerging as a new global region – the first we have encountered in many years. This is not to deny the 4,000-plus year history of the Sivullirmiut, Thule/Tuniit and Inuit; or the long history of contact in the Arctic that occurred during the search for the Northwest Passage, whaling industry, fox fur trade, and 20th century colonization. Rather, my reference to the Arctic as an "emerging region" is a direct response to the current role the Arctic is playing in international relations and how this differs from its role during the Cold War. During the Cold War the Arctic served as a "stage" for international geopolitics and bipolar tensions between the United States, the Soviet Union and their allies. In a post-Cold War world, I argue that the Arctic is "emerging" as a distinct actor in international relations based on a regional sense of identity. A new world view, specifically an Inuit world view, is challenging conventional concepts of territory, security and social justice and could provide new understandings of world regions as identified in the Title VI field of area studies.

There are many definitions for what constitutes the Arctic as a region. These include the region that lies north of the Arctic Circle, at approximately 66° latitude; the region north of which the average temperature for the warmest month of the year is 10°C/50°F (the July isotherm); or the region north of tree line (north of which trees can no longer grow due to the low temperatures and permafrost). There is no clear border – natural or political – for the Arctic. For the purposes of this research project, I use the term Arctic to refer to the region and its peoples
north and just south (sub-Arctic) of the 10˚C/50˚F isotherm. This definition is used in major scientific reports as being integral to the "functioning of the arctic system" (Hassol, 2004, p. 4). Important to this research project, this definition includes the northern regions of the eight Arctic nation-states that comprise the member states on the Arctic Council, and the Indigenous peoples that form Permanent Participant organizations on the Council.

In order to effectively integrate Arctic studies into southern institutions and to enable students to address one the most critical issues of our time (climate change), we have to ask how southern institutions understand the Arctic as a region. The Arctic does not fit into the traditional area studies framework, into the political science nation-state framework, or into a disciplinary framework. Therefore, how do we understand, teach about, and conduct research on the region in an informed and effective manner?

**Educational Practice**

This research project addresses my practice as an educator and an educational administrator at the Canadian Studies Center in the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington (UW). The Canadian Studies Center is one of 100 National Resource Centers in the United States funded by a Title VI grant from International and Foreign Language Education, Office of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education. There are currently 14 programs authorized under the Title VI of the Higher Education Act including the National Resource Center program and the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship program (International and Foreign Language Education [IFLE], Office of Postsecondary Education [OPE], U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2015, para. 2). The Canadian Studies Center has formed the Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada with the Center for Canadian-American Studies at Western Washington University since 1987.
The role of a National Resource Center is to strengthen study about a world region, or in the case of Canada, a single country, as well as to teach the modern language(s) associated with the region. International and Foreign Language Education describes the program as follows:

The program provides grants to establish, strengthen, and operate language and area or international studies centers that will be national resources for teaching any modern foreign language. Grants support: instruction in fields needed to provide full understanding of areas, regions or countries; research and training in international studies; work in the language aspects of professional and other fields of study; and instruction and research on issues in world affairs. (IFLE, OPE, USDOE, 2014, para. 1)

The National Resource Center programs are usually complemented by Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Program grant that provides fellowships to outstanding students for language acquisition. For Canadian studies, the approved foreign language is French.

To achieve the above goals, I work with faculty across all three UW campuses (Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma) to encourage research and teaching that includes Canadian content. I work with undergraduate and graduate students to promote the importance of the study of Canada and study-in-Canada opportunities. I work with K-16 educators to provide training in Canadian studies and encourage the integration of Canadian content into the curriculum. And, I oversee programs that foster a greater understanding of Canada and the Canada-U.S. relationship for business, media and the general public. In addition, I work with the UW Libraries to provide funding support and advise on the Canada collections and study guides, with the Language Learning Center and Department of French to inspire greater content in Québec studies and materials on Canadian Indigenous language instruction, as well as with many other schools and
departments across campus to build collaborative relationships to broaden the reach and strengthen the impact of the Center.

Since I was appointed in 1999, I have worked with five different directors of Canadian Studies and dozens of colleagues to build the Center's impact across campus. This effort has been enormously successful. There are now 65 affiliated faculty members involved in research and teaching that includes Canadian content. They represent 13 departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, four schools in the College of the Environment, seven other professional schools, the Applied Physics Laboratory, and Bothell and Tacoma campuses. In a given year over 100 Canadian content courses are offered at the UW with enrollments of over 6,500 (including both graduate and undergraduate students). The French department offers 65-plus French courses serving over 1,500 UW students annually that also serve students in Canadian Studies. And, since 2005, the Center has worked with the Department of Linguistics and our Foreign Language and Area Studies coordinator to develop and encourage Indigenous language study opportunities. Our Center is the first and only National Resource Center in the nation to award Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowships for Indigenous languages. Since 2005, the Center has awarded 22 fellowships for Canadian Indigenous languages including in Anishinaabemowin, Dane-zaa, Inuktitut, Musqueam Salish, Nuu-chah-nulth and Tlingit.

The Title VI program has a long-established list of world regions and languages deemed critical to national interest. For example, the Grant Application for the Fiscal Year 2014 for the National Resource Centers Program and the Foreign Language and Area Studies Program provided a listing of world areas and approximate funding allocations per region including for Africa, Canada, East Asia, International, Latin America, Middle East, Russia/Eastern Europe/Eurasia, South Asia, Southeast Asia and Western Europe (IFLE, OPE, USDOE, 2014a,
What constitutes a world region/area, for the U.S. Department of Education, has remained static for most of the 50-plus years of the program – world regions are clusters of nation-states of strategic interest (security or economic) to the United States. In order to introduce the Arctic as a world region in the field of area studies with the U.S. Department of Education, the Canadian Studies Center decided to incorporate the Arctic into the Canadian studies grant proposal.

The Arctic has been established as a world region by many organizations, research programs and academic programs. In the 1940s the Canadian government established the Arctic Institute of North America to address Arctic and circumpolar issues. In the 1960s the Boreal Institute was founded later becoming the Canadian Circumpolar Institute. Both the Saami (in the 1950s) and the Inuit (in the 1970s) founded Arctic transnational organizations. Gorbachev's Murmansk Speech in 1987 envisioned the Arctic as a distinct region. His concept of the Arctic was later incorporated into the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* (1991) and the *Ottawa Declaration* (1996) that established the Arctic Council. Journals such as *Inuit Studies* or research programs such as the Institute of Arctic Studies at Dartmouth forward an understanding of the Arctic as a distinctive world region. However, in the area studies field as part of the U.S. Department of Education Title VI programs, the Arctic is not included as a region. This research project attempts to take the first step toward consideration of the Arctic as a world region in the Title VI programs.

After building significant breadth in Canadian studies at the UW, the Center needed to develop depth in a subject area. A focus on Arctic studies was a natural extension of our Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowships in Inuktitut and our foundation in Indigenous studies. The Canadian Arctic is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of Canadian studies and has become one of Canada's top foreign policy priorities. Canada is a key actor in international...
relations concerning the region given that 25% of the Arctic is within the jurisdiction of Canada. And, Canada has played a lead role in the founding of the Arctic Council, and the Inuit in Canada have served as effective leaders both domestically and internationally. The Center for Canadian-American Studies at Western Washington University provides expertise on Canada-U.S. border policy and has a vibrant undergraduate program in traditional Canadian studies (history, political science, literature and economics). Therefore the inclusion of Arctic studies creates a well-balanced National Resource Center that includes both traditional and innovative approaches to Canadian studies. This dissertation aims to reflect upon how I worked with the chair of the Canadian Studies Center and colleagues to build an area of concentration on the Arctic as part of the Canadian Studies Center while simultaneously questioning current understandings of territorial frameworks in the field of area studies.

This research project examines how we developed the initial foundation for the Arctic educational initiative – including teaching, research and public engagement activities. Since 2012 I have served as the lead-chair on the steering committee for a new interdisciplinary minor in Arctic Studies; written two grant proposals to College of Arts and Sciences for bridge funding to reimagine area studies in the 21st century; played a key role as a task force member and later board member on the University-wide Future of Ice initiative; and, co-written a successful 2014 Title VI grant proposal where the Arctic was included as a new world region.

In the fall of 2014 our National Resource Center was one of 100 area or international studies centers across the country to be awarded a four-year Title VI grant, including a Foreign Language and Area Studies grant – a total award of just over $1.6 million dollars. In our grant application we argued that the Arctic forms a new global region and that Inuktitut, the Inuit language, ought to be included as a priority language in the U.S. Department of Education's list
of less commonly taught languages.\textsuperscript{1} Our proposal received high grades, enthusiastic comments, and a significantly higher percentage of the estimated funding allocation. One reviewer summarized the proposal as follows, illustrating the positive response to the incorporation of Arctic and Indigenous languages in the grant proposal:

The Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada, consisting of a Consortium of the UW and Western Washington University, is one of the strongest Canadian Studies Centers in the United States and produces some of the most qualified specialists in Canada and the U.S.-Canada relationship. It provides professional development to thousands of K-16 teachers and outreach to businesses, media outlets and government agencies. It supports faculty teaching, research and service with regard to Canada, which has led to a high number of significant publications, some of which have influenced public policy debates. The NRC's [National Resource Centers] new emphasis on the Arctic makes it the center of Arctic Studies in the United States. The NRC also supports the study not only of French but also Indigenous languages spoken in Canada. (USDOE, OPE, IEPS, 2014)

The comments of this reviewer reassured us that our efforts to incorporate the Arctic into a Title VI grant proposal, while ultimately part of the larger Canadian studies proposal, were perceived as a positive development in the field of area studies. While this grant proposal constituted a modest challenge to the understanding of world regions in the area studies field, it nonetheless

\textsuperscript{1} There are currently 78 languages in the U.S. Department of Education's list of less commonly taught languages. They represent countries in the Middle East, Russia, Africa and Asia. There are no Indigenous languages on the list.
began a process of remapping the world according to cultural and Indigenous concepts of territory.

**Background**

The field of area studies involves the interdisciplinary study of world regions to build knowledge and understanding necessary to enable students to tackle complex international issues. Most of these programs were developed in the mid to late 20th century in an effort to respond to an increasingly interdependent international community. Across-the-board, these programs understand world regions as clusters of nation-states with similar languages, religions, cultures and political systems. Most are also concerned with world areas from a "vantage point … outside those regions" (Orta, 2013, p. 28). This is particularly true in the United States, where area studies had its beginning during World War II with support from the federal government and private funding agencies that encouraged a "systematic study of world areas … deriving from national strategic interests" (Orta, 2013, p. 18). As the United States began to emerge as a world power, fostering expertise in regions deemed important to U.S. security and economic interests, gained significant support.

In September of 1958, in response to the launching of Sputnik I, the National Defense Education Act was signed into law in the United States. The Act was founded to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national need. Funding for math, science and area studies was allocated under the Title VI grant program. In 1965 Title VI was incorporated into the Higher Education Act. The International and Foreign Language Education office in the U.S. Department of Education currently administers the programs. In 2014 the office awarded 269 grants nationally totaling over $63 million dollars. Of this, almost $23 million was awarded to National Resource Centers and over $30 million to
Foreign Language and Area Studies programs. In a press release then-Secretary Arne Duncan justified the programs explaining:

Life in the 21st century means adapting to the most hyper-connected, interdependent world we've ever seen. To help keep America safe, partner effectively with our allies, and collaborate with other nations in solving global challenges, we need professionals with solid cultural knowledge and language skills that cover all parts of the globe. These grants will enable more students and educators to gain global competencies that equip them with an understanding and openness to cultures and languages around the globe, as well as the 21st century skills needed to preserve a rich, multicultural society and thriving democracy right here at home. (USDOE, Press Office, 2014, para. 2)

Though the funding allocation sounds impressive, 2014 funding levels are still far below pre-2011 levels. In 2011 Title VI suffered the largest federal government cut backs to the program in its history. This dissertation will argue that for area studies to survive and thrive in the 21st century, we need to rethink how we understand regions, what constitutes a region, and whose interests are at stake. This dissertation will argue that the Arctic can challenge how world regions are understood based on new thinking in international relations theory, theories of social justice, and Inuit concepts of space.

In Canada, the Inuit have remapped the Arctic along cultural (use and occupancy) lines in an effort to ensure all Inuit benefit from future policy implementation. At the international level, the Inuit are promoting a concept of the Arctic based on cultural cohesion and shared challenges, in part to gain an enhanced voice in international affairs. The Inuit are also utilizing customary law to ensure that their rights as a people will be upheld. What is occurring in the Arctic is an unparalleled level of Indigenous political engagement. The Inuit are remapping the Arctic region
and shaping domestic and international policy with implications for the circumpolar world and beyond. While the impact and influence of the Inuit has been significant, the field of area studies in the United States has not yet included or referenced the Arctic in funding programs nor does it exist in the scholarly literature for the field. Yet, the inclusion of the Arctic would enhance area studies and arguably contribute to a more accurate representation of the world and thus contribute to ensuring the on-going relevance of the field.

**Scholarly Literature in Area Studies**

Chapter Two challenges the present concept of world regions by shedding light on the history of area studies in the United States. How did the nation-state become the organizing unit of analysis for the field? How has the field has evolved since World War II yet maintained its initial structure? What are the current debates in the scholarly literature, and what is absent in those debates? Chapter Two begins by assessing the initial concept for area studies as conceived during World War II by both the Rockefeller Foundation and the U.S. Office of Strategic Services. It traces the evolution of area studies through the Cold War and into the 21st century. The chapter then outlines the major debates in the scholarly literature and makes recommendations as to how the Arctic and Inuit concepts of territory could begin a new dialogue in the field, one that could contribute to the re-envisioning of area studies.

The chapter ends by arguing that the Arctic can provide a path by which area studies scholars can reconfigure and reinvigorate the field to make room for a new actor on the world stage. In the Arctic, the traditional nation-state security paradigm is evolving into a broader human security paradigm, Indigenous political involvement is more effectively integrated into international affairs than at any other time in history, cultural boundaries are replacing political borders, and international customary law (human rights law, the *United Nations Convention on*
the Law of the Sea, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) is serving to ensure that trans-boundary human rights issues are addressed. These unique characteristics define a distinctive world region. As a new actor on the world stage, the Arctic contributes to area studies and challenges how the field frames and understands world regions.

**Theoretical Framework**

To understand the Arctic as an "emerging" world region in the area studies field, I use innovative concepts of territory/space from three interrelated perspectives – new theories of territory found in international relations, theories that link space to social justice claims, and Inuit concepts of territory.

**New Concepts of Territory in International Relations Theory.** Agnew, a political geographer, integrates concepts of space found in geography to international relations theory. His scholarship linking politics to space began with *Place and Politics* (1987) in which he reinvented the meaning of geopolitics and argued that the importance of place has been devalued in the social sciences. This complex understanding of place was, Agnew argued, a way to bring a greater understanding to the role of place in the political realm. Agnew's article "The Territorial Trap" (1994) addressed how geographical assumptions limit international relations theory, particularly its ability to explain new nodes of power. This notion of the relationship between territory and sovereignty is carried into Agnew's work over the next decade. Agnew argued that there are now many non-state actors who are establishing "networks of power" (1994, p. 72) but that these networks do not necessarily fit neatly into the "territorial representations of space" (1994, p. 72). He pointed out that, "New loyalties everywhere undermine state political monopoly" (1994, p. 74). In "Sovereignty Regimes" (2005), Agnew insisted that territoriality is only one type of spatiality "or way in which space is constituted socially and mobilized"
politically" (p. 4). While the state may exercise a centralized power, there are many types of "diffuse" powers" (Agnew 2005, p. 4) that can also exercise influence through association. Agnew's work lends understanding to how the Inuit in Canada and internationally, as non-state powers, are reconfiguring territorial representations of space and thereby effectively challenging centralized power.

**Space and Social Justice.** Political theorist Fraser takes the work of Agnew a step further by adding a social justice dimension to the political concept of space. The cover of Fraser's *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World* (2009) included a picture of a scale (the traditional symbol of justice) and a geographer's metric or compass referring to the problem of "framing" or "representing spatial relationships" in justice claims (Fraser, 2009, p. 1). Fraser argued that justice is not just about the "what" of justice (the issue or the content), but importantly about the "who" of justice. Who is implicated by a particular policy and by what borders or boundaries is the subject framed? Fraser pointed out that the first justice concerns of the Westphalian system were based on economic distribution with cultural recognition being a more recent concern. However, now the political stage has shifted as transnational issues demand new ways to think about justice. For example, if spatial relations are confined to nation-state borders, how does one address issues that transcend political borders such as climate change? Where boundaries are established determines whose voices will be heard. Fraser argued that international groups and organizations are forming to address social justice issues that increasingly fall outside the parameters of the nation-state. Fraser called this the "politics of framing" (2009, p. 22). Fraser's work provides an appropriate framework to understand the limitations of the nation-state model in area studies as well as the importance of understanding the relationship between territory and justice.
Inuit Reframing of Arctic Space. There are six Arctic Indigenous organizations that have Permanent Participant status on the Arctic Council representing all Indigenous peoples in the Arctic and sub-Arctic or approximately 500,000 individuals. This research project attempts to understand the Arctic as a region from a solely Inuit perspective for several reasons. First, this is a practice-based research project that analyzes the Title VI National Resource Center that I manage – the Canadian Studies Center. Therefore, while I seek to challenge conventional understandings of world regions I must do so within the area studies framework and within the limitations of the Title VI grant for our Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada. In addition, in Canada three of the Permanent Participant organizations are represented – the Inuit Circumpolar Council, the Gwitch'in Council International and the Aleut International Association. Of the three organizations, the Inuit Circumpolar Council was the only one in existence and present at the drafting of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (1991), precursor to the Arctic Council (1996). In fact, what was then the titled the Inuit Circumpolar Conference played a significant role in the drafting of the strategy and Ottawa Declaration (1996). In addition, the Inuit are the most northerly peoples in the world, the only peoples whose traditional homeland is north of the tree line, and whose livelihood includes land, sea and ice. Finally, the Inuit are the most international of Arctic Indigenous organizations. While the Saami Council also represents the Saami from four countries, all four are in Scandinavia and Russia. The Inuit Circumpolar Council, however, represents Inuit from Greenland, Alaska, Canada and Chukotka, Russia. This research project takes the first step in understanding the Arctic region from the perspective of one Arctic Indigenous people laying the groundwork for future research that may expand this analysis to understand Arctic territory from a pan-Arctic Indigenous
perspective.²

Of the four Inuit homelands internationally, I address all four as represented by the Inuit Circumpolar Council. The research also focuses specifically on the Inuit in Canada as represented by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. Again, this is primarily due to the fact that this is a practice-based research project concerning the Canadian Studies Center. However, in addition, the Inuit in Canada are recognized as leaders in self-determination efforts including in the international Inuit organization and in the founding of the Arctic Council. The Inuit in Canada have been successful in settling four regional land claims, in setting up regional governments, and in writing national Inuit policy on the Arctic and education.

Inuit concepts of space, at the domestic and international levels, are inherently linked to social justice or the rights of Inuit and Inuit communities. Land claims are perhaps the most common way the Inuit have engaged in "remapping" the Arctic region. In the last 30 years four Inuit regions in Canada were settled in land claim negotiations with the federal government – Nunavik, Inuvialuit, Nunavut and Nunatsiavut. Beginning with the seminal 1976 study based on land use and occupancy, the map of Canada was redrawn along cultural lines (Freeman, 1976). In 2005, to celebrate the settlement of the last Inuit land claim, the national Inuit organization Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami created a new map for the Arctic entitled, Inuit Nunaat (Inuit homeland). The map replaced provincial and territorial boundaries with new political borders challenging

² Note that both Inuit Circumpolar Conference and Inuit Circumpolar Council are used in the dissertation. Inuit Circumpolar Conference is the initial name given to the organization in 1977. In 2006, the name was changed to Inuit Circumpolar Council. The name used in the dissertation will reflect the year of the activity being addressed. The acronym ICC is the same for both the original name and the name now used by the Inuit international organization.
former concepts of Canada's North. Four years later, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami took spatial reframing one step further when the association changed the name from Inuit Nunaat to Inuit Nunangat (see Appendix 1).3 Inuit Nunaat is a Greenlandic term that refers to the land only; Inuit Nunangat, a Canadian Inuktitut term, encompasses land, marine areas, and ice.

Inuit remapping of Arctic space, both at the domestic and international levels, is explored in Chapter Four. Chapter Four examines how Inuit concepts of territory and space are challenging the conventional Western notion of the nation-state as the primary unit for analysis in geopolitics. The chapter notes this is the first time in history that there is a meeting of traditional state geopolitics and Indigenous internationalism. Since the Cold War, a growing number of transnational organizations and issues have challenged the overall effectiveness of both nation-state and domestic law to represent and resolve global issues including the founding of the Saami Council in 1956 and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in 1977. This chapter focuses on how the Inuit in Canada and the Inuit Circumpolar Council, representing the Inuit globally, are remapping Arctic territory, in part, in an effort to challenge the unquestioned dominance of the nation-state borders in domestic and international policy and law.

Concerning policy development at the international level, the Inuit released two declarations that arguably serve as Inuit foreign policy or guiding documents for Inuit and nation-state relations. The declarations link space to community rights. Chapter Five analyses the first declaration on sovereignty drafted by the Inuit Circumpolar Council – A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Arctic Sovereignty (2009) – and the impact of that declaration on international
forums and Canadian domestic policy. The chapter argues the Declaration challenges conventional geopolitics in the Arctic and the monopoly that nation-states claim in international relations. If foreign policy is the way in which nation-states engage in a political dialogue, then the Declaration is an effort by the Inuit to assert equal standing in the international dialogue concerning the Arctic. The Declaration reframes Western concepts of territory and refers to international customary law as the tool via which the Inuit will ensure their rights.

**Methodology and Methods**

Chapter Three presents the methodology – analytic autoethnography – and methods used in this study. Autoethnography is a qualitative research methodology at the intersection of autobiography and ethnography. The methodology is part of a long tradition in qualitative research in the social sciences – part of the critical theoretical school of thought. Researchers choose the autoethnographic methodology because of its potential to promote social change. As a critical methodology, autoethnography stresses a reflective and critical assessment of norms and practices in society. The autoethnographic methodology seeks to understand social relations of domination and subordination in geography or other disciplines in the social sciences. Analytic autoethnography is a useful methodology for challenging the Westphalian definition of political space and the relations of power that inform academic fields such as area studies. I use this methodology to lend greater insight and assessment of the Arctic educational initiative undertaken by the Canadian Studies Center. When creating an educational program focused on a region outside of one's own with distinct cultures and societies only modestly represented at the host institution, it is important to approach this initiative with an on-going methodological approach founded on social and cultural critique.
Chapter Six analyzes the initial steps in framing the Arctic as a new world region in the area studies field in the United States for the purpose of providing a starting point for future discussions and developments. I ask: 1) how has the UW Canadian Studies Center effectively incorporated the Arctic as a world region into its academic programs and activities, in particular the 2014 Title VI grant proposal; and, 2) how do the unique characteristics of the Arctic, specifically Indigenous worldviews, challenge and broaden current understandings of area studies? I argue that Arctic studies must be based on an interdisciplinary understanding of the region and its people and, that knowledge of the Arctic is critical to building American expertise and therefore is important to the future development of informed and effective U.S. foreign policy. The focus of the chapter is an analysis of the inclusion of the Arctic as a new world region in the Canadian Studies Center's 2014 Title VI grant proposal. Important to that inclusion are the steps leading up to the formation of the activities, including the designing of the Arctic minor, the development of the UW-wide Future of Ice initiative, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant awarded to College of Arts and Sciences as bridge funding for Title VI, and the process of designing a number of activities to promote the Arctic as a new world region in the 2014 Title VI grant proposal.

The 2014 Title VI invitation letter for proposals from the International and Foreign Language Education office of the U.S. Department of Education underlines the importance for applicants to describe how their area and international studies programs will meet the "nation's present and future needs for globally competent citizens" (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, May 2014a, p. 2). In the Canadian Studies Center grant proposal we attempted to do so by incorporating text and activities that frame the Arctic as a global actor and distinct world region.
Conclusion

The Arctic provides a path by which area studies scholars can reconfigure and reinvigorate the field to make room for a new actor on the world stage. The Arctic can both contribute to area studies and challenge how the field frames and understands world regions. The Arctic challenges conventional notions of territory and introduces Indigenous epistemology into global understandings of space, place, security, and sovereignty. It has all the characteristics that qualify it as a world region. Yet, to date, there is no scholarly discussion concerning the Arctic as a new region in area studies at institutions of higher learning in the United States. The Arctic can play an important role in reinventing area studies to better serve international relations in a world that is increasingly non-Western in its approaches to politics and economics. National Resource Centers benefit from being more decentralized than disciplinary departments and are therefore more adaptive to new intellectual directions. Hence, they can take a lead role in initiating a national dialogue on the future of the field.

This dissertation makes a contribution to the scholarly body of literature that addresses the field of areas studies in American higher education. The Arctic fits the mandate for the International and Foreign Language Education programs while challenging how world regions are understood within and beyond research universities. As the former secretary of the U.S. Department of Education was quoted as saying in reference to the 2014 Title VI grant awards:

To help keep America safe, partner effectively with our allies, and collaborate with other nations in solving global challenges … These grants will enable more students and educators to gain global competencies that equip them with an understanding and openness to cultures and languages around the globe. (USDOE, PO, 2014, para. 2)

In the President's National Security Strategy for the Arctic, released on May 10, 2013, the "three lines of effort" (p. 2) included security, environmental stewardship and international
cooperation (p. 2). Some of American's greatest allies today are Arctic nation-states who have been working together for almost 20 years to ensure environmental security, cooperation and decision-making concerning the region with the inclusion and participation of Arctic Indigenous peoples. Students with an understanding of the history, cultures, politics, economics and languages of the region will have the opportunity to become future leaders and informed citizens prepared to assist in solving some of the greatest environmental challenges to human security in our history, namely climate change.
Chapter Two: Scholarly Literature in Area Studies

This chapter begins by shedding light on the history of area studies in the United States. I review the current area and international studies literature and then assess the status of the current debates. This includes the major critiques, the key challenges to the field in a post-Cold War world, and the primary recommendations for future research made by area and international studies scholars. This chapter begins by assessing the initial concept for area studies as conceived during World War II by both the Rockefeller Foundation and the U.S. Office of Strategic Services. It traces the evolution of area studies through the Cold War and into the 21st century. In this chapter I ask how the nation-state became the organizing unit of analysis for the field, and how has the field of area studies evolved since World War II yet maintained its initial structure. The chapter then outlines the major debates in the scholarly literature and makes recommendations as to how the Arctic and Inuit concepts of territory could open a new dialogue for the field and one that could serve to re-envision area studies for the future. I argue that the unique characteristics of the Arctic have the potential to reinvigorate the field at a critical time in its history.

History of Area Studies in the United States

The evolution of what is considered a world region by the Western governments and academia throughout the 20th century says much about the spatial tradition of area studies and the present-day need for the field to adjust to accommodate more appropriate designations. Area studies in the United States are a relatively new phenomenon that began during the Second World War. At that time, and throughout the Cold War, world regions were defined as those areas of the world that were of security concern to the United States. In the post-Cold War world the concept of area studies broadened to include international studies and approaches to the study
of world regions that would further U.S. economic interests. Increased globalization called into question the specificity and meaning of place. And, in the early part of the 21st century, political boundaries are being challenged by cultural spaces (that cut across domestic and national political jurisdictions) while security concerns are broadening to include transnational issues such as climate change.

**Early 20th Century Concepts of Area Studies.** In the United States, prior to World War II, there was little curricula or research on the study of non-Western or foreign regions. As a result of the war, there was a growing awareness that the United States was not prepared to respond adequately to outside threats. The Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 galvanized this concern marking the beginning of relations between the U.S. government and academia to enhance national intelligence. Immediately following Pearl Harbor, the Office of Strategic Services was founded (forerunner to the Central Intelligence Agency), and the government began hiring academics to provide intelligence information through its key unit, the Research and Analysis Branch. This was the beginning of a close, collaborative relationship between the federal government and academia and the development of what is referred to as practical or "useful knowledge" (Dirks, 2012, para. 12). In those early years area studies were both interdisciplinary, connecting the social sciences with the humanities; and strategic, building relationships between the United States and the developing world (Dirks, 2012, para. 12). The goal of area studies during World War II was to create relationships with nations of concern based on political and economic development, mutual understanding, and commercial exchange with the United States (Dirks, 2012, para. 11). The field also played a vital role in promoting understanding of previously unknown and little understood regions of the world.

**The Rockefeller Foundation and Area Studies.** In the late 1940s and early 1950s, the
Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation convened several meetings to discuss the importance of area studies knowledge for security purposes. The Rockefeller Foundation,\(^4\) in particular, played a significant role in this effort. In 1944 the Foundation held a conference to explore the concept of area studies. The conference brought together representatives from the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, the U.S. government, academics, and what were termed "area men" or men experienced in military programs (Rockefeller Foundation, n.d.-a). The Rockefeller Foundation had been in the business of funding academic programs since the 1930s. However, the war effort shifted earlier priorities from "'pure,' disinterested academic scholarship toward an overt consideration of international relations" (Rockefeller Foundation, n.d.-a, para. 5). In 1949, assistant director of the Humanities Division at the Rockefeller Foundation, Charles B. Fahs, drafted one of the earliest definitions of area studies. According to Fahs, area studies would provide a practical application to academic study:

> Area studies provide a method of bringing both students and scholars down to earth from elaboration of theoretical and abstract principles to the study of real life in its practical complexities. They are one of the best means of demonstrating the inter-relationships between the various methods of studying man. It is because of practicality and escape

---

\(^4\) John D. Rockefeller, the founder of Standard Oil, established The Rockefeller Foundation in 1913 with the mission statement, "to improve the well-being of humanity around the world" (Rockefeller Foundation, n.d.-b). It is one of the largest foundations in the United States with an annual giving budget of about $150 million. The early interests of the Foundation were public health and medical science. In the 1920s the Foundation expanded into the humanities and social sciences.
from the limitations of single disciplines that area studies are particularly useful for better international understanding; either for war or peace. (Fahs, 1949, p. 1)

Fahs' vision was to apply knowledge to practice, and to understand individuals and society from a multitude of disciplinary perspectives. However, the Rockefeller Foundation's stated intent to serve the nation's agenda ("either for war or peace") pre-determined which world regions would be studied. Thus over a 12-year period (1946-1958), the Rockefeller Foundation provided grants to programs in Russian studies, East European Studies, Asian, African and Latin American studies at major U.S. universities spending an average of a million dollars annually in the first eight years of the program (Rockefeller Foundation, n.d.-a, para. 4). In 1946 Columbia University's Russian Institute was established with Rockefeller Foundation support, creating the first "area studies" center in the United States (Rockefeller Foundation, n.d.-c, para. 7).

Whereas area studies had focused primarily on understanding world regions during the war, the field took a turn toward international relations and foreign policy. In 1955, Fahs, at that time director of the Foundation, noted the connection between area studies and foreign policy:

Since the War, with the United States catapulted into world leadership, it has been necessary to pursue simultaneously the dual objectives of cultural enrichment and the strengthening of national capacities for sound foreign policy. (1954, p. 1)

Building on the foundation created by the Rockefeller Foundation and fueled by the Cold War, the U.S. Department of Defense considered the creation of a government-based area studies grant program.

**Area Studies During the Cold War.** When the Soviet Union launched its first orbiting satellite, Sputnik 1 in 1957, the U.S. government responded by proposing new programs to support science, engineering and language. It was at this point that area studies truly emerged as
a new field in academia with strong financial support from the federal government. Catalyzed by the Soviet-led space race, Eisenhower launched the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in recognition of the need for greater expertise regarding languages and key areas of the world. As pointed out in the archival history prepared by the U.S. Department of Education, the National Defense Education Act:

… heralded a major U.S. commitment to devoting new attention to the world beyond its borders – first to teach more of the uncommonly taught foreign languages, and then to learn in depth about the histories, societies, cultures and political systems of the key foreign powers as well as the rapidly multiplying "Third World" nations. (Wiley as cited in USDOE, OPE, IFLE, n.d. para. 3)

Title VI was introduced as part of the National Defense Education Act, marking the beginning of area studies as a U.S. federal government initiative. Initially, 19 language and area centers were created in the United States. The concept for what constituted a world region continued to be based on areas of concern or threat to the United States, particularly the newly emerging nation-states or regions ideologically aligned with the Soviet Union. During the Cold War, area studies expanded in response to new national security concerns including communism in Russia and China and the potential impact of decolonization in African and Asian countries. In the 1960s area studies expanded to include Latin America – an "important area for U.S. security" during the Cold War (USDOE, OPE, IEPS, 2011, para. 10).

Cold War tensions relaxed for a decade beginning in the late 1960s, causing some to question the future relevance of the Title VI program. However, the program actually grew in an effort to further U.S. economic interests. As the concept for area studies began to shift from a defense-focused model to securing America's place as a global business and economic leader,
Title VI programs grew to include Business and International Education Centers. In the 1970s, the first allocations for Canada were designated to reflect the importance of the economic relationship between the two countries. At this time Title VI also expanded to include international studies – a field that enabled programs to focus on critical global themes.

In 1980 Title VI was incorporated into the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote President's Johnson's vision for a "Great Society." According to R. Hines, former director of the U.S. Department of Education, "This addition reflected Congressional judgment that federal support for international education should address economic productivity as well as foreign policy" (as cited in O'Meara, Mehlinger & Ma Newman, 2001, pp. 8-9). The transfer from the Department of Defense to the Department of Education emphasized, according to the U.S. Department of Education, the importance of international expertise to "all aspects of modern life, including business, technology, education, media, health and other professional fields (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, n.d., para. 12). As the United States became a global superpower during the Cold War, the nation sought to secure its new status via the development of global expertise.

Area Studies in a Globalized World. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, congressional support for the Title VI program remained strong given the desire of the government to maintain its global position. Robust funding for Title VI continued through the 1990s, with the largest allocation occurring after 9/11 under the Bush administration in an effort, according to the U.S. Department of Education, "to increase the number of international experts ... with in-depth expertise and high-level language proficiency in the targeted world areas of Central and South Asia, the Middle East, Russia, and the Independent States of the former Soviet Union" (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, n.d., para. 1). For the next decade the Title VI programs received strong bipartisan support. However, by the end of the decade, the federal government was under
increased pressure to deal with its growing deficit bringing greater scrutiny by Congress to the funding allocations of many departments including Education.

In 2011, the Obama administration cut over 50 million dollars from Title VI, or about 40% from the 2011 fiscal year budgets. R. Khalidi, the Edward Said Chair at Columbia University, warned, "With these short-sighted cuts, Congress is helping to keep the United States ignorant of the world, which cannot be a good thing in the 21st century" (as cited in Balaghi 2011, para. 23). At the University of Washington (UW), R. Kasaba, director of the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, noted "budget cuts over the last two fiscal years (2011 and 2012) have translated into a reduction of $998,772 per year, or almost $3 million over three years, substantially reducing administrative and other staff support, as well as investments in innovative language acquisition and digital learning tools" (UW, 2012, para. 6). With the Title VI program facing new challenges, it was an opportune time to propose new ideas to potentially increase the relevance of area studies. At the Canadian Studies Center, we proposed a reconsideration of how world regions are understood and territory conceptualized.

Scholarly Literature on Area Studies

While the U.S. government had slashed funding for area studies, scholars in the field overwhelmingly argued for the value of area and international studies and provided many recommendations concerning how the field might be revitalized. The two primary debates in the literature included the role of the U.S. government in shaping area studies, and questioned the relevance of area studies in a globalized world. A third focus called for the reinvention of the field to have a greater focus on cultural spaces. I begin by outlining the two major debates in area studies literature followed by a focus on the scholarly literature that addressed new ways of understanding space in the field.
**Area Studies and the Role of the U.S. Government.** A number of scholars critiqued area studies and viewed the field as little more than an arm of the U.S. government to provide information to the Central Intelligence Agency and further American imperialism globally (Cumings, 2002; Harootunian & Miyoshi, 2002; Kolluoglu-Kirli, 2003). Harootunian and Miyoshi (2002) argued that area studies evolved from a Cold War project during which time scholars gathered information about enemy regions to promote U.S. imperialism, to a post-Cold War neo-liberal\(^5\) agenda focused on the economic dominance of the country. These scholars argued that in an effort to create a global economy for the United States, area studies were in fact guilty of "ignoring the genuine political conditions that produce relationships of inequity and injustice" (Harootunian & Miyoshi, 2002, p. 13). Cumings (2002) also argued that area studies had evolved to promote neo-liberalism, paving the way for transnational corporations to operate successfully in a global economy (p. 267). In addition, the field has been critiqued for having an orientalist approach to other world regions. Kolluoglu-Kirli (2003), for example, argued that area studies is, in fact, an extension of European orientalism developed by the United States to protect its interests and enhance its domination in a decolonized world (p. 108). There is no question that the world regions with the largest funding allocations are those areas of interest to U.S. economic development. However, the competitive priorities listed in the grant application, found under the U.S. Department of Education guiding documents, are focused on providing greater access to higher education and cultural understanding (see Chapter Six of this thesis).

---

\(^5\) Neoliberalism is used to describe the economic policies that began in the late-20\(^{th}\) century emphasizing free markets, deregulation, low tariffs, and privatization of government services (von Schnitzler, 2008, p. 473).
Other scholars took direct aim at the above claims of undue influence of the government on the agenda of the Title VI programs (Khosrowjah, 2011; Moseley, 2009). Moseley (2009) argued that area studies research has, in fact, provided little value to the U.S. government. He pointed out that on close examination of Title VI programs, one would find that much of the teaching and research being conducted is, in fact, deeply critical of U.S. policy (Moseley, 2009, para. 14). Moseley (2009) pointed out, "If some of those students go on to be policy makers whose decisions may influence people in other regions, all the better if they have a less America-centric view" (para. 16). Moseley also noted that the government supports many research projects in other disciplines. The sciences, for example, are overwhelmingly supported by government grants, yet this does not necessitate the promotion of a government agenda in the research. Khosrowjah (2011) admitted that while area studies may serve the U.S. security and intelligence agenda and even shape U.S. foreign policy, it has nonetheless made a worthwhile contribution to knowledge. Khosrowjah observed that area studies have always blurred the relationship between "university borders and state interests" (2011, p. 132). He argued that so long as scholars are cognizant of the close relationship between area studies and the state, value can be found in the tremendous knowledge base produced by the field.

Although area and international studies programs in the United States were ultimately created to serve the government's need for knowledge about the world, to argue that this is all these programs do (promote a U.S. imperialist, capitalist and orientalist agenda), is to misunderstand the contribution these programs have made to an enhanced understanding of the world by students, educators and the general public. I agree with Khosrowjah (2011) and Moseley (2009) and argue that while it is important to understand world regions according to
non-Western worldviews, the Title VI program has made a major contribution to improving Americans' knowledge about the world.

**Area Studies and Globalization.** In the scholarly literature, globalization and its impact on area studies is, by far, the debate that has received the most attention by scholars in the field. Scholars have described area studies in a post-Cold War world as becoming "unmoored" (Simon 2013), experiencing "decline and reappraisal" (Sidaway, 2013, p. 986), and as being in the "thramls of a fiscal and epistemological crisis" (Goss & Wesley-Smith, 2010, p. ix). However, for other area studies scholars, the field offers a necessary counter to globalization (Dirks, 2012; Ludden, 2003; Merkx, 2012; Mirsepassi, Basu & Weaver, 2003; Mitchell, 2003). While globalization is eroding borders and flattening cultural distinctiveness, area studies provide a needed sense of place. Contrary to the predictions of Friedman's *The World is Flat* (2005), perhaps even in response to globalization, regions continue to assert their uniqueness. Mirsepassi, Basu and Weaver (2003) argued that if we do not want to privilege globalization, then training in area studies is critical. Area studies can serve to challenge meta-narratives or universal truths, as do postcolonial, postmodern and cultural studies, by "privileging the local, the everyday, and the particular" (Mirsepassi, Basu & Weaver, 2003, p. 8). Mirsepassi, Basu and Weaver (2003) asserted, "The fluid concept of globalization can be made more precise and meaningful only by being grounded in area studies" (p. 13).

Other scholars have countered the debate concerning globalization, and have noted that the local-global tension is not new, rather it has long been part of the study of humanity (Ludden, 2003; Mitchell, 2003). According to Ludden, "Area studies are a necessary counterweight to the decontextualizing force of universal globalization" (2003, p. 136). Mitchell (2003) also argued that the global-local dichotomy is not a recent occurrence and that the disciplines have
perpetuated universalism by treating the nation-state as a "universal social template" (p. 156). Mitchell observed that the disciplines have oriented themselves around the theoretical territory of the "self-enclosed, geographically fixed form of the nation-state as the assumed space of all social scientific inquiry" (2003, p. 160). Therefore, the disciplines are serving to further embed the West, and Western values, as the norm. On the other hand, the field of area studies, according to Mitchell, challenges the "universality of the disciplines" (2003, p. 168) via its understanding of the particulars of a location/place. I agree with Mitchell's (2003) critique of disciplines however, I argue that area studies also relies on the nation-state framework to understand world regions and that is it imperative to challenge the field according to Agnew's (1994) "territorial trap" in order to destabilize the West and Western values in the field.

Dirks (2012) and Merkx (2012) make some of the most compelling arguments for the potential of area studies to serve as a "counter" to globalization. Referring to anthropologist Clifford Geertz, Dirks (2012) argued for the value of studying in locations and not just about other cultures (para. 17). In addition, he credited the U.S. government for understanding the importance of study abroad as part of the area studies project. Dirks noted:

Today's increasingly interconnected world – with its global flows of processes, goods and markets, desires and pleasures, ideas and movements, information and media – seems to transcend the particular. But as Geertz argued, we should be cautious about assuming that abstract social theories are never affected by where they are read. We must study not just the connectedness of things, but the things that connect, what happens when they connect, and what connection looks like from specific places and to specific people. For all their limitations, both our OSS [Office of Strategic Services] predecessors and the practitioners of cold-war area studies understood that. (Dirks, 2012, para. 18)
Dirks did not call for a return to traditional area studies in service of state knowledge about enemy regions. Rather, he envisioned an area studies focused on global understanding. Dirks (2012) noted, "Now, without a world war or a cold war, we have the luxury to move to the global in a more deliberative, engaged, disciplined, and intellectually serious (and less directly politicized) way than when area studies began" (para. 21). Merkx (2012) agreed that while Title VI programs face an uncertain future, globalization is, in fact, creating a huge demand for area studies, study abroad and educational partnerships (p. 7).

The Future of Area Studies. There is unanimous agreement in the area studies literature that in order for the field to thrive in the future, it has to be reinvented to address the challenges of a globalized world. Some scholars have argued for the increased relevance of international studies, or the addressing of global themes from an international perspective (Glew, Riedinger & Jamison, 2010). Schäfer (2010) argued for transformation of area studies into global and local studies. Still other scholars have suggested a comparative area studies model (Ahram, 2011; Basedau & Köllner, 2007; Heryanto, 2013). Finally, some of the most innovative thinking comes from those scholars who have argued that conventional notions of space found in area and international studies need to be challenged if the field is to remain relevant (Sidaway, 2013; Steinberg, 2009).

Glew, Riedinger and Jamison (2010) focused on enhancing international studies to address thematic issues across regions. They argued that international studies centers were intended to be "problem-oriented or thematically focused on important international issues that transcend geographical regions" (Glew, Riedinger & Jamison, 2010, p. 6). For these scholars, international studies is the answer to addressing 21st century problems. Schäfer (2010) similarly valued the unique role international studies can play however, he argued area and international
studies are both critical to understanding the complexities of globalization. For Schäfer area studies, along with international or global studies, address distinctive regions and global processes. At the same time, he critiqued area studies for not sufficiently responding to the multipolar challenges of a globalized world. I agree with Schäfer's caution that we cannot have one without the other. For example, climate change is currently a key theme for several Title VI international studies programs. However, climate change is more than a global theme. In order to address it adequately, new voices and worldviews need to be included in the dialogue including those of Indigenous peoples. Arctic Indigenous peoples have a profound experience of climate change given that the Arctic is warming at twice the rate as the rest of the world (Hassol, 2004, p. 8). For this reason, it is essential that Arctic Indigenous voices are fully integrated into climate change discussions. While global themes need to be addressed, it cannot be at the expense of understanding distinct regional voices.

Other scholars have argued that global challenges are best dealt with via comparative area studies – or the understanding of inter-state relations within a world region as well as intra-regional relations. Basedau and Köllner (2007) argued that intra-regional studies (comparing regions within an area), inter-regional studies (comparing entire areas to one another), and cross-regional studies (comparing an analytic unit across different regions) can provide future relevance for area studies. Ahram (2011) argued that comparative area studies takes the field beyond geography to a more theoretical understanding of regions (p. 84) or an understanding of regions that takes into account the histories and institutional relations between and among states in a region.

Heryanto (2013) explored the relationship between area and cultural studies (with reference to Southeast Asia) and argued that a positive future for area studies might include a
greater convergence with cultural studies (p. 303). Cultural studies, as Heryanto described, has consciously diverged from mainstream academics, "resisted universalist claims, and radically questioned academic disciplinary boundaries and authority" (2013, p. 304). Cultural studies aims to be sensitive to social relations and local practices. In fact, cultural studies began to increase in popularity just as area studies were facing increased criticism. Heryanto contended that area studies are moving beyond nation-state borders to address transnational networks, particularly as borders are becoming more porous. Heryanto looked at the crisis in area studies as a potential opportunity for cultural and area studies to converge and potentially bring enhanced insight into both areas of study. Heryanto's analysis, is applicable to the Arctic where cultural regions intersect with nation-state borders. As a growing number of transnational cultural groups and civil society organizations gain salience in domestic and international relations, the understanding of area studies must expand to include new concepts for areas based on cultural cohesion.

Finally, the argument about the importance of "place" in a globalized environment is one of the most interesting in the area studies debate as it connects the field to other scholarly literature concerning the politics of place and how we understand territory. However, this debate has received the least attention. According to Sidaway (2013), [g]eography remains relatively marginal also to evolving debates concerning the status of area studies in restructuring the academy and changing the world" (p. 985). In his article, "Geography, Globalization, and the Problematic of Area Studies," Sidaway (2013) pointed out the absence of geographers in the scholarship on area studies (p. 985-986). He provided examples from van Schendel (2002) and Scott (2009) who have both used the region Zomia, in Asia, as an example of an "intellectual partition of space" (Sidaway, 2013, p. 990). In addition, Sidaway brought in literature from
geographers, particularly Steinberg (2009) who have sought to broaden the concept of space to include oceans. Steinberg addressed ocean and fluid space or the space of movement. Steinberg looked at boundaries that go beyond defining space to lines that "regulate and are reproduced by acts of movement" (2009, p. 467). The ocean, according to Steinberg, is "a space of mobility outside the boundaries of the state-society" (2009, p. 467). Steinberg's (2009) notion of place is the most fitting for the Arctic. The Arctic Ocean provides the central space for the circumpolar world, not just from a physical standpoint, but also in terms of the critical role the ocean plays in shaping community life and culture. Steinberg (2009) broadens understandings of territory to include spaces of movement that also form a key component in the Inuit argument for what constitutes territory (see Chapter Four).

The Arctic and Area Studies

The development of the Arctic as a unique region draws an interesting parallel with the evolution of area studies. During World War II and the Cold War, world regions were defined according to their strategic interest to the United States. This was also the case with the Arctic, not as a threat but as a strategic platform (Grant, 1989). Defenses during World War II included: the building of the Alaska-Canada Highway connecting Alaska to the contiguous United States through northern Canada; the Northwest Staging Route (a series of airports, landing strips and radio stations in northern Alberta, British Columbia, the Yukon, Alaska and extending into the Soviet Union); and the Crimson Route (a transportation route through communities in today's Nunavik, Nunavut, Nunatsiavut, Greenland and Iceland) (Keenleyside, 1960/1961).

During World War II and the Cold War, or between 1939 and 1963 in the Eastern Arctic (Tester & Kulshyski, 1994), Canadian sovereignty efforts also included relocation of the Inuit by the Canadian government and the integration of the Inuit into settled communities. Tester and
Kulshyski's (1994) described the concept of "totalization" where the state became "a critical agent in the struggle to incorporate Inuit into the dominant Canadian society" (p. 4). The argued that the policy of relocation and the establishment of a relief and welfare regime, were also mechanisms of totalization (p. 9).

During the Cold War expansion into the Arctic by Canada and the United States continued with the building the Distance Early Warning line – over 60 radar stations that ran across Arctic North America to Greenland and Iceland. In an excellent article on the Canadian-American relations in the Arctic, Tynon (1979) outlined a number of joint activities undertaken by the two countries concerning defense particularly during World War II and the Cold War. Tynon described the Arctic as becoming "a cold war battleground" (p. 408). Academic, public servant and Canadian diplomat, H. L. Keenleyside made the following comment in his 1949 convocation speech at McMaster University:

What the Aegean Sea was to classical antiquity, what the Mediterranean was to the Roman world, what the Atlantic Ocean was to the expanding of Europe of Renaissance days, the Arctic Ocean is becoming to the world of aircraft and atomic power.

During the Cold War, the Arctic was a stage for international geopolitics rather than its own distinct region. This would change with the thawing of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union as well as a result of the growing influence of the Inuit.

During the 1970s the Arctic began to take shape as an actor in, versus a platform for, geopolitics. This was due, in part, to the political mobilization of the Inuit at the international level. In 1977, the Inuit formed an international organization – the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (now the Inuit Circumpolar Council) – to give a voice to the region in world affairs. In the following decade, the Arctic nation-states began to envision the Arctic as having the distinct
characteristics of a region of cooperation or "zone of peace" (Gorbachev, 1987, p. 28). In his 1987 Murmansk Speech Gorbachev suggested that "The Arctic is not only the Arctic Ocean, but also the northern tips of three continents: Europe, Asia and America. It is the place where the Euroasian, North American and Asian Pacific regions meet" (p. 27). He argued that the Arctic is unique in that this is where global interests are felt most intensely. According to Gorbachev:

What everybody can be absolutely certain of is the Soviet Union's profound and certain interest in preventing the North of the planet, its Polar and sub-Polar regions and all Northern countries from ever again becoming an arena of war, and in forming there a genuine zone of peace and fruitful cooperation. (1987, p. 31)

As a result of the prior formation of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference and the Murmansk Speech, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy was formed in 1991, and the Arctic Council in 1996. The Strategy was the first international document to be drafted in collaboration with Indigenous peoples; and the Arctic Council was the first intergovernmental decision-shaping organization for the region and the first international organization founded and operated in collaboration with Indigenous peoples. By the late 20th century, the Arctic had taken on the characteristics of a distinctive region.

Conclusion

Despite the developments described above, the scholarly literature in the field of area studies in the United States has yet to address Indigenous concepts of world regions or transnational areas. The works of Sidaway (2013) and Steinberg (2009) came closest to challenging the current accepted definition of regions in area studies. In looking outside the area studies scholarly literature, there is some research defining the Arctic from an Inuit perspective. In particular, Freeman's study (1976) is the richest document to date concerning the inclusion of
oral stories and testimonies from the Inuit regarding use and occupancy of the land. However, as the study was conducted to lay the foundation for land claims negotiations, it did not include sea ice as part of territory. It was another 30 years before a document was written defining sea ice as territory, and it would be an Inuit report that would do so.

In 2008, the Inuit Circumpolar Council published their first report broadening the concept of territory to include sea ice in *The Sea Ice is Our Highway* (Inuit Circumpolar Council). The Council argued that because Inuit life is dependent on movement and sea ice is integral to that movement, ice is therefore part of Inuit territory (Inuit Circumpolar Council [ICC], 2008, p. i). The concept of ice as territory was later advanced by one of Freeman's students, Claudio Aporta, who co-led an International Polar Year project on ice use and occupancy – Sea Ice Knowledge and Use. The edited volume from the study, *Knowing our Ice: Documenting Inuit Sea Ice Knowledge and Use*, (Krupnik et al, 2011) described Indigenous people's knowledge and use of sea ice as providing the basis for social life and therefore territory. Summaries of the project's findings were later published (Aporta, 2011; Aporta, Fraser & Laidler, 2011) building on the argument that sea ice constitutes territory challenging conventional understandings. Aporta (2011) argued that Inuit concepts of ice must be considered in how the Arctic is understood in order that we are able to face the current challenges regarding the region. Aporta noted:

> The ways in which sea ice is understood by Inuit, however, are still little known to non-Inuit. Alongside the currently renewed political and economic interest in the Arctic regions, and in part as a result of the mounting preoccupation with the vulnerability of Arctic ecosystems and peoples due to climate change, new research is shedding light on significant aspects of how Inuit use and understand sea ice. (2011, p. 6)

In Chapter Four of this dissertation, I analyze how the Inuit both domestically in Canada and
internationally are framing the Arctic region and apply these concepts to my educational practice in building an Arctic initiative at the UW. This dissertation contributes to the area studies literature by adding new understandings of territory to the field – Indigenous concepts of territory.
Chapter Three: Methodology and Methods – Analytic Autoethnography

Given the critical importance of immersing oneself in the field, ethnographers who are able to meet other needs or interests while engaging in research have a unique opportunity to use life's precious time efficiently. (Anderson, 2006, p. 389)

Autoethnography is the writing of life's poignant moments as they relate to a better understanding of a cultural phenomenon – or in the case of this research project, an educational phenomenon. Given that I am situated at an institution outside the Arctic, or south of the tree line, and given that I am not Indigenous (nor are the majority of faculty members and researchers currently involved in UW's Arctic initiative), I have to consistently engage in autoethnographic methodology to reflect on the degree to which we are including Arctic Indigenous worldviews or epistemologies in the initiative in an effective, ethical and representational manner and involving Indigenous scholars and students. As Ahmed (2012) argued in On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life, it is easier to fall into symbolic commitments to diversity – even by well intentioned practitioners and scholars – than to truly embody diversity. Arctic Indigenous concepts of territory and the role of Arctic Indigenous peoples in international affairs are changing how we understand geopolitics concerning the Arctic. This is evident in how the Inuit understand territory and their unique voice and world views as expressed in foreign policy. This story has yet to be integrated in the Title VI area studies field. The analytic autoethnographic methodology provides me with the tools to reflect on my practice and to consider how we understand space and territory and their relationship to social justice. The methodology enables me to reflect on the process of developing an Arctic studies program at the UW, with its myriad challenges, and to foster a more thoughtful practice. In this chapter I outline the history of
autoethnography, the various schools within the field, and why analytic autoethnography is the most appropriate methodology for this research project.

**Autoethnographic Methodologies**

Autoethnography is a qualitative research methodology that sits at the intersection of autobiography and ethnography. The term derives from *auto*, meaning self, *ethno* meaning culture, and *graphy* referring to the process of recording – whether written, scraped and scratched onto a clay tablet, or drawn or expressed in some other manner. According to Warren (2009), "autoethnography is, most fundamentally, the storying of culture" (p. 69). He noted that while any life story may constitute autobiography, what makes autoethnography distinct is its ability to link the self "to the production of cultural systems" (Warren, 2009, p. 69). An autoethnography reflects, according to May (2011), our personal experience in making "sense of social reality" or "social or cultural phenomena" (p. 77).

Autoethnography is part of the critical theoretical school of thought. As Warren (2009) described, autoethnography is a "critical methodology" (p. 69). It seeks to "resist dominant narratives, complicate taken-for-granted ways of thinking, and disrupt normative communication patterns" (Warren, 2009, p. 69). Researchers choose autoethnography because of its potential to promote social change. According to Ellis, Adams and Bochner (2011), autoethnography is unapologetically "a political, socially-just and socially-conscious act" (sec. 1, para. 1). Rather than being preoccupied with accuracy, the goal of autoethnography, argued Ellis, Adams and Bochner (2011), "is to produce analytical, accessible texts that change us and the world we live in for the better" (sec. 5, para. 5). May (2011) argued, "These narratives are meant to be springboards for new understanding and action toward a more compassionate and equal society" (p. 78). As an example from geography, Besio (2009) described the value of the
autoethnographic research methodology in providing social critique. According to Besio autoethnography may:

… contribute to a more nuanced understanding of trans-cultural interactions in postcolonial research settings … [or] interactions between groups of people positioned in asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination … It is the potential of autoethnography to work toward a more fully articulated postcolonial research method in human geography that considers these transcultural relations of power …. (2009, p. 240)

As a critical methodology, autoethnography stresses a reflective and critical assessment of norms and practices in society. As suggested by Besio above, analytic autoethnography employs geography to consider transcultural relations of power and therefore is an appropriate methodology for this research project that seeks to unsettle the Westphalian definition of political space as found in the field of area studies.

Autoethnography is part of a long-standing tradition in sociology going back to the post-World War I era. It was during that period that students were being encouraged to conduct research in areas where they had some experience or in their own social settings or workplaces. Anderson (2006) noted that while the researchers identified with their place/subject, they did not include reflexive self-observation in their research. Sociological research in the early 20th century, according to Anderson, was grounded in the realist or analytical tradition. It was not until the 1960s and 70s that more experimental self-reflective research methods were incorporated into ethnographies. In 1979 cultural anthropologist David Hayano published the first essay making a case for self-observation in ethnography. According to Anderson (2006):

Hayano argued that as anthropologists moved out of the colonial era of ethnography, they would come more and more to study the social worlds and subcultures of which they
were a part. In contrast to the detached-outsider characteristic of colonial anthropologists, contemporary anthropologists would frequently be full members of the cultures they studied. (p. 376)

Hayano was documenting a "turn" in ethnography. From the 1970s forward there was a greater emphasis in ethnography (within the fields of anthropology and sociology), to have, as its subject, the researcher's own community or experience.

In the 1980s there was a growing dissatisfaction with positivist methods that promised truth but did not take into account the influence of universal narratives on the researcher or the complex relationship between researcher and subject particularly the power imbalance. As a result, autoethnography began to gain in popularity. The term acknowledged the role of the researcher in the social construct that s/he is studying. Pratt (1991) first used the term autoethnography as a research methodology distinct from ethnography. In "Art of the Contact Zone," she described the social space where "cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other" (1991, p. 34). Pratt coined the term "autoethnography" to mean a text written by marginalized groups to "describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them (1991, p. 35). Like Hayano, Pratt described autoethnography as the colonized now writing about their societies and cultures. The development of autoethnography parallels the movement of marginalized peoples globally toward increased self-determination.

This "turn" in ethnography is illustrated by the founding of the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* in 1972. The first editor, Lofland, described the main features of this emerging methodology in the inaugural publication. He outlined that the researcher must be able to provide a "close-up" depiction of the social life under study, and that the approach be analytic and "search out patterns and regularities" (Lofland, 1972, p. 3). Lofland described that the research
needs to provide "the kind of description and quotation that moves the reader 'inside' the world under study" (1972, p. 3). The primary rationale for founding the journal was to create a space for researchers who wanted to move beyond mainstream quantitative research methods.

Over 30 years later, as editor for the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Hunt referred back to Lofland's initial criteria as providing a solid foundation for what contemporary ethnographic research ought to be. He quoted Lofland's 1972 introduction extensively, further clarifying what is meant by analytic. Hunt (2005) argued that, "being analytic requires ethnographers to clearly communicate what their research contributes – theoretically, substantively, methodologically, practically – to some area of research" (p. 4). He insisted this contribution is the central focus of ethnography and the "essential characteristic" (Hunt, 2005, p. 4) of the journal. Hunt reminded journal readers of the original intent of autoethnography while underlining the argument that this research methodology is indeed analytic and therefore viable.

According to Waterston (2013) the autoethnographic methodology is more concerned with a "postmodern effort to deconstruct established paradigms" (p. 36), than with "discovering universals truths" (p. 37). She noted that, as such, the autoethnographic research methodology has no set formula other than the "presence of the ethnographic self," the acknowledgement of the "subjective, even emotional aspects of the enterprise," and the acceptance of "alternative narrative forms of experimental writing" (Waterston, 2013, p. 37). While my relationship to the subject and narrative form are perhaps more conventional than may be common in autoethnographical research, the methodology is good fit for a dissertation that analyses educational practice.

There are a myriad of approaches to autoethnography. For this research project I found it valuable to identify between two main traditions – analytic (Anderson, 2006; Atkinson, 2006;
Atkinson, Coffey & Delamont, 2003; Charmaz, 2006; Gans, 1999); and evocative or emotive (Ellis, 1991 & 1997; Ellis & Bochner, 2000 & 2001; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011; Denzen, 1997 & 2006; Muncey, 2010). In August 2006 the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* published Anderson's (2006) seminal essay distinguishing analytic autoethnography from emotive/evocative autoethnography. Six theorists challenged Anderson's argument or responded to issues raised. This chapter will not take up the debates between these two approaches rather, I utilize this debate to argue for the value of the analytic autoethnographic research methodology to my particular subject.

**Analytic versus Emotive Autoethnography**

The argument concerning autoethnography began with Atkinson, Coffey and Delmont (2003) in their book, *Key Themes in Qualitative Research: Continuities and Changes*. The authors set out their "manifesto" noting that new trends in ethnography cannot disregard the solid foundation that has been established by pioneers in the field. The authors reminded readers that the work of the ethnographer is to understand a social group, setting or problem (Atkinson, Coffey & Delmont, 2003, p. x), as well as to analyze (their italics) that phenomenon for the reader. The authors argued, "While they [pioneering ethnographers] were self-conscious about their own research … they were not self-obsessed" (Atkinson, Coffey & Delmont, 2003, p. x-xi). They go on to warn that many current trends in ethnography (the emotive or evocative) "celebrate self-referential work, with little relevance to our understanding of actual social worlds" (Atkinson, Coffey & Delmont, 2003, p. xi).

Anderson (2006) supported the arguments made by Atkinson, Coffey and Delmont (2003) by defining analytic autoethnography as a subgenre of analytic ethnography, thereby distinguishing it from emotive autoethnography. He argued, analytic autoethography is "a
specialized subgenre of ethnography" (Anderson, 2006, p. 388) or traditional ethnography with enhanced researcher visibility. He described analytic autoethnography as:

… ethnographic work in which the researcher is … a full member in the research group … visible as such a member in the researcher's published texts, and … committed to an analytic research agenda focused on improving theoretical understandings of broader social phenomena. (Anderson, 2006, p. 375)

Anderson (2006) argued that the analytic autoethnographer engages in dialogue with the subjects/community with the idea that the process will contribute to social knowledge (p. 386). Anderson (2006) strongly argued against overly emotive texts, cautioning that, "analytic ethnographers must avoid self-absorbed digression" (p. 385).

Charmaz (2006) agreed with Anderson that autoethnography comes out of the tradition of realist ethnography and therefore that the methodology is more than simply self-observation. She argued, "it [autoethnography] is self-observation in ethnographic research that necessarily attends to the social worlds in which autoethnographers participate" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 396). Atkinson (2006) went even further, arguing that the anthropologist and social scientist have always been implicated in their research – this is nothing new. However, he noted:

It is a misrepresentation of the history of social research to imply … that until fairly recently, sociologists and anthropologists were unrealistically wedded to an ideal of entirely impersonal and dispassionate fieldwork. The long tradition of life-history research has been predicated on close relationships between the researcher and the informant. (Atkinson, 2006, p. 401)

Atkinson (2006) argued that ethnography is the product of the interaction between the researcher and subject – that the term autoethnography simply recognizes this interface but is not an
invitation to replace the subject with the self (p. 402). Like Anderson, Atkinson (2006) cautioned against the ethnographer becoming "more memorable than the ethnography" or "the self more absorbing than other social actors" (p. 402).

In the autoethnographic methodology, there continue to be two distinct approaches to research – analytical and emotive. Maréchal (2010) provided an excellent description of the difference between the two:

Evocative and emotional autoethnography promotes the ethnographic project as a relational commitment to studying the ordinary practices of human life, which involves engaged self-participation, makes sense in the context of lived experience, and contributes to social criticism. Analytical autoethnography finds it necessary to look outward at distinct others in order to generate meaningful social analysis. (p. 7)

According to Maréchal (2010), with analytic autoethnography the researcher participates as a full member or participant in the study while maintaining, "a distinct and highly visible identity as a self-aware scholar and social actor" (p. 3). In analytic autoethnography, Maréchal (2010) pointed out, the researcher's feelings and experiences are included in the study for the purpose of understanding the social world observed (p. 3). Given that this dissertation is about my practice as it relates to the larger field of area studies and social justice within educational programming, it is my goal that the research project transcend my personal experiences, and seek to broaden the findings in my practice for greater application in the field of area studies.

**Five Key Features of Analytical Autoethnography**

In distinguishing analytic from emotive autoethnography in the 2006 publication of the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Anderson further defined autoethnography according to five key features. These included that the researcher:
1. Have complete member status in the community s/he is researching.

2. Practice analytic reflexivity.

3. Be visible in the narrative.

4. Engage in dialogue with informants that will extend beyond the self.


I use these features as benchmarks for my approach to the research on the Arctic academic program initiative at the UW.

According to Anderson (2006), the researcher must be a "complete member of the social world under study" (p. 279) as opposed to being a detached observer as required in conventional ethnography. The rationale is that the understandings that develop out of analytic autoethnography arise from "engaged dialogue" (Anderson 2006, p. 382). In analytic autoethnography the researcher is both a participant in the research and an observer or recorder. This dual positioning adds complexity to the research including the challenge in maintaining an appropriate balance between participation, observation and critical analysis.

Anderson's (2006) second key feature of analytic autoethnography is for the researcher to practice self-conscious introspection (p. 382). An ethnographic researcher attempts to understand a particular social world and make it understandable to others, while the autoethnographer, as part of the social world under study, is also shaped by the research. For Anderson this "mutual informativity is one of the most appealing features of autoethnographic work" (2006, p. 383).

His third key feature is the visibility of the researcher in the text (as opposed to the invisibility of the ethnographer in a research project). The autoethnographer's own feelings or experiences are, as described by Anderson (2006), "vital data for understanding the social world being observed … Autoethnographers should expect to be involved in the construction of
meaning and values in the social worlds they investigate" (p. 384). At the same time, Anderson (2006) cautions against overt self-absorption, reminding the researcher that the goal of analytic autoethnography is for a social purpose that goes beyond the self.

Anderson's (2006) fourth key feature is that the analytical autoethnographer engage in a rich dialogue with informants noting "[t]he ethnographic imperative calls for dialogue with 'data' or 'others'" (p. 386). Here I add the work of Kral (2014) who argued that the relationship between researcher and researched needs to be given more attention as it is central to the content and quality of the data. Kral (2014) argued, "The data one gets depend on levels of comfort, trust, respect, and genuineness that interviewee and interviewer have with each other" (p. 144).

Finally, Anderson's (2006) fifth key feature is the commitment of the researcher to the analytical agenda. Here Anderson reinforced his argument that "the defining characteristic of analytic social science is to use empirical data to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena than those provided by the data themselves" (p. 387). Anderson (2006) pressed that the distinctive feature of autoethnography is this "value-added quality" (p. 388) that transcends the particular social world under investigation. The greatest challenge to achieving this goal is for the researcher to strike a balance between engagement in the research and time/distance for reflectivity and analysis. Anderson (2006) noted:

Autoethnography is somewhat unique in research in that it is particularly likely to be warranted by the quest for self-understanding … The kind of self-understanding I am talking about lies at the intersection of biography and society: self-knowledge that comes from understanding our personal lives, identities, and feelings as deeply connected to and in large part constituted by – and in turn helping to constitute – the sociocultural contexts in which we live. (p. 390)
At the end of the day, when the fieldwork is done, the analytic autoethnographer must spend considerable time rewriting the field notes and reflecting on her/his role in the research in order to effectively combine ethnography with autobiography.

**Anderson's Analytic Autoethnography and My Practice**

Anderson's (2006) vision for and approach to analytic autoethnography well fits this research project. In response to his five key features of the methodology first, I am a well-integrated member of the community that I am researching. In terms of the area studies community, I have served as assistant, associate and now managing director of the Canadian Studies Center for 15 years during which time I have written five successful Title VI grant proposals and organized and implemented hundreds of academic activities addressing Canada as a world region. Over the last six years, I have played a leadership role in integrating the Arctic into the area studies field. In my research I benefit from being an intimate part of the area studies community that I research. For this study I have extended that role to challenge former territorial concepts and meet "other needs and interests" (Anderson, 2006, p. 389) beyond myself. I serve as the lead-chair of the Arctic Minor Steering Committee, as an appointed board member of the UW-wide Future of Ice initiative, as co-investigator on two Andrew W. Mellon sub-grants, and as the instructor of the new core course in Arctic Studies, ARCTIC 200 Indigenous Diplomacies and International Relations in the Arctic. Second, I am part of the social world under study and, as a result of the analytic autoethnographic methodology, my leadership and practice have evolved. In working to launch a successful academic program on the Arctic, I am aware that in the process I am challenging my own ways of thinking about territory, space and what constitutes foreign policy. My practice is also becoming increasingly committed to full collaboration and inclusion of Indigenous scholars, students and other Indigenous voices (artists,
elders, leaders). Third, my own responses are included in the text in the form of field notes making me a visible part of the study. Fourth, this analytic autoethnographic methodology involved intensive meetings, telephone discussions, email communications, and co-written proposals and reports. This meaningful engagement with other participants, including UW administrators, colleagues, students, community members, Indigenous colleagues, and outside experts and organizations was key in informing the findings of this research. Finally, it is my goal that this research has value for other area studies centers and for institutions looking to develop an Arctic academic program. This dissertation may be used to inform academic programs outside our Center and institutions potentially providing a broader social value.

Methods

This research project began during Fall Quarter 2012 at the same time that the Canadian Studies Center was starting to develop the minor in Arctic Studies. It ended with the submission of the Center's Title VI grant proposal, in Spring Quarter 2014. The research began with a brief assessment of three initiatives by way of laying the groundwork for the Title VI grant application. These included an analysis of the drafting of an application for the Arctic minor including the efforts to include the Indigenous voice; the Future of Ice cross-campus initiative; and the writing of the Andrew W. Mellon 2013-14 sub-grant proposal and the organization of grant activities. Via these three initiatives I was able to assess our success in furthering research on the Arctic as an emerging region in area studies. This foundation laid the groundwork for the writing of the 2014 Title VI grant proposal. In Chapter Seven, the Conclusion, I examined the impacts of this research project on the inclusion of Arctic studies in the Jackson School of International Studies activities as well as in the 2014-15 Andrew W. Mellon sub-grant proposal. Finally, I attempted to identify next steps in both my practice and the research that I hope will
eventually contribute to a nation-wide discussion on Indigenous concepts of territory in the field of area studies. During the above activities and proposal writing process I asked the following questions:

1. How do the unique characteristics of the Arctic – defined by Arctic Indigenous peoples – challenge Western understandings of what constitutes a global region, including how we understand territory, sovereignty and the relationship between space and social justice?

2. Can Inuit concepts of territory, foreign policy and law be effectively integrated into academic programs in southern institutions such as the UW?

3. What are some of the responses and challenges that may be faced in introducing these concepts?

4. How do these concepts influence or shape thinking by southerners on the Arctic, and the definitions of Title VI area studies more broadly?

My data sources consisted of discussions with faculty, students, and other on- and off-campus colleagues in the development of the above activities, including meetings, phone calls, and emails; grant proposals and reporting documents; the Title VI technical meeting with the International and Foreign Language Education programs in Washington, DC; and, my field notes taken during and following the above interactions. I analyzed these documents using analytic authoethnography (see Appendix 4 for a sample of how I used field notes to explore connections between theory and practice). During and following the activities and proposal writing process, I strove to examine my practice via the lenses of political theory, space and social justice, and Inuit concepts of space (as explored in Chapter Four). I also used the findings in Chapters Four and Five – Inuit remapping and renaming of Arctic space and policy development – to inform
my practice.

This research project used analytic autoethnography established by Anderson (2006) with modest adaptations. As this research project is less a personal journey or exploration, and more an effort to understand conventional concepts of territory in the U.S. Department of Education's National Resource Program and as it pertains to the Foreign Language and Area Studies Program, the analytic autoethnographic methodology was appropriate. In addition, I felt that analytic autoethnography fit the nature of educational practice that is multi-faceted, qualitative and responsive. Other characteristics of analytic autoethnography include that the researcher's text is accessible and therefore able to provide "new understanding and action toward a more compassionate and equal society (May, 2011, p. 78), and that it is a post-colonial research method" (Besio, 2009, p. 240) that can therefore unsettle Westphalian definitions of space.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this research project are first that the activities leading up to the writing of the Title VI grant proposal took place at an institution south of the tree line where there is just one Inupiat faculty member who I am aware of. Therefore, the Arctic Minor, grant proposals for Andrew W. Mellon funding, and Title VI grant proposal did not include Inuit voices other than a very modest inclusion by one of our visiting guest speakers from Arctic Canada. I am not Inuit, Indigenous, nor have I lived in an Arctic community. Therefore, I have to ask the question, is it ethical for me and for UW faculty members to develop an Arctic Studies research agenda, academic program and outreach activities in the absence of this representation? My answer is, yes. It is critical that non-Indigenous students and students who live outside the Arctic understand developments in Indigenous political involvement, and the role of the Arctic in international affairs. Here I draw on one of the recommendations made in the report of the first
national summit on Inuit education in Canada – the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami Summit on Inuit Education and Background Research (2008). One of the recommendations was to "[p]romote teaching of Inuit history in Canadian schools" (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2008, p. 33). The education of students outside the Arctic was seen as one of the key issues in bringing collective attention to the educational crisis for the Inuit. In addition, it is critical that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples work together to contribute to decolonization efforts. This argument was made in the edited volume, Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships (Davis, 2010), a collection of papers from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council funded conference in 2006.

The second main limitation of the study is that the Center is ultimately seeking funds for a U.S. Department of Education Title VI National Resource Center. The U.S. federal government has yet to integrate Indigenous worldviews and concepts of territory and sovereignty into their policies and practices. Therefore, I have to ask myself whether, in the process of attempting to create space for new ways of envisioning world regions, I am working within a structure that is sufficiently flexible to allow for new thinking and new voices in international affairs. Again my answer is, yes as a result of new commitments by the U.S. Department of Education. The Department is increasingly dedicated to and even requires that Title VI funding be disseminated to underrepresented students and Title III or Minority Serving Institutions as evidenced by the competitive priorities for the 2014 grant application. Nonetheless, it would no doubt be risky to submit a grant proposal for the Arctic because the understanding of world regions within the Department of Education has not changed in 40 years.

I also have to ask whether attempting to incorporate Indigenous concepts of territory into a colonial project can be accomplished without perpetuating the very colonialism the research
project hopes to critique. As with the first consideration, I argue that it is better to make a modest contribution in challenging conventional programs and processes than to make no contribution at all. In Chapter Two I discussed those area studies scholars that disagree that the field is solely an imperial arm of the U.S. government and argued that within the field there is space for new ways of thinking.

**Conclusion**

Just as the analytic autoethnographic methodology has provided an understanding for social relations of domination and subordination in geography and other disciplines in the social sciences, so too can the research methodology provide insights concerning asymmetrical social positioning found in educational initiatives in area studies. In this research project analytic autoethnography, a critical methodology, is applied to lend greater insight and assessment of the Arctic educational initiative at the Canadian Studies Center. When creating an educational program focused on a region outside of one's own with distinct cultures and societies only modestly represented at the hosting institution, it is important to approach this new program with an on-going methodological approach founded on social and cultural critique and on going introspection.

Additionally, it is important to understand the Arctic from the perspective of Arctic-centric notions of space and territory. For this purpose I undertook two extensive studies between 2010 and 2012 that informed my data analysis in the research. The first is a documentary analysis of Inuit remapping of the Arctic both in Canada and internationally and how that remapping has challenged and altered domestic and nation-state thinking about what comprises an Inuit concept of Arctic territory. This research is found in Chapter Four. Chapter Five examines Inuit concepts of space and analyzes how the Inuit use land claims and the concept of
Inuit Nunaat to draft Inuit foreign policy. I also look at how the development of Inuit foreign policy strengthens Inuit values and interests in Canadian and international policy. I analyze how that mapping fosters more effective policy implementation and thereby contributes to the self-determination of the Inuit at the domestic and international levels. These two chapters inform our Arctic initiative at the Canadian Studies Center and our integration of the Arctic into the Center's Title VI grant proposal.
Chapter Four: Inuit Reframing of Arctic Space

The inextricable linkages between issues of sovereignty and sovereign rights in the Arctic and Inuit self-determination and other rights require states to accept the presence and role of Inuit as partners in the conduct of international relations in the Arctic. (ICC, 2009, Article 3.3)

As a result of climate change, the Arctic is now a key focus for the eight Arctic nation-states – Canada, Russia, Denmark (Greenland), the United States, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland – as well as many non-Arctic states. In fact, some scholars have argued that since the Cold War the Arctic has become "the center of world politics" (Heininen & Southcott, 2010, p. 4). By 2011, each of the Arctic nations had released an Arctic or northern dimensions of its foreign policy clearly illustrating the surge in geopolitical interest in the region.6 Even the European Union and China are planning to draft Arctic policies.7

Although the Arctic was a key geopolitical focus during the Cold War, the current situation differs in two important ways. First, the Arctic nations are, for the most part, committed to collaboration on issue-resolution and governance (Brosnan, Leschine & Miles, 2011; Heininen, 2011; Heininen & Nicol 2007; Heininen & Southcott, 2010; Keskitalo, 2004, 2007; 6 The United States issued its first Arctic foreign policy in 1994. Since then each Arctic nation-state has issued one or more Arctic or northern dimensions of foreign policy. The most recent Arctic foreign policies are: Denmark, 2008; Russia, 2008; Norway, 2009; Canada, 2010; Finland, 2010; Iceland, 2011; and Sweden, 2011.

7 The European Union released a communication on the Arctic in 2008, "The European Union and the Arctic Region" laying the groundwork for an Arctic strategy. China does not have an Arctic policy but there is considerable mention in the media that a strategy is forthcoming.)
Young, 2009, 2011) including active participation in the Arctic Council, a high-level intergovernmental forum, created in 1996 to foster Arctic cooperation. Second, Arctic Indigenous peoples have mobilized politically and effectively in the last 30 to 40 years and now play a significant role in Arctic policy development and decision-making at both the domestic and international levels (Abele & Rodon, 2007; Griffith, 2011; Koivurova, 2010; Shadian, 2010; Plaut, 2011; Wilson, 2007; Wilson & Smith, 2011). The Arctic has become the meeting ground for traditional state geopolitics and Indigenous diplomacies. Heininen and Nicol (2007) call the geopolitical reality in the Arctic today "some sort of renaissance of regional co-operation by circumpolar Indigenous peoples and civil societies" (p. 161). The combination of a collaborative approach to geopolitics combined with the participation of new actors on the world stage – actors who have distinct values and goals that are not nation-state-centered – may be contributing to a new approach to international relations as they concern the Arctic.

In international relations theory, the nation-state has traditionally been used as the primary unit for political analysis. Therefore, traditional foreign policies reflect the interests of the nation-state and prioritize national interests over community or individual security. The northern dimensions of foreign policy for the eight Arctic nations begin to diverge from this tradition placing greater emphasis on state collaboration (Heininen, 2011) including a commitment to working closely with Arctic Indigenous peoples to address current and future challenges to northern communities. At the same time, Arctic Indigenous organizations, in particular the international Inuit organization, the Inuit Circumpolar Council, are challenging
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8 The Inuit Circumpolar Council is a multinational non-governmental organization founded in 1977. The primary goal of the organization is to strengthen Inuit unity across the circumpolar North, promote Inuit rights and interests, and ensure the survival of Inuit language.
nation-state dominance in international relations by reframing the Arctic as a region that transcends nation-state borders and by asserting their rights as a people. Even mainstream media have noted the growing influence of the Inuit. For example, in March 2010, *The Economist* published an article about how the Inuit are influencing natural resource development in the Arctic. The article noted, "although they [the Inuit] are only a small minority – an estimated 160,000 of them are spread across the Arctic – they have achieved a degree of power" (Now it's their turn, para. 4). Parallel efforts are also found at the national level particularly evident in recent efforts by the national Inuit association in Canada, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, to redraw the map of Canada to ensure Inuit benefit from domestic northern policies (see Appendix 1).

Both domestically and internationally Arctic Indigenous peoples are challenging the conventional concepts of territory in favor of a regional understanding of the Arctic in an effort to enhance their voice and influence in political affairs. This chapter analyzes the nature of Inuit political engagement in the Arctic via spatial and policy theory by examining how the Inuit are reframing political space to create more appropriate "maps" for policy implementation and for the application of international customary law, in particular the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, to Indigenous interests.

**New Concepts of Territory in International Relations Theory**

Spatial theory provides a broad context for understanding the role of territory in international relations. Prior to the 1970s, the analysis of space or territory was relegated to the study of maps, surveys and physical geography with little relevance to the social sciences. This and culture. The Inuit Circumpolar Council represents about 160,000 Inuit from Greenland, Alaska, Canada and Chukotka, Russia (see Appendix 3).
changes with the publication and translation of Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* (1975/1991). Lefebvre argued that space has inherent value – social relations create space, and space creates social relations. With Lefebvre's work, the politics of space was born. Social scientists began to develop new and innovative ways of looking at space. From the mid-70s forward, space moved out of "the exclusive domain of geographers" and became the "intellectual terrain across a broad spectrum of social science disciplines" (Ferrare & Apple, 2010, p. 209), including contributing to a better understanding of global relations. The recognition of the limitations of the nation-state model to effectively analyze international relations, combined with an emerging understanding of the inherent relationship between concepts of territory and social justice issues, lends insight into contemporary Arctic geopolitics.

Agnew (1987, 1994, 2005, 2013) is credited with reinventing the meaning of geopolitics. He argued that international relations must include an understanding of the role of territory or place in political power structures. In his seminal article, "The Territorial Trap" (1994), Agnew pointed out that international relations theory has been limited by its insistence on defining states as "fixed units of sovereign space" or "'containers' of society" (Agnew, 1994, p. 53). Agnew advocated for a redefinition of political space. He called for the new conceptual framework to foster a more nuanced and appropriate lens within which to understand the evolving nature of political relations at the global level. As the impact of globalization intensified in the 1980s and 1990s, the redefinition of political space became increasingly critical.

Agnew (1994) observed that a growing number of non-state actors began to gain significant power at the international level challenging the conventional nation-state framework. These new "networks of power" (Agnew, 1994, p. 72) no longer fit into the "territorial representations of space" (Agnew, 1994, p. 72). Rather, transnational entities begin to be defined
by cultural cohesion and/or organized around shared concerns. Agnew (2005) insisted that the
nation-state model, emphasizing the "geographical expression of authority" (p. 437) is, as a
result, becoming increasingly inadequate in understanding sovereignty. The nation-state model
does not provide the appropriate frame to analyze transnational movements from multi-national
corporations to non-governmental organizations, environmental organizations, or Indigenous
movements. Rather, territoriality, Agnew argued, is only one type of spatiality "or way in which
space is constituted socially and mobilized politically" (Agnew, 2005, p. 442). In other words,
while the state may indeed exercise a centralized power, there are many types of "diffuse power"
(Agnew, 2005, p. 4) that exert varying degrees of influence in world affairs. The Arctic is a
perfect example of how centralized powers and "diffuse" power (international organizations) are
interacting to create an enhanced international dialogue.

In 2013 Agnew assumed the editorship of a new journal, *Territory, Politics, and
Governance*. In the inaugural editorial he defined the two key ideas behind the new journal. The
first indicates new directions in area studies and most importantly, the relationship between
space and politics. Agnew (2013) argued:

The first [key idea behind the journal] is that territory and related spatial terms (place,
space, and territoriality) offer a profitable theoretical lens through which to analyze the
workings of governance and politics. Governance, in this construction, extends beyond
formal government into the realm of various forms of authority exercised by agents other
than states at and across a variety of geographical scales. Politics likewise is not simply
the machinations of national politics, elections, and so on, but also the operation of local
politics, various forms of supranational political organization, and the nexus between
private power and public authority. (p. 1)
Agnew's initial thinking on the "territorial trap" broadened to include a range of diffuse powers that gain degrees of effectiveness via new avenues for spatial representation.

The Arctic Council is the first entity to involve nation-state and Indigenous peoples in decision shaping and policy making at the international level (Axworthy & Dean, 2013; English, 2013). The eight Arctic nation-states serve as members on the Council along with six Arctic Indigenous organizations, or Permanent Participants. The Permanent Participants include the Saami Council, Inuit Circumpolar Council, Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), Aleut International Association, Gwich'in Council International, and Arctic Athabaskan Council (see Appendix 2). In fact, the Permanent Participant category was created to ensure the Indigenous voice on the Council. All of the Permanent Participants, except RAIPON, represent Indigenous peoples from two or more nation-states. There is no question that these transnational entities exercise significant influence in international affairs. Their effectiveness is evident in the fact that three of what are now the Permanent Participant organizations were present at the founding of the Arctic Council and assisted in the development of the organizational structure of the Council and its mandate. The Rovaniemi Meeting in 1989 (the

9 Permanent Participants do not have the same status as the member states, however they may raise points with the chair and must be informed of all decision-making and activities. Few decisions are made within the Council without the support of the Permanent Participants.

10 Seven of the eight Arctic Council member states have significant Arctic Indigenous populations represented by the Permanent Participants. Permanent Participant organizations, as stated in the second statement in the Ottawa Declaration (1996), must represent an Arctic Indigenous people from more than one nation, or many Indigenous groups within a nation as with RAIPON (Arctic Council, 1996).
first meeting of the eight Arctic nations), included the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Saami Council, and the Association of Indigenous Minorities of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation (now RAIPON). Rovaniemi was an historic moment because it was the first major international accomplishment since the Cold War. In addition, important to this discussion, Rovaniemi was the first time in history that Arctic Indigenous peoples participated in the preparation of an international strategy – the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* (1991). As noted by Tennberg (1996), "The indigenous peoples considered the Rovaniemi ministerial meeting "historic" since it was the first time that indigenous peoples of the area also participated in the preparatory process of making of an international declaration" (para. 4).

Axworthy and Dean (2013) also observed the distinct role of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in shaping the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* and the Arctic Council:

> In the negotiations leading to the creation of the Arctic Council, the ICC was a full participant, with various internal briefing papers referring to it almost like one of the states. In a paper on the definition of indigenous representation, for example, a member of the U.S. delegation noted that "the ICC played an important role with the AEPS. That role is expected to continue in the Arctic Council." (p. 41)

The *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* evolved into the Arctic Council. Since the founding of the Council in 1996, three additional Indigenous organizations, those representing the Aleut, Gwich'in and Athabaskan, were formed *specifically* to have a seat on the Council to ensure their interests were represented. The role of the Permanent Participants effectively illustrates how the conventional nation-state framework is becoming increasingly inadequate to address the concerns of transnational peoples.

Like Agnew, Fraser (2005, 2009) also critiqued the limitations of the nation-state model
in international relations theory. Fraser focused specifically on social justice issues and human rights in the global context and argued that such challenges can no longer be fully understood in the nation-state framework. Fraser pointed out that until the 1970s human rights were understood, and dealt with, within the nation-state framework. However, as a result of globalization and "post-Cold War geopolitical instabilities" (Fraser, 2005, p. 71), social justice issues began to emerge at the transnational level (e.g. the impacts of climate change). These new global challenges called for a politics of "frame-setting" (Fraser, 2005, p. 80). According to Fraser (2005), framing territory can be achieved one of two ways. The conventional nation-state model can be revised or affirmed via redrawing boundaries or creating new ones (i.e., the creation of new post-colonial states); or, nation-state borders can be transcended in favor of a new organizing structure that prioritizes transnational interests and issues. For example, Fraser (2005) pointed out that environmentalists and Indigenous peoples are "casting off the Westphalian grammar of frame-setting" and "applying the all-affected principle directly to questions of justice in a globalizing world" (p. 84). A good example of this is found in the recent efforts of the Inuit Circumpolar Council to address global warming as human rights abuse.

In 2005 the Inuit Circumpolar Council on Human Rights charged the United States with human rights abuses as a result of global warming – *Petition to the Inter American Commission on Human Rights Seeking Relief from Violations Resulting from Global Warming Caused by Acts and Omissions of the United States* (Watt-Cloutier, 2005). Prior, human rights had been understood within a local context as the violation of one person's rights by another or the violation of individual/group rights by one's own government. In other words, human rights were understood and addressed domestically. Rarely have human rights been understood in the global context or, in the case of the Inuit
Circumpolar Council petition, by an Indigenous group claiming violations by a foreign government. The filing of the petition by then-president of the Council, Sheila Watt-Cloutier, and 62 Inuit hunters from Canada and Alaska, changed the politics of global warming and climate change and how human rights abuses are understood. The Inuit Circumpolar Council effectively challenged the limits of the nation-state model and its ability to address the growing complexity of international relations in an increasingly globalized world. This is one example of how the Inuit are challenging conventional representations of territory to exert influence at the international level.

**Indigenous Diplomacies in International Relations**

While there is a large body of literature on Indigenous political activism, the role of Indigenous peoples in international affairs is a relatively new scholarly focus (Abele & Rodon, 2007; Beier, 2007a, 2007b; Graham & Wiessner, 2011; Wilson, 2007; Zellen, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010). Beier (2007a) argued that while foreign policy practitioners have realized the effective role of Indigenous peoples in international affairs for some time, international relations scholars are just beginning to address this fact. He critiqued international studies as focusing primarily on the traditional relationship between nation-states and argued that, "Indigenous diplomacies are not at all new, but merely newly noticed in these fields" (Beier, 2007a, p. 9). The result is a "small but growing conceptual space within which to consider increasingly important intersections between Indigenous diplomacies and the foreign policies of states" (Beier, 2007a, p. 9). Beier (2007b) observed the "growing currency of Indigenous diplomacies in mainstream
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international politics” (p. 126). He argued that the integration of Indigenous involvement in political affairs is destabilizing conventional nation-state relations, and that this destabilization is fast becoming a norm in international relations (Beier, 2007b, p. 128). Certainly, the Inuit Circumpolar Council is a perfect example of the "growing currency" of the Inuit in global affairs.

Wilson (2007) applied the concept of Indigenous diplomacies directly to the Inuit. He argued that the Inuit Circumpolar Council has played a key role in how the rest of the world understands the Arctic and Arctic foreign relations. The Arctic Council is usually credited with promoting the concept of the Arctic as a region (Keskitalo, 2004, 2007; Young, 2009, 2011). However, Wilson argued that the Inuit Circumpolar Council was, in fact, the first organization to provide a regional model for the Arctic. Wilson referred to the Council as a "multi-state nation" (2007, p. 77), a concept that challenges conventional nation-state models and allows for a new framework within which to better analyze the complexity of actors in the Arctic today.

Abele and Rodon (2007), like Wilson, argued that the Inuit Circumpolar Council has contributed significantly to the regional, transnational concept of the Arctic. They noted that the founding of the Council in 1977 was, in itself, the beginning of the promotion of a trans-Arctic identity. They noted that the Arctic Council:

… was able to promote and participate in the establishment of the Arctic as a coherent political region, to foster international cooperation in a strategic Cold War zone, to develop and advocate a pan-Arctic environmental strategy, to support a non-threatening decolonization of the Arctic, and to establish Inuit people as international actors. (Abele & Rodon, 2007, p. 55)

Abele and Rodon credited the Inuit as one of the most effective of all Indigenous peoples in challenging nation-state conventions in international relations (Abele & Rodon, 2007, p. 58).
International studies have, for the most part, ignored Indigenous political mobilization. Nevertheless, Indigenous involvement is significant. For example, at the domestic level, the Inuit in Canada are challenging both federal policy and international law as they engage in reframing political space. Internationally, the Inuit have recently drafted two international declarations to assert their voice in the global dialogue on the future of the region. The Inuit are actively remapping and renaming the Arctic and, in the case of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, drafting what could be understood as Inuit foreign policy. These examples illustrate how the Inuit are destabilizing conventional political relations in an effort to carve out political space.

**Remapping Arctic Territory at the Domestic Level**

Land claims are one way, perhaps the most common way, the Inuit have engaged in "remapping" the Arctic region. In the last 30 years the four Inuit regions in Canada were settled in land claim negotiations with the federal government – Nunavik (1975), Inuvialuit (1984), Nunavut (1993), and Nunatsiavut (2005) (see Appendix 1). The legal basis for Inuvialuit and Nunavut were identified in the study *The Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project* (Freeman, 1976) commissioned by the national Inuit association, then the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada was formed in 1971 specifically to protect territorial and resource rights in Canada's Arctic. As a result of growing concern about the rising number of resource development projects in the Arctic, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada requested a study by legal experts that would support Inuit land claims. The Government of Canada provided significant funding for the project as part of its growing acknowledgement of aboriginal title based on land use (e.g., hunting, fishing, etc.) and occupancy (i.e., the meaning or value placed on the land). Dozens of researchers were involved in the project resulting in a three-volume document that relied heavily on maps and included oral interviews and supporting government studies.
The methodology used in the *Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project* has become a model for all land claims studies in Canada as it emphasized "the importance and relevance of oral evidence" (Freeman, 2011, p. 28). *Our Footprints are Everywhere: Inuit Land Use and Occupancy in Labrador* (Brice-Bennett, 1977) was published the following year and used a similar methodology to provide the legal basis for the Nunatsiavut land claim settled in 2005. Both studies marked the first step in redrawing of the map of Canada along cultural lines. To celebrate the settlement of the last Inuit land claim, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami created a new map for the Arctic in 2005 entitled, *Inuit Nunaat* (Inuit homeland). The map replaced provincial and territorial boundaries with borders based on use and occupancy.

Four years later, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami took spatial reframing one step further when the association changed the name of Canada's Inuit regions from *Inuit Nunaat* to *Inuit Nunangat* (see Appendix 1). *Inuit Nunaat* is a Greenlandic term that refers to the land only whereas *Inuit Nunangat*, a Canadian Inuktitut term, encompasses land, marine areas, and ice. According to Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, "As Canadian Inuit consider the land, water, and ice, of our homeland to be integral to our culture and our way of life it was felt that "Inuit Nunangat" is a more inclusive and appropriate term to use when describing our lands" (2009). The significance of the new name could have implications for international law. If the Inuit concept of territory is broadened to include ice and water how would this influence the ability of the *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea* in its ability to settle the current dispute over the Northwest Passage? Saul (2008), in *A Fair Country: Telling Truths about Canada*, provocatively asked the question, if Canada were to conceptualize territory from an Inuit perspective, how might this influence international law? He described, for Northerners:
Territory is a space in which you live, and in that space land and ice are one … And if we were to take on our Northerness and argue from the position of Inuit legitimacy and Inuit concepts – of stable life involving a joining together of land and ice or water, how would the rest of the world react? Would international tribunals and courts have trouble with this rectification of names? Of course they would … [b]ut they would be obliged to consider it and therefore to consider differently the very nature of the opposing arguments. (Saul, 2008, p. 301 & 302)

In other words, how territory is conceptualized can have far-reaching implications that could challenge international legal instruments.

In 2009 the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami used Inuit Nunangat to challenge domestic northern policy. In July of that year the Government of Canada released Canada's Northern Strategy: Our North, Our Heritage, Our Future. The main map in the document was the conventional political map of Canada's north featuring the Yukon, Northwest Territory, and Nunavut. The map completely excluded the Inuit regions of Nunavik in northern Québec, and Nunatsiavut in Newfoundland and Labrador. Mary Simon, then-president of the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, immediately criticized the government for using a map that did not include all of the Inuit regions in a federal policy that implicates all northern peoples. Her comments drew considerable media attention, including a half-page article in The Vancouver Sun complete with images of the two competing maps (Boswell, 2009). The Canadian government immediately acknowledged the oversight, apologized and promised to reprint the Northern Strategy. Though Canada's northern strategy has never been reprinted as promised12, the issue of how the Arctic ought to be

12 In the winter of 2010, I co-instructed the course, JSIS 495 Task Force on the Arctic that took 12 UW students to Ottawa for a week. There we met with representatives from what
conceptualized received significant media attention promoting public awareness. The new map, *Inuit Nunangat*, is used by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami to reference the Arctic serving to challenge political jurisdictions (see Appendix 1).

**Reconceptualizing Arctic Territory at the International Level**

At the international level the Inuit Circumpolar Council is also challenging the nation-state-centered approach to international relations and presenting the Arctic as a distinct region in an effort to strengthen Inuit sovereignty claims and to enhance the Inuit voice in Arctic affairs. This occurred most recently with the drafting of two Inuit Circumpolar Council declarations that arguably serve as foreign policy statements. At one time it was meaningless to speak of a non-nation-state having a foreign policy, but the scenario evolving in the Arctic is giving significant meaning to this development. While each Arctic nation-state has issued its own Arctic foreign policy, as mentioned above, both the Inuit Circumpolar Council and Saami Council, have released international declarations. To date, the sub-field of foreign policy analysis has not included Indigenous policies and declarations as part of the foreign policy dialogue. And yet, this is precisely what is occurring in the Arctic. The potential influence of non-nation-state bodies, peoples and organizations that prioritize the rights of a people in the foreign policy dialogue was then the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, under whose authority *Northern Strategy* was developed. I asked if the *Strategy* had been reprinted with the *Inuit Nunangat* map. We were told that this would have been a considerable expense, but that the document would be updated on the website. At the time of the writing of this dissertation, the *Northern Strategy*, on the department's website, does not include the Inuit map.

13 The Saami Council represents about 70,000 individuals from Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia.
could have a profound impact on the way we understand the world.

In April 2009 the Inuit Circumpolar Council launched *A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic (Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty)*. The declaration was written to address increased outside interest in the Arctic as a result of climate change and the race for Arctic resources (specifically oil). Griffith (2011) argued that the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* is a manifesto as well as "an outline of a possible legal case against the Arctic states" (Griffith, 2011, p. 131). He noted, "the Inuit believe that they have a legal right to participate in Arctic governance that coexists with and cannot be trumped by state sovereignty" (Griffith, 2011, p. 136). Perhaps the most impressive challenge to nation-state sovereignty occurs in Article 2.1 of the declaration:

"Sovereignty" is a term that has often been used to refer to the absolute and independent authority of a community or nation both internally and externally. Sovereignty is a contested concept, however, and does not have a fixed meaning. Old ideas of sovereignty are breaking down as different governance models, such as the European Union, evolve. Sovereignties overlap and are frequently divided within federations in creative ways to recognize the right of peoples. For Inuit living within the states of Russia, Canada, the USA and Denmark/Greenland, issues of sovereignty and sovereign rights must be examined and assessed in the context of our long history of struggle to gain recognition and respect as an Arctic Indigenous people having the right to exercise self-determination over our lives, territories, cultures and languages. (ICC, 2009a)

By referencing the European Union, the Inuit Circumpolar Council cleverly bases its claims to sovereignty on concepts that are widely accepted in the international community and extends these innovative notions to Inuit claims. Indeed, a journalist for *thestar.com* (the digital desk for
the *Toronto Star*), introduced the release of *A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic* by describing the Inuit as "a new party … shouldeering its way into international sovereignty discussions" (Weber, 28 April 2009, para. 1). Mary Simon (2011) argued that the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* defines sovereignty as not incompatible with nation-state membership and that the Inuit have and will continue to take legal action if necessary to ensure their involvement in development in the Arctic.

In 2011 the Inuit Circumpolar Council released its second declaration, *A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Resource Development Principles in Inuit Nunaat (Inuit Declaration on Resource Development)*, to respond to the growing interest in resource development in the Arctic by nation-states and transnational corporations. The release of the *Inuit Declaration on Resource Development* was to coincide with the Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council in Nuuk, Greenland in April 2011. The declaration draws on the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2007), arguing that Inuit rights are protected under domestic and international law. While there is considerable debate within the Inuit Circumpolar Council regarding natural resource development, Inuit want the right to decide on the future of the region as a people. The two declarations effectively challenge traditional nation-state-centered concepts of territory and sovereignty and furthering Inuit rights to land and resource use.

**The Role of Customary Law in Inuit Political Engagement**

The Inuit are also increasingly using international law to ensure their rights and voice on the international stage. There is a growing body of literature from legal experts (Christie, 2011; Graham & Wiessner, 2011; Griffith, 2011; Koivurova, 2010) who anticipate the impact of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* on enhanced Indigenous involvement internationally.
Koivurova (2010) and Griffith (2011) addressed legal notions of territory and the potential use of international law to further the rights of Arctic Indigenous peoples. Koivurova examined how Indigenous peoples have been successful in utilizing international law to their advantage. He acknowledged that while the primary subject of international law continues to be the nation-state, "it is interesting to study how much space peoples (which are not states) have been able to carve out for themselves in international law" (Koivurova, 2010, p. 192). Koivurova noted that since World War II international law has focused increasingly on peoples rather than states and that this may have some bearing and even legal ramifications for how self-determination is understood. In particular, Part 1, Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1976, states, "all peoples have the right of self-determination." Koivurova called this "pretty explosive stuff" (Koivurova, 2010, p. 192) as this implies there is a legally binding obligation to honor the self-determination of peoples.

Griffith (2011) examined how international law could become a more effective tool for the Inuit. The challenge, according to Griffith, is that international law was initially used against Indigenous peoples as the principal subject of international law has always been the state. Therefore, only states can bring cases to the International Court of Justice or "benefit from the prohibition on the use of force and other forms of trans-boundary intervention" (Griffith, 2011, p. 132). However, using The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) as an example, Griffith described how what was once a set of guiding principles has become customary law. Today, Griffith (2011) explained, the majority of states act in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and do so out of a sense of legal obligation (p. 139). Increasingly, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is being referred to in declarations and by commissions and has every possibility of also becoming customary law. Once the UN
Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples has achieved the status of customary law, then the Inuit can argue that "not having a role in Arctic governance will threaten their internationally recognized rights as a people" (Griffith, 2011, p. 142). According to Griffith, this would then provide the Inuit with "a solid claim to the rights they seek" (Griffith, 2011, p. 142).

Christie (2011) insisted that it is only via the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples that the Inuit will be able to successfully challenge nation-state dominance in the Arctic. Christie is not convinced that the Arctic Council equates to the new paradigm in international relations. When the Inuit, or other Indigenous groups, participate in the Arctic Council proceedings, decision-making is still bound by the limitations of "intergovernmental relations" (Christie, 2011, p. 336). However, if the rights of Indigenous peoples are increasingly recognized in international law, then these dynamics may shift. According to Christie (2011), Indigenous rights as "a people," affirmed by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, is challenging the "absolute' nature of territorial sovereignty" and fostering the "growth of international institutions" (p. 336). The primary issue here is one of territoriality or the reframing of the political map in addition to the effective integration of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in legal decision making in the Arctic.

International law, like international relations, has traditionally utilized the nation-state as its primary unit of analysis. However, as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples evolves from a guiding principle to international customary law, it has the potential to safeguard Indigenous rights globally and to provide the Inuit with an effective tool in assuring their voice and rights in the dialogue on the future of the Arctic. The Inuit Circumpolar Council strategically included mention of their rights as "a people" under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in both A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the
Conclusion

The Arctic is going through a dramatic change as a result of climate change. Increased access to natural resources and new shipping routes are focusing international attention on the region. The implications of this change are unpredictable, particularly concerning geopolitics. There is no question, according to a recent front-page article in *The New York Times*, that "the world's superpowers are increasingly jockeying for political influence and economic position" (Rosenthal, 19 September 2012, p. A1) in the region. While significant research is being conducted on how international law might resolve competing interests in the Arctic, much less attention is given to how Arctic Indigenous peoples are reframing the political map to develop a method of governance better suited to the unique challenges of the circumpolar world. What distinguishes international relations in the Arctic today from the Cold War, is that there are new actors on the world stage who are exercising a relatively influential role in how future global interests in the region will play out. Arctic Indigenous peoples are forming effective transnational political organizations (Permanent Participant organizations), challenging conventional concepts of territory, drafting international declarations, and securing their rights as a people via international customary law. These efforts are effectively enhancing the Arctic Indigenous voice and influence in domestic and international affairs and transforming the global dialogue concerning the Arctic region. According to Wilson and Smith (2011), the Inuit voice has "challenged the state-centric status quo and dominant economic ideologies that shape the current world order" (p. 910). What is occurring in the Arctic is an unparalleled level of Indigenous political engagement. Arguably, for the first time in history, Indigenous peoples and
nation-states are working together to address some of the most significant environmental, social and geopolitical challenges of our time. The Inuit are "remapping" the Arctic region and shaping domestic and international policy with implications for the circumpolar world and beyond.

In the UW's Arctic initiative, undertaken as part of my research project, I attempt to challenge my own thinking, as well as that of the students and colleagues I work with, to consider the most northerly part of the Arctic as a sovereign Inuit space and one that includes land, sea and ice as part of what is understood as territory. I examine the effectiveness of using the terms *Inuit Nunangat* to describe Canada's Arctic and *Inuit Nunaat* to refer to Inuit territory globally. These terms will inform my thinking about how area studies might be reconfigured in the short term to include new concepts for world regions and ultimately, may have its own designation and funding allocation with the U.S. Department of Education Title VI grant program.
Chapter Five: Inuit Foreign Policy and International Relations in the Arctic

The conduct of international relations in the Arctic and the resolution of international disputes in the Arctic are not the sole preserve of Arctic states or other states; they are also within the purview of the Arctic's Indigenous peoples. The development of international institutions in the Arctic, such as multi-level governance systems and Indigenous peoples' organizations, must transcend Arctic states' agendas on sovereignty and sovereign rights and the traditional monopoly claimed by states in the area of foreign affairs. (ICC, 2009a, Article 4.2)

The Inuit are challenging the monopoly claimed by Arctic nation-states in foreign affairs via the work of the international Inuit organization, the Inuit Circumpolar Council. The Inuit Circumpolar Council, representing Inuit in Greenland, Alaska, Canada and Chukotka, Russia, has become a significant international civil society organization. It serves as a permanent participant on the Arctic Council and has obtained consultative status with the United Nations. However, as Shadian (2010) has argued, the Inuit Circumpolar Council "is not merely a contemporary non-governmental organization attempting to influence international politics but rather an Inuit polity seeking to attain a degree of sovereignty as a political collectivity" (p. 490). Indeed, many scholars hold that the Inuit are becoming effective international actors who represent a distinct world region (Abele & Rodon, 2007; Axworthy & Dean, 2013; Eide, 2009; Fabbi, 2012; Koivurova, 2010; Loukacheva, 2009; Penikett, 2012; Penikett & Goldenberg, 2013; Plaut, 2012; Shadian, 2010; Wilson, 2007; Wilson & Smith, 2011). Abele and Rodon (2007)

14 The Inuit Circumpolar Council is one of over 3,000 non-governmental organizations accredited with consultative status by the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The Council was granted this status in 1983.
noted that the Inuit have been particularly successful in framing the Arctic as a "coherent political region" (p. 55) and establishing themselves as "international actors" (ibid). Wilson (2007) has referred to the Inuit Circumpolar Council as a "multi-state nation" (p. 77). Mainstream media have recognized the political influence of the Inuit. In addition to the 2011 article in *The Economist* (see Chapter Four), in the 2012 end-of-the-year special edition of *Foreign Policy*, the Inuit are listed as third among the "100 Top Global Thinkers of 2012" (Inuits [sic] strike it rich, p. 13). This growing international awareness of the Inuit Circumpolar Council can be attributed, in part, to the fact that the Inuit have entered into the foreign policy dialogue. The Council has now released two international declarations as described in Chapter Four. Arguably, both declarations serve as foreign policy for the Inuit, furthering the Inuit Circumpolar Council's efforts to enhance the interests of the Inuit in international relations.

Foreign policy is one way a nation-state can further its interests internationally. As Doran (2011) noted, foreign policy is "the currency of international relations, the medium of exchange in foreign affairs … the practical, day-to-day reality of international political discourse" (p. 605). Foreign policy has traditionally communicated national interests to the international community in an effort to safeguard those interests and to achieve state goals. With the advent of globalization, many new transnational entities, multinational unions, and non-nation-state organizations are forming and developing policies to affirm their roles and interests in the international arena. Concerning the Arctic, the European Union has released two communications concerning the development of an Arctic policy (2008, 2012). Similarly, the two declarations of the Inuit Circumpolar Council can be understood as foreign policy for the Inuit. These declarations communicate the interests of the Inuit as a cohesive nation of Arctic
peoples, and seek to safeguard the interests of the Inuit and to further the goals of the Inuit Circumpolar Council in international affairs.

As the Arctic increases in importance globally, it is critical that educational leaders and scholars in international studies understand this unique phenomenon in international relations. How do a transnational people further their interests in a political framework that has prioritized the nation-state as the primary unit in decision-making and international law? The most accurate understanding of Arctic indigenous internationalism would come from the organizations themselves – their declarations, strategies, the speeches of their leaders, and their presentations before international bodies.

This chapter analyses the first Inuit Circumpolar Council declaration released in 2009 – *A Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic* – assessing its salience in the international dialogue and success in furthering the Inuit agenda. The chapter reviews the historical context that provided the impetus for the development of the 2009 declaration and describes how the Inuit Circumpolar Council utilized the declaration to position itself as an equal partner with Arctic nation-states. I then analyse key articles of the declaration, explaining how they frame an Inuit concept of Arctic territory, as well as how the declaration refers to customary international law to ensure Inuit rights. Finally, I examine the influence of the document on the proceedings of the Arctic Council and in Canadian Arctic policy. I conclude by arguing that the *Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* is effectively bringing the Inuit into the political dialogue in both the international and domestic realms.

**Inuit Internationalism**

Inuit internationalism began just over 40 years ago at the First Arctic Peoples’ Conference held in Copenhagen in 1973. Some scholars have argued that this was the beginning of modern
Indigenous internationalism broadly speaking (Jull, 1999, p. 13). Outside interest in Arctic was the impetus behind the organization of the conference. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the peoples of the Arctic were concerned about new oil and gas developments in the region and the possible impacts of outside influence on Indigenous cultures and languages (Jull, 1999; Kleivan, 1992). Kleivan (1992) noted that, "The conference was a major event that increased Arctic peoples' awareness of their own situation and their interest in and solidarity with the other Arctic peoples" (p. 228). Two Indigenous organizations were established as a result of the First Arctic Peoples' Conference – the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (1975)15 and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (1977).16 Eben Hopson, Inupiat leader and mayor of North Slope Borough, Alaska, organized and chaired the first meeting of the Inuit leaders in Barrow in June 1977. He sought to ensure justice for the Inuit, encourage the settlement of regional land claims, develop strong local governments, and devise a strategy for working effectively with oil companies (Hopson, 1977). The resolutions of the conference established the Inuit as "one indivisible people" and declared the "wholeness of the homeland" of the circumpolar region (ICC, 1977, Resolution 77-01). The 54 delegates from Alaska, Canada and Greenland (representatives from the Soviet Union were not able to attend) agreed to form an international Inuit organization to "study, discuss, represent, lobby and protect" Inuit interests "on the


16 At the 2006 ICC General Assembly in Barrow, Alaska, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference adopted the new name, Inuit Circumpolar Council (see Utqiagvik Declaration, 2006).
international level" (ICC, 1977, Resolution 77-01). The Inuit Circumpolar Conference was formally established at a follow-up meeting in Greenland in 1980.

Just 10 years after the Inuit Circumpolar Conference was founded, the organization participated in drafting the first multilateral agreement on environmental protection with the Arctic nation-states. Following Gorbachev's famous Murmansk Speech in 1987 where he advocated for an "integrated comprehensive plan for protecting the natural environment of the north" (p. 31), Finland organized a meeting of the eight Arctic nation-states in Rovaniemi to propose and establish an international organization focused on protecting the Arctic environment. A series of meetings followed that led to the signing of the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* in 1991. The *Strategy* is considered one of the major geopolitical accomplishments in the post-Cold War era (Brigham & LaMourie, 1994, p. 176). The drafting of The *Strategy* also marked the first time in history that nation-states worked with Indigenous peoples to draft an international agreement. 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, participated in the two-year consultation process and in the drafting of the final *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy*. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference pushed for the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge in the agreement and held that Indigenous organizations should have a "meaningful, active role" (Faegteborg, 2005a, p. 1001) in the development of the agreement and follow-up activities. Mary Simon, president of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference at the time, insisted that Indigenous organizations be present at the table with the nation-states (English, 2013, p. 129). Her efforts led to the establishment of Permanent Participant status for Indigenous organizations on the Arctic Council. Today six Indigenous organizations sit on the Arctic Council, representing about half a million Arctic and sub-Arctic
peoples. Permanent Participants have full consultation rights on the Council with respect to all decisions – a first in an international forum. As Penikett (2012) has pointed out, "Nowhere else is there a forum where nation states and international Indigenous groups can meet" (p. 10). The influential role of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in drafting the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* and in forming the Arctic Council is now well documented by scholars (Axworthy & Dean, 2013; English, 2013; Koivurova & Heinämäki, 2006).

Throughout most of the 20th century, foreign policy was concerned with land-based control and political and economic dominance. The dissolution of the Soviet Union opened the way for a new set of values and priorities to take hold in foreign relations. Gorbachev's sweeping reforms played a pivotal role in promoting *perestroika* and the policy of *glasnost* and in igniting the global environmental movement. Concerning the Arctic, Gorbachev's Murmansk Initiative marked the first time the idea of international cooperation was extended to the Arctic region. As Scrivener (1989) observed, the Murmansk Speech was the "first wave in a Soviet diplomatic offensive directed towards the Arctic and the Nordic states" (p. 5). Purver (1988) has argued that the Murmansk initiative was "the hallmark of his [Gorbachev's] foreign policy" (p. 147). The Murmansk Speech effectively centralized the Arctic as a new stage for international relations, singling out the importance of Arctic Indigenous peoples in international affairs (Scrivener, 1989, p. 6) and marking the first time the environment was presented as the basis for global security (Keskitalo, 2004; Young, 2009).

The influential role of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in the development of the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* and the Arctic Council marked an important development in Indigenous involvement in foreign affairs and also had an impact on the evolution of
international relations in the post-Cold War world. Just prior to the First Arctic Leaders' Summit in 1991, Aqqaluk Lynge, then president of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Greenland, noted:

With the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the many confidence-building-measures taken between the East and the West, We – the inhabitants of the Arctic – necessarily must talk about what We can offer each other to solve Our common problems, and what We can offer the rest of the world (as cited in Faegteborg, 2005b, p. 4).

The Inuit Circumpolar Conference was initially founded to respond to oil and gas development in the Arctic. The organization now saw the opportunity to play a key role in international relations in a post-Cold War world. The converging of these two worldviews or intellectual traditions – the evolution of nation-state foreign policy in a post-Cold War world and the growing involvement of Arctic Indigenous peoples in international relations – marked the beginning of a new approach to foreign policy concerning the Arctic.

In 2009 the Inuit Circumpolar Council began to engage in international policy development to bring the thinking and concerns of the Inuit to global attention. The Council has now drafted three major declarations – A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic (2009); Inuit Arctic Policy (2010); and A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Resource Development Principles in Inuit Nunaat (2011). Of these, Inuit Arctic Policy is comparable to domestic policy as it is "created by and for Inuit" (ICC, 2010, p. 7). The declarations on sovereignty and resource development principles, on the other hand, serve as foreign policy. They were specifically drafted to ensure the Inuit voice would become part of international

---

17 This does not include the declarations from the meetings of the Inuit Circumpolar Council General Assembly every four years as these constitute short-term goals.
political discourse. When the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* was released, the Council Vice Chair for Greenland, Aqqaluk Lynge, clarified that it defined, for the Inuit, "who we are, what we stand for, and on what terms we are prepared to work together with others" (ICC, 2009b, para. 6). This 2009 declaration is the first official international communication of the Inuit Circumpolar Council. It affirms the unity of the Inuit across the circumpolar world and establishes an Inuit perspective on sovereignty.

**The Ilulissat Declaration**

The impetus for the development of an Inuit statement on sovereignty occurred when the Inuit were not invited to a major international conference on legal rights concerning the Arctic Ocean – the Arctic Oceans Conference of 2008. The Arctic Oceans Conference was held in Ilulissat, Greenland, hosted by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, and the Premier of Greenland, Hans Enoksen. The foreign affairs ministers of the five littoral states of the Arctic Ocean were the only participants invited. Finland, Sweden, and Iceland were excluded as were the six Permanent Participant organizations. The conference was organized to address on-going territorial tensions in the region and to assert the unique position and legal rights of the coastal states. This exclusion of the Inuit Circumpolar Council from the conference and the follow-up release of the *Ilulissat Declaration* were matters of great concern to the Inuit given they are the world's most northerly people and live predominantly in coastal communities. Møller justified the exclusions by asserting the "need to send a common political signal to both

---

18 Key ministerial-level attendees included Per Stig Møller, Foreign Affairs Minister, Denmark; Hans Enoksen, Premier, Greenland; Gary Lunn, Canadian Minister for Natural Resources; Jonas Gahr Støre, Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs; Sergey Lavrov, Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs; and John D. Negroponte, Deputy Secretary of State, USA.
our own populations and the rest of the world that the five coastal states will address the
opportunities and challenges [in the Arctic] in a responsible manner" (as cited in McLaughlin,
2008, para. 3). During the conference Møller clarified that one of the main goals of the meeting
was to affirm a legal regime for the region. He argued that no further participants were necessary
as the *UN Convention on the Law of the Sea* (1982) provided a sufficient legal framework for
rights over the Arctic Ocean. However, the organizers made no reference "to emerging
international law on the rights of Indigenous peoples," as Penikett and Goldenberg (2013, p. 38)
have astutely pointed out.

Although the Inuit Circumpolar Council was not invited to the conference, Aqqaluk
Lynge, president for the Inuit Circumpolar Council, Greenland, was asked to provide a keynote
address. In his remarks Lynge challenged Møller's decision to exclude the Inuit Circumpolar
Council stating that the Inuit were "being marginalized in this new debate by those who are now
in control over our lands and seas" (2008, para. 4). Lynge questioned conventional nation-state
concepts of sovereignty and requested the ministers consider an Inuit perspective on sovereignty.
He went on to explain:

Sovereignty is an interesting term. It means different things to different people, and to
different countries. What I would like ministers and others here today to understand is
that Inuit have their own definition of sovereignty. While we have been loyal servants to
the Arctic states in the past, while we have started conversations of peace and co-
existence with them despite the hardships we have endured, and while we have in fact
promoted their own respective claims of sovereignty from time to time, it does not mean
that we are merely pawns in the new debate. (Lynge, 2008, para. 14)
Lynge ended his address warning the conference participants that the Inuit would voice their concerns "loudly, clearly, and collectively" (2008, para. 16) in response to the Ilulissat meeting.

The *Ilulissat Declaration* was released on May 28, 2008. It asserted that the *UN Convention on the Law of the Sea* was a sufficient legal instrument for governance of the Arctic Ocean and that the five coastal states had both the "sovereign rights and jurisdiction" (*Ilulissat Declaration*, 2008, para. 3) to address opportunities as well as the challenges of climate change. While the *Ilulissat Declaration* mentioned future impacts of resource development on Arctic Indigenous peoples, the Inuit were not included in the document as the original people of the region or as a trans-national nation with inherent rights. Immediately following the release of the declaration, Duane Smith, president and vice-chair of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, Canada, stated, "Our Canadian land claims and self-government processes makes it mandatory for the Federal Government to include us, yet the Declaration that Minister Lunn signed on behalf of Canada ignores the role we should be playing" (ICC, June, 2008, para. 2). The Inuit Circumpolar Council quickly mobilized to draft an Inuit declaration on sovereignty that could counter nation-state claims and dominance in the Arctic.

**Toward an Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty**

The Inuit Circumpolar Council called a meeting to decide on an appropriate response to the *Ilulissat Declaration* and on November 6th and 7th, 2008, the Inuit Leaders' Summit on Arctic Sovereignty was held in Kuujjuaq, Nunavik. November 7th is the birthdate of founder of the Inuit

---

19 The *Ilulissat Declaration* fails to take into account the 20% unclaimed area of the Arctic Ocean (beyond the 200 nm Exclusive Economic Zone) known as the "doughnut hole" (Gallucci, Fabbi & Hellmann, 2012, p. 36).
Circumpolar Conference Eben Hopson and was declared International Inuit Day, by the Inuit Circumpolar Council, in 2006. The symbolism of holding the summit on that date did not pass unnoticed. As mentioned in a follow-up article on the meeting in Alaska's *The Drum*:

This year on Inuit Day, Inuit Leaders from throughout the Arctic met in Kuujjuaq, Nunavik, on the topic of Arctic sovereignty. As a result of Eben's visionary leadership, ICC continues to make great strides in advancing the interests of Inuit on many important topics like Arctic sovereignty. (2008, p. 4)

Thirteen Inuit leaders from Greenland, Alaska and Canada convened in Kuujjuaq including the premier of the Northwest Territories, the international leadership of the Inuit Circumpolar Council (except for the Inuit of Chukotka), representatives of the Alaskan borough governments, the president of the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, an Inuit Circumpolar Youth representative, and leaders from the four Inuit regions in Canada20 (ICC, 2009c, p. 16). Duane Smith opened the meeting. He stated that while climate change may have spurred international interest in the Arctic, discussions regarding the future of the region would not take place without the consideration of the Inuit – "the rights of Indigenous peoples are all part of the equation" (as cited in Irwin, 2009, p. 34).

Prior to the summit, the Inuit Circumpolar Council conducted extensive research in order to understand and articulate sovereignty from "an Inuit perspective" (ICC, December, 2008, p. 1). On the first day of the summit, several outside experts provided insights on Arctic sovereignty issues.21 On day two, the Inuit leaders discussed differing notions of sovereignty.

20 Nunavut, Nunavik, Nunatsiavut and Inuvialuit.

21 Expert guests included: "Professor Donald McRae, University of Ottawa, on the legal framework surrounding sovereignty over the resources and territory of the Arctic; Peter Harder,
Melissa Irwin, communications director for the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, noted, "The discussions examined concepts of sovereignty as traditionally embraced by nation-states, but also extended to the central importance of the right of self-determination enjoyed by the peoples of the world, including Indigenous peoples" (2009, p. 32). Delegates also examined the differences in international legal instruments by comparing collective rights and rights to self-determination, protected by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, with sea boundaries as outlined in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (Irwin, 2009, p. 34).

According to the report issued from the summit the meeting concluded with a "high level of unity" (ICC, December, 2008, p. 2) among the leaders, with consensus on an Inuit concept of sovereignty, Inuit rights to self-determination, and "the right of the Inuit to be meaningfully and directly included in all government discussions of sovereignty over the lands and seas we have lived on for thousands of years" (ICC, December, 2008, p. 2). The delegates agreed to draft a formal declaration on Inuit sovereignty to be presented at the Arctic Council Ministers meeting in Tromsø, Norway, the following April. On April 28, 2009, the day before the Arctic Council meeting, the Inuit Circumpolar Council released A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Arctic Sovereignty in the Arctic signed by the leaders of the four regions, Alaska, Canada, Chukotka, former Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs for Canada, on the Canadian perspective on sovereignty with references to Russia; Professor Douglas Nord, Western Washington University, on the American perspective with references to Russian interests; Professor Rasmus Ole Rasmussen, Roskilde University in Denmark, on the Danish perspective; and, finally, Professor James Anaya, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights and fundamental freedoms of Indigenous peoples, on the international instruments available to Indigenous peoples" (ICC, 2009c, p. 15).
and Greenland, and by the chair of the Council.\textsuperscript{22} The \textit{Inuit Declaration on Arctic Sovereignty} challenged Arctic Council member states to provide for greater inclusion of the Inuit in future decision-making. As Byers (2013) noted, the declaration urged the Arctic nation-states to consider the Inuit as "partners in the conduct of international relations in the Arctic" (p. 233).

\textbf{Arctic Council 2009 Ministerial Meeting in Tromsø}

On April 29, 2009, Patricia Cochran, president of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, presented the \textit{Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty} to the delegates at the 6\textsuperscript{th} Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council in Tromsø, as one of two statements presented by the Permanent Participants to the Ministers.\textsuperscript{23} In her presentation Cochran asserted the Inuit are not merely stakeholders, as they were often referred to, but rights holders. Cochran (2009) explained, "We are \textit{rights} holders, Mr. Chair. We are land owners, resources owners; we have settlement and treaty rights and it is our right to be at the table on all matters related to the Arctic" (para. 4). The \textit{Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty} appears to have been given significant consideration by the Arctic Council as the

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Arctic Sovereignty in the Arctic} was signed by Edward S. Itta, Inuit Circumpolar Council, Vice-Chair, Alaska; Duane R. Smith, president and vice-chair of Inuit Circumpolar Council, Canada; Patricia A.L. Cochran, Inuit Circumpolar Council, Chair; Tatiana Achirgina, Inuit Circumpolar Council, Vice-Chair, Chukotka; and, Aqqaluk Lynge Inuit Circumpolar Council, Vice-Chair, Greenland.

\textsuperscript{23} The president of the Sámi Council, Mattias Åhrén, also presented a statement at the meeting asking that the Council ensure that claims to resources in the Arctic are based on "claims to rights to Indigenous territories" (Sámi Council, 2009), and that efforts to develop renewable resources take into account their impact on Sámi lands.
ensuring Tromsø Declaration\textsuperscript{24} provided direct mention of the role of Indigenous peoples in the work of the Council. The ministers representing the eight Arctic nation-states agreed to recognize "the rights of Indigenous peoples and the interests of all Arctic residents" (Arctic Council, 2009, para. 5). The Tromsø Declaration further emphasized "the engagement of Indigenous peoples as being fundamental to addressing circumpolar challenges and opportunities" (Arctic Council, 2009, para. 5). By contrast, the Arctic Council's Salekhard Declaration from the 2006 Ministerial Meetings expressed only a vague commitment to the increased participation of Indigenous peoples in the "work of the Arctic Council and its subsidiary bodies" (Arctic Council, 2006, para. 5).

As noted by Byers, "What we see with this declaration [\textit{Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty}] is an organized attempt [for the Inuit] to insert themselves back into the discussion" (as cited in Weber 2009, para. 13). According to Zellen (2012), \textit{An Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty} enabled the Inuit to draw a "new line in the tundra" (para. 8) concerning Inuit and non-Inuit political relations. Successful applicants for Permanent Observer status on the Arctic Council must now describe how they will partner with the Permanent Participants; respect Indigenous values, cultures and traditions; and, commit financial support for the Permanent Participants and other Arctic Indigenous peoples (Arctic Council, 2009b). \textit{An Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty} was also presented at the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues held in New York in May 2009 (United Nations, 2009). James Anaya, Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Freedoms of Indigenous Peoples, called the \textit{Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty} a "tremendous piece of Indigenous diplomacy" (ICC, Canada, 2009, p. 17), and "a document that truly changes the way

\textsuperscript{24} At the end of each Ministerial meeting of the Arctic Council, a declaration is drafted summarizing the Council's work over the past two years and laying out a vision for the future.
Indigenous peoples will view sovereignty from here on in" (ICC, Canada, 2009, p. 17). Anaya also referred to the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* as visionary noting that other Indigenous peoples would surely use it as a model.

**Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty as Foreign Policy**

*A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic* is a document of 2,500 words, comprising 30 articles, and organized into four categories: Inuit and the Arctic; The Evolving Nature of Sovereignty in the Arctic; Inuit, the Arctic and Sovereignty: Looking Forward; and A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic. The document begins by establishing Inuit concepts of territory for the Arctic region. In a globalized world, the nation-state framework is becoming increasingly inadequate for understanding the identities of transnational peoples and organizations, and resolving transnational issues such as climate change. This is addressed in the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*, which challenges the dominance of Westphalian sovereignty, arguing that the rights of the Inuit as a people must also be considered in international negotiations. Further, "[o]ur status, rights and responsibilities as a people among the peoples of the world, and as an Indigenous people, are exercised within the unique geographic, environmental, cultural and political context of the Arctic" (ICC, 2009, Article 1.5). The Inuit frame the Arctic as a cohesive region distinguished by climate, geography and people. The Inuit are not seeking independence rather "self-governance within the borders of existing states" (Byers, 2013, p. 216). The *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* defines an Inuit concept of territory that both recognizes and transcends nation-state borders (see Chapter Four). Using the European Union as a model, the declaration argues for an Inuit concept of sovereignty that goes beyond the conventional nation-state model. It challenges the unquestioned dominance of nation-states as the *de facto* units in international relations, and favours unions based on
cultural boundaries defined by a more fluid understanding of territory. Penikett and Goldenberg (2013) have observed the same challenges to political boundaries in the Canadian territory of Nunavut (and beyond). They noted, "With the emergence of a territorial government controlled by a permanent Inuit majority [Nunavut], self-governing First Nations, and the European Union, the concept of sovereignty is now layered and overlapping" (Penikett & Goldenberg, 2013, p. 11). The *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* argues for a more complex and nuanced understanding of place and rights that currently defines international relations.

Following the discussion on sovereignty, the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* next refers to international customary law, arguing that Inuit have rights as "a people" as found in the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* and other legal instruments. Article 3.2 of *An Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* explains how customary law has defined the relationship between peoples and states. The article reads, "The actions of Arctic peoples and states, the interactions between them, and the conduct of international relations must give primary respect to … the inextricable linkages between issues of sovereignty and sovereign rights in the Arctic and issues of self-determination" (ICC, 2009, Article 3.2). By focusing on the standards of behaviour recognized by customary law, the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* addresses a legal justification for the Inuit concept of territory.

Legal scholars are increasingly examining Arctic Indigenous political effectiveness as it relates to international customary law (see Chapter Four). Koivurova and Heinämäki (2006) have argued the most effective way to advance the voice and interests of Arctic Indigenous peoples, particularly the role of the Permanent Participants on the Arctic Council, is by utilizing

---

25 For an excellent discussion on Arctic Indigenous rights and international law, see the chapter entitled, "Indigenous People" in Byers (2013, pp. 216–244).
customary law. They note that since the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* was adopted in 2007, pressure has increased for domestic and international forums to incorporate the voice and concerns of Indigenous peoples into their discussions and proceedings. Koivurova (2010) analysed Inuit and Saami efforts to utilize customary law to ensure their rights within the legal framework of Arctic nation-states. In his view, the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* has been an effective tool in assisting the Inuit in defining and affirming their legal position in Arctic governance. For instance, the Inuit Circumpolar Council was quite effective in leveraging Inuit self-determination as a transnational people in the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* by "contrasting the self-determination of Inuit of four States to the sovereignty of five Arctic Ocean coastal States" (Koivurova, 2010, p. 211). Christie (2011) argued that it is only via the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* that Inuit will be able to challenge nation-state dominance in the Arctic successfully. He notes that the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* affirms Inuit rights as a people by challenging the "absolute nature of territorial sovereignty" (Christie, 2011, p. 336). Penikett (2012) argued that Article 36 of the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* provides the Inuit with the right to maintain and develop contacts with Inuit globally including for political activities (p. 13). Similarly, Byers (2013) held that the Inuit are in a unique position to "influence and engage in international law-making" (p. 225) by claiming their transnational identity as a people. The *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* has become a critical legal instrument that is utilized effectively by the Inuit Circumpolar Council in the first international declaration issued by the organization.

The *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* was written specifically in the context of growing outside interest in the Arctic and in *Inuit Nunaat* (homeland) as a result of climate change and outside interest in Arctic resources. Affirming Inuit unity across the four nations, it argues for an
enhanced role of the Inuit Circumpolar Council in international relations and in decision-making in and for the region. The *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* criticizes the five Arctic Ocean coastal states for not going far enough in affirming Inuit rights gained through international law and land claims. As stated in Article 4.2, "The conduct of international relations in the Arctic and the resolution of international disputes are not the sole preserve of Arctic states or other states; they are also within the purview of the Arctic's Indigenous peoples" (ICC, 2009). While Ilulissat meetings were meant to solidify coastal state claims, Dodds (2012) has argued that they had an unexpected "wider significance" (p. 308) including the response of the Inuit Circumpolar Council. The *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*, as Inuit foreign policy, challenges the conventional nation-state claim to the Arctic Ocean and serves as a game changer in the politics of the Arctic region.

**Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty and Arctic Domestic Policy in Canada**

Over the past decade, the government of Canada has appointed numerous committees to examine sovereignty issues in the Arctic and to make federal policy recommendations. In 2009 the Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans issued two reports, *Rising to the Arctic Challenge: Report on the Canadian Coast Guard* (April, 2009), and *Controlling Canada's Arctic Waters: Role of the Canadian Coast Guard* (December, 2009). Although the evidence for *Rising to the Arctic Challenge* was collected prior to the release of the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*, Inuit concepts of sovereignty feature in the report. *Rising to the Challenge* includes a map of *Inuit Nunaat* (see Appendix 1) showing the boundaries for the Inuit regions of Canada rather than the conventional political map featuring the territories (Canada, Senate, 2009a, p. 39). The report asserts that Inuit sovereignty goes hand-in-hand with national sovereignty. The report stated, "In theory, Canada, in defending its sovereignty claim against other nations in regard to
shipping in the Northwest Passage, could invoke the long unbroken history of Inuit usage of the lands and waters" (Canada, Senate, 2009a, p. 41). At about the same time that the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* was released, similar concepts of territory were being applied to federal Arctic claims by the Government of Canada.

The second report, *Controlling Canada's Arctic Waters: Role of the Canadian Coast Guard*, was requested in response to increased shipping in the Canada's Arctic archipelago (as a result of summer ice melt). The Government of Canada sought recommendations to ensure the nation's security. Again, the Senate Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans was mandated to examine and report on issues related to ocean management to assist the federal government in developing its federal Arctic policy. The Standing Senate Committee gathered evidence from March to September 2009, when the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* was available. The Honourable Bill Rompkey, P.C., chaired the committee and Charlie Watt, a senator, served as a committee member. Witnesses included representatives of several Indigenous organizations and businesses. In the foreword to the new report, *Controlling Canada's Arctic Waters*, Rompkey firmly asserted that federal Arctic policy must be crafted with the full participation of Indigenous peoples:

26 In the summer of 2007 the Canadian Northwest Passage became navigable for the first time in recorded history.

… we need to craft our Arctic policy with the Aboriginal peoples of the Arctic as full partners. Too often, good intentions from the rest of Canada have fallen short. As in Nunavut last year, our Committee heard this year in the western Arctic that programs and policies needed to get down to the level of the people – and for that, the people need to help shape the programs and policies in the first place. For the Coast Guard and for the government in general, we urge a renewed commitment to that goal – not just through official structures like the Cabinet committee recommended in this report, but through determination and attitudes of the heart. (Canada, Senate, 2009b, p. xi)

Full participation included, in part, reference to the Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty.

In the section on Geopolitical Developments, the report discussed the Ilulissat meeting noting that three of the Arctic nation-states were excluded, as were Arctic Indigenous peoples. Here the report referred to the Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in asserting that "the rights, roles and responsibilities of Inuit must be fully recognized and accommodated" (Canada, Senate, 2009b, p. 6) in discussions on matters linked to Arctic sovereignty, including climate change and resource development. By referring to this section of the Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty, the report effectively recognized and recommended the importance of the full participation of the Inuit in decision-making to ensure Canada's national security. The report continued:

Inuit and First Nations have a critical role to play in reinforcing Canada's sovereignty in the Arctic and demonstrating Canada's presence and exercise of jurisdiction in the region.

Last year, the testimony of witnesses in Nunavut underlined the need for territorial, community and Inuit involvement in developing the Northern Strategy. This year, in the western Arctic, the evidence heard by the Committee similarly indicates a need to better integrate the views of Northerners and Aboriginal people in priority-setting, policy-
making, and decision-making. (Canada, Senate, 2009b, p. 10)

Throughout *Controlling Canada's Arctic Waters*, Arctic Indigenous peoples are accorded significant visibility and their full participation in the national decision-making process is strongly recommended. In Appendix 1, Northern Strategy Commitments, a budget is included to realize the report's nine recommendations. To support the wellbeing of Northerners, this budget suggested allocations of well over four million dollars for housing, health care and education (Canada, Senate, 2009b, p. 53). Under the section on Governance, the report recommended that land claims agreements and self-government be negotiated with Northerners. Recommendation 4 concerned the need for Northerners to be consulted in all future policy development and called for the establishment of a new cabinet committee to "further develop national Arctic policy, in cooperation with the three territorial governments, and to ensure that attention to northern issues and Arctic policy is maintained" (Canada, Senate, 2009b, p. 31).

While the Government of Canada did not agree to the creation of a new committee to address Arctic policy, it affirmed its commitment to collaborating with territorial governments in the development of policy and meeting regularly with Arctic Indigenous representatives via the Arctic Council Advisory Committee (Canada, Parliament, October, 2010a, Recommendation 4, para. 4). *Controlling Canada's Arctic Waters* marks the beginning of the impact and influence of the Inuit Circumpolar Council's *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* on federal policy in Canada.

At roughly the same time that the Committee on Fisheries and Oceans was conducting its study, the Standing Committee on National Defense was in the process of collecting evidence for a report on Canada's national security in the Arctic. In April 2009, this committee began an 8-month study that resulted in *Canada's Arctic Sovereignty: Report of the Standing Committee on National Defense*. The report was released in June 2010. In *Canada's Arctic Sovereignty* report,
there is direct reference to the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*. During the evidence gathering, the Committee heard from 41 witnesses representing 30 federal departments, universities, and six Inuit organizations, including the Inuit Circumpolar Council. Of these 41 witnesses 10 were senior policy analysts and advisors to the Inuit organizations or Inuit leaders (Canada, House of Commons, 2010, pp. 21–23). Only two weeks after the release of the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*, Inuit Circumpolar Council representative Chester Reimer, Senior Policy Analyst for the Council in Canada, presented the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty* to the Senate Standing Committee on National Defense.

The first witness to provide evidence to the committee was the CEO of a Canadian space company. He spoke of the importance of satellite surveillance to monitor conventional security concerns such as illegal fishing, transit, polluting and search and rescue. Chester Reimer of the Inuit Circumpolar Council followed. He began his comments by challenging conventional concepts of security:

> I'm going to present to you a little bit of a different twist on what some members here believe sovereignty is. I want to talk about more of an international dimension of sovereignty and how the Government of Canada, especially this committee, should be aware of how the Inuit – who don't only live in Canada – can be a good partner, building relationships with Canada and furthering its political goals. (Canada, Parliament, 2009a, Sec. 1540)

Reimer spoke of the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*, released two weeks prior in Norway and then explained the rationale for the *Inuit Declaration*:

> This circumpolar declaration on sovereignty in the Arctic, Mr. Chair, came about for several reasons. One, as the previous witness just said, there's an increasing focus on the
Arctic by Canadians and also by people abroad, and by states, by academics, by industry, and, as we heard today, by the space industry. (Canada, Parliament, 2009a, Sec. 1540)

Summarizing the requests of the Inuit, Reimer stressed the importance of the Inuit concept of sovereignty as found in the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*, and urged that the Inuit be at the table in discussions about military action, economic development and scientific research.

The committee interviewed the president of the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Mary Simon, who also referred to the recent release of the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*. She quoted Article 2.1 of the *Declaration* (that sovereignty has become a contested concept, as old ideas of sovereignty are breaking in favour of more representative models) and recommended that the Government of Canada undertake six activities in response to the *Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty*. Simon requested that the government acknowledge Inuit use and occupancy of lands and waters; engage in policy-making for the Arctic in partnership with the Inuit; fulfil land-claim promises; bring Inuit standards in education, housing and health up to par with all Canadians; stand up for Indigenous rights globally; and reinstate the office of the Arctic Ambassador (Canada, Parliament, 2009b, Sec. 0915-0920). Of the 17 recommendations in *Canada's Arctic Sovereignty*, four concern the inclusion of the Inuit in the development of future Arctic policies, recognition of the role of Indigenous peoples in Canada's Arctic sovereignty to date, and the inclusion of the Inuit regions in Canada's domestic northern strategy.

In contrast to the government of Canada's response to the two earlier reports by Fisheries and Oceans, the official response to the report on *Canada's Arctic Sovereignty* indicates a far greater commitment to engaging Arctic Indigenous peoples in meeting federal objectives. The report recommended that appropriate representatives of Canada's Indigenous Arctic peoples be included in the development of future Arctic policies (Canada, Parliament, 2010,
Recommendation 2). To this the government responded, "Canada will continue to engage with Northerners on Canada's Arctic foreign policy and will continue to meet regularly in Canada's North to find common ground and work towards common objectives" (Canada, Parliament, 2010, response to Recommendation 2). The Committee recommended that the government of Canada recognize the historical contributions of Indigenous peoples to Arctic sovereignty (Canada, Parliament, 2010, Recommendation 3). The Government response was enthusiastic. Finally, although not directly referring to the Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty, the Committee recommended that both Nunavik, in northern Québec and Nunatsiavut in Labrador (not part of the territories) should be included in development of northern policy. The committee challenged conventional political boundaries with the appropriate inclusion of cultural regions. The government responded positively to several recommendations, acknowledging the role played by Inuit in protecting Canada's Arctic sovereignty, in shaping Canada's international actions, and the efficacy of innovative governance in the North and its positive influence on Canada and the world.

Three Canadian government studies were conducted concerning the future of Canada's sovereignty in the Arctic. These three reports reflect the influence of the Inuit Circumpolar Council and An Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic in introducing new concepts of sovereignty into the domestic discussion and arguing for Indigenous participation in federal government policy development. Rising to the Arctic Challenge: Report on the Canadian Coast Guard (October 2009), Controlling Canada's Arctic Waters: Role of the Canadian Coast Guard (December 2009) and Canada's Arctic Sovereignty: Report of the Standing Committee on National Defense (June 2010) all integrated new concepts of territory based on cultural boundaries and affirmed the importance of an Inuit voice in future decision-making concerning
the Canadian Arctic region.

The Arctic Five and Beyond

In 2010 the Government of Canada hosted the 2nd Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Ocean Coastal States in Chelsea, Québec. Though the international Inuit organization and three non-littoral states were once again not invited to participate, the omission was criticized by a very high-level participant – the U.S. Secretary of State. At the 2010 meeting, Hillary Rodham Clinton embarrassed the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs by pointing out that "Significant international discussions on Arctic issues should include those who have legitimate interests in the region" (as cited in Blanchfield. 2010, para. 4). That the Secretary of State of the world's most powerful nation would make such a comment is indicative of a major rethinking in conventional international relations. Zellen has called Clinton's rebuff "surreal in its prioritization of a sub-state Indigenous minority over an allied nation-state" (2010, p. 9).

As Byers (2013) noted, "no further 'Arctic-5' meetings have taken place and, to this degree, the Inuit Circumpolar Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic has already proven quite successful" (p. 234). Given the effectiveness of Inuit activism and the impact of the Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty, it now seems highly unlikely that such a conference could be held in the future without the involvement of the Inuit. According to Dodds (2010), "those Arctic coastal states seeking legal 'certainty' and 'recognition' will have to do so in a world much changed from the Cold War era when extra-territorial actors and Indigenous communities were either marginal or marginalised, respectively (p. 72). The Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty has influenced the thinking of the Arctic-5 coastal nation-states.

28 The Arctic Five is a term used to refer to the coastal states of the Arctic Ocean – Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia and the United States.
Conclusion

The Arctic is emerging as a unique region where noteworthy reform can take place, a potential laboratory for international collaboration and the site for meaningful engagement between nation-states and Arctic Indigenous peoples. This region can provide an opportunity to revise traditional or mainstream approaches to international relations, to geopolitics, and to foreign policy analysis. The traditional monopoly claimed by nation-states in foreign affairs is changing rapidly in the Arctic in no small part due to the effectiveness of Arctic Indigenous involvement in international relations. As Heininen and Southcott (2010) observed, the fact that the Arctic is developing as a "platform for international and interregional collaboration" (p. 3) has everything to do with a growing vision of the circumpolar north "first and foremost as a homeland for Indigenous peoples" (p. 3). The Inuit Circumpolar Council has taken the lead in challenging conventional nation-state concepts of territory for the Arctic region and in furthering values that promote the rights of its peoples on a par with the rights of nation-states.

As global attention turns toward the circumpolar world and the Arctic Council admits more non-Arctic nation-states to observer status (as it did with China, India, Italy, Japan, Singapore and South Korea in 2013), it is critical that scholars and students of international studies gain a deeper understanding of the political discourse of non-nation-state entities. The Inuit Circumpolar Council has been particularly successful in influencing the global dialogue on the future of the region via the development of foreign policy. At one time, it seemed meaningless to speak of a non-nation-state having a foreign policy. Today, however, the situation evolving in the Arctic has reversed this. As yet, the sub-field of foreign policy analysis has not included Indigenous policies and declarations as part of the foreign policy dialogue – but that is precisely what is occurring in the Arctic. A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the
*Arctic* was drafted specifically to influence international affairs and to affirm Inuit participation in discussions on the future of the region. Foreign policy is part of the "currency of international relations" (Doran, 2011, p. 605), part of day-to-day political discourse. *A Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic* has become part of international political discourse – it lays out an Inuit definition of territory and sovereignty, embeds Inuit rights in international customary law, and defines the conditions for international relations concerning the Arctic. The Inuit Circumpolar Council effectively employs an Inuit-centered concept of Arctic territory as well as refers to customary international law to ensure Inuit goals are achieved at the international level. The following chapter will reflect on how Inuit foreign policy informs the Canadian Studies Center's Arctic initiative.
Chapter Six: The Arctic as a New World Region in the U.S. Title VI Program

The basic concept of area studies is the application of many or all of the social science and humanistic disciplines, sometimes also natural science disciplines, toward a better understanding of a single region, well defined in both geography and time, preferably through attention to specific problems. (Fahs, 1949, p. 1)

In 1949, assistant director of the Humanities Division with the Rockefeller Foundation, C. B. Fahs, drafted a three-page description of area studies that formed the foundation of the field (Fahs, 1949). Important to his definition is that a region is defined by geography and time. Fahs would prove to be one of the most influential individuals in promoting area studies as a scholarly field in the United States. He first served in the newly founded Office of Strategic Services in the wake of Pearl Harbor, one of the first academics hired to provide intelligence to the U.S. government. At the Rockefeller Foundation, Fahs promoted the study and scholarship of cultures and politics outside the United States partly for the benefit of knowledge of the world for knowledge sake, but also for the development of effective American foreign policy (Rockefeller Foundation, n.d.-a, para. 9). Although the Arctic was certainly not considered a world region in the 1940s and 50s, Fahs' concept for area studies continues to be apt today and relevant to the UW's Arctic educational initiative to promote the Arctic as a world region. The Arctic is cohesive both geographically and temporally, and is a key actor in addressing one of the greatest security issues of our time – climate change.

While the U.S. Department of Education assures applicants that "the applying institution can put its own designation for a region into an application" and that "the application is judged on the ability of the applicant to respond to quality in terms of the area suggested and to align to regulations" (personal communication, January 26, 2015), there is nonetheless a long tradition of
defining areas according to their importance to U.S. Government interests. The 2014 Title VI call for proposals, for example, lists each world area, Canada, and international studies with an approximate funding allocation for each (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, p. 16). Therefore, while it may be allowable to write a grant proposal for a new region, doing so would seem to pose a considerable challenge. Rather than to take a risk in submitting a grant proposal for a world region not listed in the application, we chose to incorporate the Arctic into the Canadian Studies Center's grant application to begin a dialogue to broaden the concept of world regions in area studies to include regions defined by cultural boundaries.

The focus of this chapter is an analysis of our inclusion of the Arctic as a new world region in the Canadian Studies Center's 2014 Title VI grant proposal. Important to that inclusion are the steps leading up to the drafting of the proposal including designing an Arctic studies minor, the development of the UW-wide Future of Ice initiative, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant awarded to the College of Arts and Sciences as bridge funding for Title VI. The 2014 Title VI invitation letter for proposals underlines the importance for applicants to describe how their area and international studies programs will meet the "nation's present and future needs for globally competent citizens" (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, 2014, p. 2). In the Canadian Studies Center proposal, the Center attempted to do so by incorporating activities that frame the Arctic as a global actor and distinct world region.

This chapter employs analytic autoethnography to shed light on the process of integrating a new world region into area studies. Data sources include notes from lectures, meetings, phone discussions, and email correspondence with leaders in the field, colleagues and partners. Data are analyzed using new theories of territory in international relations, theories linking space and social justice, and Inuit concepts of territory. This research project provides the first
autoethnographic analysis for introducing the Arctic as a distinct region in area studies, initiating an important dialogue on the future of the field and its ability to adapt to new concepts of territory and sovereignty.

**Background on Canadian Studies Center's Arctic Educational Initiative**

In 2011 the Title VI programs received their first major reduction in allocations when the Obama administration reduced program funding by almost 50%. The National Resource Centers were in the middle of their four-year grant cycle. Significant reductions had to be made in all activities. (Perhaps the greatest fear for those administering the grants was that these reductions marked the end of the Title VI program.) The following year, the Canadian studies centers world-wide suffered additional budget reductions when the Harper administration phased out its 35-year Understanding Canada program. This program supported Canadian Studies centers and academic associations in 55 countries at a cost of five million dollars annually. The impact of these cuts caused a significant blow to Canadian studies and led to the almost complete dismantling of the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States.

As a result of these reductions, our Center was forced to reevaluate the program and find ways to make our activities more relevant in a tighter fiscal environment. The reductions provided the opportunity to bring new thinking to the field. At the time, I had served 12 years as the full-time administrator for the Canadian Studies Center overseeing the academic program, research and outreach activities. There was no question of the value and impact of the funding as evidenced by the number of research projects undertaken by our faculty, the number of students who gained language acquisition in French and Canadian Indigenous languages, the impact of the Canadian Studies Center on alumni in fields from higher education to public service to the private sector, and the dozens of educators who now include Canada in K-16 curricula. I agree
with Khosrowjah (2011) and Moseley (2009) that those who benefited from Canadian Studies tend to have a broader knowledge base, a more critical approach to U.S. policy, and a less America-centric perspective than those who are not part of area studies (see Chapter Two). Therefore, with our many Canadian and Arctic studies colleagues, the Center attempted to address area studies from a new and innovative perspective and to re-envision both Canadian studies and the field of area studies to include the Arctic and Arctic Indigenous peoples.

**Laying the Foundation for the Title VI Grant Proposal**

From 2012 to 2014, the Canadian Studies Center was involved in three major initiatives that would lay a solid foundation for the writing of the 2014 Title VI grant proposal. The first was an initiative to draft an application for a new interdisciplinary minor in Arctic Studies, including four new course proposals. The second was the Center's participation in a campus-wide initiative known as Future of Ice. The third was the writing of a grant proposal to the College of Arts and Sciences for funding from an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant to launch innovative ideas in area and international studies to include the Arctic. All three initiatives would connect the work of the Center to the College of the Environment, effectively incorporating the natural sciences into building a knowledge base on the Arctic and ensuring an interdisciplinary approach to the region and its people.

**Interdisciplinary Minor in Arctic Studies.** In the late spring of 2012, I approached V. Gallucci, one of the Center's affiliated faculty members from the College of the Environment, to begin the process of developing an Arctic minor at the UW. In 2009, Gallucci and I had designed and co-taught the first interdisciplinary course in Arctic studies offered at the UW, JSIS 495 Task Force on the Arctic. Given the interest of the students in subject matter and the fact that several went on to pursue advanced degrees in Arctic studies, or found professional positions in
the field; and the high enrollments in Arctic-focused courses on campus, we felt there was significant interest to propose a minor in Arctic studies. Gallucci and I approached the associate director of the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, and the founder of the Task Force program, to further explore the idea of a minor. Both were enthusiastic. We then approached the director of the Jackson School of International Studies and division dean of Social Sciences and received their support to move forward. The first step was to appoint a committee of eight faculty members (four from the College of Arts and Sciences and four from the College of the Environment) to begin the challenging process of building a new teaching focus. It was an extremely time consuming project and a political one. Developing the minor involved designing the intellectual goals of study, defining and developing new core courses, working across departments and schools to include relevant electives, creating a new prefix, analyzing the value of collaborating with University of the Arctic, and patiently working through the politics between partnering units and colleges. Over the course of nine months, well over a hundred hours were put into the development of the Arctic minor application. The committee first met in November of 2012, the new courses were approved the following October, and it was January of 2014 before the minor had the full approval and signature of the University's president.

The steering committee decided early on that if the UW was going to develop a new minor in Arctic studies – the first in the contiguous states and sixth in North America – it would address the Arctic as a distinct region and from an interdisciplinary perspective. As stated in the application, "Future leaders in the region will be those who can combine interdisciplinary knowledge covering policy, culture, and science to address the unique and urgent challenges to the region" (UW, College of Arts and Sciences [A&S] and College of the Environment [CoE],
May 2013, p. 1). Therefore, students would be required to take courses in the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities.

The School of Oceanography was selected as the most appropriate partnering unit for the minor given the centrality of the Arctic Ocean to the region. The application states:

The Arctic Ocean is critical to the study of Arctic change, influencing all elements of the Arctic system and connections to the rest of the planet. Interactions between polar seas and ice play a major role in shaping the trajectory of climate and sea level change. As the Arctic sea ice cover continues to thin and recede, access to natural resources is increasing, new shipping lanes are opening, and ecosystems are changing. Sea ice is also integral to the lives of the Inuit whose culture, identity and food security are based on free movement across land and frozen sea. (UW, A&S, CoE, May 10, 2013, p. 6)

This thinking was informed by Steinberg (2009) who discussed places of movement and "a space of mobility outside the boundaries of the state-society" (p. 467). Using new theories about the meaning of territory assisted us in identifying an appropriate partnership for the minor.

The steering committee for the Arctic minor met virtually with University of the Arctic administrators and faculty to explore the inclusion of University of the Arctic courses as electives. Two Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies courses were included to fill gaps in course offerings at the UW, and importantly, to enable UW students to participate in a global classroom with University of the Arctic students. As described in the application:

Courses available in collaboration with the UArctic enable UW students to participate in a global classroom with colleagues from around the circumpolar world including from Canada, Russia, Greenland, and the Scandinavian countries. Curriculum design for the UW minor in Arctic Studies includes two on-line Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies (BCS)
The vision of the committee members was to build a program that trained students to understand the Arctic as a distinct region. Participation of UW students on-line with students from the circumpolar world would further this goal.

Development of the Arctic minor included four new course applications and one course revision. The four new courses were ARCTIC 200 Introduction to Arctic Studies: Indigenous Diplomacies and International Relations; ARCTIC 401 Current Issues in the Arctic Region; ARCTIC 400 Integrating Policy and Science in Arctic Studies; and, ARCTIC 498, a special topics course. OCEAN 235 Arctic Change was revised to become a core science course for the minor. The application for the course syllabus for the social science core course, ARCTIC 200, included a description that was informed by the research findings of Chapter Five. It reads:

The Arctic – home to 400,000 Indigenous people – is emerging as one of the most dynamic regions in global geopolitics in no small part because of the role of Arctic Indigenous peoples in international relations and sovereignty efforts. For arguably the first time in history, Indigenous peoples are engaged in foreign policy and international politics on almost equal par with nation-states. (UW, Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies [JSIS], April 1, 2013, p. 3)

In this core social science course the Arctic will be presented as a new world region. Students will examine how Arctic Indigenous peoples frame Arctic space and how that framing contributes to an understanding of the Arctic from an Indigenous perspective.

The application for the minor in Arctic Studies (see Appendix 5) received tremendous support from department heads and faculty members across campus. After identifying all of the
northern studies or Arctic studies programs internationally, I am fairly certain that the UW’s Arctic minor is the first in the world to have an ARCTIC prefix. The steering committee felt the prefix was important in framing those courses as being part of a unique region. During the tri-campus review (an open review period for faculty members and staff from the UW Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses) the application received over 30 comments in support of the minor. According to the curriculum office, no new academic program had received such support during the tri-campus review. One reviewer commented:

This new cross-college minor will mark the beginning of an important and growing interdisciplinary educational effort at the UW focused on the critical world region of the Arctic. I am privileged and excited to work with students and colleagues across campus to help bring it to fruition. (UW, Undergraduate Curriculum Office, May 10, 2013, p. 2) 

The process of developing the minor and the four new courses generated a lively campus-wide dialogue on what Arctic studies ought to be. By the end of the nine months, dozens of faculty members and administrators had played a role in its development. The steering committee felt they had achieved the goal of melding the social and natural sciences, addressing the Arctic as a cohesive world region, and including Indigenous political involvement on par with nation-state geopolitics in the course content. The meetings with the steering committee, University of the Arctic colleagues, and school administrators, along with the research on pre-existing undergraduate programs in northern and Arctic studies, contributed to a critical approach to the design of the minor and contributed to providing a foundation for the inclusion of the Arctic in the upcoming Title VI grant proposal.

**Future of Ice Task Force.** Paralleling the work of the Arctic Minor Committee was a Task Force appointed by the Dean of the College of the Environment to explore a campus-wide
effort to consolidate and build university-wide expertise in the polar regions. The initiative was entitled Future of Ice. Nine faculty members were appointed to report on the status of polar studies at the UW and to recommend future developments. Faculty members represented the Jackson School of International Studies, Earth and Space Sciences, Oceanography, the Applied Physics Laboratory, Anthropology, Program on Climate Change, and Atmospheric Sciences. This task force was effective in bringing together the faculty and researchers most interested in the polar regions to discuss how to synergize efforts and recommend new faculty lines. While the College of the Environment played a lead role in Future of Ice, the commitment of the dean of College of the Environment raised the visibility of Arctic studies in the Jackson School of International Studies and the College of Arts and Sciences.

During the period of time in which the Arctic minor steering committee and Future of Ice Task Force were meeting, I was approached by a student from the UW School of Law who was interested in applying for a Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowship in Inuktitut – the first request for study in Inuktitut since our initial awardee received a number of consecutive fellowships between 2005 to 2008. The student spoke to me about her interest in the Arctic and her wish to approach environmental issues from an Indigenous perspective. In my field notes I write:

*We talked about the UN Convention on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the value of international customary law in furthering the voice and rights of the Inuit [as outlined in Chapter Four]. We talked about Inuktitut and how the language represents a transnational region and that therefore, via the study of Inuktitut, K. might gain a greater ability to implement the UNDRIP as it pertains to environmental issues in the sovereign region of Inuit Nunaat.* (Fabbi, field notes, December 4, 2012)
The discussion with the student marked the beginning of engaging in analytic autoethnographic methodology to analyze the process of building a pan-UW Arctic initiative. From this point forward I began to take field notes to imagine how these three foundational activities – the Arctic Minor, Future of Ice, and Arts and Sciences sub-grant proposal for Mellon funding – could contribute to the inclusion of the Arctic in the 2014 Title VI grant proposal.

From the above discussion through the writing of the 2014 Title VI grant proposal, I used Anderson's (2006) key features of analytic autoethnography as a guide (see Chapter Three). Following an engaged dialogue with a student, faculty member or colleague, I would conduct a brief introspection of the interaction focusing on how I might achieve broader educational goals via the Arctic initiative. I recorded my thoughts in field notes. In January of 2013, more than a year before the writing of the grant proposal, I began to ponder the challenge of integrating the Arctic into a Canadian Studies grant proposal. I wrote:

*The Title VI grant proposal and mandated activities form a structure via which to introduce the Arctic initiative. How can I bring the Arctic in to the national structure of the Title VI program? There is no question that Title VI will provide new possibilities for the initiative or an avenue of possibilities. However ... at the same time using the Title VI structure may also create its own limitations.* (Fabbi, field notes, January 14, 2015)

Here I draw on the work of Ahmed (2014). Is it possible to turn "the tangible object of institutional resistance into a tangible platform for institutional action?" (p. 175). In other words, as the U.S. Department of Education and the UW will have the institutional limitations of a larger colonial project, will I be able to work within those institutions to further social justice via a greater focus on Indigenous approaches to territory and foreign policy? For example, while the Future of Ice initiative generated a campus-wide discussion on the polar regions, there was a
marked absence of the involvement of Indigenous faculty members. This was something I attempted to rectify in the Title VI grant proposal and in follow-up grant activities (see Chapter Seven).

**Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Grant.** The final activity to lay the foundation for the writing of the Title VI grant proposal was the writing of a grant proposal to the College of Arts and Sciences. The genesis of this request began in the fall of 2011 when the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation approached a number of universities with Title VI National Resource Centers inviting them to submit proposals for bridge grants or grants to enable their area and international studies centers to continue their important work in the face of the recent and significant government cutbacks. The UW was one of the invited institutions. The following spring the UW received notice that it was awarded one of eight three-year $750,000 grants from the Mellon Foundation. The purpose was clearly stated by the Foundation – funds were designated "[t]o support transitional efforts in area studies programs that are adapting to reduced federal funding" (Andrew W. Mellon, 2012, p. 54). The request provided the opportunity to bring together our new colleagues from the Arctic Minor Committee and Future of Ice initiative to work together on a proposal that would continue to explore the notion of the Arctic as a world region.

The College of Arts and Sciences grant proposal focused primarily on international studies and critical global themes and their impact on world regions rather than on area studies. In fact the terms "global" or "international" are mentioned no less than 75 times in the 11-page proposal. "Area" is mentioned half as many times. The Mellon grant application centers on the concept of "Making the 'Global Turn'" – a concept not explained but that appears to give focus to thematic issues cutting across world regions. In the proposal, the concept of world areas or
regions is not challenged, rather it is accepted that the eight area and international studies centers\textsuperscript{29} in the Jackson School of International Studies are the \textit{de facto} world regions and that via employing "area studies depth" the UW will be able to effectively address key global themes.

The proposal included several key themes – Multiple Democracies and Multiple Capitalisms, Climate Change and Human Vulnerabilities, Newly Globalized Religions, and Borderlands. The nation-state as the primary unit of analysis remained unchallenged in the proposal. In addition, none of the themes provided the necessary "space" for the inclusion of the Arctic as a region. The Arctic, when mentioned, was as a stage or platform where the above global themes are played out. Within the theme of Climate Change, the Arctic is included. However, the focus is on what regions outside the Arctic will do to take action in response to climate change. There is no critical analysis of the causes of climate change or the direct relationship between capitalism and climate change and resulting social justice issues. Even the theme of Borderlands, a theme that lends itself to new interpretations of political space, takes a Western-centric view of the Arctic. Under Borderlands the Arctic is a site where Indigenous peoples are challenged by externally imposed borders. Here Arctic Indigenous peoples are not actors or effective initiators of change. Rather, they are victims of global forces.

To disseminate the funding at the UW, the College put out a university-wide call for proposals in the spring of 2013 for up to $40,000 for the "Area and International Studies

\textsuperscript{29} The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the UW, houses eight Title VI centers – an international studies center and seven area studies centers. In addition to Canadian Studies these include: East Asia; South Asia; Southeast Asia; Middle East; West Europe; and, Russia, East Europe and Central Asia. There is also a Title VI center in the Foster School of Business.
Initiative." The call noted that the funds were to be used to enable the University "to formulate new ideas concerning how area and global studies can be organized and conducted at the institution in the decades to come" (UW, A&S, 2013, p. 1). Suggested activities included research projects, courses, symposia, instructional tools or trainings. The call for proposals from the College added new thematic areas and broadened the Borderlands theme to include "new conceptualizations of border regions" (UW, A&S, 2013, p. 1). The Center seized on this theme to prepare a proposal that would begin a university-wide dialogue concerning the Arctic as an emerging global region.

**College of Arts and Science grant.** In writing the grant proposal to the College of Arts and Sciences, the Canadian Studies Center partnered with other units in the Jackson School of International Studies and in the College of the Environment to ensure an international and interdisciplinary approach. The proposal was entitled "Re-Imagining Area/International Studies in the 21st Century: The Arctic as an Emerging Global Region." The proposal made the argument that the Arctic is not a theme within international studies but a "unique world region in global affairs" (Fabbi & Gallucci, April 1, 2013, p. 1). It pointed out that to date there is no area studies program in Arctic studies in the United States and only one undergraduate program, Arctic and Northern Studies, at University of Alaska, Fairbanks. The proposal argued that in order to address this absence, a dialogue must begin about how the Arctic can be understood as a distinct region. Our goal was to formulate new ideas concerning how area studies can be organized at the UW in decades to come. For example, we attempted to broaden traditional area

30 There were four principal investigators two representing the Jackson School of International Studies and two from the College of the Environment representing Atmospheric Sciences, and the Program on Climate Change.
studies scholarship encompassing the social sciences and humanities, to include the natural sciences. The grant investigators did this by working directly with the College of the Environment, specifically the Program on Climate Change and Atmospheric Studies. To answer the above questions, our application focused on two primary grant activities – a graduate course to begin a dialogue on the Arctic as a new world region, and support for graduate research projects that would similarly address the Arctic as an emerging global region from an interdisciplinary (natural and social sciences) perspective.

**JSIS 582 The Arctic as an emerging global region.** The graduate course, JSIS 582 The Arctic as an Emerging Global Region, was cross-listed with OCEAN/ESS/ATMOS 586 Arctic Science and Policy, and offered in Fall Quarter 2013. The course description noted that the Arctic is "fast becoming a region of considerable scientific and geopolitical interests" and promised the seminar would "explore the Arctic as an emerging region in the 21st century from a variety of perspectives" (Fitzhugh et al, 2013, para. 1). The course was co-taught by four faculty members including from the Jackson School of International Studies, Oceanography, Anthropology, and Scandinavian Studies. As the co-investigator for the College of Arts and Sciences grant, I served as a co-instructor and liaison between the course and the student fellowship program.

There is an obvious tension between working within the area studies field while, at the same time, pushing the boundaries of the nation-state model to suggest new ways of dividing up the world. This tension surfaced during the planning of the interdisciplinary course. In the drafting of the course syllabus, I noted the lack of Canadian-focused content. I emailed one of the instructors to remind him, that as a Canadian Studies Center grant project, it is imperative that there be significant Canadian content. This, naturally, confused him, because the point of the
grant project was to challenge conventional notions of territory. Nonetheless, I had to maintain compliance with a grant that was, at least, partially to bolster the Canadian Studies Center. In my email to the faculty member, I requested:

[W]e want to have at least 33% Canadian content in our presentations and research papers. Not necessarily $\frac{1}{3}$ content for each presentation/paper, but for the entire program. I take this figure from the US department of education for their criteria of what constitutes a Canadian content course … Once we get below $\frac{1}{3}$ content, it is pretty much no longer a Canada program and therefore we are out of compliance with our grantors. (personal communication, September 5, 2013)

The instructor wrote back expressing an understanding for my concern, while also pointing out the irony of the situation:

I don't think that will be a problem. I have to admit being confused about the extent to which the Mellon grant is intended (by the grantors – or the co-PIs) to facilitate Canadian Content specifically … I thought the whole idea was to try to create a NEW model for area studies, one focusing on the Arctic as a region (defined according to environmental and cultural parameters, thus, necessarily circumpolar), not exclusively Canada. I suspect this is a balancing act you are walking between a center mandate and an effort to create synergy between centers … I would like to discuss this a bit when we get the group together just to make sure everyone understands the bureaucratic/institutional parameters.

(Instructor, personal communication, September 5, 2013)

I responded that this was exactly the issue – how to argue for the new model for area studies that includes the Arctic while working within the parameters of the U.S. Department of Education definition for what constitutes a world region. We were experiencing the "territorial trap" Agnew
(1994) identified as we attempted to work within the current understandings of world regions to promote new ways of addressing political and cultural spaces.

Maintaining an interdisciplinary approach in the course proved far less challenging. The course was organized such that each meeting included presentations by three of four faculty members. For example, Week Two was entitled Marine Ecology, Fisheries and Art and included three presentations by University natural and biological scientists and a presentation by a local expeditionary artist who works directly with a narwhal scientist to visually record fieldwork. A total of 18 UW faculty members and researchers, our current Canada Fulbright Chair in Arctic Studies, and several outside guest speakers provided short presentations. This turned out to be an effective way to initiate a dialogue for Arctic scholars and to realize the breadth of research on the Arctic at the UW.

One of the more interesting outcomes of the course was the response of the teaching faculty in understanding the Arctic from a disciplinary perspective different from his or her own. In response to a presentation on fisheries management and the need to utilize a circumpolar management perspective in order to effectively manage Arctic fisheries, I made a note that I had "no idea science mattered ... no idea [science] would actually lend insight into understanding the Arctic as a region" (Fabbi, field notes, October 6, 2013). And yet, in terms of the management of Arctic cod, attempting to bring nation-states together to develop policy from a circumpolar versus nation-state centric perspective, made perfect sense and certainly illustrated the value of science in lending a cohesive understanding to the region.

**Arctic research fellows program.** Students in the course had the option to do a research proposal for course credit or submit a proposal for consideration for a $5,000 Arctic Research Fellowship (funded by the Mellon sub-grant). The call for proposals for the Arctic Research
Fellowship required research projects to address the Arctic as an emerging world region from an interdisciplinary perspective. The call described that:

The objectives of the fellowships are to foster innovative research that strengthens area studies at the University and to build vital research linkages across disciplines, particularly between the natural and social sciences and the humanities, on a range of issues related to the Arctic. Resulting research papers will focus on the Arctic as an emerging world region from a variety of perspectives. (UW, JSIS, Canadian Studies Center [CSC], December 2015, para. 2)

Eight graduate students were awarded an Arctic Research Fellowship. Four were from the College of Arts and Sciences, three from the College of the Environment, and one from the Evans School of Public Affairs. The Arctic Research Fellows worked with faculty member advisor(s) throughout Winter and Spring quarters 2014. On May 30th, 2014 a final symposium was held where the students presented their research. Of the eight Fellows, six submitted their papers to a peer-reviewed journal. Three of the research papers had a key focus on the Inuit influence in international relations.

The activities for the Canadian Studies Center's College of Arts and Sciences grant "Re-Imagining Area/International Studies in the 21st Century: The Arctic as an Emerging Global Region," resulted in significant synergies, collaborations, the development of new networks and relationships across campus. Both the graduate seminar and the Arctic Research Fellowship program provided a strong basis from which to write the upcoming Title VI grant proposal. The Arts and Sciences grant activities confirmed the interest in Arctic studies by the UW community of faculty and graduate students and the desire to approach the Arctic from an interdisciplinary perspective. The Canadian Studies Center would build on these newly established networks and
research projects in writing the upcoming grant proposal.

**Title VI Technical Assistance Workshop, September 2013**

Every four years the International and Foreign Language Education office provides a technical workshop for colleges and universities that are planning to submit a Title VI grant proposal. In preparation for the 2014 grant proposal, a technical workshop was offered in September 2013 in Washington, DC. The workshop provided practical instruction for drafting a proposal as well as informed participants as to the current vision of the U.S. Department of Education in international education. Information for writing our successful application was derived from presentations, keynote speeches, and one-on-one discussions with program officers and other staff. In addition, follow-up discussions with our consortium partners, the Jackson School of International Studies, and the Vice Provost for Global Studies at the University, assisted the Canadian Studies Center in shaping the effective incorporation of the Arctic into the Title VI grant proposal. In the following section I outline the highlights of the meeting and follow-up discussions as they relate to the inclusion of the Arctic as a new world region in the Canadian Studies Center's Title VI grant proposal.

**Keynote Address.** In the opening address and closing remarks Clay Pell, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International and Foreign Language Education, noted a successful

---


32 The keynote address was entitled, "Increasing our Nation's Capacity for Global Competitiveness: International Education Competencies for K-16 Instruction."
National Resource Center proposal would cooperate and coordinate with other units to achieve maximum impact, evaluate activities on an on-going basis to assure impact, ensure student placement, and create a K-16 pipeline in language training and international education. Pell assured the audience that international education remained important to the federal government and that the Title VI program and the National Resource Centers are increasingly expected to serve as the responsible units in leading the nation to greater international understanding. It was clear that we would need to collaborate with other area studies centers and international studies in the Jackson School of International Studies, Indigenous colleges, Canadian universities, and other off-campus organizations in arguing for the value of Arctic studies. This would become a key part of our proposal.

**Presentations.** The six non-technical presentations\(^\text{33}\) repeated many of the goals Pell laid out in his two addresses. My field notes highlighted the importance of connecting with colleagues and faculties at colleges and universities that serve underrepresented populations to expand our breadth of impact and build foreign language capacity. Our Title VI center would need to take more of a leadership role in sharing federal resources to foster international

\(^{33}\) The presentations included: Strategies for Increasing the Participation of Underrepresented Institutions and Students in International Education Programs; Integrating Area Studies Courses and Language Courses into the Professional Schools; Collaborations with Schools of Education to Increase the Number of Teachers with World Language and International Education Competencies; Outreach Activities: Making a Difference beyond Outputs; The Impact of Study Abroad on Student Persistence and Success; and, Building Expertise in International Education through Internships, Language Learning, and Research and Training (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, September, 2013).
education beyond the UW. The words "bridges" and "partnerships" were often repeated. My field notes also highlighted the focus on "critical world regions." While no explanation was provided for what constituted a critical world region, it was continuously reinforced that a competitive proposal would focus on regions where further understanding was critical to national need. Foreign language capacity was stressed for a successful National Resource Center, including an interesting comment that American Indian groups were pushing the U.S. Department of Education to recognize American Indigenous languages as "foreign" languages.

In my field notes following the presentations I wrote:

*Where does the Arctic fit with the U.S. Department of Education's mandates? The U.S. Government is primarily concerned with security. The Arctic is key to national and international security both from an environmental and a conventional understanding of security. Gorbachev was the first to introduce environmental security in his Murmansk Speech, but 10 years earlier the Inuit formed their international organization specifically to respond to outside interests in their lands and increasing security over their sovereignty. And, isn't language key to effective understandings of regions?* (Fabbi, field notes, September 30, 2014)

Increasingly I was convinced that the Arctic ought to be described as a critical world region in our proposal – critical to U.S. security both conventionally speaking and as it concerns the environment. The proposal would also need to argue that proficiency in the Inuit language is necessary in developing expertise in Arctic issues. While some area studies scholars have argued that the field is purely in service to the imperial interests of the U.S. Government (see Chapter Three), other scholars like Moseley (2009) and Khosrowjah (2011) pushed that understanding other regional and cultural norms actually challenge an American-centric project. Similarly I
argue that in introducing Inuit institutional organizations, regions (see Chapter Four) and foreign policies (see Chapter Five) into educational programming, conventional views are challenged.

**One-on-One Meetings.** Finally, our National Resource Center staff had the opportunity to meet with the academic officer for Canadian studies. Over lunch we asked her advice on including the Arctic in our Title VI grant proposal. She immediately challenged, "why wouldn't the Arctic be part of a grant application for international studies?" (Program Officer, personal communication, September 23, 2013). This was precisely the response we were most concerned about – how would we argue that the Arctic is not a theme within international studies but rather a region and actor on the world stage?

We explained to our program officer that the Arctic was *not* an international issue; rather, it was emerging as a critical global region that was also a natural extension of a Canadian studies program application. She seemed to accept our argument and added, "a stand out application will maintain the traditional area studies frame while adding *innovative* elements" (Program Officer, personal communication, September 23, 2013). Given that our consortium partners (Center for Canadian-American Studies at Western Washington University) have an excellent undergraduate program in traditional Canadian studies, she agreed that it did not make sense to duplicate these efforts at the UW, but rather to build an academic program that provided an innovative and focused approach to Canadian studies. The discussion with our program officer was a good reminder that we would need to carefully craft how we included the Arctic in our proposal so that it would simultaneously be understood as a new world region while at the same time constituting an innovative approach to Canadian studies.

**Debriefing the Technical Workshop.** On our return to Seattle further discussions to debrief the DC meetings occurred with our consortium partners at Western Washington
University, with the other Title VI programs in the Jackson School of International Studies, and with the UW's Vice Provost for Global Affairs. These discussions would solidify our thinking as to how to effectively incorporate the Arctic into a Title VI grant application and how to do so in a manner that would push the boundaries of thinking on what constitutes a world region in the area studies programs. In a follow-up phone conversation with the director for the Center for Canadian-American Studies, he noted Pell's focus on national interests and national security. The director felt that our focus on security issues in the Arctic provided a perfect balance to Western Washington's expertise on border security, creating a well-rounded National Resource Center (Director, personal communication, September 30, 2013). During the Jackson School of International Studies follow-up meeting to the technical workshop, the director of the School noted that his "take-away" points, included the importance of working with underrepresented populations and minority-serving institutions (Fabbi, field notes, October 2, 2013).

Lastly, the UW Vice Provost for Global Affairs urged the Jackson School Title VI centers to move away from the silo approach to area and international studies and enhance collaboration to address key global competencies (Fabbi, field notes, October 22, 2013). The Arctic provided the perfect focus for cross-unit collaboration. The Vice Provost also challenged that our proposals take a leadership role in defining area studies and that we not let the "tail wag the dog" (Fabbi, field notes, October 22, 2013). Following from his comments I noted:

*If we do not allow the tail to wag the dog, then this demands educational leadership – we need to develop a strategy for the Jackson School and campus-wide – we need to embrace priority themes such as the impact of the diffuse powers that Agnew discusses or the all-affected principle of Fraser and then move from this reframing of political space to push the envelope even further with Inuit concepts of territory that include water and*
Many of the concepts used in the 2014 Title VI proposal were developed in the two years leading up to the call for proposals from the Arctic minor, to the Future of Ice initiative, to the Andrew W. Mellon sub-grant proposal and activities, and at the U.S. Department of Education technical meetings.

**Title VI Call for Proposals**

On Friday, May 30th, the U.S. Department of Education issued the application notice for the 2014-17 National Resource Centers Program and the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships Program. The deadline for applications was June 30th, 2014, providing just 21 days to submit the proposal. Given the lead time needed by the Office of Sponsored Programs at the UW, we had less than two weeks to write the proposal. In addition, our annual flagship program – *STUDY CANADA Summer Institute for K-12 Educators* – was scheduled to start in Ottawa on June 25th. It was an extremely stressful time during which we literally had to work around the clock to meet the deadline. All activities needed to reflect the current U.S. Department of Education priorities, as presented and discussed at the September 2013 technical meetings, and forward the announced priorities. In addition, our Center had the added challenge of integrating new concepts for area studies into our proposal – concepts that would highlight the role of the Arctic as a cohesive region and the importance of the Inuit language to current and future national (American, not Canadian) needs.

The Funding Opportunity Description outlined the basic elements of the proposal for both the National Resource Center and Foreign Language and Area Studies programs. The 2014 description read:

The NRC Program provides grants to institutions of higher education and consortia of
such institutions to establish, strengthen, and operate comprehensive and undergraduate foreign language and area or international studies centers to serve as national resources for (a) teaching of any modern foreign language; (b) instruction in fields needed to provide full understanding of areas, regions, or countries in which the modern foreign language is commonly used; (c) research and training in international studies and international and foreign language aspects of professional and other fields of study; and (d) instruction and research on issues in world affairs that concern one or more countries.

The FLAS Program allocates academic year and summer fellowships to institutions of higher education and consortia of institutions of higher education to assist meritorious undergraduate and graduate students undergoing training in modern foreign languages and related area or international studies. (USDOE, OPE, May 2014, p. 31109).

Given the basic criteria outlined in the call, we needed to continue to show the relevance of a center focused on Canada, while at the same time arguing for how the Arctic plays a significant role in Canadian studies as a distinct region. The teaching of modern languages would assist in this argument. While French has always been the language for Canadian studies, branching into the teaching of Inuktitut served to frame the Arctic as an influential yet distinct region.

**Application Priorities.** Every call for proposals includes absolute and competitive priorities. Absolute priorities are necessary for a successful application. Competitive priorities include activities that respond to current national need. To date, the absolute priority has always been, and continues to be, teacher training – to "provide for teacher training activities on the language, languages, area studies, or thematic focus of the center" (USDOE, OPE, May, 2014, p. 31109). The 2014 Title VI call for proposals included two competitive priorities worth a total of 10 bonus points. The first competitive priority was for applications proposing "significant and
sustained collaborative activities with one or more Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) … or with one or more community colleges" (USDOE, OPE, May, 2014, p. 31109). These activities were required to be designed to "incorporate international, intercultural, or global dimensions into the curriculum at the MSI(s) or community college(s), and to improve foreign language, area, and international studies or international business instruction at the MSI(s) or community college(s)" (USDOE, OPE, May, 2014, p. 31109-10). The second invitational priority was to collaborate with colleges or schools of education (USDOE, OPE, May, 2014, p. 31110) to ensure that area and international studies are introduced at the teacher training level.

An additional two competitive priorities were included for Foreign Language and Area Studies. The first competitive priority was for proposals that promised to give preference to those student applicants that demonstrated financial need. The second competitive priority was for proposals committed to awarding "25 percent or more of academic year FLAS fellowships in any of the 78 priority languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's list of less commonly taught languages (LCTLs)" (USDOE OPE, May, 2014, p. 31100). No Indigenous

34 The U.S. Department of Education's list of less commonly taught languages includes: Akan, Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Azeri, Balochi, Bamanakan, Belarusian, Bengali, Berber, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano, Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese, Gan, Mandarin, Min and Wu, Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew, Hindi, Igbo, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer, Kirghiz, Korean, Kurdish, Kurdish, Lao, Malay, Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala, Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen, Ukranian, Urdu, Uyghur, Uigur, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu (OPE, May, 2014, p. 31100).
language is listed among the 78 priority languages. One of our goals was to begin to build the case that Inuktitut be added to the U.S. Department of Education priority language listing.

**Building Collaborative Relationships.** The process of building collaborative relationships with Jackson School of International Studies, other University units and off-campus partners was something that had to be achieved in record time given the short turn-around to complete the proposal. While many of these relationships had been established over the life of the Center (for example, with other Title VI programs in the Jackson School of International Studies), the Center had no colleagues in Title III-eligible colleges. In addition, as indicated at the Washington, DC technical meetings, co-sponsoring activities with partners was no longer sufficient. Rather, true collaboration was what was now required for a successful proposal. Meaningful collaboration demands strategic planning, common goals, and working together to achieve those goals as a community. This is a significant challenge in a competitive institutional setting where units tend to work independently rather than as communities. In terms of designing activities to build knowledge of the Arctic as a region, the challenge was to find partners willing (or even able) to challenge conventional models of area studies to include the Arctic. The Center would work with three different communities to build meaningful collaborations concerning the Arctic. These included the other Title VI National Resource Centers in the Jackson School of International Studies and Title VI Global Business Center in the Foster School of Business; Title III institutions in rural Alaska; and, off-campus organizations including the Makivik Corporation and Nunavut Arctic College in Iqaluit, Nunavut.

**Proposed Activities with an Arctic Focus**

The grant proposal included over 20 activities per year (for the UW) for each of the four years of the grant period, including the development of non-language and language courses,
planning and development of a graduate certificate, site visits to build collaborative relationships with other institutions, outreach activities (serving K-16 educators, business government, media and the general public), and research projects. Of the 20-some activities, almost half had an Arctic focus. In the next section I analyze how we identified the activities, and how collaborations were used to further the framing of the Arctic as a distinct global region. I begin with the activities included in the development of the academic program and then address outreach activities and research projects.

Development of the Center's Academic Program. Since the founding of the Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada in the late 1980s, the academic program at the UW's Canadian Studies Center has been weak. Whereas Western Washington University has always had faculty members and courses on Canadian history, politics and culture, our Center does not have a full-time faculty line designated to Canadian studies. Instead, the Center relies on faculty members from across campus, who serve as affiliated faculty of the Center, and uses data from Canadian content courses to illustrate the strength of the program. As a result, while thousands of students enroll in Canadian content courses annually at the UW (see Chapter One), no more than two or three students have declared a major or minor in the 15 years that I have been with the Center. Although the Center has been awarded Title VI grants for over 25 years, the lack of an academic program had to be addressed. This was one of the driving forces in our getting the Arctic Minor in place before the call for proposals for the Title VI program.

Non-language undergraduate courses. In the Title VI grant proposal, we included the development of four courses in Arctic studies. Two of the courses would have significant Canadian content, one would be a joint course with other Title VI centers in the Jackson School of International Studies focused on climate change, and the fourth would be an intensive one- or
two-week leadership course for youth. The last two would serve underrepresented students both on campus and at Title III institutions in Alaska.

**Core courses.** Two courses would have 100% Arctic content and include significant Canadian content. ARCTIC 200, the core course for the minor, was scheduled for the fall of 2014. It would effectively link Indigenous and nation-state relations concerning decision-making in the Arctic. ARCTIC 400-level Inuit Nunangat (Inuit Homelands) in Canada was written into the grant as a course to be developed in year three and offered in year four. The course included to "offer in-depth focus on the history, culture, and growing political influence of the Inuit in Canada" (Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada [NRC], 2014, p. 35). The rationale for the course was to enhance the Canadian content in the grant application while addressing the Arctic from a pan-northern perspective. The course will look at the Arctic in Canada as an Inuit region.

**Partnership course with underrepresented youth.** An additional course was designed to bring together undergraduate students from the UW Honors Program with underrepresented high school students. This course responds to the focus at the technical workshop to partner and collaborate to reach underrepresented groups. ARCTIC/HONORS 200-level Climate Change: Science and Human Rights was proposed as a joint offering with four other Title VI centers – Russian Studies, East Asia Studies, West European Studies, and Global Studies – as well as with the Honors Program and Ida B. Wells School for Social Justice @ UW. The course fills a core science requirement for the Honors Program, serves as an elective for the new Arctic Minor, and is part of the Ida B. Wells curriculum. It also addressed a critical effort in academia to encourage the younger generation to be involved in responding to climate change impacts. The course will
introduce students to the science behind climate change with a focus on climate-change impacts in the Arctic.

The Ida B. Wells School for Social Justice @ UW, part of the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity, serves over 20 high school students from low-income families and/or families where they are the first to attend college. This new course is part of the curriculum for the program. Students from the Honors Program and Jackson School of International Studies will be matched with Ida B. Wells' students to serve as mentors and learning partners. In engaging secondary education, the project will establish a collaborative academic partnership between the Ida B. Wells School and the two University units (Honors Program and Jackson School of International Studies) to encourage the high school students to consider the Honors Program or Jackson School of International Studies in the future.

We continued to hone the course outline from one purely focused on climate change to a course where the Arctic is centralized in climate change impacts. Initially the instructor envisioned a course that would address climate change impacts more broadly. When encouraged to focus solely on the unique impact of climate change in the Arctic, he responded:

I think a focus on the Arctic and climate change is a great approach. I would certainly be onboard with that as a focus. I also think having an Inuit component could be an important component of the course from multiple perspectives: western science and traditional knowledge, art and culture, and as a frontline of adapting to climate impacts.

(Instructor, personal communication, May 24, 2014)

In the end it was agreed that the Arctic would be the focal point for addressing climate change.

**Leadership course with Alaskan colleges.** We also wanted to develop an innovative course that would enable students from the north to take courses with UW students and a course
that would provide leadership training. Given limited budgets and human resources, we decided that the most realistic program would be a short course where students from the north could come to the UW for a week or two. The third non-language course proposed was ARCTIC 400-level Circumpolar World Leadership Program. The course will be a collaboration with off-campus units in an effort to respond to the first competitive priority, promising significant and sustained collaborative activities with one or more Minority-Serving Institutions. Meeting this competitive priority was a challenge for our program because these were not relationships that were formerly established. Working with the Alaskan colleges responded to concerns about the lack of significant Indigenous participation in the Future of Ice initiative (see above).

The course was to build north-south networks for youth and to provide them with a leadership training based loosely on Nunavut Sivuniksavut in Ottawa. Nunavut Sivuniksavut is a college program that prepares Inuit youth from Nunavut for careers created by the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement or with the Government of Nunavut. Our concept was to prepare students to work for governments or non-governmental organizations dealing with Arctic policy. The short course would provide students with communications skills, research skills, a history of the Arctic Council and the current geopolitical issues facing the Council and Permanent Participants (Arctic Indigenous organizations). I wrote to the secretariat for University of the Arctic35 (Rovaniemi, Finland) to ask about their interest in collaborating on such a course and received an enthusiastic response.

35 University of the Arctic is a network of institutions of higher learning and organizations committed to education "in the North, for the North, by the North." University of the Arctic was endorsed by the Arctic Council in 2001 and presently has over 120 member institutions worldwide including, most recently, from China. The UW is currently one of just three University of the Arctic council members in the contiguous states.
response. "Sounds just fantastic – I do think that our two initiatives and interests can be aligned perfectly" (Representative, personal communication, May 13, 2014).

When I submitted a revised version of the project to University of the Arctic we were put in touch with the Vice President Academic for University of the Arctic at University of Alaska, Fairbanks. University of Alaska, Fairbanks, including its Title III-eligible branch campuses, would be the Center's partner institution for the Circumpolar World Leadership Program. We were then connected with one of the leads for the five University of Alaska branch campuses all of which are Title III eligible institutions. In a relatively short period of time, we had begun the process of envisioning a short course that would bring students from the north to the UW and train students from both north and south in the necessary leadership skills and knowledge to prepare them for work in the circumpolar world. University of the Arctic would also play a key role in the Youth Leadership Program. The representative from University of the Arctic noted in a final email:

Circumpolarity is one of the core values of UArctic. It is quite special to observe how UArctic can play an important role even in national cooperation when new partnerships are formed. There is great value in that. I hope that over time this educational partnership can also expand to include a circumpolar dimension. (Representative, May 29, 2014)

Indeed, the Circumpolar Leadership Program (short course) will begin as a collaboration between four units, hopefully growing to become truly circumpolar in scope. The following was included in the 2014 Title VI grant proposal:

A new 10-credit intensive leadership program, ARCTIC 400-level Circumpolar World Leadership Program (UW), will be designed in partnership with the College of Rural and Community Development (with five Title III-eligible branch campuses under
administration of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks). The summer course will provide NRC and Title III-eligible institutions with academic and professional development training in Arctic geopolitics, policy writing, and analyses of topics ranging from the environment to economics. Particular emphasis will be on Arctic Indigenous political involvement in Canada and internationally. (PNWNRCC, 2014, p. 34)

**Inuit language courses.** Since our first grant proposal was awarded in 1988, French has been the language for the Canadian studies National Resource Centers as designated by the U.S. Department of Education. Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships for other languages can be awarded on a case-by-case basis but must be approved by the International and Foreign Language Education. The Canadian Studies Center is the first in the nation to award Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships for Canadian Indigenous languages (see Chapter One). In seeking approval our argument has always been that the role of Indigenous peoples in Canada has significant influence on national policy and therefore on the Canada-U.S. relationship. While we wished to continue to fund fellowships for any Canadian Indigenous language, the grant proposal focused on the Inuit language as Inuktitut is critical to understanding the Arctic as a distinct region of the world. The text from the grant proposal reads:

> Proficiency in Inuktitut, the Inuit language in Canada, is becoming increasingly critical in global geopolitics concerning the Arctic. By the end of the grant project the NRC will become the first Center in the nation to offer modules on Inuktitut language structure and access to Inuktitut courses via video-conferencing with Nunavut Arctic College.

(PNWNRCC, 2014, Abstract)

The language program is one of the most critical aspects of the International and Foreign Language Education mandate. The technical workshop, as discussed above, highlighted
American competence in foreign languages, perhaps more so than for any other criteria of the program. The workshop emphasized that a successful grant proposal will develop enhanced language training as part of its teaching program as well as increase access for students to less commonly taught languages as part of the Foreign Language and Area Studies grant.

Although Inuit languages are not identical across the circumpolar world, they are closely related. These less commonly taught languages have become critical to Arctic geopolitics given the influential role of the Inuit in foreign policy, natural resource development, land claims, and future directions of the Arctic Council. Inuit languages – in particular Inuktitut, the Canadian Inuit language – are becoming increasingly important for international cooperation and critical to U.S. security and cooperation concerning the Arctic. The Canadian Studies Center is the first and remains the only National Resource Center to award Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships in Inuktitut, the Inuit language. Providing access for Inuktitut language instruction has been a significant challenge as the Center must rely on partnerships with off-campus instructors and programs.

To offer training in Inuktitut, the Center designed a teaching program with two of Nunavut's top Inuktitut instructors and in conjunction and collaboration with Nunatta Campus of Nunavut Arctic College in Iqaluit, and the Language Learning Center at the UW. In the proposal we promised to create a real-time video connection with Nunatta to enable our students to be in courses with students in Nunavut for the first two years of the learning of the language. We stated that we would also create an introductory module for our students as a prerequisite for the language classes to introduce them to the complexities of Inuktitut. One of the Inuktitut instructors noted the importance of a pre-language module for non-northern language learners:

… Inuktitut is unlike almost all the familiar "foreign" languages we try to learn. They all
share the same basic structure with English. To over simplify it, you take an English sequence, substitute the new words, make a few adjustments and "voilà, nous parlons français." This doesn't work in Inuktitut. You don't have a frame to drop the new words into. You need to establish the structure. Then you know where to drop the new word, and you know how to adjust it to the demands of the unique Inuktitut framework."

(Instructor, personal communication, May 22, 2014)

These ideas were then presented to the language experts at the University's Language Learning Center, including a doctoral candidate in linguistics with extensive experience in Indigenous language revitalization. After dialoging with all of our community members, the grant proposal for the language project read:

Working with the UW Language Learning Center and current FLAS instructor in Inuktitut … distance-learning modules on the grammar and unique structure of the Inuit language will be developed. UW students will be required to successfully complete the module study before enrolling in first-year Inuktitut. To provide students with access to first- and second-year Inuktitut, a collaborative partnership will be established with Nunatta Campus in Iqaluit, part of Nunavut Arctic College, to offer distance-learning language courses via video-conferencing. UW and WWU students will be able to take ARCTIC 101-103 or ARCTIC 201-203 Inuktitut: Canadian Inuit Language and interact with Inuit faculty and students in Nunavut, Canada. (Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada [PNWNRCC], 2014, p. 38)

If the initiative is successful, UW students will be able to study Inuktitut from Seattle in an institutional partnership with a Nunavut Arctic College branch campus. This would also serve to build networks between students from the north and UW students.
One of the competitive priorities for the Fellowships was to offer at least 25% of our designated fellowships in one of the languages on the list of less commonly taught languages identified by the U.S. Department of Education (see above). Inuktitut is not on this list. In the competitive priority section of the proposal, we included an argument for Inuktitut:

Inuktitut is not yet on the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) list of less commonly taught languages. Yet, in addition to being a less commonly taught language, Inuktitut has significant strategic importance to the U.S. and is critical to national security. The Inuit in Canada (and globally) have significant political influence concerning land claims, rights to natural resources, and who has legal rights over the Northwest Passage. In order that international affairs in the Arctic are effective and peaceful in the future, it will be necessary to understand Inuit legal rights and interests and to be able to communicate effectively with communities, Inuit organizations and leaders. The NRC has strived to respond to this area of growing national need via awarding the first FLAS fellowship in Inuktitut in the nation in 2005. Since that time, the NRC has awarded a total of five FLAS fellowships in the Inuit language. The NRC will work with the US DOE in the upcoming grant cycle to have Inuktitut added to the list of 78 strategic languages and is committed to identifying a FLAS Fellow for Inuktitut annually. (PNWNRCC, 2014, p. 60)

Of the three reviewers one noted that Inuktitut was not on the list of strategic languages and did not award us the five additional points. The other two reviewers agreed with our argument and each awarded the bonus points for our efforts to increase language awards for Inuktitut as an identified strategic language. This marks a move forward in realizing the recognition of Inuktitut as a critical foreign language by the U.S. Department of Education.
**Graduate certificate in Arctic studies.** The Title VI proposal allows for the building of new academic programs. We proposed a new graduate certificate in Law, Rights and Governance in the Arctic. As outlined above, the Arts and Sciences funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant enabled the Center to offer Arctic Research Fellowships to graduate students and build a community of faculty members working on Arctic research. A second Arts and Sciences grant was awarded to the Center for the 2014-15 academic year to build an Indigenous epistemological foundation across academic units, including Indigenous worldviews as a critical part of the foundation for a new Graduate Certificate in Arctic studies.

The Graduate Certificate will include significant content on Canada's leadership role in the Arctic, the role of the Inuit in Canada in global geopolitics, international customary law as it applies to the Northwest Passage and Arctic Indigenous rights, and successful Canadian diplomacy efforts and governance models concerning the Arctic. It will also attract and train Ph.D. students with competency in Arctic studies to become leaders in the field. The Graduate Certificate in Law, Rights and Governance in the Arctic will become part of the University's academic programs institutionalized by the end of the four-year Title VI grant cycle.

We worked closely with the associate director for the Jackson School of International Studies (also the director of the Jackson School's Ph.D. program) on the graduate certificate. It was the suggestion of the associate director that we connect the master's certificate to the Ph.D. program to enable courses offered in the master's to serve the doctoral students. In an email the associate director suggested: "The only thing I might mention is that, through this graduate certificate, you aim to attract and train Ph.D. students with competence in Arctic studies who will subsequently become shapers and contributors to debates in the national arena" (Associate Director, personal communication, May 21, 2014). The most appropriate theme was under law,
rights and governance, which would enable us to build significant Arctic Indigenous content into the program. The grant proposal promised:

The NRC will also create a new Law, Rights and Governance in the Arctic graduate certificate in Arctic Studies – the first of its kind to be offered in the contiguous states. The focus of the certificate aligns with one of the four themes of the Jackson School's new doctoral program and will address law of the sea disputes, resource rights, and nation-state/Indigenous governance issues. It also will contribute to course work for the new Jackson School of International Studies Master of Arts in Applied International Relations. (PNWNRCC, 2014, p. 37)

The graduate certificate would effectively broaden current understandings of area studies by addressing the Arctic from a place-centered perspective.

**Outreach Activities.** In addition to new courses covering non-language and language content, outreach is a key component of a Title VI program. To serve off-campus communities we proposed an annual Arctic Institute in collaboration with the four other Jackson School of International Studies Title VI Centers, the Title VI center in the Foster School of Business, Future of Ice, the Arctic Caucus with the Pacific Northwest Economic Region, and the new Polar Initiative at the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars in Washington, DC. The goal of the Arctic Institute will be to train both scholars and practitioners in current issues being dealt with by the Arctic Council and/or internationally. Our abstract introduced the Arctic Institute as follows:

[T]he NRC will partner with other Title VI centers, the Woodrow Wilson Center and the Pacific Northwest Economic Region Foundation to offer a development training on North American leadership on the Arctic Council, and will offer a series of Cross-Border Economic Forums to bring together businesses and Indigenous organizations from
Canada and the US providing updates on salient issues. (PNWNRCC, 2014, Abstract)

Dramatic geopolitical changes resulting from the end of the Cold War and ongoing climate change have greatly increased the strategic importance of the Arctic. Managing the many changes emerging from this shift – including environmental, economic and security issues – demand American expertise. In order to ensure the future security, stability and economic vitality of the United States, U.S. experts need to be knowledgeable about the Arctic as an emerging world region and have the tools to conduct research in this area.

This one-week summer institute is designed to train professionals from international affairs-related sectors, government, business, civic, and nonprofits in the United States as well as students from the Jackson School's Master's in Applied International Studies and other graduate students. The institute will provide comprehensive training about Arctic issues, including the science behind climate change, the geopolitics of the Arctic nation-states, Arctic Indigenous organizations on the Arctic Council, the growing interest of the Asian countries in the Arctic, the new Arctic Economic Council, and resource development and shipping issues, including legal instruments such as the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Graduates will become part of a growing pool of Arctic experts prepared to meet national need.

The institute will include significant content concerning Canada's leadership role in the circumpolar world and the influential role of the Inuit in Canada. The training will include a half-day language workshop in Inuktitut, the language of Inuit Nunaat (Inuit in Canada, Russia, Greenland and Alaska). Our proposal for the Arctic Institute read:

Proposed NRC outreach activities for business, media and the general public includes establishment of a new institute for professionals and five additional new/continuing activities with funds going toward guest travel to the NRC, professional fees, materials
and publicity. The Arctic Geopolitics Summer Institute for Practitioners & Scholars is a new collaboration between six other Title VI centers in the Jackson School of International Studies and the Foster School of Business (UW), the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars in Washington, DC, and the Pacific Northwest Economic Region Foundation (PNWER) based in Seattle. Together the NRC and partners will design the institute (YR 1), offer it at the UW (YR 2), and at Woodrow Wilson (YR 3) when the U.S. chairs the Arctic Council. (PNWNRCC, 2014, pp. 40-41)

By focusing on the Arctic as critical to national need, including the effective role of Indigenous peoples, and connecting this with other issues key to the Canada-U.S. relationship, we felt the inclusion of the Arctic made good sense and would be acceptable to the readers.

**Research Activities.** Two proposed research activities were included in the proposal to enable the Center to work with other units to develop research dealing with the question of the Arctic as an emerging region. Both research projects are proposed for year one of the grant. The first proposed activity is also included in the 2014-15 Mellon grant. It is to build Indigenous ways of knowing into the foundation for our Arctic academic programs. The second proposed research activity is included in a grant proposal to the Government of Québec to address the Government of Québec-Nunavik policy dialogue concerning the Arctic.

**Indigenous worldviews in education.** The proposal promised a research paper on Indigenous worldviews in education to provide a stronger Indigenous epistemological foundation for the Arctic minor and graduate certificate. Here we promised to broaden our impact to collaborate with Latin American and Caribbean Studies, Comparative History of Ideas, and American Indian Studies to dynamically engage in questions that challenge the conventional area studies approach to understanding global regions by looking at transnational Indigenous nations
and other diffuse and effective powers; Indigenous concepts of territory that include water and ice as part of land and region; and other global Indigenous political movements now bolstered by the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. The research paper will focus on the findings of the workshop on Indigenous worldviews.

**Québec and Nunavik policy dialogue.** The second research project will be the proceedings or edited book on the Québec-Nunavik relationship. Québec is currently the only region in the world where a sub-national jurisdiction and Indigenous people are engaged in a policy dialogue about the Arctic. Regardless that the goals of the two entities may diverge, the fact that a dynamic policy dialogue exists between a regional government and an Indigenous people is unique and worthy of closer analysis. The workshop and follow-up publication will ask how this policy dialogue sheds light on, or even creates a model for, Indigenous internationalism and international relations broadly speaking. The workshop will address the priority areas for the Ministère des Relations internationales and the Nunavimmiut, including the history of the Québec-Nunavik relationship, the policy dialogue today (*Plan Nord-Parnasimautik*), case studies providing focused insights into the current characteristics of the Québec-Nunavik relationship, and projections into the future.

**Conclusion**

In late September 2014 the Center received word that our Title VI National Resource Center and Foreign Language and Area Studies fellow grant proposals were successful. In fact, the Center was awarded nearly the full amount requested – almost unheard of for awarded proposals. The Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada was awarded $225,000 per year (for four years) and, received the full $167,500 requested for Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships – a total award of almost $1.6 million dollars.
It is difficult to determine the exact reasons for the success of any grant proposal, but certainly the inclusion of the Arctic seemed to strengthen our Title VI grant proposal. The Arctic program was referred to 19 times in the comments of the three reviewers, and Inuktitut (or the Inuit language) was mentioned nine times. A number of the comments indicated that our inclusion of the Arctic was positive: "The NRC's new emphasis on the Arctic makes it the center of Arctic Studies in the United States;" "UW will become a magnet program for Arctic studies nationwide;" "The NRC is a hub of expertise on geopolitical and cultural issues in the Arctic and has offered an array of programs on this topic;" "The Center is clearly one of the primary resources worldwide for Arctic research and based on the assessments included in the proposal, this impact is increasingly yearly;" and "UW will achieve its goal to be a magnet program for Arctic Studies nationwide through development of the Center's new interdisciplinary undergraduate minor in Arctic Studies. It will also offer the nation's first graduate level Certificate in Law, Rights and Governance in the Arctic, Inuktitut language courses, and an institute that trains professionals about Canada's role in Arctic geopolitics" (USDOE, OPE, IFLE, 2014). These reviewer comments speak to the strength of the Arctic in our grant proposal.

In the press release issued by the U.S. Department of Education announcing the final year 2014 awards under five Higher Education Act-Title VI programs and including the National Resource Center and Foreign Language and Area Studies grants, Secretary Arne Duncan was quoted as saying:

Life in the 21st century means adapting to the most hyper-linked, interdependent world we've ever seen. To help keep America safe, partner effectively with our allies, and collaborate with other nations in solving global challenges, we need professionals with solid cultural knowledge and language skills that cover all parts of the globe. These
grants will enable more students and educators to gain global competencies that equip them with an understanding and openness to cultures and languages around the globe.  

(USDOE, PO, October, 2014, para. 2)

Our grant proposal argued for the importance of developing expertise in the cultural knowledge and language skills of the Arctic region and for training our students to understand Arctic peoples and gain proficiency in the Inuktitut language. The Title VI grant proposal from the Pacific Northwest National Resource Center on Canada articulated how the Center would adapt to 21st century challenges by offering our students, and underrepresented students both on campus and at Title III-eligible institutions, Arctic studies and language training to enable better communication with the world's most northerly people.

This chapter addressed how initial activities including the development of the Arctic minor, the Future of Ice initiative, and the College of Arts and Sciences sub-grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation were used to build a strong foundation and argument for the inclusion of the Arctic as a new world region in the Canadian Studies Center's 2014 Title VI grant proposal. The chapter then utilized analytic autoethnography as the discussions and writing of the proposal took place. After one-on-one discussions or meetings with students and/or faculty members occurred, and following the technical meetings in Washington, DC, I inserted my reflections into my field notes (see Appendix 4). There I attempted to connect the activities I was undertaking in the field with the theories I used including new concepts of territory in international relations theory, space and social justice, and Inuit reframing of space (see Chapter Three). Throughout I sought to identify ways to make my initial thinking manifest in my practice with as broad an impact as possible. The most significant limitations continue to be the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous peoples in the Canadian Studies Center's programming. In
Chapter Seven I discuss the next steps in my research and practice which I hope will begin to address this imbalance.

Analytic autoethnography, specifically Anderson's (2006) five key principles, guided me throughout this process and in my final analysis of its outcomes including what I determine are the limitations of the research project. First, Anderson noted that the researcher must be part of the community under study. There is no question that I am a long-term member of the UW, Title VI, and Canadian studies communities. However, I am not part of the Indigenous communities that are central to an effective and representative Arctic initiative. Here I hope to slowly develop new communities that involve more of my Indigenous colleagues.

The second feature presented by Anderson is introspection. This research project has entirely reshaped how I conduct my practice. I now use a field notes during discussions and meetings and try to spend at least a few moments reflecting on my practice at the end of the day. This is having an enormous impact on my leadership and practice.

Third, Anderson noted the importance of the visibility of the researcher in the text. I feel this was accomplished to some degree but that I have yet to write my own educational autobiography that surely informs my commitment to my practice. Having come from an Italian immigrant family where my parents were not able to complete their education, I have some experience of what it is to be an outsider in academia. Strengthening these insights would bring greater sensitivity and commitment to my practice.

Anderson's fourth feature is to engage in rich dialogue with informants. This goal is surprisingly challenging in institutions of higher learning today. Time for discussion and reflection can be surprisingly rare. I feel that my practice is limited by not taking the time necessary to connect with students, faculty and colleagues. Certainly this research project has
caused me to be more cognizant of the value of rich dialogue.

Lastly, Anderson argued that the highest value of the analytic authoethnographic methodology is the value-added component. This critical methodology must influence not only the self, but also "the sociocultural contexts in which we live (Anderson, 2006, p. 390). I hope that this research project has impact beyond my field notes and dissertation and will ultimately foster a greater inclusion of voices in academia.
Chapter Seven: Conclusion

Unlike the time of Sputnik 1 when the National Defense Education Act first provided federal support for international education to serve Cold War needs, today's challenges require a far wider and deeper range of knowledge about the world, its cultures and many more of its languages, from high level expertise to a globally competent citizenry. The increased demand for highly proficient speakers of many strategic, less commonly taught languages by federal agencies in recent years is stark illustration of the expansion in needs. The federal government must continue to strengthen its catalytic role in international and foreign language education. The path to peace and prosperity lies in engaging the rest of the world. (Coalition for International Education, 2013, August 2)

This dissertation argued that a "wider and deeper range of knowledge about the world" requires that the field of area studies consider new understandings of what constitutes territory, whose interests are at stake in spatial framing, and Indigenous concepts of space and social justice. As described in Chapter Six, the Canadian Studies Center sought new and more meaningful collaborations with other National Resource Centers in the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, Title III institutions in Alaska, and Inuit organizations in Canada. It also integrated other-than-Western worldviews into research and teaching. The Center took the first steps in including the Arctic as a new world region in area studies. In this concluding chapter I describe how the Center's Arctic initiative is influencing the Jackson School's priorities and practice; I reflect on how I can further the dialogue on the future of area studies in future projects as well as with policy recommending associations; and I summarize the findings of this research project and what this study means for the field of area studies.
Impacts on the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies

The Canadian Studies Center's inclusion of the Arctic as a new world region in the interdisciplinary Arctic minor, the College of Arts and Sciences grant proposal "Re-Imagining Area/International Studies in the 21st Century: The Arctic as an Emerging Global Region," and the Center's successful 2014 Title VI grant proposal generated a Jackson School of International Studies school-wide initiative, Arctic and International Relations. The initiative now includes new activities by faculty members outside the Canadian Studies Center illustrating the growing interest in Arctic studies. In 2014 the Arctic was included in three additional Jackson School of International Studies activities, including a symposium held in Washington, DC addressing future trends in area and international studies, the new Master's Degree in Applied International Studies, and in a successful grant proposal to the Carnegie Foundation. All three activities will continue to influence the area studies field.

Future Direction of International Affairs Education Conference. In May of 2014 the Jackson School of International Studies, in collaboration with the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Woodrow Wilson Center) in Washington, DC, hosted a one-day conference entitled, "The Future Direction of International Affairs Education and Foreign Language Study in the United States" (Woodrow Wilson Center, 2014a). Academic, industry and government experts examined current developments in the field and analyzed the role of "area studies in a globalized world" (Woodrow Wilson Center, 2014a, para. 1). The purpose of the day-long discussion was to tackle the "bigger problems" in international affairs in the 21st century and to engage in conversations about new and novel issues that have not been part of past dialogues.

36 For activities under the Arctic & International Relations initiative, see http://www.jsis.washington.edu/arctic/
The Canadian Studies Center was asked to participate on the panel, "Creating Global Citizens for the 21st Century." The Center's chair, V. Gallucci, presented on the concept of the Arctic as an emerging world region and one that is critical to the future of the area studies field.

The director of the Title VI Center for Global Studies in the Jackson School of International Studies, S. Curran, opened the panel by challenging nation-state dominance in world governance. Curran began by pointing out that one of the greatest challenges in educating students today is in providing them with the skills to navigate in an increasingly complex world – a world that is no longer about just nations, but that includes a proliferation of new stakeholders (Woodrow Wilson Center, 2014b). Curran described:

… we're not just talking about national leaders shaping the world, we're talking about transnational organizations, social movements, social grassroots movements and we're also talking about corporations … governments are shrinking mostly around the world and governance is taking place not only in what we would think of as intergovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations, but governance is taking place in many other places besides the usual ones. (Woodrow Wilson Center, 2014b)

Curran pointed out that while world governance is becoming increasingly complex, it is precisely this complexity that area and international studies must address.

Gallucci followed Curran using the Arctic as an example of a non-area studies region. He pointed out that the Arctic "doesn't fall into the category of one of the Arctic nations. It's all of the nations … not one of the traditional area studies" (Woodrow Wilson Center, 2014b). Complementing Curran's remarks about the shrinking of governments, Gallucci noted that future complexities in governance will challenge how we teach about world regions and international
studies. He stated, as "we move in to the 21st century … the world is no longer going to be as neatly compartmentalized as it has been. We, or at least the people who come after us, are going to have to learn to deal with these blurry boundaries" (Woodrow Wilson Center, 2014b).

Gallucci described how the Inuit in Canada have contributed to the blurring of boundaries via their land claims in Canada's north and noted that Indigenous political effectiveness is growing.

In a discussion following the symposium, Gallucci relayed to me that after his presentation participants were referring to the Arctic as a new area in area and international studies. The International and Foreign Language Education program officer for Canadian studies attended the conference and noted, in an email to me, that an effective connection between Canadian studies and the Arctic had been made. The conference provided an opportunity to move the dialogue concerning the Arctic as a new world region from UW to a national forum that included participants from the U.S. Department of Education.

**Master's Degree in Applied International Studies.** In Fall Quarter 2014 the Jackson School of International Studies welcomed the first cohort of students for its new Master's Degree in Applied International Studies – a 10-month, fee-based program for mid-career professionals.

Area and international studies form the core of the program design. Initially the steering committee for the new Master's Degree included the Arctic in a course entitled, New Frontiers. In my field notes I made the comment:

*What is in a title? If the Arctic is a new frontier, this is then very much from an outsider's perspective. Here we see the gap that Abele and Rodon (2007) and Wilson (2007) speak about … that there is tremendous Arctic Indigenous involvement in global geopolitics but that this is not really seen yet by governments and the outside world [see Chapter Four].* (Fabbi, field notes, November 21, 2013)
In the end the steering committee requested that the Arctic be included as part of the course, JSIS 578D Global Economic Trends and Challenges. The program describes the Arctic as a "key region" and one that is presently "engaged on the world stage" (UW, JSIS, Master's in Applied International Studies [MAAIS], 2014). The course description notes that the Arctic content will provide "a detailed analysis of the opening of Arctic waters to global trade, a global economic and environmental challenge for the coming generation" and address "one of the world's most pressing confrontations between global capitalism and the world's environment with the specific case study of social, political, and economic trade in the Arctic region" (JSIS, MAAIS, 2014, p. 1). The inclusion of the Arctic in the master's program is a clear indication that the Jackson School of International Studies views greater knowledge of the Arctic as critical to understanding current global security and economic issues. The course also includes a week-long component on Indigenous internationalism and the use of customary law to secure Indigenous rights in the region. Inclusion of the Arctic in the Jackson School's new fee-based Master's program is a significant development in the curriculum of the School.

**Carnegie Corporation Grant.** In June of 2014 (at the same time we were submitting our Title VI grant proposal), the Jackson School of International Studies submitted a successful million dollar grant proposal to the Carnegie Corporation of New York as part of Carnegie's Rigor and Relevance initiative. Five institutions across the nation received awards. The focus of the project is to "address ongoing concerns over the growing gap between the scholarly work of academics and the needs of policymakers dealing with the same complex international issues" (Carnegie Corporation, 2014, para. 1). A team of five key personnel from the Jackson School of International Studies submitted a proposal to develop a new International Policy Institute in the School based on four thematic areas of relevance and expertise. The proposal reads:
Building on our strengths and leveraging existing relationships with public, private, and non-profit stakeholders, we propose three [four] thematic programs that cut across our existing area-based programs and directly address critical challenges facing the international affairs community today. (UW, JSIS, June 16, 2014, p. 5)

Arctic and International Relations was selected as one of the four themes. The proposal affirms that the project will involve "looking at the Arctic as a new region in global affairs with distinct goals and regional characteristics" (UW, JSIS, June 16, 2014, p. 7). The project activities should continue the development of the Center's Arctic initiative by broadening it to become part of this new international institute. I will work with the director of the Center to propose an allocation of funds to bring leading scholars in political geography and political theory to the UW, including Inuit thinkers, to lay a theoretical foundation for a workshop on Arctic sovereignty and governance. This workshop will begin to establish an epistemological foundation for a National Science Foundation Research Coordination Network grant proposal with the tentative title, "Arctic Sovereignty, Climate Change and Politics: Indigenous and Nation-State Governance in the Circumpolar World." The Carnegie Foundation grant activities and National Science Foundation grant proposal build on the findings of this research project.

The three above activities illustrate the growing importance of the Arctic to international relations. In each case – at the symposium, in the master's degree, in the Carnegie grant – the Arctic provides a synthesis between traditional area studies programs. For the first time in the history of the Jackson School, five of the eight Title VI National Resource Centers are pooling their resources to understand a region that is both an extension of the nation-states represented, and defined by other than nation-state borders. Educating students as to the complexity and influence of key Arctic stakeholders, in particular the Arctic Council and Arctic Indigenous
organizations, will provide Jackson School of International Studies students with an example of how new stakeholders are challenging the limitations of nation-state governance. Each of the above activities undertaken by the Jackson School of International Studies needs further analysis, more salient inclusion of the Arctic Indigenous voice and participation, and consideration as to what the Arctic means in world affairs.

**Next Steps in My Educational Practice**

Once the Canadian Studies Center successfully incorporated the Arctic into a Title VI National Resource Center grant proposal for Canada, I considered the next steps in my educational practice. Below I outline three activities to further the Arctic initiative. The first step is for the Center to play a leadership role in an upcoming conference in collaboration with the Coalition for International Education. The second step is to bring Inuit understandings of Arctic space to a fall 2015 workshop that the Center will co-sponsor with the Korea Maritime Institute. The third, and perhaps the most important step, will be to include significant participation of Indigenous colleagues and Indigenous worldviews into the activities that will be part of the 2014-15 College of Arts and Sciences Mellon sub-grant proposal.

**Coalition for International Education.** The Coalition of International Education, introduced in the opening quote to this chapter, is a group of over 30 higher education organizations in the United States that have an interest in the U.S. Department of Education programs and initiatives. The Coalition strives to put forward agreed-upon policy recommendations for issues that affect international education. In addition, the Coalition co-sponsors academic conferences on an ad hoc basis. Its last meeting was in the spring of 2014 at the College of William and Mary in Virginia. The conference was entitled, "Internationalization of U.S. Education in the 21st Century: The Future of International and Foreign Language
Studies." Similar to the symposium sponsored by the Jackson School of International Studies at the Wilson Center in Washington, DC at about the same time (see above), the conference at William and Mary focused on the importance of global education for "national security, economic competitiveness, and foreign policy leadership" (College of William and Mary, 2014, para. 1). Neither of the two conferences included a discussion of how world regions are understood and if, in fact, they need to be reconsidered in order that International and Foreign Language Education evolves to more accurately reflect new global complexities. In my practice, I would like to see the Canadian Studies Center play a leadership role in hosting a future Title VI conference and use the conference discussions to challenge on-going concepts of world regions from a potentially wide-range of new perspectives.

**Korea Maritime Institute Contract.** In December of 2013 the Canadian Studies Center and the Korea Maritime Institute began discussions concerning an educational contract. As a result of the recent admission of South Korea to permanent observer status with the Arctic Council, the Korean Maritime Institute sought out the expertise of the Center. The criteria for admitting observers to the Arctic Council must include evidence that the applicant respect the "interests, culture and traditions of Arctic indigenous peoples and other Arctic inhabitants" and a demonstration of "political willingness as well as financial ability to contribute to the work of the Permanent Participants and other Arctic indigenous peoples (Arctic Council, April 2011, para. 3). The Korean government has no experience with or understanding of Indigenous peoples. The Institute requested a report from the Canadian Studies Center to provide them with some understanding of Inuit foreign policy (Chapter Five was initially developed for this purpose). From my field notes I wrote:

*It is interesting that J. [with the Korea Maritime Institute] is on the Task Force to draft*
South Korea's Arctic policy and, while engaging in this process, is also searching out information to understand the Arctic Indigenous agenda. I sincerely hope we can assist in this by bringing in Arctic Indigenous thinkers from Canada to meet with the Korean delegation. This is potentially a superb way to serve as allies to Arctic Indigenous self-determination efforts by being a bridge between these two communities. I want Korea to know that they are leaders in the Asian world in terms of recognition of Arctic Indigenous interests particularly when neither China nor Japan are taking an interest. (Fabbi, field notes, December 2013)

In May 2014 the Korean Maritime Institute and the Canadian Studies Center signed a three-year Agreement on Academic Cooperation with the mandate to engage in a dialogue about the role of Canada and the Inuit in Canada in the Arctic. The first symposium will be offered in early fall 2015. The analytic autoethnographic process in this dissertation has enabled me to realize the importance of serving as an ally to Arctic Indigenous peoples. It is critical that Arctic Indigenous colleagues are included in the symposium and that we spend some time to frame Indigenous concepts of Arctic space in the discussions.

**Andrew W. Mellon Sub-Grant in Indigenous Worldviews.** The Canadian Studies Center submitted the first grant proposal to the College of Arts and Sciences for a Mellon sub-grant in 2013. In undertaking the activities of the first Mellon sub-grant (during the 2013-14 academic year), the steering committee received feedback from faculty members concerning the lack of significant involvement by Indigenous faculty members and colleagues (this limitation is also noted in Chapter Six). Though we invited our Indigenous colleagues to participate in the grant activities, the degree of participation was minimal. In 2014, a second call for proposals was
issued by the College of Arts and Sciences again for up to $40,000 in funding. We would focus the second Mellon sub-grant proposal on area studies and its relation to Indigenous worldviews.

The steering committee for the 2014-15 College of Arts and Sciences Mellon sub-grant proposal includes Latin American Studies, Comparative History of Ideas, and American Indian Studies. The members of this new steering committee all have an investment in Indigenous epistemologies and two of the members are Indigenous. The initial thinking for the proposal included an integration of the theories mentioned in Chapter Two into the grant activities. Appendix 4: Field Notes, April 21, 2014 provides a sample of how I attempted to integrate the thinking of theorists, designation of funding, and personal analysis into my analytic autoethnographic process. This Appendix is an illustration of the process that was carried out throughout the research project.

In June 2014 the Canadian Studies Center was awarded its second College of Arts and Sciences sub-grant for Mellon Foundation funding. The steering committee plans to work through Fall Quarter 2015 to undertake the proposed activities. The new grant proposal is entitled, "Comparative Intellectual Traditions: Indigenous & Western Worldviews in Area Studies – Developing a Graduate Certificate in Arctic Studies." While the initial intent had been to focus solely on the Arctic, the "gentle push" of one of the members on the steering committee encouraged the team to rewrite the proposal to include all Indigenous peoples. From the field notes from the first meeting of the committee, I noted:

*We are discussing a more meaningful challenging of nation-state boundaries with the suggested symposium by having all invited guests be Indigenous scholars or allies. We discussed the symposium starting a campus-wide discussion about the limitations of the*
area studies field by looking at other geographies of sovereignty. (Fabbi, field notes, May 16, 2014)

In the grant activities I hope to build from the work of Heryanto (2013) who argued for an integration of cultural and area studies. I also hope to include the thinking of Sidaway (2013) and Steinburg (2009) who brought the ocean into territorial space (see Chapter Two). Importantly, the grant activities will include Inuit concepts of territory as initially identified in the oral histories in Freeman's (1976) study and in Aporta (2011), Aporta, Fraser & Laidler (2011), Krupnik et al, (2011); and in the work of the Inuit Circumpolar Council including in the 2008 sea ice study and the international declarations (2009, 2011) (see Chapters Two and Four).

The Mellon sub-grant will continue to support research fellowships for graduate students however, the focus of the research projects has also been broadened to include worldviews from any Indigenous people or organization. The call for proposals for the research fellowships is a step forward in the thinking at the Canadian Studies Center. The current draft, written by a member of the steering committee reads:

Emerging from the fruitful convergences of an emergent Arctic Studies program and on-going cross-campus projects on Native and Indigenous Studies, the Canadian Studies Center, the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program, the Jackson School of International Studies, American Indian Studies, and the Comparative History of Ideas program invites graduate students to apply for support of research that contributes to a dialogue between global studies and Indigenous ways of knowing. With support from an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant administered by the College of Arts and Sciences, we will be able to fund three graduate student grants of $5,000 each.
This fellowship grant is part of a broad effort to re-think the epistemological, methodological and geographic orientations of area studies, and explore the transformational encounters with Native and Indigenous intellectual traditions and frameworks. Applicants are encouraged to consider projects that engage central and long-standing areas of area studies research like sovereignty, governance, territory, natural resource management, social movements, and security (to name only a few) and put these in dialogue with knowledge-systems, intellectual traditions, and Native knowledge-production as they take place in various sites throughout the world. Projects may take the form of an article manuscript or an artistic, creative work (film, video, fiction, poetry etc.). (UW, JSIS, CSC, February 12, 2015)

This draft for the call for research proposals reflects the complexities of the area studies field. The activities undertaken as part of this grant project will form one of the most important next steps in my practice – to move beyond the Center to influence the research agenda of UW students and our campus community more broadly.

**Implications for Research and Practice**

This dissertation will hopefully provide an initial step in understanding the Arctic as a distinctive region via the culture, worldview and political activities of one Arctic Indigenous people/organization – the Inuit. Future research could address the influence of other Permanent Participant organizations on understanding the Arctic as a unique region as well as the interplay between those organizations. What is the impact, for example, of the Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat, as a unit, on the deliberations and strategic planning of the Arctic Council? In addition, this research project focused on Inuit political influence in Canada. Future research could include a focus on the Kalaallit people in Greenland, the Inupiat and Yu'pik in Alaska, or
the Yu'pik in Siberia.

This dissertation could serve to inform future efforts to challenge the nation-state framework of the area studies field for Title VI either as defined by geography or by social spaces. Concerning geography, the Arctic provides one model for a region that is not defined solely by nation-state borders but rather integrates nation-state borders with cultural boundaries (Arctic nation-states and Permanent Participant organizations). In addition, as Sidaway (2013) suggested, current "colonial categories" (p. 989) as found in Southeast Asia, the Middle East or Latin America (p. 989) could be challenged to reconsider former assumptions for geographic constructs. Sidaway (2013) also explored the literature on world oceans that challenged the "traditional national or continent-based studies" (p. 990). This research project could also be extended to challenge the framework of area studies to include social spaces such as religion (Islamic Studies, for example) or sexuality in an effort to envision new concepts of sovereignty.

In terms of practice, this research project focused on Arctic studies as new field of study within the Title VI area studies program. Practice could be enhanced via a research project that compares the Arctic as understood in the field of area studies to other Arctic programs such as are found at University of Northern British Columbia, University of Saskatchewan, University of Alaska, Fairbanks; or research institutes as found at Dartmouth, University of Alberta, or University of Colorado, Boulder, to mention a few. A research study of the epistemological foundations for University of the Arctic would be particularly meaningful given its vision to provide a truly circumpolar education to University of the Arctic students.

**Summary of Findings**

In the 21st century global governance is taking place in many arenas besides the usual ones. This dissertation argued that this is certainly the case for the Arctic region. As stated in
Chapter Four, the Arctic has become the meeting ground for traditional state geopolitics and Indigenous diplomacies. Heininen and Nicol (2007) call the geopolitical reality in the Arctic today "some sort of renaissance of regional co-operation by circumpolar Indigenous peoples and civil societies" (p. 161). The combination of a collaborative approach to geopolitics combined with the participation of new actors on the world stage – actors who have distinct values and goals that are not nation-state-centered – can contribute to a new approach to area studies.

As mentioned in Chapter Four, in 2013 Agnew became the editor of a new journal, Territory, Politics, Governance, the official journal of the Regional Studies Association. Agnew (2013) in the editorial for the first edition stated that the purpose of the journal is "to publish and encourage research on territorial politics, spaces of governance, and the political organization of space" (p. 1). The journal supports the premise that the nation-state-centered narrative ("territorial trap") is no longer adequate and that people are now inventing "territories (and other spatial forms of political organization) to also fulfill their more positive projects from changing society to administering goods" (Agnew, 2013, p. 4). These new social science theories provide a tool for administrators of U.S. Department of Education Title VI centers to challenge conventional concepts of political space with understandings of territory that are cultural and that serve the political and social agendas of sub-national and supranational organizations. Arctic Indigenous organizations certainly comprise such a group, as is evident by the findings in this dissertation concerning the Inuit. The effectiveness of the Inuit in creating new boundaries for cultural territories and then developing policies to provide benefits to those that occupy Inuit space, is a concrete example of Agnew's territory, politics and governance.

Fraser's (2011) work similarly critiques the limitation of the Westphalian frame that does not allow for an adequate discussion of transnational issues or provide an appropriate legal
framework. For Fraser (2011) the nation-state frame crops the picture "to exclude transnational vectors of domination" (p. 452). She argued, "To locate them [transnational issues] within the Westphalian fame is in fact to misframe them" (Fraser, 2011, p. 452). Fraser's work divided the world into the global north and the poor global south which is not representative of the Arctic. However, her theories of social justice nonetheless apply to Arctic Indigenous peoples who must use an other-than nation-state legal apparatus to enhance justice for their communities.

In the summer of 2014, the Inuit Circumpolar Council held their general assembly in Inuvik, Northwest Territories under the title, "One Arctic, One Future." The focus was both for Inuit control over natural resource development and involvement in the future of the Arctic economy and for the increased cooperation and coordination of the Inuit. The incoming chair of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, Okalik Eegeesiak, from Iqaluit, Nunavut, noted in her opening comments at the meeting:

It is an honour to assume this role to advance the interests of Inuit in the circumpolar region. We know that the world is looking to our homeland to develop our renewable and non-renewable resources and Inuit must be at the table as discussions and decisions are being made about activities in our own backyard. Inuit will still be in the Arctic when the last barrel of oil and the final piece of ore is extracted from our land. (ICC, 2014a, para. 8)

Later in the year, president of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, Canada was invited by The Economist to participate on the panel "Canada and the Arctic Council" at a summit in Canada. Duanne Smith served on the same panel as Tony Guthrie, Chief executive of De Beers Canada. Guthrie called the Arctic the "last global frontier" (ICC, 2014b, para. 4). Smith countered by suggesting the "Arctic was better described as a vibrant place full of life and, most notably, 'a
place where Inuit live in an area covering 40% of Canada's land mass" (ICC, 2014b, para 4). As argued in Chapter Four, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Inuit Circumpolar Council have used the renaming and remapping of the Arctic region along cultural lines to assert their voice domestically and internationally. In addition, the Inuit Circumpolar Council is increasingly using international customary law to protect the claims of the Inuit globally.

As outlined in Chapter Five, a number of scholars argue that the Arctic was first conceptualized as a world region in 1987 when Gorbachev gave his famous Murmansk Speech. In the speech Gorbachev refers to the Arctic as the "common European home" (Gorbachev, 1987, p. 28) for the Arctic nation-states. However, it can be argued that the Arctic was first "framed" as a cohesive international region by the Inuit a decade earlier with the founding of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in 1977. The mandate of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference was to strengthen unity among Inuit, promote Inuit rights and interests internationally, develop policies to protect the Arctic environment, and protect Inuit culture and language. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference went on to play a key role in forming the Arctic Council. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference was one of three Arctic Indigenous organizations involved in the Rovaniemi Meeting in 1989 (leading to the founding of the Arctic Council in 1996). The Rovaniemi Meeting is considered the first major international accomplishment in a post-Cold War world, as it involved all eight Arctic nation-states (Axworthy & Dean, 2013). Rovaniemi marks the first time that Indigenous peoples and nation-state representatives worked together, on an almost equal par, to draft a major international declaration. The role of Arctic Indigenous peoples in framing the Arctic as a distinct global region is critical in understanding the unique aspects of the Arctic as a global actor (Axworthy & Dean, 2013).

According to Scrivener (1989) the Murmansk Speech effectively centralized the Arctic as
a new stage for international relations, singled out the importance of Arctic Indigenous peoples in international affairs (p. 6), and marked the first time the environment served as the basis for global security. In other words, how the Arctic was framed or understood as a region for both Gorbachev and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference had less to do with geopolitical borders and more to do with the northern dimensions of foreign policy for the Arctic nation-states and the values and perspectives of Arctic Indigenous peoples. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference also took advantage of the end of the Cold War to enhance the voice of the Inuit in international relations. While Gorbachev envisioned the Arctic as a region where the values of perestroika and glasnost could be tested, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference used the end of the Cold War to promote the unique voice of the Inuit on the world stage (see Chapter Five).

The Arctic provides an opportunity to challenge traditional or mainstream approaches to area studies, international relations, geopolitics, and foreign policy analysis. The traditional monopoly claimed by states in the area of foreign affairs is changing rapidly in the Arctic, in no small part due to the effectiveness of Arctic Indigenous involvement in international relations as outlined in Chapters Four and Five. As astutely observed by Heininen and Southcott (2010), the Arctic is developing as a "platform for international and interregional collaboration" (p. 3). The Arctic nation-states and Inuit are forwarding a new set of priorities in the Arctic that includes protection of cultures and languages as the "pivotal area" via which a "nation" maintains its strength. As the interest of non-Arctic states in the Arctic intensifies, it will become increasingly important to understand the policy priorities of this new actor on the world stage. The Arctic can play an important role in reinventing area studies to better serve a world that is increasingly non-Western in its approaches to politics and economics.

Scholars now argue that the Arctic is a region where reform can take place. The Arctic is
viewed by some as a potential laboratory for international collaboration and a site for meaningful engagement between nation-states and Arctic Indigenous peoples. In the last few years, each of the Arctic nation-states has released an Arctic or northern dimensions of foreign policy, a first in foreign policy development. The Arctic foreign policy of each of the nation-states, without exception, prioritizes environmental stewardship, geopolitical collaboration, and the well-being of Indigenous peoples. Even Iceland, with no Indigenous population of its own, includes support for Indigenous rights in its Arctic policy (Iceland, 2010, Principle 6). As argued in Chapter Five, the Inuit Circumpolar Council's declarations on sovereignty and resource development principles (2009 & 2011) make a significant contribution to this dialogue. The Council's declarations similarly prioritize environmental stewardship and sustainable communities as well as argue for a meaningful role for Inuit in foreign affairs. The convergence of these two worldviews or intellectual traditions – that of nation-states and Arctic Indigenous peoples – essentially marks the establishment of the Arctic as an actor on the world stage with unique characteristics that challenge conventional approaches to foreign policy and international relations.

For the first time since area studies programs were founded in the United States, a new world region is emerging – the Arctic. While there are many regional organizations in the Arctic affecting larger global processes (including the Northern Forum, Barents Euro-Arctic Region and Nordic Council, to name a few), the Arctic's impact in global affairs is more than the amalgamated voices of various regional entities. Rather, the Arctic has developed into a distinct region in its own right and effective actor in global geopolitics. This has implications for international relations, particularly considering the prominence of the latest observers admitted to the Arctic Council in 2013 – Japan, China, India, Singapore, the Republic of Korea, and Italy.
Conclusion

With the Title VI National Resource Center and Foreign Language and Area Studies grant programs challenged by budget reductions, it is more important than ever to reconsider how world regions are understood and how territory is conceptualized to enable new ways of thinking outside the nation-state framework as well as to consider global issues that challenge tradition nation-state security. Today the world faces the greatest threat to human security ever experienced in history – the impact of climate change – and more so in the Arctic than anywhere else in the world. For about the last 20 years, the Inuit have been noticing that the ice has been breaking up earlier than usual and forming later or not at all; sea ice changes are altering traditional travel routes and impacting access to traditional foods, thinning ice is posing increased danger to hunters, and coastlines have started to erode, impacting some communities. The Inuit called this phenomenon, Uggianaqtuq. Uggianaqtuq is an Inuktitut word that means to behave unexpectedly, or in an unfamiliar way (Iyago, 2003). The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (2004) was the first time those outside the Arctic realized the tremendous impact of climate change to the Arctic and its residents. The Assessment was a joint effort of the Arctic Council and the International Arctic Science Committee. It was the culmination of a four-year study involving over 300 scientists, researchers and Indigenous representatives from around the world. The Assessment included scientific information, traditional knowledge and Indigenous perceptions on how climate change and ultra violet radiation were changing the Arctic. The findings of the study were staggering. The key finding was that the Arctic had warmed at twice the rate of the rest of the world and that this warming was expected to accelerate in the 21st century. The Assessment also warned that climate change would threaten the long-term survival of numerous species, including polar bears, and the cultures of northern Indigenous peoples.
most tragic irony is that greenhouse gas emissions do not originate in the Arctic. Rather, climate change is a result of industrialization in the south while its greatest impact is found in the Arctic. Regardless, climate change is opening the Arctic to a "cold rush" for resources and opening new shipping lanes. Climate change is also bringing Arctic Indigenous peoples, particularly the Inuit, into the international spotlight. As noted by Murray (2014) in *International Relations and the Arctic*:

> The Arctic is quite prevalent in media and political discourses, but as a field of study, international relations and political science have been relatively slow to make the Arctic a central component of debates in the field. In all, we hear a lot about the Arctic – especially through political rhetoric – but we know comparatively little about its political importance and what is actually happening, as opposed to what is being said. (as cited in McMaster, 2014, para. 5)

As scholars and the media (see Steinberg, Bruun, & Medby, 2014) put the Arctic on the political and global map, educational programs need to adapt.

For the past 60-plus years, the field of area studies in the United States has divided the world according to defined regions that, for the most part, have remained stable. While there has been considerable criticism about the relevance of area studies in a post-Cold War world, as of yet there is little discussion about rethinking the concept of world regions, either by the U.S. Department of Education or in the scholarly literature. In a period in which area studies is facing significant challenges, particularly concerning the future of government funding, it seems an opportune time to formulate new ideas concerning how area studies can be organized and conducted at colleges and universities in the decades to come. This research project argued that the field of area studies must be reimagined to include new global regions, such as the Arctic,
that require new ways of thinking about what constitutes a world region, in particular Indigenous or Inuit concepts of territory.

The Arctic can provide a path via which area studies scholars can reconfigure and reinvigorate the field to make room for a new actor on the world stage. In the Arctic, the traditional nation-state security paradigm is evolving into a broader human security paradigm; Indigenous political involvement is more effectively integrated into international affairs than at any other time in history; cultural boundaries are replacing political borders; and, international customary law (human rights law, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and the UN Declaration on the Right of Indigenous Peoples) is serving to ensure that trans-boundary human rights issues are addressed. Together these unique characteristics define a distinctive world region. As a new actor on the world stage, the Arctic can both contribute to area studies, while challenging how the field frames and understands world regions.

Steinberg, Bruun, and Medby (2014) conducted a media analysis of the Arctic Council documenting how many times "Arctic Council" was mentioned in over 500 news sources over a 14-year period. In 2013, the year that China, India, South Korea, Singapore and Italy were admitted as permanent observers to the Council, mention of "Arctic Council" in media sources almost tripled as a result of their admission. For the first time in history, according to the study, the Arctic mattered to nation-states and to the world. The authors pointed out than in the news reports the Arctic was "framed as a region that reflected a wide-reaching geopolitical game in which all of world's states participated" (Steinberg, Bruun & Medby, 2014, p. 286). Steinberg, Bruun, and Medby noted:

As such, their [nation-states] focus was on how the Arctic – a region seemingly distant from the world's centers of power – was now playing host to high-level politics far
beyond latitudinal borders, and which, as an ever-imminent space of potential future diplomacy, required the unwavering presence of states from around the world. (2014, p. 286)

The authors described how the journalists overwhelmingly viewed the Arctic region as "a space of global significance" (Steinberg, Bruun & Medby 2014, p. 287). Steinberg, Bruun and Medby (2014) argued that, as a result of the new permanent observers and the media attention afforded their admissions, world audiences were now positioned to understand the Arctic as "a space where future developments would have global implications" (p. 287).

The process of engaging in an analytic autoethnographic methodology while building an Arctic educational initiative in the Jackson School of International Studies at the UW involved an examination of what constitutes a territory, who has a voice in international relations, and how the U.S. Department of Education frames world regions. This research project and the subsequent development of a community of scholars both at the UW and beyond will continue this important dialogue concerning what constitutes a world region in Title VI programs.

Both the process and findings of this research project have enabled me to take a much greater leadership role at the Canadian Studies Center and in the Jackson School of International Studies and will continue to move my practice toward a greater integration of Inuit concepts of space, international relations and geopolitics in my teaching, research, and development of outreach activities. As the UW continues to build the academic program in Arctic studies, it is critical to assess how Arctic studies is understood from the perspective of a southern institution and from the framework of area and international studies in the United States. This reflective process will contribute to building a more thoughtful and appropriate set of activities that contribute in a positive way to a larger international dialogue on these issues.
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Appendix 1: *Inuit Nunangat* (© 2005, permission granted)

"At the June 10, 2009 Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami Annual General Meeting in Nain, Nunatsiavut, the Board of Directors adopted a change in terminology from 'Inuit Nunaat' to 'Inuit Nunangat.'

'Inuit Nunaat' is a Greenlandic term that describes land but does not include water or ice. The term 'Inuit Nunangat' is a Canadian Inuktitut term that includes land, water, and ice. As Canadian Inuit consider the land, water, and ice, of our homeland to be integral to our culture and our way of life it was felt that 'Inuit Nunangat' is a more inclusive and appropriate term to use when describing our lands" (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, n.d.-b).
Appendix 2: Permanent Participants to the Arctic Council (Rekacewicz, 2006, p. 20, permission granted)
Appendix 3: The Inuit Circumpolar Region (© 2000 Cartographic Services, Makivik Corporation, permission granted)
Appendix 4: Field Notes, "Dreaming Mellon," April 21, 2015
Appendix 5: Application for a Minor in Arctic Studies

INTERDISCIPLINARY MINOR IN ARCTIC STUDIES
May 2013

Rationale
The Canadian Studies Center, Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, College of Arts and Science, and the School of Oceanography, College of the Environment, propose to establish a new interdisciplinary minor in Arctic Studies at the University of Washington (UW). The Arctic is one of the most critical emerging regions of the world. The environmental, social, economic, and political changes occurring in the Arctic present challenges in both the natural and social sciences. These challenges require students to have an interdisciplinary understanding of the complex interface between human societies and the environment. Future leaders in the region will be those who can combine interdisciplinary knowledge covering policy, culture, and science to address the unique and urgent challenges to the region. At the UW there is growing undergraduate interest in Arctic studies. This proposal for an undergraduate minor responds to student interest and to the opportunity for the UW to combine its strengths in polar science with growing expertise in the social sciences to become an international leader in Arctic Studies.

The purpose of this minor is for undergraduates to have an opportunity to gain skills relevant to addressing major science and policy issues in the Arctic. Students may pursue research topics such as indigenous governance; adaptation of northern communities to environmental and social change; security issues (e.g., health issues, food sovereignty, education, culture, and language); northern economies; processes that are controlling the physical and biogeochemical changes in the Arctic, such as the impact of the state of the atmosphere and the ocean on sea-ice distributions and land ice melt; impact of physical changes on marine ecosystems and biodiversity; and the changing transportation pathways in the Arctic Ocean.

By partnering with northern institutions and organizations, the minor encourages arctic-subarctic research collaboration fostering future professional networks. The minor will train students to work with international organizations, national governments, and sub-national organizations and/or to pursue graduate study at the intersection between science and policy in the polar regions. Already the Jackson School and Oceanography have had notable success in student placement and advanced study in Arctic related fields. The minor will enable the UW to facilitate further success in this endeavor.

Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies and Oceanography – Partnering for Excellence
The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies (JSIS) and Oceanography are the ideal administering units for the Arctic Minor. JSIS and Oceanography are among the first units on campus to offer Arctic-specific courses (JSIS 495 Canada Task Force on Arctic Governance; and OCEAN 122 Arctic Change & 482/508 The Changing Arctic Ocean). These courses have been highly subscribed and successful including placement of students in advanced degrees in Arctic studies and Arctic-based professional fields. Both units also share the largest Arctic collection on campus. Librarians Sion Romaine and Louise Richards created the Arctic and Northern Studies Subject Guide and provide research training sessions on the Arctic for UW students.

JSIS has an interdisciplinary faculty with expertise in area and international studies. The undergraduate and graduate curricula, including a new doctoral program, are designed to build
in-depth knowledge and understanding of world areas, civilizations, and their interactions on the
global stage. JSIS is home to 13 academic programs and 14 centers including centers that
represent seven of the eight Arctic nation-states (Canada, Russia and the Scandinavian
countries) and non-Arctic nation-states with strong interest in the Arctic region (European Union,
China, Japan and Korea).

Canadian Studies leads the Arctic Initiative in JSIS. The Center established the International
Studies capstone course on Arctic governance and security, fostered several scholarly
publications on Canada and the circumpolar world, and has sponsored dozens of lectures,
symposia and conferences on the region over the last few years. Canadian Studies is also the
first National Resource Center in the nation to award Foreign Language and Area Studies
fellowships in Inuktitut, the Inuit language. Canada is the world's second largest Arctic nation-
state – home of the Northwest Passage and Arctic Archipelago – and plays a leadership role in
the Circumpolar World. The Arctic is one of the top foreign policy priorities for both the
governments of Canada and Québec; and, the Inuit in Canada are among the most politically
active indigenous people in the world.

The School of Oceanography, also host to a strongly interdisciplinary faculty, fosters continued
advancement of the ocean sciences, solutions to problems of societal relevance, and public
awareness of the marine environment. It is at the forefront of generating knowledge and
understanding of the ocean through observation, experimentation, theory, modeling and
 technological innovation. The School focuses on learning and discovery, equipping students
with knowledge and insights, scholarly methods, scientific tools and communication skills. Its
research programs encompass the physical, chemical, biological, and geological sciences and
the interfaces between these natural sciences and climate change, the foundation of Arctic
change. The School of Oceanography has a highly integrated relationship with UW's Applied
Physics Laboratory, one that benefits its linked educational and research missions. Both
Oceanography and the Applied Physics Laboratory perform world-leading Arctic research.

The Arctic Ocean is critical to the study of Arctic change, influencing all elements of the Arctic
system and connections to the rest of the planet. Interactions between polar seas and ice play a
major role in shaping the trajectory of climate and sea level change. As the Arctic sea ice cover
continues to thin and recede, access to natural resources is increasing, new shipping lanes are
opening, and ecosystems are changing. Sea ice is also integral to the lives of the Inuit whose
culture, identity and food security are based on free movement across land and frozen sea.

**The Arctic Minor and UW's Future of Ice Initiative**
The Arctic minor is part of a parallel initiative between the College of Arts and Sciences and
College of the Environment: *The Future of Ice: A Polar Regions Science and Policy Initiative* to
enhance UW's profile in research, education and public engagement about the polar regions.
The February 2013 report submitted by the *Future of Ice* Task Force to the Deans of the
College of the Environment, College of Arts and Sciences, and Director of the Applied Physics
Laboratory, calls for a significant commitment to scholarship on the polar regions including a
cross-college interdisciplinary education program centered on the Arctic minor; a new Scholars
Program for graduate students, post-doctoral and visiting scholars; new hires in the science and
policy of the polar regions; and a strategy that ensures the flow of knowledge between the
University and community of stakeholders in the polar regions, including indigenous peoples.

**Cross-College Partnerships & University of the Arctic**
The proposed Arctic minor has the support, and interest, of 20 departments in the College of
Arts and Sciences, the College of the Environment, and Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences at
UW Bothell. In addition, the Arctic Minor includes further development of an established partnership with University of the Arctic (UArctic). UArctic is an international cooperative network of institutions from around the circumpolar world, and UW is currently one of just two UArctic members in the lower 48. Courses available in collaboration with the UArctic enable UW students to participate in a global classroom with colleagues from around the circumpolar world including from Canada, Russia, Greenland, and the Scandinavian countries. Curriculum design for the UW minor in Arctic Studies includes two on-line Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies (BCS) electives from UArctic (BCS 321 & BCS 322 Contemporary Issues in the Circumpolar World).

**Integrating Policy and Science – A Unique Vision for the Arctic Minor**

The Arctic Minor has the unique vision to build knowledge and understanding of Arctic change from a social sciences, natural sciences and human studies perspective. This will enhance student understanding of the Arctic and its role in the global system. One of the keys goals of the Arctic Minor is to introduce policy to students from the natural sciences and humanities, and natural science courses to students from the social sciences and humanities, effectively improving literacy across the disciplines. The ARCTIC 200 course will introduce science and humanities students to the elements of policy writing and the role of policy in Arctic geopolitics; OCEAN 235 will provide Arctic-centered content to educate non-scientists about scientific issues in the Arctic. Evaluation of the students in ARCTIC 400 (integrative experience) will take into account the differing abilities of the students (a higher level of sophistication in writing policy for the students from the social sciences, and a great degree of expertise in the physical or biological sciences for the natural science students). The differing strengths of the students will create a dynamic and relevant approach to resolving Arctic issues particularly as the students will work in teams on their final written projects. The Arctic Minor will expect all students to gain a fundamental knowledge in Arctic oceanography, climate change, policy, and Arctic indigenous peoples made possible by the required core courses and integrative experience.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

1. The environmental, social, economic, and political changes occurring in the Arctic pose challenges in both the natural and social sciences requiring students to forge partnerships across the disciplines. In addition to providing core courses in both natural and social sciences, the Arctic minor will require that students take a comparable number of courses from the natural and the social sciences in order to acquire a basic understanding of the interdisciplinary nature of Arctic issues. In addition, students will participate in an integrative experience course co-taught by faculty from each college and requiring integration of natural/social sciences in the final research paper.

2. Arctic minors, via the ARCTIC 200 required course and the social sciences electives, will develop an appreciation for indigenous governance; adaptation of northern communities to environmental and social change; security issues (e.g. health issues, food sovereignty, education, culture, and language); and, northern economies.

3. Arctic minors, via the required OCEAN course and the natural sciences electives, will develop an understanding of the processes that control the physical and biogeochemical changes in the Arctic, such as the impact of the state of the atmosphere and the ocean on sea-ice distributions and land ice melt; impact of physical changes on marine ecosystems and biodiversity; and the changing transportation pathways in the Arctic Ocean.

4. As research on the Arctic is a relatively new, yet fast-developing field, study with current leading Arctic scholars is essential to acquiring an appreciation for and integration into the field. Arctic minors will be required to take course ARCTIC 401 (offered annually) from the Canada Fulbright Visiting Chair in Arctic Studies enabling students to interact with researchers at the cutting edge of their respective fields (e.g., Spring Quarter 2013
the first Arctic Fulbright Chair, S. Graben, will offer a seminar on business and law concerning natural resource development in the Arctic.

5. Understanding the Arctic cannot only be taught in the classroom. Therefore, all Arctic Minors will be encouraged to take internships in the North, conduct fieldwork in the North, and enroll in study-in-Arctic trips nested within courses or via independent study.

6. All Arctic minors will receive training in policy writing and skills in conducting Arctic-focused research in ARCTIC 200.

Structure of the Arctic Studies Minor

The minor requires a minimum of 28 credits with a minimum of 15 credits from areas outside the student's major. A minimum 2.0 grade is required for each course applied toward the minor, and a minimum of 15 credits must be completed at the UW.

Students are required to complete four core courses (12 credits) made up of:

1. Three foundation courses (9 credits) designed to provide an orientation to:
   - indigenous and nation-state geopolitics in the Arctic and policy writing (ARCTIC 200)
   - changes to the Arctic Ocean from a scientific perspective (OCEAN 235)
   - current issues in the Arctic (ARCTIC 401) taught by the incoming Chair in Arctic Studies.

2. One integrative experience course (3 credits) that will combine the natural and social sciences and will require that students work in interdisciplinary teams on their research projects.

In addition to the core, students are required to take an additional 16 credits of electives, i.e., at least four courses of which two are in the social sciences and two are in the natural sciences. Of the elective credits, at least one course must be ranked with an North Star* indicating more than 33% Arctic content. The remaining electives are designed to provide a balance between the natural and social sciences and to build knowledge in key Arctic-relevant areas (further explanation below).

Introductory Courses (9 credits, minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0)

- ARCTIC 200 Introduction to Arctic Studies: Indigenous Diplomacies & International Relations (3 credits, Fall)
- OCEAN 235 Arctic Change (3 credits, Spring)
- ARCTIC 401 Current Issues in the Arctic Region (3 credits, Spring)

Integrative Experience (3 credits)

ARCTIC 400 Integrating Policy and Science in Arctic Studies (3 credits)

This integrative experience course is designed to integrate the core scientific and policy courses from the disciplines that constitute the Arctic minor. Students in the Arctic minor integrative experience will:

- read, evaluate, and synthesize information from primary literature in Arctic development, with a focus on climate change literature;
- integrate information from the physical/biological sciences into the policy contexts;
- present/argue/defend positions based on the physical and biological evidence that support a policy position;
- speculate, based on evidence, the direction in which policy decisions will go;
- communicate ideas in both written and oral context.
This course will focus on important background knowledge in both policy and scientific knowledge that will determine the state of the Arctic environment in the near and distant futures. UW climate change scientists and policy experts will be invited to speak in the class.

**Elective Coursework – Designed for a Tailored Program**

Electives (to total 16 credits) will be selected from a list of approved courses below. A minimum of two courses must be taken from each of the two content areas: A: Natural Sciences; and, B: Social Sciences. At least one of the electives must have an North Star* designation indicating significant (33%) Arctic course content.

Each of the courses in the electives listed was selected specifically for its Arctic or Arctic-relevant content based on a three-part vetting system: 1) relevant course content found in the course title and course description; 2) relevant course content identified in further consultation with departments/faculty members; 3) and, relevant knowledge to Arctic issues.

The Arctic Minor committee first selected those courses with obvious relevance to the Arctic or Arctic issues. For example, AIS 461 First Nations Government and Politics in Canada, JSIS A 348/POL S 348 European Union as Global Actor, ATM S 111 Global Warming: Understanding the Issues, ESS 203 Glaciers and Global Change, and so forth.

The Minor Committee next approached each department (departmental head, student services director, or faculty member) to identify additional courses with key relevance to Arctic studies not evident by titles/descriptions. As a result courses such as the following were added: AIS 340 Indian Children and Families taught by Million an Alaskan native who includes considerable Inupiat community content; GEOG 271 Geography of Food and Eating taught by Jarosz who includes a module on Canada and Canadian Arctic food security; and, ESRM 210 Introductory Soils suggested by Deluca for inclusion of permafrost issues in the course.

The third step was to indentify those courses that provide a relevant knowledge base and set of skills needed to understand Arctic issues. For example, students with an interest in natural resource development issues in the Arctic will benefit from ECON 435 Natural Resource Economics. Those interested in understanding the forced relocation of Inuit communities in Canada and Russia will learn about the history and theoretical framework for human migrations in Friedman's JSIS B 441 Forced Migrations. Or, students with an interest Arctic climate change as a human rights issue will benefit from the legal and political background provided in LSJ 320/POL S 368 The Politics and Law of International Human Rights.

This broad but relevant range of electives enables each minor to develop expertise on an Arctic issue from the framework and theoretical foundation of a particular discipline. As such, the Arctic minor is designed to offer the most complete range of topics necessary to enable the students and advisors to tailor the program to each individual student's interest. It is the vision of the Minor Committee that the Arctic Minor students will graduate with advanced expertise in a selected area of Arctic studies.

**Approved List of Elective Courses by Category & Department**

North Star courses are designated with a *. Please see the UW course catalog for course descriptions and for pre-requisites: [http://www.washington.edu/students/crsct](http://www.washington.edu/students/crsct/)

(The Arctic course content in each of the elective classes, especially the non-star classes, will be explicitly stated under each course listed on the website at launch of the minor, and distributed to the advisors.)
### A: Social Sciences Category (min. two courses)

#### Arctic Studies
- *ARCTIC 498 Special Topics (social sciences content)

#### American Indian Studies
- AIS 340 Indian Children & Families (5) I&S
- AIS 360 American Indians in Cinema (5) VLPA/I&S
- AIS 441 Gender in Native American Societies (5) I&S
- AIS 443/COM 443 Indigenous Films, Sovereign Visions (5) VLPA/I&S
- AIS 444 Criminality & "Deviance" in Native Communities (5) I&S
- AIS 461/JSIS A 426 First Nations Government & Politics in Canada (5) I&S
- AIS 465/JSIS A 422 First Nations Filmmaking in Canada (5) VLPA

#### Anthropology & Archaeology
- *ARCHY 377 Archaeology of the Arctic (5) I&S (pre-req)
- ANTHRO 371/ENVIR 371 Anthropology of Development (5) I&S (pre-req)
- ANTHRO 459/ENVIR 459 Culture, Ecology, & Politics (5) I&S

#### Economics
- ECON 435 Natural Resource Economics (5) I&S (pre-req)
- ECON 436 Economics of the Environment (5) I&S (pre-req)

#### Environmental & Forest Sciences, Environmental Science & Resource Management
- ESRM 371/SOC 379/ENVIR 379 Environmental Sociology (5) I&S/NW
- ESRM 400 Natural Resource Conflict Management (3) I&S/NW

#### Geography
- GEOG 270 Geographies of International Development & Environmental Change (5) I&S
- GEOG 271 Geography of Food & Eating (5) I&S
- GEOG 375/JSIS B 375 Geopolitics (5) I&S
- GEOG 370 Problems in Resource Management (5) I&S
- GEOG 433 Resource Use & Management in Russia & Former Soviet Republics (5) I&S
- GEOG 480 Environmental Geography, Climate, & Health (5) I&S (pre-req)

#### Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies
- GWSS 341/AIS 341 Native Women in the Americas (5) I&S
- GWSS 440/AIS 440 Reading Native American Women's Lives (5, max. 10) I&S
- GWSS 442/AIS 442 Images of Natives in the Cinema & Popular Cultures (5) I&S/VLPA

#### Jackson School of International Studies
- JSIS 201 The Making of the 21st Century (5) I&S (pre-req)
- JSIS A 301 Europe Today (5) I&S
- JSIS A 348/POL S 348 European Union as Global Actor (5) I&S
- JSIS A 420 Post-Soviet Security (5) I&S
- JSIS A 427/ANTH 425 Anthropology of the Post-Soviet States (5) I&S
- *JSIS B 350/ENVIR 360/SCAND 350 Environmental Norms in International Politics (5) I&S
- JSIS B 441 Forced Migrations (5) I&S (pre-req)
- JSIS 478 Geopolitics of Oil (5) I&S

#### Law, Society & Justice
- LSJ 320/POL S 368 The Politics & Law of International Human Rights (5) I&S

#### Marine & Environmental Affairs
- *SMEA 407 International Organizations & Ocean Management (3)
- SMEA 476/ENVIR 476 Introduction to Environmental Law & Process (3) I&S
- *SMEA 514 Marine Pollution Management Issues (3)

#### Philosophy
- PHIL 207/POL S 207/VALUES 207 Issues of Global Justice (5) I&S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Science</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 243/ENVIR 243 Environmental Ethics (5) I&amp;S</td>
<td>PHIL 416/ENVIR 416 Ethics &amp; Climate Change (5) I&amp;S</td>
<td>PHIL 417/ENVIR 417 Advanced Topics in Environmental Philosophy (5) I&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scandinavian Studies**

*SCAND 326/POL S 326 Scandinavia in World Affairs (5) I&S
SCAN 351/JSIS A 351 Scandinavia, the European Union, & Global Climate Change (5) I&S
*SCAN 479/JSIS A 429 Eco-Capitalism (5) I&S

**Sociology**

SOC 356/POL S 356 Society & Politics (5) I&S

**Bothell Campus**

*BIS 490 Economics of Ice: Globalization & the Polar Regions (5)

University of the Arctic (on-line courses)

*BCS 331 Contemporary Issues in the Circumpolar World (4)

**B: Natural Sciences Category (min. two courses)**

**Arctic Studies**

*ARCTIC 498 Special Topics (natural sciences content)

**Aquatic & Fisheries Sciences**

FISH 250/Biol 250/OCEAN 250 Marine Biology (3/5) I&S
FISH 330/ENVIR 330 Climate Change Impacts on Marine Ecosystems (5) NW
FISH 437 Fisheries Oceanography (4) NW
*FISH 464 Arctic Marine Vertebrate Ecology (4) (pre-req)

**Atmospheric Sciences**

ATM S 211 Climate & Climate Change (5) I&S/NW
ATM S 321 The Science of Climate (3) NW (pre-req)
ATM S 475/ESS 475/OCEAN 475 Current Research in Climate Science Seminar (3, max. 6) (pre-req)

**Environmental & Forest Sciences, Environmental Science & Resource Management**

ESRM 210 Introductory Soils (5) NW
ESRM 350 Wildlife Biology & Conservation (5) NW (pre-req)
ESRM 450 Wildlife Ecology & Conservation (5) NW (pre-req)

**Earth & Space Sciences**

ESS 201 The Earth System & Climate (5) (pre-req)
ESS 203 Glaciers & Global Change (5) I&S/NW
ESS 302 Great Ice Age (5) NW (pre-req)
ESS 431 Principles of Glaciology (4) NW
ESS 433 Environmental Change in the Glacial Ages (5) NW
ESS 435 Glacial-Periglacial Geomorphology (3) NW (pre-req)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oceanography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 200 Introduction to Oceanography (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 210 Ocean Circulation (3) NW (pre-req)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 355 From Big Bang to the Blue Planet (3) NW (pre-req)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 423 Ocean Circulation &amp; Climate (3) (pre-req)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 430 Biological Oceanography (4) (pre-req)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 431 Special Topics in Biological Oceanography (3) NW (pre-req)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN 450 Climatic Extremes (4) NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*OCEAN 482 The Changing Arctic Ocean (3) NW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q SCI 210/ENVIR 210 Introduction to Environmental Modeling (4) NW, QSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>