

2022

## Indigenous Leadership on Climate Change and the Arctic

Wayne D. Garnons-Williams

Dalee Sambo Dorough

Heather Exner-Pirot

Kitty Gordon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj>

 Part of the [Transnational Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Wayne D. Garnons-Williams, Dalee Sambo Dorough, Heather Exner-Pirot, and Kitty Gordon, *Indigenous Leadership on Climate Change and the Arctic*, 46 Can.-U.S. L.J. 98 (2022)

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj/vol46/iss1/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canada-United States Law Journal by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## INDIGENOUS LEADERSHIP ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ARCTIC

MR. STEPHEN PETRAS: Everyone, our final panel today will explore Indigenous leadership on climate change and the Arctic. Our moderator is Wayne D. Garnons-Williams, who is a practicing attorney in Canada and a true expert on Indigenous and First Nations laws. Wayne is the founding president of the Inter-tribal Trade Organization and chair of the International Inter-tribal Trade and Investment Organization. He is the past chair of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations Appeal Tribunal and is a director and Secretary of the Council of the Great Lakes Region. He is a research fellow specializing in international comparative Indigenous law at the University of Oklahoma College of Law, and he is the Canadian Council for Origin of Aboriginal Business 2019 Award winner for Excellence in Aboriginal Relations. Finally and importantly, he is Plains Cree from Treaty Six of the Moosomin First Nations. Wayne, over to you.

MR. WAYNE D. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Thank you, Steve. Welcome. Hello, Atelihai. It's my pleasure to introduce our panel. And the way I'd like to introduce our panel is I'd like to give a little bit of a PowerPoint, explain who they are, and then set the table a little bit with respect to some of the issues that are out there, then allow the speakers to do their presentations in the context of that table setting. So I'm just going to see if I can share my screen here to start my presentation. Here we go. Can you see my screen? Great. Okay. So let's just get right into the introduction, shall we? First of all, Dr. Dalee Sambo Dorough. She is Inuit from Alaska, and she is the international chair of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, a non-governmental organization that represents approximately 180,000 Inuit from the Russian far, far East, Alaska, Canada and Greenland. She holds a Ph.D. from the University of British Columbia Faculty of Law, graduation year 2002 and a Master of Arts in Law and diplomacy from the Fletcher School at Tufts University in 1991. She's affiliated with the University of Alaska in Anchorage, where she served as the assistant professor, international relations within the Department of Political Science 2008 to 2018. Her current title is Senior Scholar and Special Advisor on Arctic Indigenous Peoples. Welcome, Dr. Dalee. The next one is Dr. Heather Exner-Pirot. Dr. Exner-Pirot is the managing editor of the Arctic Yearbook. She is a board member with the Saskatchewan Indigenous Economic Development Network, the Arctic Institute and the Canadian Rural Revitalization Foundation, and a research advisor to the Indigenous Resource Network. She is a member of the Global Arctic Mission Council and former chair of the Canadian Northern Studies Trust. She has previously held positions at the University of Saskatchewan, the International Center for Northern Governance and Development, and the University of the Arctic, and completed her doctoral degree in political science at the University of Calgary in 2011. Her current research interests include Indigenous and Northern economic development. Kitty Gordon

Murovic was born and raised in Nunavik, Quebec. Her grandparents raised her in the capital of Nunavut. Ms. Gordon lived in Montreal in the Montreal area for 12 years, where she had three wonderful children and had her last child in the north and moved back with her husband of 20 years. In 2007, she was employed by the Makivik Corporation as a communications officer for seven years in Ville St Laurent, which represents the Inuit of Nunavik at the political level to the federal and provincial governments. After living down south for 12 years, she moved her family back to her hometown in 2014 in the north, where she was employed by the Ungava Tulattivik Health Center as a complaints commissioner for two and a half years. In 2017, she took up the position of Assistant Director, her current post, at the Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services. Welcome, Ms. Gordon. Now, to set this set the table, I'll just be doing a little bit of a presentation here to contextualize some of this discussion. This is this is the slides from Professor Marie-Claire Cordonier Segger, who's a noted legal environmental law professor at Cambridge University. And this is part of her Leverhulme Lecture on Natural Resources, Sustainable Development Goals, and International Law, which was delivered March of this year. Highlights here. We're looking at this slide is ocean fisheries, global resource degradation. As of 2017, 33% of global fish stocks are being fished at biologically unsustainable levels. 99% of coral reefs are projected to die as global warming reaches that 2% tipping point. Biodiversity, Forestry and migratory species. Global Resource Degradation. From just 2001 to 2019, 386 million hectares of tree cover were lost, equivalent 1.7% decrease and 105 gigatons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions added to the atmosphere. 1 million animals and plant species are threatened with extinction in the context of rivers and freshwater ecosystems, again, global resource degradation. Rivers, lakes. Wetlands are biodiverse rich ecosystems, covering less than 1% of the Earth's surface, yet hosts nearly 25% of all vertebrates and 50% of all fish species. They are threatened. Since the 1970s, migratory freshwater fish populations have declined by 76%. Finally. Ecosystem. Global resource degradation. Current with our current and final environmental forecast for 2050. If we meet all environmental targets, 37% of global population will suffer heatwaves and extreme impacts. 6.6 million square kilometers of permafrost will melt when we reach that 2% average increased tipping point. Sea ice at this tipping point will melt ten times faster. So the economic and environmental clash, the flashpoint is the environment. Canadian Arctic population is 40,000 people. Half of those people are Indigenous. Indigenous nations globally want economic development, but not at the expense of our regional climate, water, air, quality of life. Northern Indigenous people suffer a form of environmental racism as nation-states wring their hands and acknowledge global warming in the North but refuse to meaningfully address the impact on its populations and the people's ability to maintain traditional sustainability. So, we've heard of concepts evolving which have basically, quite frankly, been pirated from Indigenous people. Like the circular economy, which is useful in helping offset global warming by using what you've got and reusing as many times as possible. The United Nations statements Sustainable Development Goals for 2030. They are clearly vital for the Indigenous North. Northern Indigenous nations, by their very unique experience, are best suited to

help nation-states meet these international goals. And these goals are interconnected. Often the key to success on one goal will trickle and domino effect to help other similarly associated goals. We've also got the United Nations Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Canada, which reached a second reading in the House of Commons as of April this year. It's domestic law in British Columbia, and it's important to understand that these things mean something. Article 19: Free Prior Informed Consent. Article 29(1): The Right to Conservation and Protection of the Environment for Indigenous Peoples. In February of this year, the president of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada agreed with the need to build back better together in a way that addresses the disproportionate impacts of Indigenous peoples. The United States and Canada announced joint initiatives to accelerate economic recovery of small and medium enterprises, with a focus on supporting women owned, minority and Indigenous owned small and medium enterprises by leveraging the United States-Canada-Mexico Trade Agreement. The Prime Minister and the President agreed to be partners in protecting nature, including by supporting Indigenous-led conservation efforts in advancing climate solutions and protecting nature. There was an agreement on the importance of doing this to enhance doing this vital work with Indigenous peoples. The USMCA chapters like, the Article 24.13 The Corporate and Social Responsibility of Business Conduct for Corporate Social Responsibility are key for helping meet those goals for a healthy environment. an integral element of sustainable development. Working hand in hand with corporations that want to develop a resource by stewarding the nature in a way that meets Indigenous people's needs. The Indigenous Rights Clause is important here as well of USMCA. Article 32.5 basically says "nothing in this agreement shall preclude a party from adopting or maintaining a measure it deems necessary to fill the legal obligations of Indigenous peoples." So, what that means is if there's a conflict between Indigenous rights and the trade section, the Indigenous rights protection is there. What's this mean in the north? Well, 20 treaties exist in the Canadian Arctic covering Indigenous sovereignty and security, which are considered quasi-constitutional documents protected by Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution, 1982. Section 35, of course, says existing Aboriginal and treaty rights are recognized and affirmed. Northern Indigenous peoples should be viewed as controlling partners in all the nation-states' economic development in the north-not pawns, or worse, victims. Widely known Indigenous statements exists that is used a lot by Indigenous peoples when dealing with nation-states, and that is this phrase: "nothing about us without us." It's very important. So with that, let's get a quick overview of some of the issues for this. And so, I'd like to now turn this discussion to Dr. Dorough.

DR. DALEE SAMBO DOROUGH: Thank you very much, Wayne. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to share some comments here about the impacts of climate change within our communities. And I prepared a PowerPoint presentation in order to do so, and would like to now share my screen. Once again, thank you for this opportunity. I'll try to cruise through this fairly quickly, because some of this, based on at least the previous panel that I was able to listen in with and sounded very interesting, many of these points are well known and understood,

but for those new to the issue of the work of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, again, I'll move through this fairly swiftly. This is an image of our homelands, the area in the red, a dark red color, which, if you look at it from the circumpolar view we occupy, at least in terms of our traditional lands and territories, just over 40% of the Arctic region. And if you take into account the recent conclusions about the Arctic warming at a rate of at least two times faster than other parts of the world, clearly this is significant to our people and the impacts upon our homelands or Inuit Nunaat. We were organized in 1977, and Eben Hopson is recognized as the founder of the Inuit Circumpolar Council. In 1977, when he welcomed Indigenous delegates, Inuit delegates specifically, to the organizing conference, in his welcoming address, he stated "our language contains the memory of 4000 years of human survival through the conservation and good managing of our Arctic wealth. Our language contains the intricate knowledge of the ice that we have seen no others demonstrate." And if you take into account the impacts of climate change, especially on the cryosphere or ice-covered areas, this statement speaks volumes about the need for us to be participating in any dialogue and debate concerning our homelands and in particular those concerning climate change. At the same ICC organizing conference in June of 1977, another delegate, Charles Etok Edwardsen, spoke to the issue of what was then a pending ban on whaling activity by the Inupiat. But he said something really important that rings true to this day, that Inuit are a part of the environment, Inuit are part of the Arctic environment and ecosystems. That Inuit are a species in the same way that the whales and other species exist throughout our homelands. And I think this is an important perspective and understanding when considering issues related to climate change as well as a host of other issues. One of the early objectives of the Inuit Circumpolar Council was to prepare principles and elements for a comprehensive Arctic policy. We began this work in the late 70s, in the early 80s. It seems now that every single institution across the globe, especially academic institutions, as well as entities like the Arctic Council, are looking at putting together Arctic policies. Certainly the eight Arctic states, as well as many non-Arctic states are developing Arctic policies. But it's important to underscore that the Inuit Circumpolar Council was doing so well before it became a vogue activity. But here again, in the Arctic policy that we developed, we underscored the fact that we are an integral part of Arctic ecosystems that are hunting, fishing and harvesting, have been and continue to be in harmony with the dynamic processes of the Arctic ecosystem. This is not a view held solely by Inuit. In fact, Indigenous peoples across the globe have underscored this profound relationship that we have to our environment and that this relationship has economic, social, cultural and as well as spiritual dimensions. And therefore, our role and our views have to be recognized in the context of resource management as well as conservation strategies that are related to the Arctic. Clearly, the marine environment is of great significance to Inuit and all of our communities from Takaka throughout Alaska, Canada, and Greenland. Our reliance upon the marine environment is significant and has, again, many different dimensions. So, protecting the Arctic marine environment and marine resources is clearly significant to us, and we've put a substantial amount of time toward understanding and promoting the important

elements of our reliance upon the marine environment. Much of this has pivoted on the recognition of our rights and our direct interests in terms of the marine environment. Clearly, as was touched upon in the previous panel, this relationship has both traditional as well as contemporary economic activity dimensions, and it has prompted us to become involved internationally in a host of different dialogues, inter-governmental dialogues, such as the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Oftentimes states only refer to this because of their interest in securing real estate and territory. But it's important to remember that there are numerous other chapters and elements of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, including Protection of the Marine Environment. Article 234 on protection of sea ice and ice covered areas. We're also engaged in the International Maritime Organization, where we have a pending application for consultative status within the IMO, we're presently involved in the dialogue concerning biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction as well as directly involved in the Central Arctic Ocean Fisheries Agreement, and in particular the language that addresses Indigenous knowledge and the importance of Indigenous knowledge. All of this has been done in order to gain greater coherence and coordination of Marine policy, and certainly on behalf of the Inuit Circumpolar Council, in favor of Inuit and our perspectives concerning the marine environment. I won't go through this entire list. It is obvious that there are numerous impacts of climate change throughout Inuit Nunaat, from changes in salinity of the water, marine mammal habitat, marine mammal health, algal blooms, obviously changes in permafrost, changes in the way animals migrate, where they give birth, a whole host of things. Much of this is to say that is having an incredible and adverse impact upon our food security, generating and creating food insecurity. As recent as last week, or actually now ten days, two weeks ago, there's also been loss of life because of fast and dramatic changing ice conditions. Inuit have depended upon sea ice and ice conditions for millennia, and now, because of this disruptive and rapid change, it's having direct impact at the micro level as well as at the macro level. Of course, the impact of Arctic shipping is another dynamic. We are beginning to see increasing vessel traffic throughout the Arctic. And, if you go to nearly any Inuit coastal community, which happens to be the majority geographic location for our communities, they will tell you that they are seeing dramatic changes as well as increased vessel traffic. And not only that that falls within the purview of the IMO polar code, but smaller vessels as well. And of course, all of this increased vessel traffic will have an impact on our communities. And clearly the marine environment that we depend upon, the marine mammals that we depend upon. Significantly, it's generating environmental insecurity. And if you overlay the current increasing activity in the context of defense and security, the increased militarization of the region is also of great concern to Inuit as well as many others in the Arctic. Here again, the principles and elements for a comprehensive Arctic policy are relevant. And in this regard-and I won't get into a long lecture and discussion about Indigenous knowledge-but it's to say that from our point of view, Indigenous knowledge, our knowledge, that intricate knowledge that Eben Hopson spoke of in 1977 at the organizing conference, that our knowledge, as well as scientific research, are both valid systems of knowledge. And if we are to undertake climate change policy and



make decisions concerning climate change, scientists and others have to have the best available information that exists. Our people in coastal communities are the eyes and ears and the first to witness the impacts of climate change in the Arctic upon our communities, and their insights, their observations, their knowledge about their homelands and their territory, both terrestrial as well as the marine environment, are significant and important in many ways and forms. And in this regard, it's important to take into account what we have to offer in the context of co-production of knowledge, and to do so in a way that is respectful, that recognizes and legitimizes our knowledge as equal to and helpful to understanding the impacts of climate change as well as a host of other issues. This is an example of community-based monitoring that some of our people are involved in through the Inuit Circumpolar Council and the sharing of insights and observations based upon monitoring. And in my assessment, there is a very high or increased need for engaging in this way and directly with our people out there and on the ground. This is just a series of photos of Indigenous peoples and Inuit, specifically at the Conference of the Parties of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. I'm very proud of the photo right in the center. A young group of Inuit from Tuktoyaktuk that produced a film about the impacts of climate change on their community. They were able to go to the COP25, present their film, engage in press conferences, as well as a host of other debates and dialogues on behalf of Inuit. And there their voices were loud, their voices were clear, and also coordinated and articulate. As far as our engagement in the UNFCCC, I should have indicated at the outset of this presentation that I happened to be a member of the Facilitative Working Group, which is the newest constituted body within the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is comprised of an equal number of state party representatives and Indigenous peoples' representatives. It's taken us years to pry open the door of the UNFCCC, to gain recognition of Indigenous peoples as a formal constituency within the UNFCCC, as well as to establish the local communities and Indigenous peoples' platform. And of this platform, the Facilitative Working Group was created to operationalize the Facilitative Working Group in order to increase knowledge about climate change and its impacts upon Indigenous peoples through the utilization of Indigenous knowledge, to increase the capacity of Indigenous peoples as well as state parties to collaborate with one another, and third to advance policy and decision-making within the UNFCCC, certainly in favor of Indigenous peoples. I want to point out that this Facilitative Working Group is unique from other Indigenous-specific mandates within the United Nations system. And the key distinction is that Indigenous peoples, by and for themselves, have the mandate to self-select their own representation without any oversight or good housekeeping seal of approval from state governments. And this is, in my view, one of the only ways to embrace the right of self-determination of Indigenous peoples and their engagement at the international level. There's a host of material and information about the Facilitative Working Group on the UNFCCC website, and I encourage you to visit the site and learn more about what the Facilitative Working Group is doing. One thing I will say is that myself as a co-lead with the Government of Canada representative were responsible for what is referred to as activity four within the Facilitative Working Group Work Plan.

And here again, I'm very proud of the work that we managed to do, which was focused on the objective of increasing the capacity of state government parties to the UNFCCC in the area of Indigenous knowledge. And if one thinks about it, we happen to be the experts on Indigenous knowledge. And so the idea was to ensure that state party representatives and others understand the contours and the content of Indigenous knowledge in order for its ethical and equitable utilization in the future, specifically in relation to climate change. Just to sum up, I also wanted to point to a forthcoming report on the status of tribes and climate change in the United States. Myself and other Indigenous peoples across the U.S. formulated the report that is forthcoming. It is very clear that the government-to-government relationship that has been a well-defined doctrine in federal Indian law has been revealed through this forthcoming report that tribal nations are clearly being impacted, that a host of other pressures are compounding the longstanding disparities and creating the cultural insecurity that we certainly see in many of the Inuit communities here in Alaska. I should note that just under 40% of the federally recognized tribes in the United States are in Alaska. Alaska makes the United States an Arctic state. And so it was crucial for us to lend our views and perspectives to this forthcoming report. And much of it focuses on how do we ensure that Indigenous peoples are protected in place in their own traditional communities, or how they take up in the context of the right of self-determination, a managed retreat from communities that are threatened or full relocation of their communities. These are important dialogues that are going to take a substantial amount of resources, as well as the intellectual and political space of our people to take on this important decision-making to safeguard their communities. So in conclusion, I simply want to underscore that clearly we hold distinct knowledge about our homelands. We have a holistic understanding of the Arctic that needs to be taken into account in terms of climate change. There needs to be a recognition of the interrelated nature of the environment. It's crucial that there is recognition of our status, rights, and role in the climate context. Consistent with the right of self-determination. That there needs to be engagement of our leadership in our communities, as well as Indigenous knowledge in an ethical and equitable fashion that governments and others should take advantage of. Supporting and enhancing co-production of knowledge. Recognize that we have a place at every table in all of these interrelated, international dialogues from the IMO to UNCLOS to the CAO, to the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as the increasing number of geostrategic and geopolitical issues because of many of the questions that were being posed in the in the last panel concerning the actions of the Russian Federation, the actions of the government of China, not only in the Arctic, but globally. I won't go into the work of the marine protected areas, especially with Inuit in Canada or the Pikialasorsuaq Implementation Committee, which is a fascinating project that we're pursuing. But I'll conclude with the fact that the Inuit Circumpolar Council on April 15 received good news. We were accepted as an observer within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. As many may know, we made a significant contribution to the special report on the cryosphere and oceans of the of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and we look forward to utilizing our newly minted observer status within the IPCC to make



future contributions, all pivoting on, of course, the knowledge that we have about the impacts of climate change in the Arctic region. So, Quyanaq, thank you very much for your time and attention and I look forward to the dialogue.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Dr. Sambo Dorough, thank you very much for your excellent presentation. Now turning to Dr. Exner-Pirot. Greetings. Welcome.

DR. HEATHER EXNER-PIROT: Thank you so much. It's a pleasure to be here. Wayne, thank you for the introduction. I'm also from Treaty six-I'm not Indigenous that I'm from Saskatoon and actually my husband's family's farmland is right adjacent to Moosomin First Nation. I know quite a few people. So I'm surprised that our past haven't crossed before, but happy that they've crossed today. But I'm coming here today and I'm joining you from the Tsuut'ina Nation just outside of Calgary, so acknowledging that I'm on their land today. And I also want to acknowledge my co-panelist Dalee. It's always a pleasure to hear from you and share a stage with you. It's certainly my privilege. And Kitty, I look forward to hearing from you, too. And when I acknowledge that as a non-Indigenous person, I don't intend to speak about or as an expert on Indigenous perspectives, but provide a bit, maybe a different take or perspective, maybe a more analytical, historical context of how Indigenous peoples and leaders have been really catalyzed by climate change in the Arctic and have become much more influential. My background is in political science, so I'll come at it from more of a governance and a power and policy perspective here today, but certainly would defer to Kitty and Dalee on the Indigenous perspective itself. So, you know, thinking about the conference and the goals of the conference, and in particular this panel, I thought I would talk about, you know, how climate change has really catalyzed Arctic Indigenous leadership and influence, especially in the last decade. You know, to acknowledge that obviously there has always been Arctic Indigenous leadership. So that's obviously nothing new. But certainly in the last few decades we've seen it become much more prominent on a regional and international stage. And this proceeded, you know, a kind of our interest in climate change and going back and to really, really hitting pace in the 1970s. And Dalee spoke about some of these events, too, but things that were happening really at a local or domestic level that really catalyze Indigenous leadership in the Arctic. For example, the Alaska Native Land Claim settlement in 1971, the first Arctic Peoples Conference was held in Copenhagen in 1973, I think it included Inuit and Sami people. In Canada here, the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement in 1975 really built up capacity and influence and power of Canadian, Inuit, Naskapi, and Cree people. Dalee, you mentioned the first Inuit Circumpolar Conference in 1977 with Eben Hopson. And you know, following all along the same time Greenland was developing, you know, the parameters for their own home rule, which they achieved in 1979. Of course, they have self-rule today and at the same time it took a long time to get to the finish line. But all the while also, you know, Nunavut was being established and was finally established in 1999 as a separate territory and other land claims are being organized. So this is a very intense and rapid period where Inuit and other Indigenous peoples in the North American Arctic where were reclaiming and asserting their rights and their jurisdiction and their self-determination and building a lot of capacity and influence. And this started to

percolate then into the regional and international context and seeing that in the early nineties. So one event of importance-it was probably covered earlier on today- was the incorporation of the ICC, the Sami Council and RAIPON, the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples in the Arctic Environment Protection Strategy in 1991 that preceded the Arctic Council, the establishment of the Indigenous People Secretariat in Copenhagen, and then finally the Arctic Council. I would say a lot of this culminated in the inclusion of Indigenous peoples as permanent participants in the Arctic Council. And I don't know if, you know, if the history is always told to the extent it is of how important it was, how Indigenous leaders had to push for that, that it wasn't something that was given to them, but they asserted themselves that they must be included at that level. And a lot of that credit goes to Mary Simon, who is ICC president at this time and this time after the Gorbachev Murmansk speech in 1987, when he said the Arctic should be on a piece which kind of kicked off a lot of Arctic regional cooperation. And Mary Simon, after she was ICC president, became Canada's first Circumpolar ambassador in 1994, was really pivotal in moving forward the Arctic Council, getting the Ottawa Declaration signed, and ensuring that permanent participants, Indigenous peoples were represented at the table, and then also ensuring that priority was put on the sustainable development. And I think that's an important point to make as we conceive of Indigenous peoples, as, you know, as being stewards of the environment and the land and being very concerned with climate change. But in this case, you know, the real impetus was to include that sustainable development aspect to what had been exclusively been regional cooperation on environmental protection at that point. And then, of course, the Aleut international association, the Arctic Athabaskan Council, and Gwich'in Council were later appointed as permanent participants. So just focusing. So that's kind of a, you know, a short history of the formalization of Arctic Indigenous influence in power in the region. But to turn a little bit to climate change and how the Arctic became conceived as a region, you know, marked by climate change and the way that many people think of the Arctic through a lens of climate change. You know, the greenhouse gas theory as a scientific concept has been around for a couple of centuries and understand the basic principle. But the issue of global warming, you know, as an existential threat really arose in the late 1980s and nineties. And the first, I think, major, you know, public conception of global warming, climate change as affecting polar regions, of having very practical, tangible effects, was actually in 2002 with the collapse of the Larsen B ice shelf. And so people's first understanding this was happening, this is having impacts today, you know, can be fairly tied to the Antarctic. And then of course in a couple of years later we had the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment through the Arctic Council, which really documented that things were happening. It was very credible. It was not hypothetical. It was here today and now. And so that's when we start to have the ideas of the Poles as being representatives of climate change. This is where it's starting to happen. This is where we can notice it. And again, though, I don't think we often give the appropriate credit to Indigenous leaders in this case, especially Sheila Watt Cloutier for, you know, making the Arctic into a place where people understood and recognized the impacts of climate change and global warming is

having and this really happened. You know, you can tie it back to the petition that the ICC sent to the Organization of American States Human Rights Commission, you know, alleging, you know, having a petition against the United States at that time that they were violating Inuit human rights through their large greenhouse gas emissions that were spurring climate changes. And while that was unsuccessful, the petition the campaign by Sheila Watt Cloutier and the ICC and other Inuit activists and other Indigenous activists really catalyzed in and you know put in place that people connected the Arctic to climate change, to Indigenous peoples, and saw that this was having an impact on societies. It wasn't just an impact on the environment is having an impact on societies. And so now, I think there's a lot of credit to that Indigenous leadership that people understand that connection and that the Arctic is now indelibly linked to this concept of climate change, as we see in the title this conference today. And just one other-and Dalee touched on this a little bit, too-but another prime example of the power and the influence of Arctic Indigenous peoples has been that affirmation of traditional ecological knowledge in the past decade or two, and again asserting that this must that this must be the way. And so, you know, Western science, as we all know, has become very preoccupied with studying climate change in the Arctic for decades, and it has been decades worth of Arctic climate change science. These observations and studies were done really separately from Indigenous peoples and not inclusive or not particularly interested in their experiences, knowledges, but through, you know, advocacy and exercising their self-determination become much more successful in putting traditional ecological knowledge into the scientific processes. And that's so important because those contribute to informing the policy responses, and that's reflected in some of the work that Dalee talked about. We also see, you know, the contributions in the Arctic Council working groups, and it has become normalized to include Indigenous perspectives and to include traditional ecological knowledge into, you know, policy responses to climate change.

I'm going to take a slightly different track now, and begin to think about those relations with power and policy is that in some ways, if you're looking at it kind of contextually, this is a bit of a double edged sword. The extent to which Arctic Indigenous peoples and Inuit definitely have earned their influence in regional affairs and become a voice of authority on climate change issues. But on the other hand, there's been so much attention put on to climate change. When you think about the Arctic and we think about the Arctic issues, that there's a good argument that has marginalized or overshadowed many of the other issues, the pressing issues and the pressing changes that do take place in the Arctic and do have impacts on Indigenous peoples. And if climate change, if we think of it as a more recent issue, you know, say in the last 20 years, 30 years, certainly there were extremely rapid changes happening in the Arctic and happening in Indigenous communities before that as a result of colonization, as a result of industrialization, as a result of globalization, that have had dramatic impacts on communities, and the culture, and the language, and how people live, and on their economies. And very disruptive. And there are a myriad of social, economic, health and cultural issues that are not necessarily linked or related to climate change, but are still pressing issues for

Indigenous people. And they don't probably get the attention that they deserve because from you know, a southern lens, the southern gaze is very preoccupied with thinking about climate change when we think about the Arctic. And I'll be curious, Dalee and Kittie, you guys agree or to what extent you think that's true, to what extent you've seen that? So, I'm also very you know, in the in terms of how are we going to ethically approach climate change and address climate change and what is, you know, what are the right approaches? If I think about the policies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, especially in the North, in the Arctic. There's you know, I think it's well understood, and it's certainly documented, how important the environment is to Indigenous peoples and to northerners. And this just kind of gives a more recent opinion poll that shows, you know, how important, especially Nunavut, which is more Arctic and more Indigenous, you know, the environment is even more important than protecting jobs. So very, very strong commitment, obviously, to the land as part of cultural identity, food security, economic security, social, everything. And the environment similar to that is just, you know, a scene from the north perspective, more so than any other region in Canada, as a top problem for the north. And so you see it there. 18% said it was the most important problem facing them. And just if you dove into the north a little bit deeper into Yukon Northwest Territories and Nunavut, you would see, that poverty, homelessness, and affordable housing was actually the top priority for people of none of it at 27%, but still, environment a very top problem. And the reason I bring that up is because, you know, there are ethical challenges to how we go about addressing climate change. And it's not a secret that northern and remote communities in Canada and everywhere require more energy, consume more energy, and often don't have access to clean sources of energy. And so in this case, for example, Nunavut, which is heavily reliant on diesel, I'm not saying this to criticize, just to point out that when we talk about reducing greenhouse gases and we talk about mitigating climate change, we are probably imposing a higher burden on northern communities and remote communities because of the way that the economies and societies are structured require more energy. They are colder. They are, for parts of the year, much darker. The economies that they do have are more carbon intense because you're talking usually about moving heavy, heavy materials. They're more reliant on air transport for medical, for health, for transportation, to bring food in. So there there's a heavy energy commitment to live in the north. And when we talk about the kind of mitigation strategies, this will have a higher impact and a higher burden on the north. And it's just not North America either. Even our Nordic friends, when we think about per capita emissions, the northern counties in Scandinavia again have higher emissions per capita than their southern neighbors because of all the challenges I just mentioned, all the ways in which rural and remote and northern communities require greater energy. I know in the last panel, Martha brought up carbon taxes, and Canada has imposed a carbon tax. And the question was, can we oppose a carbon tax on the north? Is that fair to disincentivize the only energy source that that they have? And the response by the territories has been, for example, to provide a 100% rebate at the point of sale for the carbon tax, basically, in effect, you know, kind of reducing any impact the carbon tax might have because there isn't a way to disincentivize

the energy use. There's you know, there's people require food, and they require heat and they require, you know, bringing things in through air transport. And it's really not possible at this point to replace those kinds of things. So, this all brings me to some key questions that maybe we can get to. But the way I think about, you know, the approaches that we take, the policies we take, the ethical questions we create in addressing carbon, our climate change in the Arctic, you know, how much is it a local/regional, responsibility, and how much is it a global responsibility? And more specifically, when we think about energy options in the Indigenous Arctic communities, I know in Canada there's been lots of focus placed on solar and wind and other things, you know, that are renewable and reduce greenhouse gases. But sometimes that comes at the expense of affordability or reliability. And I think we need to be fair in balancing different priorities, different public goods. And, you know, and not, again, placing a higher burden on Arctic and northern peoples than people in the south have to face. In our last panel-and Hugh had many great points on this-we've seen how the Arctic has become a very difficult place to attract investment to. And there has been a bit of a bandwagon in the last few years of companies saying, you know, kind of in an ESG green kind of way, saying, we're not going to we're not going to use Arctic shipping routes. We're not going to invest in any Arctic extraction. You know, we're going to stay out of the Arctic to keep it pristine and that kind of thing. And for people who are trying to attract investment and trying to create jobs and employment and own source revenues, that can be a real problem. And so, you know, the question is, is it fair to impose restrictions on development in areas that have already been economically marginalized? And I think if Indigenous peoples and northern governments want to impose their own restrictions, they should be able to. But how ethical is it for southern corporations in southern peoples and southern NGOs to want to impose those restrictions on the north in the Arctic without those people's consent? And then, you know, the whole question and I just don't think we have quite the answer yet. We haven't found a common understanding of how much is the Arctic, a common heritage of mankind that requires or deserves global protection, and how much is at the home line for Indigenous nations with the right to steward their own lands. And, you know, what are the consequences on policy for that? So those are the ways that I think about it. And of course, I again want to mention that, you know, as non-Indigenous person, I defer much to Dalee and Kitty and some of the response to this. But from an analytical perspective, I think it's very interesting to consider this and important as we develop climate change policies in and for the North. So, I'll end there, Wayne.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Oh, thank you very much, Dr. Pirot. Wonderful presentation, very insightful. Our next presenter is Ms. Kitty Gordon. Kitty, the floor is yours.

MS. KITTY GORDON: Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me? Can you hear me? Okay? You can hear me. Hi. Nice to meet everyone. I'm Kitty Gordon from Kuujjuaq, Nunavik, Northern Quebec. I've come from a region that's still very much developing. I don't have a presentation per se, but I can talk about firsthand experience, what kind of impacts we're seeing here in our region. I like to consider Inuit as one of the most adaptive people on earth. We went from igloos

to internet in a short period from 30 to 40 years. So, I feel like we're one of the most adaptive people on earth, as I said. There's 14 communities within our region. We're in the jurisdiction of Quebec. The government of Quebec and our communities range from 150 people to 2500. I could talk about how some of the changes we've seen as an example for this year is the Cook River has not frozen in the first time ever. That's a direct impact that that we see. And this is this can be very, very dangerous. As Dalee has mentioned earlier, we're losing hunters who are going through sea ice. And so it's very much impacting our communities. We're seeing insects and animals that we've never seen before. There's moose that are arriving in our region. And this is something that's unheard of, moose hunting. We're above the 55th parallel. The berries that we harvest in the fall are now different. There's some years where there's none at all. And then last year there was an abundance of them. In terms of climate change in our region here, in the fall of 2019, a first of its kind, a climate change workshop organized by regional organizations and then COVID hit. And so, that kind of put a halt to gauging and assessing how climate change is affecting our communities. And then Dalee mentioned the Indigenous knowledge that we have within our communities. I feel like it's not very recognized in the scientific world. It's very much scientific based within our knowledge. I think of my grandmother who made me [inaudible] without even using a measuring tape, like using her hands by for measuring meat. And this is just an example of how already scientific and mathematic into the Indigenous knowledge can be. And so, I feel like this could be looked at and a lot more recognized by the scientific world. And it's underappreciated. So, those were just some of the examples that I had here today for you. And like I said, it's still very much developing here. And we have one Internet service provider. And there's times where the discussions were very choppy. So I missed some of what you guys were talking about. That's pretty much what I have for today.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Thank you, Miss Gordon. Appreciate your insightful comments. It's really good to get the firsthand knowledge of experiencing what's happening on the land, invaluable discussion. Thank you so much. So I believe at this point we're going to open it up to discussions. Are there any questions we have? Let's just see. I don't see the questions. Oh, here's one. Okay. Following the Russian government move to restrict RAIPON on in 2012, there have been a number of media stories that the Russian government has continued to limit its ability to act independently. Is this true? If so, how does this affect the rights of northern Indigenous peoples in Russia? And what has been the international response? What should it be?

Dr. EXNER-PIROT: Dalee, do you want to tackle that first? And I can add something?

Dr. DOROUGH: Yeah. Thank you very much for the question. I also wanted to acknowledge the contributions from Heather and from Kitty. I think that the comment especially that Kitty made about the fact that Indigenous knowledge, the IQ is underappreciated. We could have a whole discussion just on this particular issue alone. I think what she's stated is really, really crucial, and how to how to move forward with the right to our knowledge and its utilization and its ownership and the different safeguards. But to the question about the RAIPON and the



Russian Federation. It is oftentimes, especially within the Arctic Council venue, oftentimes difficult to really separate out the perspectives that are being expressed genuinely by the representatives, in contrast to the views and the policy of the Russian Federation on a host of different issues. And one example is a lengthy debate that we had about Indigenous knowledge and the use of the term Indigenous knowledge within the Arctic Council and the various different, various different working groups. And it was it was difficult because the in the Indigenous peoples, the permanent participants as representatives of RAIPON had a particular view that they held really firmly to. They didn't let go of their insistence and the use of the term traditional knowledge. And it was it was kind of slow to kind of peel away all the different layers. But anything that started to get into the neighborhood of expressing our rights like the right to own and control your knowledge. You know, there was just a lot of gray area in the discussion. And I think that I think that for our purposes, especially as the Inuit Circumpolar Council, I also find this to be the case for the Sami Council. We held a meeting just last week to prepare our statements for the ongoing UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues session. And one of the key concerns that was raised in the Sami Inuit dialog was how to ensure that our socio-cultural region, which has been long understood by the UN as the Arctic region consisting of Inuit and Sami, wasn't encroached upon by really-there's no other way to put it-the Russian Federation. How do we safeguard our political and intellectual space within that particular dialog? And it was in in the end of the day, all of the statements that are being delivered to the permanent forum make a reference to the Arctic region as they as a well-known, long-standing socio-cultural region of the Inuit in the same way. And I guess this isn't directly answering the question, but gives you an idea of the kind of the kind of pressures swirling around nearly everything that we do. It poses a huge problem for the ICC because of our counterparts in Chukotka and the ability for us to assist them without being identified as a foreign agent. But at the same time, we're seeing it not only in terms of how to offer support and assistance to our Chukotka office, but how our interests are being stifled in other fora. The most recent example I have of this is we were able to make a presentation to the committee that reviews applications for consultative status of non-governmental organizations within the International Maritime Organization. And we didn't anticipate that our application would be met with such hostility by the Russian Federation. So in all this is to say that we're starting to feel these impacts in in unexpected places, but they seem to be fairly consistent. And I guess to some extent we'll be as vigilant as they are vigilant in terms of moving forward with the work of the organization and the directors of the organization in order to ensure that we have a seamless and inclusive participation from Chukotka all the way to eastern Greenland. So I don't know if I've answered Rob's question or not, but that gives you some insights.

Dr. EXNER-PIROT: I might just add a little bit to that. And I don't have Dalee's, you know, obviously very personal information on this and the experiences. But I will say, you know, Russia is not a liberal democracy. So they obviously have a different relationship in terms of respecting, you know, same kind of rights that we would expect in Canada, for example. But I just do want to say, you know, I have had the privilege of going to Yakutsk and we did some work

with Northern Eastern Federation University in Yakutia and have had some colleagues from that region who are Indigenous. And, and I just wouldn't want anyone to think that, that all Indigenous people there are victims, you know what I mean? Not to have the perception over there in Russia and they don't have the right to speak that there is such a rich, cultural, Indigenous, you know, tradition in Russia and it is a federation. And so it does allow, I think, in their governance system, some leeway, especially in the east, where it is far from Moscow for self-determination, for self-governance. There's still nomadic peoples, you know, which isn't it doesn't happen in Canada anymore, for example. So just want to recognize that it's there are strong Indigenous peoples in Russia and they have capacity and the ability and have preserved their culture and in ways that, you know, haven't been possible in some of the rest of the world. So I just want to I didn't want to leave anyone with a taste again that, you know, Russia has taken, you know, all that all the soil out of Indigenous peoples because they have such strong cultures there. I guess I hope, you know, I don't know if you would agree with that. But just to give, you know, just to not put this all on Indigenous peoples in Russia, I guess.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: We have another question. This is from Bradford Patrick, who's a CASE Western Law grad from 1998. It's directed to Ms. Gordon. Ms. Gordon, how would you like the scientific community to include and value and adhere to the knowledge of Indigenous peoples? You and your ancestors have more knowledge than any scientists on earth will ever have in my lifetime, as your ancestors have lived on the land for thousands of years.

Ms. GORDON: By meeting with our Indigenous leaders and having a good discussion with them and asking them questions, the right questions, I guess. Starting with a discussion with our Indigenous leaders and perhaps these Indigenous leaders could lead them to elders in the community. And have a workshop.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Thank you. Great. We have another question. This is from Professor Bradford W Morse. He asks, what can be done to increase the influence of the Arctic Council and its effectiveness as a vehicle to engage all Arctic national governments and important observer nations and EU with Indigenous peoples as permanent members?

Dr. DOROUGH: Well. I suppose that I'll take a stab at that question. First, let me say that in in the formulation of the rules of procedure going all the way back, as Heather noted, to Mary Simon's role as the president of the Inuit Circumpolar Council in the mid-nineties and before the adoption of the Ottawa Declaration in 1996, I happened to be the special assistant to the President for the Alaska office and advised that. Because Inuit Nunaat homeland and is so important to us, we should not be merely permanent participants. We should have an equal seat at the table. We should also have the right to vote. And so now you think about you think about the kinds of questions that are being posed by friend and colleague, Bradford Morse, I think that the possibility for our consideration of reform and a real evaluation of what the Arctic Council has become as a regional "soft law" entity. I think that that would be extremely useful to do evaluated too often in political science, we don't go back and evaluate decisions made or policy implemented.

But this is one case where I think it would be highly useful to do so, especially from a permanent participant perspective. Certainly the Ottawa Declaration makes clear reference to our ties to the region, but it does so kind of only in the framework of culture, not the not the full complement or a comprehensive understanding of our economic, social, cultural, spiritual, and political dimensions and rights. So, I think in terms of its effectiveness, it would also be helpful to the eight Arctic states and certainly the five literal states to have a real careful assessment of the role that it can play, especially against the backdrop of some of the built in limitations, where it's focused on the environment, but no discussion clearly about economic development issues. And yes, they've created the Arctic Economic Council to kind of cover that agenda, but also the issues of defense and security, which are presently off the table. I've heard other scholars hint at the idea of that kind of need and potential for reform. With regard to the other the other interests and the current observers from my perspective, from my point of view-and it's likely shared by others within the ICC, but potentially not-that this is our homeland. The Arctic is our homeland. That's why Eben Hopson's quote was so, so important. You know, that that our Arctic wealth, his understanding of the place of our people out there and on the land and on the coastal seas, that the interests of the interests of Japan, China, Singapore, India, the EU. There's this host of other states that are looking at how to how to get their hands on the commodities either from the Arctic or being transported across the Arctic. I think that that the status of observers and having a seat in the back of the room, it sounds kind of offensive, but I think that that's actually the place that they really should be. Too often Indigenous peoples have been the ones taking the seat at the back of the room. And I've been in inter-governmental fora where our rights are wholesale thrown out the window because we don't have a direct say in matters. And I think that in, in, in the unique structure of the Arctic Council that they that these are issues that have to be taken up and in a very serious fashion, and done so consistent with who we are as distinct peoples that belong to this unique region that we call home. So, again, I don't know if I've answered the question, but those are some of the thoughts I have on it. Thank you.

Dr. EXNER-PIROT: Might just add a little bit there, Wayne, if that's okay.

And I think it was Peter Mackay in his in his remarks earlier talked about, you know, the discussion and how we want to go. Cook was very concerned when, you know, China brought on and that was at the time of the Korean chairmanship. And if there's still that underlying tension, the Arctic Council's is it a global forum or a regional forum? And as Dalee, you know, insinuated, the permanent participants very much want to keep it a regional forum. You know, again, where they're at the table, you know, they're, you know, bigger members of a smaller table rather than having that diluted with observers. But I do want to point out the Arctic Council, compared to almost any other institution, has normalized this idea of Indigenous peoples as nations in their own rights. In this case, they're called permanent participants, but they're viewed as nations. And I point to the EU meeting separately with the permanent participants when it discusses its Arctic policy, because that is unique to the Arctic. I had never heard and would be surprised if the EU consults with first nations and meeting Inuit peoples when it was developing its trade relationship with Canada and its trade agreements. And

we, you know, you mentioned your experience at the USMCA, and that, you know, was pretty progressive for a trade agreement, to include that you know, that Indigenous clause there, but uniquely with the Arctic it's just become normalized that if you're going to do business in the Arctic, you are also going to do business with Indigenous peoples. And I think a lot of the observers have, you know, have formalized that have done that in ways that they don't do it when they're negotiating with countries in other regions to consider the Indigenous peoples and nations in those in those countries. So, it is, you know, definitely an interesting model.

Dr. DOROUGH: If I if I could just add. So I definitely accept that it is become the norm within this this specific intergovernmental entity. And just wanted to also comment that that my own view doesn't mean that we're unwilling to have dialogue with others if it's done in a straightforward, and transparent, and good faith fashion. So, I mean, obviously our membership in Greenland and their relations with the EU are significant in this realm. And so, this is not to say that I'm so rigid to indicate that no, you know, no one else, you know, we don't want to talk to anybody else. But obviously where we're engaged in a host of different initiatives in in a host of different diplomatic fora and will continue to do so. But at the same time, when it comes to recognizing the way forward in a host of different areas, that our voice has to matter. And too often we have heard about the meaningful engagement of Indigenous peoples in Arctic Council working groups. When push comes to shove, show us the beef, right? Show us how that actually is revealed in working group reports and outcomes and impacts and so forth. I think if we took a real careful and critical evaluation of conditions, there's room for improvement in terms of the place of the permanent participants within the Arctic Council. And maybe I'm just too close to it to be a little less strict about my approach to the question and the issue.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: We have only dying minutes left. So one last question and we have just literally a minute left. Assuming that you have senior regional and federal policy people listening to you right now in this session, they can wave a magic wand and get something done. What policy advice would you give them to effect positive change? Each one of you. One minute, please.

Dr. DOROUGH: Okay. I'll jump in. I think that consistent with the presentation I made, that states should take their international obligations to promote and protect Indigenous human rights in a serious fashion. That's one of the key purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We have the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Those in Canada are intimately familiar with it now in the form of Bill C-15. I think that in this regard, it should be done in every context that the recognition of and respect for our views, our perspectives, our knowledge, our status, our rights, and our role that we should be included at every table, and especially that any table covering issues related to climate change. Thanks.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Ms. Gordon?

Ms. GORDON: I completely agree with Dalee, it's to have the Indigenous voices heard and understood. And even perhaps having a cultural awareness about how we make our decisions and govern ourselves, how we have governed

ourselves for thousands and thousands of years. So I think it's very important to see our point of view and have discussions with our Indigenous leaders moving forward with this. So I think it's very, very important to have our voices heard and see our perspective.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: And finally, very briefly, Dr. Exner-Pirot.

Dr. EXNER-PIROT: I would just encourage policymakers to make policies and activists to make policies for their own communities and for their own regions and let other regions and other communities make their own climate change policies for themselves. I know we have to integrate it, but sometimes it's just too easy to tell other people what to do. You know, especially when you're coming from Southern more polluting, more, more energy intense, you know, regions. Focus on what you can do, I guess, in your own community instead of telling others what to do.

Mr. GARNONS-WILLIAMS: Thank you all. Ms. Gordon, Dr. Exner-Pirot, Dr. Sambo-Dorough, thank you so much. It's been a privilege and honor to be with you on this panel. Thank you. And I turn it over to Stephen, for our master of ceremonies.

Mr. PETRAS: Thank you, Wayne, Dalee, Heather and Kitty. That was a fabulously informative explanation of Indigenous leadership in facing and addressing climate change in the Arctic. We have much to appreciate of Indigenous knowledge and we need to utilize it. Now it's time, by the way, to conclude, and our concluding remarks will be provided by our Canadian national director, Chios Carmody, Associate Professor of Law at the University of Western Ontario Faculty of Law, a noted expert in legal issues concerning climate change. Chi, floor's yours.

DR. CHIOS CARMODY: Thanks very much, Steve. For those of you I haven't met, I'm Chi Carmody, and I'm the Canadian National Director of the Canada-U.S. Law Institute. I teach at the University of Western Ontario Faculty of Law, one of the two partner schools in the administration of this institute. I've been attending these annual conferences since 2000, and the subject this year promises, and I think has promised, to be one of the more immediately compelling ones. I've been asked to provide some closing remarks, and I'm happy to do so here.

I think the Arctic region is a unique area among the Earth's ecosystems. The cultures in the region and the Arctic Indigenous peoples have adapted to its cold and extreme conditions, and its fauna and flora are unique. To begin with, this morning we heard from Michael Sfraga, who reminded us that it is hard to grasp the scale and scope of the Arctic. He referred to the seven Cs, climate change being preeminent among them, but also commodities, commerce, connectivity, communities, cooperation and competition. For him, climate change is the principal driver. And his voice was added to by Hugo Eicken, who added that the Arctic is a disrupter and a provider, and it's this first aspect-disruption-that's key and new. The Arctic provides services and benefits which are now being disrupted, and these disruptions are much more profound in the Arctic than almost anywhere else on Earth. The changes are challenging much infrastructure and they promise greater instability in times to come. Marcel Babin followed up that estimate by

adding how the Arctic is a sentinel, a kind of canary in the coal mine, if you will. Now, if this forecast that we have to start the day off was a little pessimistic, there was also the geopolitical aspect of the Arctic. Is the Arctic indeed a flash point? And our panelists in panel number two appeared on the whole, not to think so. Dr. Michael Byers spoke of a tradition of working together, the way that there is this remarkable tendency to try to cooperate and not to conflict with each other. Rear Admiral La-Cour Andersen was prepared to recognize that antagonists or potential antagonists like Russians or Russia might use their Arctic resources in a defensive manner, but could potentially go beyond that, and added that there is the possibility of China developing into a near-Arctic state. However, he also suggested that NATO should be in the forefront of these developments by focusing more attention on the Arctic. He observed, And I think that it's important to appreciate what he had to say to us because his experience is long. And he noted that all countries are strengthening their military capabilities in the region and that this is not necessarily unique, what countries like Russia and China are doing is not unique. So, operations in the Arctic are massively more challenging. And in, I think a memorable quote, he had to say that the Arctic is not the Wild West, and we have to realize that there are rules that apply to operations in the Arctic. Jonathan Quinn also said that the Arctic is at an inflection point. There's a demand for assistance in the future by its people that will grow. And this may take many different forms. But he said that a top priority is a layered approach to defense in the far north and reduce reliance on fossil fuels. At the same time, he reminded us that the Arctic is not an emerging geopolitical flashpoint. It's instead a set of slow burn that's gradually intensifying. He also suggested that you just can't look at the headlines. There are long-term unintended consequences of what is happening in the Arctic; for example, in the changing nuclear configuration among powers that are arranged around the Arctic Sea. And all of this, I think, was neatly wrapped up and summarized by my U.S. counterpart, Steve Petras, who pointed out that all we can do is keep our eyes open and our fingers crossed. Now, later in the morning, our Canadian Distinguished Lecture by Peter Mackay recalled his past and personal connections with Canada's north. He mentioned that the people of the north should not be overlooked in all of these discussions about both the scientific and the military importance of the north. Northern expectations of governments in the South are low. But Peter exhorted us to see the north not as an obligation, but as an opportunity. There should be greater commitment to fight climate change. There should be a commitment to improve telehealth health and tell a mental health a need for high-speed internet and efforts to facilitate Indigenous Canadians in employment and entrepreneurship. Now, subsequent to that, as those of you who attended the conference today will know, our US Distinguished Lecture by coordinator James DeHart spoke both of positive changes in terms of sustainable economic development, improved infrastructure, communications, and improvements to people's livelihoods in the North. But also the fact that there's a lot to preserve in the region, and that the region is one of piece of fairly stable ecosystems, at least stable until now, and a zone of cooperation where countries have come together over issues like safety, pollution response, and scientific cooperation. But Mr. DeHart was also clear that there will be in the future more



tourism in the region and more energy exploitation. And inevitably out of this we're going to see more problems. So how can these problems be resolved or managed? And what Coordinator DeHart suggested to us was possibly a reference to President Biden's recently enunciated strategic themes of upholding international law, the revitalization of alliances, and connecting foreign policy to domestic policy. He pointed out that the North is not terminal. Yes, rules exist, and strong governance already prevails based largely on the law of the sea. There are strong institutions like the Arctic Council, the premier institution in the field. This framework includes representatives from Indigenous people. Although I think as we saw at the end of our comments today, perhaps those voices should be amplified and made more directly representative and responsive to the Indigenous concerns of the people in that region. The second possible option for work in the field, he suggested, is the revitalization of alliances and the need to deter adventurism through NATO and NORAD, to work to prevent mishaps. Close coordination with the U.S. and its allies and continuing discussion in the form of an Arctic dialogue. He also pointed to the need for foreign policy to be linked to domestic renewal and that there are right kinds of investments that need to be made and the need to pursue a green energy. And he suggested that we should, in some sense, be watching this space that at the Reykjavik meeting of the Arctic Council Foreign Ministers, in a month's time, there will be a very important, a momentous handover of a presidency. And countries at that point will have to decide whether or not they want to continue sharing a dialogue based on peace or whether there is something else. Now, I thought his comments were interesting to contrast, particularly with those of Ambassador Rosemary McCarney. McCarney pointed out, I think very astutely and shrewdly, that the Arctic, at least from a southern perspective, is often seen through more of a telescope than a microscope. The reality is that, at least from a Canadian perspective, there has been a lot of treaty making that's been going on with Indigenous peoples in Canada's far north, and there's a multi-jurisdictional aspect to Canada's sovereignty in the far north that is not always understood by those who are dealing with Canada from the outside. Since 1999, for example as was pointed out, we have the creation of an experiment in self-determination domestically in the form of the Nunavut territory. And we also have some very interesting developments now in self-determination in other forms, for example, in the form of Indigenous marine stewardship. Ambassador McCarney was quite clear that, you know, to the people who live in these regions, the North isn't dark, it's not dangerous, it's not cold. And that security means different things to different people. She also pointed out that there's a little bit of a disconnect here because everyone that is every major country that's involved in the Arctic region is starting to issue an Arctic policy. They're not all the same, and there are gaps, and these are going to have to be worked out and reconciled. And one wonders, in listening to her comments, how to reconcile her comments with those of some of Mr. DeHart in thinking about developments that have been taking place and are about to take place in Canada. There was some reference to the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, which is now about to be incorporated in Canadian law in the form of Bill C-15 before Parliament. And when one does have to wonder and as I sat in the audience, I wondered what is the

US equivalent of that? I didn't hear any response to that question, but I thought that our last panel on Indigenous leadership, on climate change in the Arctic touched on some very, very important points. Dalee Sambo-Dorough, Heather Pirot and Kitty Gordon pointed out the way that the Arctic is a vast space, a place of encounter, and a homeland, a real homeland for those who are there and to have pride of place and I think a sense of ownership in the space that they have lived in for thousands of years. It's a place of tradition and of Indigenous peoples and for the time being, a place of peace. So the speakers that we've heard from today and many of the interventions left a lot of food for thought now and for future conferences. In closing, I'd like to thank all of our sponsors, particularly our lead sponsor, DLA Piper, and Cleveland-Cliffs, Barudan America, Charles Schwab, Formica, the Consulate General of Canada in Toronto, Taft LLP, the Office of the Province of Quebec in Chicago, and the Burke Center on Environmental Law. I'd also like to thank my fellow institute co-directors, Steve Petras, and especially the institute's indefatigable managing director, Ted Parran. Both Ted and Steve have worked very hard over the last few months to put this conference together, and they continue to do so with great efficiency, imagination and verve. Now, at this point in pre-pandemic times, those of us who are sort of left in the room would retire to Angelo's Nido Italiano restaurant in Cleveland's Mayfield Road, a Little Italy district, for a delicious Italian meal, multiple courses washed down with plenty of [inaudible] refreshments. Now, that's not going to happen this year, but we hope that it will happen next year. And we hope that you'll be able to accompany us on that on that fateful trip. So thank you, everybody. Merci beaucoup. Stay safe. And we look forward to seeing you next year. Thursday, Friday, April 21st and 22nd, 2022, in Cleveland for the 46th annual conference. And without any further ado, I'd like to turn the microphone over to Steve.

Mr. PETRAS: Thank you, Chi. You have given us a very thorough summary and a lot to think about. We've learned a lot today about the Arctic, and everyone here leaves with more knowledge of the Arctic as a precious place, along with the challenges it needs to face. We have a lot to care about with respect to the Arctic. I'd like to thank all the moderators and all the panelists for an outstanding, outstanding conference, absolutely superb. And for our keynote speakers. I also like to thank our executive committee for their good work and of course, our sponsors. That guy was kind enough to name and acknowledge. Anyway, one other thing I want to do is I want to say that special thanks. Go to Ted Parran, our managing director, as well as Eric Seiler and Martin Rask, our technical experts. They're the ones who made this technological conference proceed flawlessly, as best as I can determine. So thank you, Eric, and thank you, Martin. And, of course, thank you, Ted. Finally, for those of you who want CLE credits, Continuing Legal Education Credits, I'm now going to turn the program over to Eric Seiler, who will provide us with the CLE credit code for this conference. As Chi said, we very much look forward to seeing you next year. We hope you stay involved. We're always welcome to new ideas and new faces. So thank you very much. And the conference is now adjourned. Eric, it's over to you.