Sustaining the Arctic:
How the concept of sustainability is formulated by the EU and the Finnish Sámi community

Master Thesis in European Studies
The Faculty Of Social Science, Aalborg University – December 2016

Birgitte Bjerge Poulsen
Master Student at European Studies specialized in Arctic Studies

Supervisor
Lill Rastad Bjørst, Associate Professor

AD NYE VEJE
AALBORG UNIVERSITET

Preface

This research is an expansion of a previous research, facilitated during an internship at the Danish embassy in Finland from January to July 2016. The previous research was titled: *Arctic Development: Business opportunities and Indigenous peoples' rights (Poulsen 2016).* Interesting new sources of data and problems came to my awareness during the process, which has then later served as the initiators for this research, my Master's thesis.

Partners, interlocutors and stakeholders from the previous research has been contributing with several important points of view which has been indispensable for this thesis.

By the termination of my thesis, the research will be distributed to institutions and organisations who are dealing with Sámi issues, European politics, Arctic politics and Arctic challenges. It is the aim that these activities will contribute to the advocacy towards the topic, and might serve as inspiration for further research.

A Special Thanks to participants, counsellors and interlocutors:

Lill Rastad Bjørst, Aalborg University

Aleksi Härkönen, Ambassador of Arctic affairs in Finland

Pentti Pieski, Finnish City-Sámi Chairman

Tiina Sanila-Aikio, President of the Finnish Sámi parliament

Sámediggi, the Finnish Sámi Parliament

The Arctic House, Aalborg

The Royal Danish embassy in Finland d

1. Introduction, the discourses related to sustainability formulations

Sustainability has turned into a buzzword, and is used in a variety of contexts, spanning from agriculture, fashion, transport and policies, just to name a few. In 1987, the United Nations (UN) published the report *Our Common Future,* also known as the Brundtland report *(Brundtland et al. 1987).* The Brundtland Commission described sustainable development as

"Sustainable development meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs" (Brundtland et al. 1987, 8)

With this definition, the aim was to formulate a concept of sustainability which supported economic and social growth, especially for those with low living standards, while ensuring protection of the environment and natural resources (Bärlund n.d.). This definition sets an inter-generational timeframe, which challenged short term planning. In the report it was argued that there are three components of sustainability which are interdependent and interlinked. Firstly "*we"* need to ensure environmental sustainability, understood as the ability to maintain the resources of the earth as a life support system. Secondly, "*we"* need to have economic sustainability, which is understood as maintaining a financial system which provides equal and fair standards of living for this and future generations. Lastly "*we"* need to secure social sustainability, understood as the ability to maintain communities which foster equal participation and treatment of all stakeholders (Brundtland et al. 1987). However, questions arise concerning the constant use of *"our"* and *"we",* as it is challenging to understand from whose perspective this is meant. It could be the entire world, the western world, the experts or an entirely different group.

In 2008 the OECD report "*Sustainable Development, linking economy, society, environment"* was published, in which sustainability is defined as being about integration between levels and systems

"Developing in a way that benefits the widest possible range of sectors, across borders and between generations" (Tracey and Anne 2008, 24).

This definition is very much in line with the definition of the Brundtland report, as the formulation seeks to look at sustainability from a wide and deep perspective.

In September 2015 the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) adopted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The aim of the SDGs was to provide the Millennium Development Goals with a sustainability agenda, and thereby, according to the UN, addressing the root causes of global issues and challenges,

"All 17 Sustainable Development Goals are connected to UNDP's Strategic Plan focus areas: sustainable development, democratic governance and peacebuilding, and climate and disaster resilience" (Sachs 2012).

Within the SDGs there is a promise of including even the most marginalized people within the plans of ensuring sustainable development. Meaning that environmental, social and economic systems are understood as systems which work in complementary ways, and therefore when formulating sustainability one must have this same interdependent perspective (ibid.). Adding these together with the inter-generational perspective from the Brundtland report, sustainability according to the UN is a continuing, interdisciplinary process, where adaptive management and integrated politics is highly necessary.

In the European Union (EU) one formulation of sustainability is to be found in the report *Sustainable development in the European Union (2015)*:
"Sustainable development policy aims to achieve a continuous improvement in citizens' quality of life and wellbeing. This involves the pursuit of economic progress while safeguarding the natural environment and promoting social justice." (European Union. Eurostat 2015, 8).
The report and its formulation of sustainability was developed to be a strategic tool which can ensure development within the EU by continuously improving the quality of life, regionally and globally (European Union. Eurostat 2015). In addition to this, the monitoring report is published every two years, and it is based on several indicators formulated by the EU, which serves as an assessment to calculate whether Europe is moving towards a more sustainable future (ibid.). Thus, through this EU perspective, sustainability is linked to measuring development.
What can be seen through the above formulations is that several stakeholders, has been making formulations about sustainability for some years. These formulations has, through the years, made their way into Arctic matters, integrated in strategies, policies and action plans.

Parallel to this or maybe because of this, the indigenous people living in the Arctic has been working with their own formulations. In a report which was developed in Norway by Association of World Reindeer Herders (WRH) in Arctic Council, Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) in 2013, it is stated that
"A deep understanding of and insights into the sustainability and resilience of reindeer herders' societies' is often embedded in their knowledge, languages and traditions." (EALÁT 2013, 9).
Through this, we gain an understanding of sustainability from the indigenous peoples' point of view, that external actors and stakeholders cannot bring sustainability from the outside and in, as concepts of sustainability is a formulation and a process which is embedded within the indigenous people who live within the Arctic area. Thus, the discourses in the various formulations are

subjective and contextual, according to who is formulating them and the setting in which it is used. Foucault (2008) argues that no knowledge, and formulations of knowledge, is objective or value-free, and that there are clear lines between knowledge and power, which is therefore an important factor to take into consideration when analysing the formulations of sustainability.

Sustainability is used as a concept, a goal and a criteria according to the stakeholder and the context in which it is used. Experts, politicians and stakeholders formulate sustainability, however, in most cases they all fail to explain what it is that they wish to sustain. This is highlighted through the above mentioned examples where institutions and organizations formulate sustainability according to their own specific goal and agenda. Moreover, sustainability is utilized, used and understood in many different ways according to sender and receiver. Therefore it is the aim of this research to analyse who formulates the criteria of sustainability, and how those formulations are used. How sustainability in the Arctic is formulated by the EU, and whether their formulation becomes a concept, a tool, a goal or a method. Moreover, it is the aim to understand how sustainability is formulated by indigenous people who are living in the Arctic, narrowing the field of study to Sámi people in Lapland, and their view on sustainability. In addition to this, it is the aim of to investigate if the discourses in sustainability formulations are conflicting, and why such conflicting interpretations happen.

2. Problem formulation

2.1 Problem formulation

How is the concept of sustainability formulated by the EU and indigenous people in Finnish Lapland? How is sustainability discursively constructed by the actors, and what is their agenda?

2.2 Subsets

European Policy for the Arctic: Enhancing the Arctic profile

1. The fundamental interest of survival:

Hypothesis: The EU is promoting sustainability as a tool in a security strategy.

By exercising power through the Arctic region, to maintain security, and in order to remain a hegemon in the area.

2. The European dream of Arctic partnerships

Hypothesis: The EU sees the world as interdependent, and thus strive for cooperation, international trade and common markets.

Therefore sustainability is promoted as a way to ensure partnership and interdependence.

Finnish Sámi people: The first to arrive and the last to leave

1. The pawn in a postcolonial sovereignty game

Hypothesis: Sámi communities are promoting sustainability as a pawn in a game play to obtain independence.

The concept is used to hold and gain power within a sovereignty game.

2. A key to Sámi identity and cultural survival

Hypothesis: Sámi communities are promoting sustainability in order be able to claim identity and self-images.

3. Methodology

3.1 Abstract

This project consists of six chapters. Chapter one consists of the introduction to the topic, and reflections on the historical formulations of sustainability and the discourses in these. This leads to the problem formulation and subsets, which are found in chapter two. Chapter three consists of the methodology which has been used for the research. The methodology for this research has been to conduct a case study, based on hypotheses which have been formulated based on the theoretical framework. In addition to this, the methodological chapter also holds reflections on the limitations which have occurred during the research. Some limitations are of a practical nature, such as time and resources available, while other limitations encountered have been of scientific nature, such as subjectivity and ensuring validity of the project. Lastly, chapter three holds an explanation of the data collection for the research. The data comes from various sources, and counts articles, interviews, reports, press material and policies. Chapter four contains the theoretical framework. The theoretical framework includes several theories, such as theories of international relations, theories specifically concerned with Arctic and Nordic matters, and theories of discourse analysis. Moreover, chapter four contains reflections upon those theories which were also considered for the analysis, but were deselected due to different reasons. Chapter five consists of the analysis. The analysis is initiated with chapter 5.1, which holds a summary of, and reflection upon, the European Policy for the Arctic. Within this chapter, the points of the policy which calls for attention, reflection or analysis are highlighted and discussed. It is concluded that the policy has the expected features, however, it also lacks important points, such as specific action plans and security considerations. Following chapter 5.1, is chapter 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 which each consists of an analysis of the European Policy for the Arctic, based upon the theoretical framework. Chapter 5.1.1 consists of an analysis based on a realist hypothesis, by focusing on how the EU is using sustainability as part of a security and survival agenda. Chapter 5.1.2 holds an analysis based on a liberal hypothesis, and through this focus is on how the EU is promoting sustainability as part of their agenda to normalize and argue their own role in the Arctic based on the aim for interdependence. Chapter 5.2 consists of historical, cultural and political background of the indigenous Sami people in Finnish Lapland. Within this chapter some of the obstacles which the communities have been facing, are described and reflected upon, because the history of Sami communities has an impact on the current issues. Following chapter six, are chapters 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, which holds the analysis of how Sámi

communities formulate sustainability. Chapter 5.2.1 consists of an analysis based on a postcolonial hypothesis. Within this, it is argued that Sami representatives are using sustainability to gain power within a sovereignty game. Chapter 5.2.2 consists of an analysis based on the identity hypothesis, which argues that Sami communities are promoting a sustainability discourse through which sustainability is viewed as being part of the local identity and thus cannot be achieved by outsiders. Based on the findings in the hypotheses and analysis throughout chapter five, a discussion and conclusion is made in chapter six. The conclusion is that there are discrepancies between how the EU formulates sustainability, and how Sámi people formulate sustainability, and that the discourses which are promoted by the EU and Sámi people shows that each of these actors has the agenda of ensuring increased level of power for themselves. Lastly, the research is finalized with a perspective, which considers what the outcome would have been if other theoretical or methodological choices were made.

3.2 Methodology

The aim of this project is to explore the formulations and discourses of sustainability in an Arctic context. It is the objective to investigate how sustainability is formulated in the EU, through policies and strategies, and by Sámi communities, through speeches and strategies, and how the these formulations might be conflicting. Within this objective, there are subset aims, which will serve as guides towards answering the problem formulation. The aim within the subsets is to study formulations and perceptions of sustainability, and how they are used.

The objective will be fulfilled by conducting an analysis of EU's Arctic policy, by focusing on how sustainability is formulated, and by analysing how Sámi communities formulate sustainability. The approach will be to focus on sustainability as a political concept, and through this gain knowledge of how sustainability is conceptualized by the stakeholders, how the formulations respond to the political agendas and whether there are strategical considerations behind the formulations. Through representative case studies, together with valid documents, it is possible to narrow down the focus of the analysis, thus making it possible to reach a conclusion which includes different aspects and perspectives, all together serving as tools to answering the research question.

The method of the research is a case study, with which *the aim is to study a specific instance in depth* (Blatter 2012). According to Blatter (2012) the use of case study is suitable when the researcher wants to engage heavily in an in-depth analysis and discourse analysis, which is the case with this research. Despite that there is no consensus concerning the characteristics of a case study, it is agreed that it involves engaging in a context and/or path dependent entity (Blatter 2012). This

specific case study will be focusing on sustainability formulations made by the EU and Sámi communities in Finnish Lapland. Therefore it is not the aim of this research to generate generalizations which can serve as static answers, or copied for other settings. Rather the aim is, as described by Blatter (2012), to highlight how this current issue can be analysed and interpreted,

"The quality of a case study, thus, does not depend on providing detailed evidence for every step of a causal chain; rather, it depends on a skillful use of empirical evidence for making a convincing argument within a scholarly discourse that consists of competing or complementary theories." (Blatter 2012, 7)

The choice of theories within this research comes from various areas, and includes theories of International Relations, Postcolonial studies and Identity theories. Throughout the research, a discourse analysis will be conducted. Discourse analysis is a cluster of methods which enables studying language and how it is used (Potter 2012).

"Some of these methods study language use with a particular interest in its coherence over sentences or turns, its role in constructing the world, and its relationship to context." (Potter 2012, 2).

This analysis is an attempt to identify how the discursive formulations of sustainability causes conflicts between the EU and Sámi communities. Based on the theoretical framework, hypotheses were constructed. According to Davis (2012) the purpose of using hypotheses, in a qualitative research, is to understand and explain the multiple realities and in this case the complex nature of sustainability formulations. In addition to this, Davis (2012) states that when engaging in the use of hypotheses, the researcher is able to view behaviour or opinions according to other behaviour or opinions. With hypotheses variable conclusions are discovered and re-defined during the analysis, and knowledge is understood as being relative, rather than absolute (Davis 2012). The hypotheses will be used for engaging in a comparative analysis between the hypotheses,

"Comparison can take place between different entities, such as individuals, interviews, statements, settings, themes, groups, and cases, or at different points in time." (Mills 2012, 2).

The aim is to analyse the similarities or differences between the findings within the hypotheses. This method means that one propose a hypothesis based on the theory, and then work from the theory towards a more specific reasoning to the research question. The hypothesis is then tested systematically through data.

3.3 Limitations

There have been limitations due to different languages, and cultural backgrounds. The research has been conducted within a setting, in a country and based on a culture which at the time was unfamiliar to the researcher. During the collection of data there have been limitations in the availability of data, due to an amount of data and articles are in languages which are unknown by the researcher, and therefore making it unavailable. Moreover, the findings and the discussions which have been facilitated through the interviews are limited due to having been carried out in a second- or for some even third language. Some information may have been 'lost in translation'. The sample size of the project serves as a limitation, due to interviews being carried out with just a few people who serve as representatives. Moreover, this approach creates a level of subjectivity within the project. However, due to the method of data collection and the use of validated sources, the strategy of using a small sample size have been evaluated as being reasonable, and it still serves as a representative study, thus, despite that the sample size might be small, the conclusion is valid and representative since the data comes from reliable sources. Some of the limitation within this research are of practical nature. The project is carried out within a short time frame, and with limited resources available. However, a timeframe also serves as a deadline and thus it has been the aim to use this limited time frame as a strength more than a limitation.

3.4 Data

The data which has been used for the study comes from various sources, and counts articles, briefings, interviews, speeches, reports, blogs and press releases. The Arctic policy of the European Union, together with other policies published by the EU has been used. Moreover, articles published by news agencies and non-government organizations has served as sources of data. The credibility of the data is evaluated as very high due to *the credibility of the publishing institutions* (Bryman 2016). Inevitably some of the data will have biased opinions, as strategies, policies and articles might reflect the opinions of the institutions which has served as publishers. Due to this, it has been the aim, throughout the research, to reflect critically on the collected data and how it is used. In addition to this, the use of data from a variety, and sometimes conflicting, sources makes the overall reliability of the analysis and conclusion high (Bryman 2016). The documents will be used for conducting document and content analysis, this will assure a systematic and methodologic approach,

"At its simplest, content analysis concentrates on word and phrase counts as well as numerical measures of textual expression.." (Prior 2012, 2).

Within any research it can be a struggle to decide when collected data is sufficient to fulfill the goal of the study. This study includes various sources, such as interviews and policies, but references are also made to private blogs and articles which are not peer-reviewed. Therefore it is necessary to highlight that critique must be maintained towards the sources of data, however, due to the ongoing use of data which comes from sources with high validity, the credibility of the study, as well as the findings, are maintained.

The interviews have been facilitated by conducting conversational interviews and observations. Conversational interview is a method which engages the interviewer in informal, casual conversations with the participants, without using structured interview guides (Roulston 2012). Only brief and unstructured notes are taken, and the notes later serves as guidelines which the interviewer can use to recall the experiences and knowledge which has been obtained (ibid.). Roulston (2012) states that it is beneficial to use this interview method, when research is being done within a field where little literature or data exists. While carrying out a conversational interview, the researcher takes part in what can appear like an everyday conversation, and at times these will occur on the fly (ibid.). The interviews can be done without scheduling and without any formal setting being present, and therefore participants might be more open towards sharing their personal perspectives and speaking more freely than if the interview was carried out according to a formal structure (Roulston 2012). This is also one of the reasons why conversational interviews can be beneficial to use, as the anarchist structure enables the participants to see the interview as part of a normal conversation. For the participants, as well as the interviewer, conversational interviews means low pressure, and the gathering of data is based upon mutual relations, and therefore serves as a great tool to gain a thorough understanding of the participants' personal perspectives. The interviews have been conducted with Finland's ambassador of Arctic affairs, a Sámi representative, and the president of the Finnish Sámi parliament. The participants have been selected based on a Purposive method and due to their roles as stakeholders in the field. The general principle behind Purposive sampling is to:

"Think of the person or place or situation that has the largest potential for advancing your understanding and look there." (Palys 2012, 4).

A stakeholder selection is made based on an identification of those who are involved in, receiving, giving or administering the issues which are under research (Palys 2012).

Discourse analysis have been used as a method to analyse the collected data. The aim has been to engage in discourse analysis; to be able to understand how sustainability is discursively constructed by the stakeholders, what is their agenda, and how do they develop agency through this? Moreover discourse analysis has been an analytical tool which provides a point of view through which one can identify the subject positions within concepts and formulations (Potter 2012). Due to the framework of discourse analysis, the data has not been coded. Instead the data has been analysed by a constant reflexivity on 'statement events' (Keller 2012). According to Keller (2012) when using discourse as an analysis method, the researcher should decide where the focus will be, as the toolbox of discourse analysis is comprehensive. In this study the focus lies in analysing the roles of addressee and audience; those to whom the discourse is directed or received (Keller 2012, 72). In addition, it has been the aim to identify the roles of the actors; who use and produce the discourses (ibid.). Moreover, it has been an aim to analyse the subject positions which are formulated through the discourses; speaker and addressee positions (Keller 2012, 74). Lastly, the aim has been to use these questions and discoveries to reflect upon and analyse the power relations which are constructed through the discourses. These elements of power can, according to Keller (2012), be found within statement events, formalized texts (such as law, action guides and so on), within institutional processes, and within power resources (such as money, knowledge and symbols) (Keller 2012, 79). According to Keller (2012) the methods of conducting a discourse analysis is to constantly facilitate a multi-methodological process, where the researcher deals with the chosen specific focus, Keller (2012) formulates this as

"social science Discourse Analysis combines a precise analytical dissection of statement events with stages of a hermeneutically reflected and controlled interpretation" (Keller 2012, 81).

The overall aim has been to analyse how sustainability is formulated by the EU, in their Arctic policy, and formulated by Sámi communities through their representatives, and based on these findings it will be possible to answer the hypotheses, compare the findings, and formulate a conclusion.

4. Theoretical framework

4.1 Liberalism

The core idea of liberalism is that peace is possible, and that humans are rational enough to strive for this to happen (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 112). Personal liberty, the pursuit for happiness and moral freedom are essential rights in the liberalist paradigm (ibid.).

According to the liberal perspective, humans have no interest in going into war, and therefore the promotion of interdependence and collaboration is at the core of liberalists (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013), and according to this theory, the interdependent relationship between states should create peace and prevent war. Democracy is also a key factor within liberalism, as liberals argue that the spread of democracy, international trade and political cooperation will prevent countries from engaging in conflicts with one another due to their interdependency. In addition to this, it is argued in the liberal theory that democratic states would not engage in war with one another (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013).

The liberal paradigm can be divided into two dominating perspectives. The anarchic liberal view, which argues that nations coexist in a state of peace. At its core, the anarchic liberal perspective argue that the world does not need states or international organisations, as all 'we' need is free trade and that in a cosmopolitan world the resources would be equally shared (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 111–112). On the other hand one finds the hierarchical liberalists, who view nations as being in a state of peaceful super or sub-ordination. Within this perspective, it is believed that there is a need for a system which balances power, and the goal is a world government which has powers to mediate and enforce decisions (ibid.).

The liberal perspective will be used to analyse the first hypothesis concerning the Arctic policy of the EU. Specifically the paradigm and theory which is formulated by Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye. According to Keohane and Nye (1987) the politics of interdependence means that individual governments will seek to obtain benefits by engaging in international exchange. In their own revisited analysis of their previous work *Power and interdependence,* Keohane and Nye (1987) argues,

"From the perspective of the international system, the problem is how to generate and maintain a mutually beneficial pattern of cooperation in the face of competing efforts by governments (and

nongovernmental actors) to manipulate the system for their own benefit." (Keohane and Nye 1987, 730).

Thus, when trying to answer the hypothesis concerning the Arctic policy of the EU as being part of a liberal agenda, it is necessary have a focus on how interdependence is shaping the overall international society. Keohane and Nye (1987) argue that interdependence is complex and not systematic, and that a hegemon such as the EU can be necessary as a tool to establish peace (Keohane and Nye 1987). In addition to this, one could argue that the Arctic policy of the EU is an example of the use of cooperation used as the answer to the conflict which has been building up in the Arctic region. Keohane and Nye (1987) state that cooperation is one of the main objectives within peacebuilding and interdependence,

"Our discussion of complex interdependence focuses on transnational and transgovernmental as well as interstate relations, and it seeks to examine how certain patterns of political processes affect actor behavior rather than to employ a structural explanation to account for action." (Keohane and Nye 1987, 732).

In its core, the liberal perspective of Keohane and Nye (2001) place emphasis, within international relations, on economic issues and institutionalism. According to Keohane and Nye (2001) economic dependency is what shapes worldpolitics. In addition to this, the theory states that the growing interdependence between states positively shapes how cooperation grows. Keohane and Nye (2001) claims that despite the argument that states act based on their own interest, states also have an interest in the potential benefits which comes from cooperative strategies, and thus seeing this as a win-win game with relative gains for both stakeholders (Keohane and Nye 2001). Knowing that a state will strive to put their own needs before that of another state, the liberal perspective argues that faith must be put upon institutions to assure that such behaviour is avoided (ibid.). Thus, Keohane and Nye (2001) argue that institutions serve as providing the necessary mechanisms and frames which assures gains for all stakeholders of the cooperation, and thus increasing the opportunity of outcome.

4.2 Realism

Realism at its core seeks to explain the state of war which, according to realists, is the normative condition of the world and international relations (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013). Therefore, within a realist perspective, nation-states are the main actors behind any action, also known as the *reason of state* (ibid.). These reasons are either causing a state to ensure power or security for one's

territory, and this aim is at the essence of any strategy which a state will follow (ibid.). In their work *The globalization of world politics*, Baylis et. al. (2013) describes the realist reason,

"Most importantly, the state, which is identified as the key actor in international politics, must pursue power (...)" (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 92).

Therefore, as security and power maximising can never be guaranteed, war and conflict becomes a legitimate instrument, according to realism, because only through such strategy can a state ensure sovereignty and power within its territories (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013). In addition to this, realists argue that the need for survival requires states to distance themselves from universal ethic or moral standards (ibid.).

Within the realist paradigm one finds two ways of viewing the international society. Anarchic realists, who believes that nations coexist in a state of war. Hierarchical realist, who sees nations as living in state of conflict (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 92–93). The difference within these views is the perspective on hegemony. The anarchic perspective argues that each sovereign state can be their own highest authority and that the international system is multipolar, which is also likely the very reason for conflict and war (ibid.). Thus, war is normal and rational, and alliances shifts through time. On the other hand, the hierarchical perspective argues that states coexist in conflictual order or suborder. Within this perspective the international society will always have a dominant hegemon which is superior, and the smaller states rely on the hegemon (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 91–103). Hierarchical realism could be understood as a form of Darwinism, where survival of the fittests is what sets the agenda and where states strive for ultimate power (ibid.).

Realism can be divided further into key concepts: *offensive or defensive realism* (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 91–103). With an offensive realist approach, the state seeks to maximise its powers, through military activity, obtaining more territory and to always strive for growing power (ibid.). Defensive realists argue for maximizing security. Maximizing security means that a state will not necessarily strive to gain more power, instead the state would strategically posit the appropriate amount of power according to the context (ibid.).

The realist perspective will be used to analyse the second hypothesis concerning the Arctic policy of the EU. Specifically the theoretical work of Kenneth Waltz, who is a structural neorealist. Waltz claims that the anarchic logic of the international system leads states to have a self-help strategy, where security maximising is the main goal (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 96). Moreover, Waltz argue that the distribution of power should be bipolar as this will lead to stability (ibid.) According

to Kenneth Waltz (1999), the international society, and its structure, is defined by an ordering principle and by a distribution of power (ibid.). Within this theory, the state is seen as a logic actor, which will always strive to work for their own best interest by not submitting to the interest of other states (Waltz 1990, 25). Thus, the primary force behind any state's strategy is survival, Waltz (1990) argues that,

"International structure emerges from the interaction of states and then constrains them from taking certain actions while propelling them toward others" (Waltz 1990, 29).

Thus according to Waltz (1990) a state will assure their power through means of military forces and foreign interventions, and in addition to this, the relationship between states is based on lack of trust and fear of losing power to one another (Waltz 1990). Therefore, the international society and international relations are in a constant negotiation between balance of power and security dilemmas (ibid.).

In his neorealist perspective, Waltz (1979) argues that the anarchic international system has shaped the states, and that states constitutes the political system. Thus, the system is structured and shaped by the worried states who need to take action regarding security and power (ibid.). In addition to this, Waltz (1999) claims that the behaviour of a state is constituted by its means of power, and therefore behaviour will vary according to power. Cooperation and dependency should be avoided, Waltz (1999) argues, because a friend today could become an enemy tomorrow, and therefore, cooperation brings with it insecurity and questions, and the concern about who would benefit most from the partnership. These concerns are due to the overall reflections on the balance of power (Waltz 1999). Thus, the perspective of Waltz (1979) is that international cooperation is impossible due to a desire of security, power or self-help, or all of these, and states are in competition with each other to ensure their own gains will outweigh that of any other state (ibid.)

4.3 Post-imperial sovereignty games in the Nordic region

To understand the relationship and interdependence between the international society and the Arctic region it is beneficial to use a theory which has its specific focus on this. According to Adler-Nissen and P. Gad (2014), understanding this means conducting an analysis which considers Nordic foreign policy and regional dynamics, while challenging the prevailing understanding of the Nordic region as harmonious and equal. Adler-Nissen and P. Gad (2014) argue that the emphasis on Nordic exceptionality, homogeneity and peacefulness is overstated, and that it is therefore time to start studying the north based on postimperialism and postcolonialism (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 8). With the current development trends, which are happening all over the Arctic, and thus also within

Lapland, it is profitable to understand how narratives and images of the Arctic is constructed by insiders and outsiders (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 11). According to Adler-Nissen and P. Gad (2014), insiders and outsiders are constructing the understanding of the Arctic based on their own agenda, and therefore postimperial theory and postcolonial studies can give some explanation as to how the differentiating point of views are affecting development in the Arctic:

"*Postcolonialism explore, both in more abstract terms as well as in more diverse locales, how the colonized can acquire sovereignty, subjectivity or agency" (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 12)*.

Thus, by analysing the negotiation of the narratives and identities, it is the aim to gain understanding of who sets the agenda for development strategies, sustainability goals and regional dynamics.

According to Adler-Nissen and P. Gad (2014), the EU is playing a large role by negotiating political subjectivity within international politics. Moreover, it is argued that the growth of the EU is affecting regional autonomy movements all over Europe (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 10), due to EU favoring and helping to contain regional autonomy movements.

"The triangular relations between the small Nordic countries, their metropoles and the EU combine extreme disparities in terms of power and room to manoeuvre with a tendency towards the most powerful actors voluntarily limiting or redistributing their power." (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 20).

However very little focus has been given towards the regional autonomy movements in the nordic, and therefore, this point of view will become an interesting angle for this research, as there are examples to be found of Sámi groups looking for an autonomic area.

According to the postimperial theory, we need to analyse sovereignty in a new way, to understand the full picture, because our current way of understanding it as either hierarchical subordination or an external equality leads to academic blindness (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 14). Within this theory, sovereignty is a concept which is constantly negotiated, and it involves understanding the alternative types of politics together with analysing the strategies which are used by the involved players (ibid.) It is due to this, that the theory has been considered highly useful for this research, as the relationship, collaboration and negotiations which is going on between Sámi people in Lapland, the Finnish government and the EU, is multifold and it should be understood from a historical perspective, together with an IR perspective

"*We are facing a perplexing encounter between the two types of non-sovereign polities: the international organisation (EU) and self-government arrangements. Such an analysis may be undertaken in a more nuanced manner when not blinded by the either/or concept of sovereignty (...)" (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 16).*

Despite Lapland being different from the other Northern former colonies, which have been the main focus area of Adler-Nissen and P. Gad (2014), there are still similarities and interesting points of view which can be transferred from this theory and into the Lapland region, especially since the Sámi community have their own parliament and have their own right for decisionmaking, in some aspects. Moreover, like the other Northern countries with postcolonial history in the Arctic, Finland and Lapland is challenged by its goal of balancing the relationship between the metropoles, the Arctic territory and the EU. Adler-Nissen and P. Gad (2014) are describing sovereignty as a card which can be played when dealing with dependency issues or self-determination challenges. A sovereignty card can be played by both insiders and outsiders, and it can be used as an asset, a way to maintain control or a way to avoid responsibility (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 18).

4.4 Identity and self-images

According to a study on Inuit communities in Canada by Keiichi Omura (2002) self-images can be used by indigenous movements as a tool to betterment their socio-political situation (Omura 2002, 101). Omura (2002) described self-imagery as:

"Inuit manipulations of self-images can be seen as attempts to establish control over their ethnic identity against Western hegemony." (Omura 2002, 101)

According to Omura, the construction of self-images is a tool through which a cultural identity is maintained as part of a struggle for the right to a modern, self-defined identity, which plays an important part in indigenous people's movements. Omura (2002) argues that the Arctic indigenous societies have a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards the Western hegemony, and that Arctic communities are undoubtedly affected by the way they are represented in the political arena,

"The flood of Western dominant culture through mass media has changed their culture greatly" (Omura 2002, 102).

The ambivalence happens when the Arctic communities are trying to balance assimilation and integration towards the western society (Omura 2002). The indigenous communities appreciate the benefits which comes with modernity, such as modern equipment and higher living standards. On the other hand, they are facing a socio-political subordination towards the hegemon (ibid.). According to Omura (2002) the effect that this has on the indigenous communities and their

socio-political situation, is that they are facing a greater need to represent a positive self-images, for themselves, but also against their opposition, the Western hegemony. Representation and self-image can be expressed *as a concrete tool, or a cultural emblem* (Omura 2002, 104), through which the individual or the group can constitute their own self-image according to the purpose or context:
"the `emblems' which are the constituents of selfimagery are selected from a pool of `cultural traits' according to the purpose in each occasion, but these `cultural traits' selected as `emblems' lose `emblem' status and return to the ranks of ordinary `cultural traits' in other contexts." (Omura 2002, 104).

According to Gad (2016), concepts regarding states and nations are impossible to ignore, when talking about collective identity, at least in the modern world, because this facilitates a frame for defining a people. In addition to this Gad (2016) argues that any understanding of identity, should go hand in hand with an understanding of identity discourses
"a discourse proceeding from the (often implicit) premise that someone or something is identical" (Gad 2016, 16)
Within this, it is understood that identity is created continuously and contextually in relation to oneself and others, through stories and relationships. Gad (2016) formulates identity as a constant story, which must make sense in the mind of the holder, yet also be accepted by the outsiders.
"Identity narratives involving self and others play a part in constructing our individual identities." (Gad 2016, 16).
Gad (2016) explains that this means that identity is a constant relation between individual and collective understanding, which define each other, while also being in opposition to one another. However, when groups, communities or societies develops identities which formulates a "we", it is almost inevitable that disagreements will also arise. According to Gad (2016) an identity narrative is never complete, and the various stakeholders will seek to promote their own agenda and preference, thus creating clashes of *"Who 'we' are, where 'we' are going, and from where 'we' come." (Gad 2016, 17)*.
In addition to this, Gad (2016) also argues that a group can share a point of view on their common identity, whilst still disagreeing about everything else. In the end these constant negotiations of identity becomes part of a political game regarding which truth about identity is correct and can thus be used to create the future of the group.
Self-imagery and representation theory is used to analyse the hypothesis which questions whether Sámi communities are using sustainability formulations as an identity tool in political representation

to claim certain rights. Moreover, this theory is a tool used to analyse how internal and external representation can manipulate understandings and images.

4.5 Discourse analysis

"Foucauldian discourse analysis is about identifying, selecting, and using tools from those in the extensive tool box provided by Foucault's work to shape and frame the research conducted and analysis undertaken." (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008, 4).

Foucauldian discourse analysis is an approach which can be used to challenge the normative aspects of reality by exploring how knowledge is developed, who is developing it and what the agenda behind the knowledge is (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008)? In addition to this, the Foucauldian discourse analysis seeks to put emphasis on the nexus between power and knowledge, and does so by keeping in mind that no knowledge is objective or value-free and that there therefore are clear links between knowledge and power (ibid.)

"Foucault described power as a network or a web that enables certain knowledge(s) to be produced and known. Somewhat paradoxically, such power can also constrain what it is possible to know in certain situations. Thus, in Foucault's analysis, power is a productive concept; it is not simply repressive." (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008, 2)

Moreover, the Foucauldian discourse theory argues that power is more than a hierarchical concept, as power is also a product of socio-historical processes, which changes according to time, place and context. Thus, power based on knowledge can be used as a tool to present certain realities or to exclude other realities. The focus of the analysis will be on the discursive power relations. The field of discourse analysis is narrowed down into a focus on political discourse analysis. Foucault claims that power is highly abstract, and that it is a complicated, strategic situation (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008). Analysing the discursive power relations thus means to look at how power is formulated, conceptualized and executed. Power in this regard, cannot be found within a specific power hegemon, as power can spring from any place or time, and it can come in many forms and shapes (ibid.). The objective is therefore to analyse how the actors are constructing sustainability as part of establishing their power, through the way they formulate their perspective and the subjects; understanding how their power works. Moreover, how the actors are creating subjectification will be analysed through their choice of rhetoric, words and linguistics; by looking at how individuals are made into subjects, who need to submit to the given discourse and power.

Another Foucauldian tool which is used, has been to analyse how the actors are formulating discourses of resistance to power (Given 2008). Foucault argues that power is not something, which

anyone has, and therefore it cannot be studied directly. Thus, a researcher must analyse power through where it exists, which is within formulations and actions, also known as strategies. Power is found where strategies collide (ibid.). Foucault is in many ways the father of discourse analysis, however due to the nature of this research and the sources of data which has been used, it is necessary to draw on different tools from discourse analysis.

The overall idea of discourse analysis is that knowledge is constructed, and therefore does not reflect reality. Thus, truth is discursively constructed and the regimes of knowledge defines what is contextually truth or false (Potter 2012). The aim is therefore to conduct a discourse analysis and to find the structure within a regime, and within this, the argued truth or false:
"Why was this said and not that? Why these words? Where do the connotations of the words fit with different ways of talking about the world?" (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008, 3).
Originally Foucauldian discourse analysis worked based on the idea of only one regime of truth. However todays discourse analysis acknowledge that several regimes can coexist (ibid.). The objective with using discourse analysis is to process what has been said or written, the context in which it is happening, and the patterns within the statements, and to analyse the consequences of the claimed truth (Potter 2012). Moreover, discourse analysis can be used as a tool to understand how language and regimes are used to either express or resist dominance. Therefore, when using discourse analysis there are several questions which the researcher should ask during analysis of texts or during interviews:
"What rules permit certain statements to be made? What rules order these statements? What rules permit us to identify some statements as true and some as false? What rules allow for the construction of an explanatory map, model, or classificatory system for this text?" (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008, 3).

The objective is to reveal the political agenda of statements, and to find in which ways language is used to manipulate conceptualizations. Yet as Wilson (2001) argues, it is necessary to remember that it is not so much the manipulation itself, which should draw the attention of the researcher, but it is the agenda behind such manipulation which should be seen as problematic. Therefore the aim is to analyse how words and phrases are reinterpreted and used within different frameworks. Moreover, any formulation should be seen contextually and in relation to other factors. The overall objective with the political discourse analysis is thus to understand how formulations are used for specific political agendas. Discourse analysis is a way to examine how knowledge and statements sets the agenda for conceptualizing sustainability. In addition, it is a tool which helps to position the

subjects within the debate and their possibility for acting (Potter 2012). Discourse analysis will be used within the analysis of statements and quotes, as a tool to question how sustainability is used, how the addresser is using it, and exploring the agenda behind this. It will be used to gain an understanding of how sustainability is formulated, conceptualized, shaped and used by the EU and the Finnish Sámi community.

4.6 Other relevant theories

As with any social science research, the selection of theories means that other theories have been deselected (Hunt and Colander 2015). The choice of the above theories has been made due to their ability to analyse the hypotheses thoroughly and deeply. However, no theory can deliver all the answers, and thus it is necessary to briefly discuss some of the theories which might also have been relevant, however not used, due to various reasons.

One of the first theories which was examined for this research was critical theory, specifically the work of Anthony Giddens. The use of critical theory, means enabling focus on the problem statement, with a primary perspective on the conflicts. Critical theory focuses on identifying power relations and inequalities within relations. Moreover, critical theory is an approach which seeks to challenge the current world order and the capitalist modes of production (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013). Giddens is a well published researcher, most famous for his work on structures within society, and his holistic view of modernity (Giddens and Pierson 1998). The theory of modernity could set the framework for analysing how and why local communities and external stakeholder might have diverting perspectives towards sustainability concepts. Giddens' perspectives about trust in modern institutions (Giddens 1990, 27) could help shed a light as to why society has faith in expert institutions, such as the EU, when they speak of sustainability. Moreover, *The Politics of Climate Change (Giddens 2009)* could have been used for this research, as climate change and sustainability discussions are often closely linked together. Giddens (1990) claims that the Arctic has become the image of climate change; melting ice, polar bears and disappearing permafrost are some of the symbols which we see in the media when speaking about climate change (Giddens 2009). Giddens argue that political actions and interventions on a local, national and international level is necessary to adapt to climate changes (ibid.), yet despite this, Giddens states that we do not have a systematic politic towards climate change. *The Politics of Climate Change* deals with theories and arguments regarding how new policies and strategies should deal with the challenges which is a result of climate change, and according to Giddens (2009) it is not enough to stop using the car, or refrain from eating meat, it is rather about finding new ways of developing our societies.

The theories of Anthony Giddens regarding climate change could have been used for an analysis of discourses of sustainability because the theory deals with the politics which are shaped in the wake of climate change. However, one of the obstacles when using critical theory is that the perspective itself calls for a specific perspective, namely seeing things from the conflict point of view with the emphasis of the issue from those who suffer under oppression (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013). Another obstacle is that the researcher does not remain objectivity during the research (ibid.). However, this could also have served as strength when conducting a qualitative research as this recognizes that subjectivity guides everything; from the choice of topic which one studies, to formulating hypotheses, to selecting methodologies, and to interpreting data (Ratner 2002). However, it was the aim of this research to analyse the concepts of sustainability when formulated both by people and in policies, strategies and articles. The work of Anthony Giddens would be reaching towards an analysis of the manoeuvrability of the institutions more than the formulations.

Another theory which was visited and considered for this research, was semiotics. The theories of semiotics and signification could have been used to analyse the rhetorics and formulations of sustainability. By engaging in a study of semiotics, the researcher follows an approach which enables a focus on and problematization of the process of representation (Chandler 2007). Therefore when seeking to study who formulates sustainability and how the formulations are used, semiotics could serve as a helpful tool in doing so. By engaging in a content analysis of how sustainability is described and why it is described in those specific ways (ibid.). Moreover, semiotics and language studying can lead to finding the paradoxes and agendas which are also part of sustainability concepts and formulations. through the use of theories of semiotics it would have been the aim to analyse and map how the use of sustainability creates oppositions and intersections (Chandler 2007, 106). However, semiotics is a complex theory to understand and to work with, and there is only a small chance that one will find answers towards international relations issues with this theory, and therefore it was considered more profitable to look for theories from social sciences which could direct towards a similar analysis but with a different tool. In addition to this, working with semiotics calls for great knowledge of the theoretical framework, and given the time and resources which was available, it was not considered possible to use semiotics in a profitable way. Due to the deselection of semiotics, constructivism was considered as a theory which could have been used. Constructivism is a theory and a tool through which the researcher can analyse how ideas define structures and behaviour (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 162). What would have been interesting with using constructivism would have been to understand how formulations of sustainability is

organized and institutionalized in international relations, and how norms are then created (ibid.). However, a choice was made to narrow this theory down to simply using discourse analysis, which is a branch of constructivism.

It could also have been a choice to work with different perspectives of realism and liberalism. According to classical realists, power politics is part of human law and natural order (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013). Structural realism acknowledges the strive for power, yet does not see it as part of human nature (ibid.). In addition to this, realism can be divided into anarchic realist, who believes that nations coexist in a state of war and several hegemons coexisting; hierarchical realism, who sees nations as living in a state of conflict with one hegemon always as the unipolar power. Furthermore within realism one finds offensive and defensive perspectives, which defines whether a state develops policies due to power maximizing or security maximising (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013). For this research, a structural realist was chosen, as this was considered as being in line with the hypothesis. However, one could also have used a classical realist such as Hans J. Morgenthau. Morgenthau argues based on six principles; laws of society should have roots in human nature; interests are defined in terms of power; the idea of interest is the essence of politics, interests are the same no matter time and place; tensions between moral command and successful political action; ideology should not intervene with foreign policy; policy should be built upon the power of the nation (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 91–98). The limitations of Morgenthau and classical realism is that its focus is based on human nature as the source of decisions. This view calls for an analysis of policies as being observable laws of human nature and thus they would be difficult to challenge (ibid.) In addition to this, the view of power balance within classical realism means seeing nation-states as being restricted from relating and collaborating with each other, which contrasts with understanding the EU. Thus, structural realism, which takes into consideration structures and systems was considered best for finding explanations towards international relations issues and European politics.

Within the liberal perspective, one finds similar varying theories. The anarchic idealist view, who view nations as coexisting in a state of peace; the hierarchical idealist view, who view nations as being in a state of peaceful super- or subordination. The choice of theory for this research has been Keohane and Nye (1987), who are modern liberalists with a focus on institutionalism. However, one could also have chosen another predominant thinker within the liberal theory; Francis Fukuyama. Fukuyama is mainly known for his writings *The end of History and the last Man (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013, 111–121).* Within his work, Fukuyama argues that society has

reached the end and that capitalism and the free markets, which are part of a liberal democracy, is the final stage of any society and the spread of this will lead to peace (ibid.). However, despite Fukuyama being one of liberalism's grand thinkers, his theory mainly focuses on intergovernmental market cooperation, and this leaves little room for understanding the complexities which we see within the Arctic; as this consists of cultural and political oppositions, together with financial and security issues, all which are interdependent on each other. Therefore, a choice was made to use Keohane and Nye, as their perspective also consists of the arch-liberal ideas, together with tools which enables an analysis based on idealist conclusions, with concern for the complex interdependence within the international system (Baylis, Smith, and Owens 2013).

5. Analysis

5.1 European Policy for the Arctic: Enhancing the Arctic profile

In 2014, the Council and the European Parliament (EP) requested that the European Commission (EC) would develop an integrated European policy on Arctic matters. The background for this was to further enhance the European profile in the Arctic (EC 2016). This has led to the development of a proposed policy focusing on three priority areas: *1. Climate Change and Safeguarding the Arctic Environment; 2. Sustainable Development in and around the Arctic; 3. International Cooperation on Arctic Issues (EC 27. april 2016, 4)*.

High Representative Federica Mogherini explained in a press release, that the safety and sustainability of the Arctic region, not only serves the 4 million inhabitants living there, but that it is of importance to *"all of us" (EC 2016)*. Mogherini also argued in the press release that the Arctic policy underlines the commitment of the EU to "*the region, its states and its peoples"*. These rhetorical ways of referring to the development of the Arctic policy as being something which serves the global greater good, is an important discourse to note, because the choice of these words is a way through which the EU positions the Arctic region, and its people, into subjects which must be safeguarded by external powers, and preferably by the EU.

According to the EC (2016) the EU will pay special attention towards reaching their goals through research, science and innovation initiatives across all priority areas. It is also stated that the priority areas must be in line with Agenda 2030 and with the 17 Sustainable Development Goals by the United Nations of 2015 (ibid.). The overall aim, claimed by the EU, is to ensure that the Arctic is safe, stable and prosperous (EC 27. april 2016, 2). Moreover the EC (2016) states the issues and impact of climate change in the Arctic are the root of great concern, and therefore, the EC (2016) argues that the response to climate change must be to better understand the developments which are taking place in the Arctic region. Due to this the EU is a major contributor to Arctic research. In their Arctic policy it is stated that the EU has already committed EUR 40 million under the 2016-2017 work programme to Arctic-related research (EC 27. april 2016, 6).

In addition to research, the EC (2016) also aims at working on climate mitigation and adaptation strategies, by continuously working towards the objectives of the Paris agreement and limit the global average temperature increases (ibid.), together with CO2 commitments for 2030 and 2050, alongside with other major- and climate-related activities. Furthermore the EU suggests aims which protects, preserve and improve the environment in the Arctic region (EC 27. april 2016, 7). What one should find interesting in this is that despite the Policy of the Arctic just having been

formulated, and that the EU is claiming that "collaboration and partnerships should lead the way", the EU has already taken action into their own hands. Within their Arctic policy the EU is claiming which assessments are necessary in order to reach their goals. This promotes a discourse in which the EU is advocating itself as the 'saviour' of the Arctic region, holding powers which is shown through its knowledge and actions in the region. Thus, the Arctic policy becomes more of a way to legitimize their own agenda, more than an actual policy tool.

The EC (2016) claims that

"Sustainable economic development faces specific challenges in the Arctic region."(EC 27. april 2016, 8),

the reason for this is that the Arctic region is so sparsely populated, spread over a wide geographical area, and that there is lack of infrastructure (ibid.). However, in the eyes of the EC (2016) the Arctic region holds potential for economic growth because the area is rich in natural resources such as fish, minerals, oils and gas (EC 27. april 2016). One gets the impression that the potential of economic development in the Arctic region is of special interest to the EU, and this impression is supported by the continuing emphasis on sustainability as a concept which is connected to economy, business and access to resources. The EC (2016) is promoting this discourse by arguing that,

"The European part of the Arctic also has significant potential to support growth in the rest of Europe."(EC 27. april 2016, 9).

This is an example of how the EU emphasize their support to sustainable innovation and development, and arguing that doing so is for the greater good and benefit for all of Europe. The EU is also arguing that sustainable innovation should be connected to *effective access to the Single Market (EC 27. april 2016)*. According to the EC (2016) this should happen through special efforts which promote business opportunities for Arctic stakeholders. The discourse which promotes economy and business opportunities is thus further boosted, as the EC (2016) continues to argue that investment is crucial for sustainable Arctic development. This can ensure the economic development, infrastructural development, energy projects and other cross-border projects (ibid.). By promoting this discourse, the EC (2016) connects sustainability to economy and financial growth, however, leaving out both ecological and social reflections on sustainability. Even as focus shifts towards the safety and security of the maritime areas, the EC (2016) remains focused on the business and economic perspectives. According to the EC (2016) maritime safety must be obtained by using technologies and tools which can *monitor spatial and temporal developments of the maritime activities* (ibid.), and based on this, the EU should take possible measures. The EC (2016)

argues that the international society should come together to obtain more information regarding the ecosystems of the Arctic Ocean, and develop fishery policies based on this information (EC 27. april 2016, 16). Thus, as previously argued, these formulations strengthen the discourse of sustainability being linked to business and economy.

Another area which the EC (2016) links to sustainability is science and research. According to the Arctic policy, scientific research should be made through cooperation and transnational access to research infrastructure and open data resources. Moreover, the EC (2016) argues that joint research and open data resources are important for driving sustainable growth in the blue economy:
"It is estimated that making the high-quality marine data held by public bodies in the EU widely available will improve productivity by over EUR 1 billion a year (...)"(EC 27. april 2016, 16).
These claims are important because they become part of how the EU legitimize their agenda, and promote sustainability as a concept, which is linked to economic growth and business opportunities, whether it be through infrastructural development, maritime activities, natural resources or blue economy. However, the EC (2016) fails to answer how the local arctic communities and stakeholders will accept the European interpretations of sustainability, and how to ensure that one road to sustainability does not conflict with another.

According to the EC (2016) activities and development in the Arctic region should be built upon common understanding and jointly agreed solutions (ibid.). Throughout their Arctic policy, partnerships and collaboration is formulated in various ways,
"The challenges affecting the Arctic, and the solutions required to address them, require a joined-up response at regional and international level." (EC 27. april 2016, 13).
Therefore, according to the EC (2016) it is necessary to support the Arctic cross-borders foras which have been set up, and the EU continues its collaboration with such foras. The EC (2016) also empathize that the EU should collaborate with all the Arctic partners, including Canada, Russia and the United States, and participate in dialogues with Arctic indigenous people to ensure that their point of view is also heard,
"The European Commission hosts an annual dialogue meeting with representatives of Arctic indigenous peoples to exchange views and agree on areas for further cooperation, particularly in relation to business and human rights."(EC 27. april 2016, 15).
The EU is promoting itself as the host of collaboration and dialogue, and this boosts the powerful discourse, where 'the others' becomes the subjects who should submit to the agenda of the EU,

because it is for the greater good. However, due to the variety and diversity of stakeholders in the Arctic region, it is questionable whether this powerful self-claim as a 'savior', will engage the Arctic partners in enhancing their connection to the EU, or if such strong subjectification of 'the others' may just lead to disagreement and conflict.

The integrated European policy for the Arctic should serve as a guide for EU's actions in the coming years (EC 27. april 2016). The three priority areas serve as strategic guidelines on how the EU should engage itself in the Arctic (ibid.). Jørn Dohrmann, Chair of Parliament's delegation for relations with Switzerland and Norway, argues that with this Arctic policy, the EU has finally determined that the geopolitical developments in the Arctic call for a European strategy for the region (Dohrmann 2016). However, according to Dohrmann (2016) it is important to pay attention to the areas which have been left out of the policy; it is odd to see that the policy has little to say regarding the EU-Russia relations, especially in the light of the Kremlin re-arming the Arctic region. However, this may be because when it comes to the Arctic, the EU views Russia as a partner more than an enemy (ibid.). Moreover, Dohrmann (2016) argues that despite the EU mentioning collaboration with, and support of, the local indigenous people of the Arctic, the policy fails to explain how this could happen. Therefore, Dohrmann (2016) sums up by arguing that what have been left out of the policy, speaks towards the EU developing a policy which mainly ensures that all Arctic players are satisfied, so that the EU can continue its diplomatic bonds with the Arctic partners and strive to become a member of the Arctic Council, Dohrmann (2016) explained in a blog on the parliament magazine webpage that:
"Other than climate change, concrete challenges such as socioeconomic problems or Russian military activity have elegantly been left out of the text. All together this signals - to me at least - that the EU is eager to pursue its status as a fully-fledged observer in the Arctic Council."(Dohrmann 2016).

With the Arctic policy, the EU is promoting a discourse through which they are establishing their own self-perception of being a key actor concerning climate change, sustainability and Arctic development. This is promoted by the claim that the EU holds the knowledge, resources and capabilities in practically any Arctic matter; by using strong rhetorics of "sustainability", necessity and power to support their discourse, not to mention their ongoing argument of their Arctic actions being "for the greater good for all of us". In an analysis for the newspage High North News, an independent newspaper published by the High North Center at the Nord university, Andreas

Raspotnik and Adam Stępien, both authors from the Arctic institute, claimed that the EU is using the Arctic policy as a tool to establish their own credibility as an indispensable Arctic player,

"With climate change being the component of why the EU should be engaged in Arctic matters, research, science and innovation are considered the key component of how the EU aims to create regional credibility."(Raspotnik and Stępień 2016).

Based on the analysed data, together with historical knowledge of European integration and expansion, this policy should be viewed as part of a discourse through which the EU is highlighting that it will not settle by being a secondary participant in Arctic affairs. Thus, the EU remains focused on growth and economy, however well wrapped in *a traditional "sustainable development" vocabulary (Raspotnik and Stępień 2016)*.

5.1.1 Sustainability: survival and security in the Arctic

The hypothesis for this analysis was developed based on the theoretical framework of realism, and through this the aim has been to discover the discourses in the Arctic policy which deals with security and survival. Therefore the hypothesis is:

The EU is promoting sustainability as a tool in a security strategy. By exercising power through the Arctic region, to maintain security and in order to remain the hegemon in the area.

Andreas Østhagen, who takes part in the research program Security and Defence in Northern Europe (SNE), claims that one cannot discuss Arctic issues without taking security into account. According to Østhagen (2015) military activity in the Arctic is at its highest point since the cold war. In an article for the Arctic Institute in 2015, Østhagen argued that,

"Although struggle over the Arctic is not cause for grave concern, the regional relationships with Russia in the Arctic cannot be sheltered from the deterioration of the relationship between Russia and the West." (Østhagen 2015).

With this, Østhagen (2015) argues that these military developments are not due to a rising conflict over the Arctic, as much as they are results of conflicts from elsewhere in the world, spilling over and into the Arctic. There is concern among experts, regarding the continuing effect of trust deterioration together with the growth of hard security (ibid.). Moreover, due to the history between the EU and Russia it is unlikely that security considerations would not have been part of the thoughts behind an Arctic strategy. This is also an argument which can be found through the realist perspective, and the theory of Waltz, as he would argue that all actions will be based on a strategy of survival, Waltz (1979) claims,

"Internationally, the environment of states' actions, or the structure of their system, is set by the fact that some states prefer survival over other ends obtainable in the short run and act with relative efficiency to achieve that end" (Waltz 1979, 93)

Thus, according to Waltz (1999) this is because a state (in this case a state-like actor[1]) will always have one fundamental interest; survival. Thus, from a realist perspective, sustainability is closely linked to security, safety and therefore also power. The EU touches upon the issues of security maximising and foreign intervention within in their Policy for the Arctic. In addition to this, one needs to keep in mind the history of the EU and analyse the policy between the lines, because by doing so, one can thoroughly analyse the discourses which seeks to promote security and self-help as being the agenda behind the Arctic policy. The very first sentence of the policy states

"*A safe, stable, sustainable and prosperous Arctic is important not just for the region itself, but for the European Union (EU) and for the world." (EC 27. april 2016, 2)*

The discourse which is promoted through such claims is found by looking at the rhetorics which are used. A safe, stable, sustainable and prosperous Arctic is important for the world. If safety is of such great importance for the future of the entire world, it calls for reflection that when looking through the policy, the EU fails to give answers regarding, what scholars would argue being one of the biggest security topics; the EU-Russia relation (Dohrmann 2016). In addition to this, critique has been made towards the policy as it fails to deliver concrete tools as to how we ensure these goals being met (Raspotnik and Stępień 2016), which seems paradoxical when arguing that this is of such great importance to the entire world. One should view this as the EU using such strong discursive formulations to represent their Arctic policy as the only truth, claiming the EU as being the one to lead this 'rescue mission', and the policy then becomes a powerful tool which promotes the EU's own agenda within Arctic affairs, and maybe not so much a matter of the importance for the entire world, despite, the EU setting off by arguing that a safe Arctic is a topic which 'concerns the entire world'. Yet the local voices are overlooked and in some cases even kept silenced. Furthermore within the policy (2016), the EU argues that international cooperation is the way to respond to these safety issues. However, despite the Arctic Council being present to promote

[1] "The discussion of the EU's statehood has divided the academic community. At one end of a continuum, McKay (2001) and Dosenrode (2003) argue for the statehood of the EU, whereas Moravcsic (1998) at the other end denies this. In the middle, one finds, for example, Caporaso who already in 1996 called the EU an international state, or Simon Hix who considers the EU to be a full-functioning political system (1999)." (Dosenrode 2007, 180) "The EU possesses a statehood of its own. But being a state does not imply that the EU is a superpower or a superpower in the making." (Dosenrode 2007, 185)

collaboration and joint actions in the Arctic, Waltz (1979) will argue that such non-state actor would have very little influence, since the Arctic states would still strive for survival before any other objective, and thus these strategies of self-help will always be the dominant reasons behind their actions (Waltz 1979). Waltz argues that interdependence will not lead to peace and collaboration, as there will always be unequal gain and lack of trust among the collaborators. The EU would always be uncertain about the intentions of the other Arctic actors and states, and would always have to be afraid of the possible losses and dependence which would come from collaborating with other actors.

Within the Arctic policy, the EU is promoting an increased use of surveillance and monitoring in the Arctic region, a strategy which, by its nature, is closely linked to a security and safety strategy,

"*The Copernicus programme already provides for surveillance and monitoring services with satellites in polar orbits, thereby contributing to key environmental, safety and security needs." (EC 27. april 2016, 12)*.

Analysing this statement, reveals that the EU is seeking to promote a discourse which argues that safety and security in the Arctic, is a matter which can only be left to the EU to deal with. The agenda behind the statement should therefore be understood as the EU mobilising their own interest of being the one to monitor, and keep the Arctic safe. However, it is then again necessary to highlight, that reflections on who and what to keep the Arctic safe from, is in large part left out of the Arctic policy (Dohrmann 2016). This strategic choice of mobilizing specific interests, while leaving out others, is in line with what Gad and Adler-Nissen (2014) would argue is part of game play (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014), and the outsider, the EU, is seeking to establish their own role and an image of the Arctic through rhetorics of safety and peace. In their policy the EU argues that surveillance is a necessary part of safety and security in the Arctic. According to Waltz (Waltz 1999), and the realist perspective, one would conclude that the EU is promoting surveillance due to a fundamental lack of trust towards others. Moreover, according to Waltz (1979) it is not in the best interest of a state to become dependent on other states, and in addition to this in a self-help strategy security issues will always have higher importance than economic gains (Waltz 1979). Thus, from this realist perspective, self-help and independent security maximising efforts, through strategic measures such as surveillance, would be the way to create a safe Arctic, and therefore the discourse which is claimed here is that sustainability equals security.

Thus, there are links between security and sustainability when it comes to the Arctic region, and this is part of the thinking behind the Arctic policy. However, the hypothesis which claims security as

being one of the main concepts which the EU links together with sustainability is challenged. This is very much due to the emphasis which Waltz and the realist perspective puts on independence:

"*The EU will support these efforts by engaging in a strategic dialogue with Arctic stakeholders and third countries on security matters and by promoting continued rules-based governance at sea." (EC 27. april 2016, 14)*

This sets an of the example of how the EU argues against independence, as the EU claims in their policy, that cooperation and dependence is in fact part of their strategy. The EU itself does not mention security, power or territorial safety directly within their Arctic policy. However, since the discourse in this statement is that security efforts are of great importance, it is interesting to reflect upon what is mentioned within the policy, and what is not. One could claim that it is difficult to talk about Arctic affairs without keeping in mind the players at stake, and considering the EU-Russia past and present. What has been left out of the policy leaves one wondering whether the policy is more of a game play and a strategic tool (for the EU), than an actual action plan, to satisfy all the Arctic partners, to gain access to the Arctic council, and all of this is wrapped up in a digestible vocabulary, because as argued by Adler-Nissen and Gad (2014) the EU is constantly negotiating their own political subjectivity within international politics.

5.1.2 Sustainability: the European dream of Arctic partnerships

The hypothesis for this analysis was developed based on the theoretical framework of liberalism, and through this the aim has been to identify discourses in the Arctic policy which deals with interdependence through trade and common markets. Therefore the hypothesis is:

The EU sees the world as interdependent, and thus strive for cooperation, international trade and common markets, therefore sustainability is promoted as a way to ensure partnerships and interdependence.

According to Keohane and Nye (1987) a state, in this case the EU, develop strategies based on cooperation because their overall aim is to obtain economic benefits by engaging in international exchange and cooperation. Within their Policy for the Arctic, the EU (2016) claims that there is an aim to ensure multiple levels of cooperation,

"*many of the issues affecting the Arctic region that are discussed in this Joint Communication can be more effectively addressed through regional or multilateral cooperation. This is why EU engagement is important." (EC 27. april 2016, 2)*.

The dominant discourse here is that the EU is seeking to normalize its own engagement within Arctic affairs and issues by claiming that equal collaboration is an aim, and that sustainability in the Arctic is linked to cooperation, which is why the EU should be one of the players at the Arctic table. Thus, the EU is promoting *a reality* (Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine 2008) where further action in the Arctic region should only happen while engaging the EU in doing so.

Moreover, the EU argue within their policy that one priority area is *International Cooperation on Arctic Issues (EC 27. april 2016, 4)*. Looking at this from a liberal perspective, it is the objective of the EU to create interdependence and cooperation through joint activities in the Arctic, which will then lead to international peace and stability. Within this perspective, sustainability is therefore linked to cooperation and economic prosperity. Keohane and Nye (1987) describes society as being connected through multiple channels of informal ties, multinational groups, organizations and interstate relations, and this theory meets support in another statement from the Policy of the Arctic, *"The EU has a strong interest in seeing that the Arctic remains a zone of constructive international cooperation where complex issues are addressed through negotiated solutions, and where common platforms can be established in response to emerging risks." (EC 27. april 2016, 13)*.

Analysing this according to Keohane and Nye (2001), who argues that economic interdependence is one of the most important objectives of modern world politics, this point of view could be the argument behind the EU focusing on advancing international cooperation, ensuring that the Arctic region is a zone of prosperity and by engaging within various non-state groups such as the *Barents-Euro Arctic Council, the Arctic Economic Council, the Northern Dimension policy framework* and many others (EC 27. april 2016).

In their policy for the Arctic, the EU highlights that there is an aim of collaborating with all Arctic stakeholders and nations

"*The EU should cooperate with all Arctic partners, including Canada, Russia and the United States with a view to identifying further areas for cooperation, such as science and investment." (EC 27. april 2016, 15)*.

The relevance of this statement is important to highlight, due to the history and current situation between the EU and Russia, and the Kremlin re-arming (Dohrmann 2016), it is my belief that the EU is trying to promote their own agenda of Arctic partnerships through the somewhat briefly mentioning of Russia, and other partners. The action agenda and goal, which the EU is striving towards, is likely the membership of the Arctic council, which will not happen until friendship with Russia has been established (Dohrmann 2016). With a liberal perspective one could also view this

as the answer as to why the EU is willing to engage in collaboration with Arctic partners whom, historically, has not been among friends of the EU. Because according to Keohane and Nye (2011) when a state acts based on liberal perspectives, it is believed that mutual interdependence will affect former behavioural patterns and affect how states cooperate, and globalization is part of, if it is not the reason for, this increase in interdependence (ibid.). Interdependence and cooperation is thus a tool, and an integrated part of the sustainability concept, when viewing it from this liberal perspective.

In the Arctic policy, the EC (2016) is arguing that there is underinvestment in the Arctic region, and that it is up to the EU to fill this gap, as claimed by the EC,

"Consultations by the Commission and the European External Action Service suggest that the European Arctic is suffering from underinvestment. Recognising the need to work closely with national, regional and local authorities in the European Arctic, the Commission will set up a European Arctic stakeholder forum with the aim of enhancing collaboration and coordination between different EU funding programmes." (EC 27. april 2016, 11).

Thus, based on this analysis it is my argument that there is a dominant discourse within the Arctic policy, where the EU seeks to strengthen and promote an interconnectedness, and one of the tools which will be used is to set a *European Arctic stakeholder forum.* According to Keohane and Nye (2011) states are dominant actors in international relations, however there is awareness that hierarchy exists. This is also why the EU is now seeking to be the dominant driver behind Arctic collaboration, and in addition to this, be the stakeholder of the formulations of how the Arctic can be sustainable; because this can be used as an effective political instrument towards becoming the top player in the hierarchy. Adler-Nissen and Gad (2014) describes this strategy as being part of establishing positions and sub-positions (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014), because by doing so, the EU is able to promote the discourse that their knowhow is an indispensable asset for the Arctic region.

This liberal hypothesis is in large part strengthened by the high empathises which is given to international collaboration and partnerships within the Arctic policy. The discourse is detected repeatedly, and in the many different formulations within which the EU is promoting collaboration, partnership, interdependence and common forums in their Arctic policy, and it is inevitable to think that this is part of an overall mobilization of the EU's interest in becoming, if not a member, then at least an observer within the Arctic council (Haines 2015). The EU positions itself as being the one who can facilitate and promote collaboration, and this is part of an identity political discourse as the EU promotes a view on their own identity as a frontrunner within Arctic partnership, and 'the others' are subjectified as outsiders who needs the EU in order to secure the future of the Arctic.

5.2 Finnish Sámi people: The first to arrive and the last to leave

In an article by the freelance writer Andy Kruse, published on ThisIsFinland.fi by the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs tells that,

"*The Sámi were the first to arrive in Finland – perhaps when the climate cools and great sheets of ice take over the land again, they will be the last to leave." (Kruse 2012)*.

The history of Finnish Sámi communities begins 12.000 years ago, when the ice sheets covering Finland started melting (Kruse 2012). With plants and animals exposed, humans started settling in the northern region, and thus began the story of what we today know as Sámi people (ibid.). According to Kruse (2012) there is evidence of human presence in Finland dating to around 10.500 years ago, and despite living conditions being harsh and tough, these early Sámi communities adapted to the Arctic environment. Their survival was conditioned by the various sources of nutrition, such as reindeer, moose, rabbit, fish and whales, and in the warm seasons, berries, vegetables and mushrooms (Kruse 2012).

Patrik Lantto, professor at Centre for Sami Research (CeSam), argues that Sámi history and communities must be understood through the historical developments in the original Sápmi region. During the nineteenth century, the thinking within the Nordic region became influenced by ideas of cultural hierarchies, and thus relegating the Sami to a subordinate position within this structure *(Lantto 2010, 549)*.

"*The borders have changed the basis of subsistence for the Sami and partitioned cultural communities." (Lantto 2010, 554)*

The borders created new barriers for the Sámi people, who had previously enjoyed open state structures without borders for their cultural communities (ibid.). With the borders, the Sámi people were also faced with forced citizenship, and Sámi people no longer had the right to hold taxed lands on both sides of the borders. According to Lantto (2010) this became the initiating steps towards making the Sámi identity subordinate to a superior, national identity (Lantto 2010).

"The process of defining the borders between the nation states affected the ethnic community of the Sami, breaking up traditional Sami cultural areas and creating new communities oriented within the limits placed by the national borders." (Lantto 2010, 549).

However, Sámi people made it clear from the beginning of this, that they viewed identity as something very different from citizenship, and they expressed this in the Nordic Sámi council in 1971,

"*We are Sami and want to be Sami, without therefore being any more or less than other peoples in the world. We are one people, with a territory, a language, and a cultural and societal structure of our own. Through history we have found our subsistence and lived in Sa´pmi, and we own a culture that should be developed and continue existing. (Ruong 1982, pp. 257–258)" (Lantto 2010, 551)*.
Through the years, the division of the Nordic borders have been criticised because the Sámi people were not included in the negotiations on and definitions of the borders, as well as in the unilateral and bilateral decisions concerning border crossings (Lantto 2010). Lantto states that
"They were neither fully included nor excluded in the created national contexts, but rather secluded, cut off from traditionally used lands and separated from other parts of the group by national borders and enforced citizenship, thus creating boundaries within the group" (Lantto 2010, 553)

Today there are approximately 90.000 Sámi people living in the northern region (Barentsinfo 2016). The Norwegian Sámi constitute the largest group (50.000-65.000), next is Sweden (20.000), Finland (8.000) and Russia (2.000). Sámi people are recognized as indigenous people by the UN (UNric 2016). In Finland, Sámi people were recognized as indigenous people in the Finnish constitution in 1995 (UNric 2016). This recognition protects the Sámi people's' rights to maintain and develop their own languages and culture (ibid.). In addition to this, Finnish Sámi people have had constitutional self-government concerning language and culture in their homeland since 1996 (ibid.). The self-government of Finnish Sámiland is maintained by the Sámi parliament, Samediggi (Samediggi 2014). According to Samediggi (2014) the definition of being Sámi is mainly based on the Sámi language
"According to the definition, a Sámi is a person who considers him- or herself a Sámi, provided that this person has learnt Sámi as his or her first language or has at least one parent or grandparent whose first language is Sámi." (Samediggi 2014)

According to the UN (2016) land rights and language issues are top concern to the Finnish Sámi communities. Despite language rights being constitutional, not enough official services are provided in their original languages (UNric 2016). 90 percent of original Sámi land in Finland, today belongs to the Finnish government, which means that Sámi communities do not have secure land rights (ibid.). Moreover, Finland has not yet ratified the ILO Convention No. 169, which should support indigenous people's rights. Thus making land right issues even more challenging to handle. These issues have also been addressed by the United Nations Regional Information Centre (UNric):

"(...) the Sami way of life is threatened by the competing uses of land. If the government decides to cut down forests in the reindeer herding area, it destroys the pastoral areas." (UNric 2016).

President of the Finnish Sámi parliament Tiina Sanila-Aikio adds further to this concern. According to Sanila-Aikio, promotion and protection of the indigenous Sámi people should be a top issue for the international community, because lack of doing so would mean lack of fulfilling internationally determined human rights (Sanila-Aikio 2016). This was also highlighted by Sanila-Aikio when she spoke at the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNpfii) back in 2015

"We need international support, from the UN bodies and NGOs, to convince Finnish parliament to ratify ILO 169 and to respect the rights laid down in the UN's declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." (Sanila-Aikio 2015).

According to Sanila- Aikio (2016) the fact that Finland has not yet succeeded in the ratification of the ILO speaks against sustainable development. Based on these discourses, sustainable development is closely linked to a claim of rights.

The UN (2016) argues that Sámi people in Finland fear assimilation into the Finnish population, and that the assimilation processes will affect their traditional livelihoods, culture and languages (UNric 2016). According to the Finnish Ministry of foreign affairs, these assimilation processes have been going on since the 17th century, where the states of Sweden, Novgorod and Denmark began colonizing the Sámi areas, and together with this brought Christianity, taxation systems, schools and institutions (Kruse 2012). However, during the past couple of decades, Sámi people and communities have experienced a revitalization of their culture, and the fight for land rights, languages and culture has followed (ibid.)

"The language efforts have been reasonably successful, with Sámi languages now recognised as official languages in three northern municipalities of Finland.

However, land rights have proven more difficult because of counter-pressure by non-Sámi inhabitants of Lapland who fear losing their own land rights. The issue is currently unresolved in the Finnish Parliament." (Kruse 2012).

Yet, some argue that there is still much reason to be concerned. Former President of the Finnish Sámi parliament Klemetti Näkkäläjärvi spoke at the Arctic Dialogue in Brussels (2015), and highlighted that the indigenous communities in the Arctic have been living in sustainable ways and in harmony with nature throughout history, and that this way of living is now undergoing threats by outsiders coming into the area. Näkkäläjärvi (2015) argues that:

"Climate change has already aroused increased economical activity in the North and this will increase. Arctic arouses political and military interests. This will affect to indigenous people, their culture and their possibilities to utilize nature in culturally sustainable way." (Näkkäläjärvi 2015).
This statement meets support from Pentti Pieski, member of the Finnish Sámi parliament, as he argues that if one is looking to preserve the forests, the biology and the animal life of Lapland, development in the Lapland region must occur together with the Sámi, not despite of them (Pieski 2016).

5.2.1 Sustainability: a pawn in the postcolonial sovereignty game

The hypothesis for this analysis was developed based on the theoretical framework of postcolonial sovereignty games, and through this the aim has been to discover the discourses promoted by Sámi representatives which deal with sovereignty and independence. Therefore the hypothesis is:
Sámi communities promotes sustainability as a pawn in a game play to obtain independence. The concept is used to hold power within a sovereignty game.

To understand how Sámi communities formulate sustainability it is interesting to view this based on a postcolonial and post-imperial perspective. According to Adler-Nissen and Gad (2014) the idea of the Nordic region as a harmonious, peaceful and equal area is overstated, and to understand the complexity of the relationships within the Nordic region, one should view it from a post-imperial and postcolonial perspective. According to Lantto (2010) Sámi people have lost their room to manoeuvre due to the original Sápmi land (Lapland and Finnmark) being divided between states and becoming territorial sovereign areas,
"*Minorities living in regions partitioned by state borders face the challenge to find their voice and space in the political arenas of the majority in different states, while at the same time trying to maintain a cultural unity across dividing borders." (Lantto 2010, 543)*.
With this, Lantto (2010) argues that the colonization of the original Sámi land has had a great influence on the current situation of the Sámi communities, and thus, Sámi parliaments need increased autonomy, harmonization of legislations and rights (across the Nordic), constitutional protection, control/ownership of land and a joint Sámi parliament for all Sami. Lantto (2010) claims that only when this area has been ensured, some of the negative effects of the state borders and enforced citizenship can be reversed (Lantto 2010, 554). This perspective is enhanced by the post-imperial and postcolonial perspective of Adler-Nissen and Gad (2014) who argues that the dynamics between the western hegemon and the Arctic region is dominated by dependency and

unequal representation, which pressures the local communities to strive for sovereignty, subjectivity and agency (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 12).

The president of the Finnish Sámi parliament, Sanila-Aikio, argued in a speech at a UN forum that issues of rights need to be addressed to secure the future of the Arctic, she said:

"We need international support, from the UN bodies and NGOs, to convince Finnish parliament to ratify ILO 169 and to respect the rights laid down in the UN's declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Sámi Parliament pleads that the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples will do follow-up remarks on the situation in Finland." (Sanila-Aikio 2015).

The discourse which we should understand through this argument, is that according to the president of the Finnish Sámi parliament Tiina Sanila-Aikio (2016) there is a lack of political will and courage to promote the rights of Sámi people, and that when it comes to the promotion of rights of the indigenous people and political cooperation, there is reason for Sámi people to be disappointed (ibid.). The discourse is then a specific political agenda, arguing that sustainability is linked to rights and protection of the indigenous people living in the Arctic. By using a political framework to support the agenda, Sanila-Aikio is using legal references to promote the argument of Sámi rights being disadvantaged. Thus, making the issues problematic not only for Sámi people, but for the international world as international rights are being violated.

Sustainability becomes part of a debate regarding indigenism and rights, because it is argued, by Sámi communities and representatives of indigenous people, that the key to sustainability in the Arctic, lies within the indigenous people. In his speech at Arctic Dialogue, the former president of the Finnish Sámi parliament, Näkkäläjärvi 2015, said that:

"*Arctic is a home of indigenous people. Indigenous cultures are still naturally bound and live from the nature and within the nature. Nature is part of livelihoods, spiritual values, language, culture, diet and health. We have lived in sustainable way and in harmony with the nature through history. Now we have to struggle for our way of life harder than never before and even for the right to be in the Arctic, in our home. Arctic indigenous people want to live according to their cultural traditions and want to safeguard their future. Climate change and national states are making it more and more difficult." (Näkkäläjärvi 2015)*

With this statement Näkkäläjärvi claims that sustainable living and the key to a sustainable Arctic lies within the know-how of Sámi people. The regime of truth which is being used to build his argument, is that sustainability is an integrated part of how Sámi people live, and that sustainability must thus be conceptualized by Sámi communities. The statement was made during a speech at

Arctic Dialogues in Brussels (2015), and it is therefore important to keep in mind that this strong message is based on a wish to mobilize the listeners towards a point of view, and agenda, of promoting Sámi people as being 'the key' to sustainability.

Based on my study, we are now able to view the use of sustainability as part of a *game play* (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014). Sámi representatives are promoting a discursive agenda which claims that the power to maintain the Arctic region lies within the knowledge and culture of indigenous people, and if this is not maintained through special rights, the entire Arctic could be endangered. Adler-Nissen and Gad (2014) argues that sovereignty and autonomy can be used as a tool within a sovereignty game, through which the player is seeking to maintain control. The sovereignty game involves two or more players, who interact and make strategic claims concerning authority and responsibility. The sovereign states, and potential sovereign states, manoeuvre between dependence and self-determination, by using the sovereignty card in different ways throughout the game (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014, 25). Based on this, traditional identity and sustainable living should be analyzed as a tool which is used when Sámi communities are aiming towards a claim of more sovereignty, as according to Lantto (2010), which has also been seen before

"*International events and debate were also beginning to affect the Sami movement during this time (after 1945), influencing both the rhetoric and the outlook, and the term indigenous was starting to be used as a base for Sami demands for stronger land rights." (Lantto 2010, 551)*

According to Näkkäläjärvi (2015), the increasing economic activity in the North will continue, and this will affect the sustainable, indigenous communities and their possibilities to utilize nature in culturally sustainable ways. Furthermore, Lantto (2010) argues that,

"Minorities living in regions partitioned by state borders face the challenge to find their voice and space in the political arenas of the majority in different states, while at the same time trying to maintain a cultural unity across dividing borders." (Lantto 2010, 543)

Together with this, the UNric has been highlighting that legislation which has been presented in Finland within the past years do not contain the necessary safeguards for the Sámi peoples' rights to traditional livelihoods, lands, territories and resources (Tauli-Corpuz 2015). This, together with the Sámi people increasingly becoming outnumbered in their own areas, by non-indigenous populations (Näkkäläjärvi 2015), could very well be some of the reasons as to why Sámi communities are now using the concept of sustainability as a pawn in a sovereignty game.

According to Lantto (2010) borders are instruments, which can be used as a tool of power within politics, for example to mark identity, as well as to manifest a discourse (Lantto 2010, 543). The existing borders, and maybe the wish within Sámi communities of changing these borders, are therefore important perspectives for seeing the formulation of sustainability in the Arctic through the eyes of Sámi communities, because according to Lantto (2010) it is necessary to know borders as a process which can have several functions.

"The early growth of organized pan-Sami cooperation was described in 1959 by one of the leading Sami activists in Sweden, Gustav Park, as a development where 'one Sami people unconstrained by dividing state borders is on the verge of being welded together into a true national community." (Lantto 2010, 551).

Perhaps in the eyes of Sámi people the borders should serve as line between those who are truly living in a sustainable way; Sámi people, and those who are not; the modern world.

Through this we see how formulations of sustainability in some cases is conceptualized by Sámi communities to create the dividing lines between 'them and us', yet, there is not much reason to believe that this is because the Sámi community wishes to grow into a sovereign state, however, it is likely a tool used to obtain rights and representation. Moreover, arguing against this battle for sovereignty, one finds the former president of the Finnish Sámi parliament Näkkäläjärvi:

"Arctic needs governance. We need new-thinking and we need to remember our roots. I feel that biggest threat for future generations is ignorance, individualism and nationalism. The whole humankind has a common background, history and heritage." (Näkkäläjärvi 2015).

However, according to Adler-Nissen and Gad (2014) this constant game of going back and forward between the goal of sovereignty is a part of the game itself, and it can be used with the aim of avoiding responsibility, just as much as it can be used to claim rights (Adler-Nissen and Gad 2014). Discursively the strong statements, often with a sort of 'doomsday' shadow to them, which are used by Sámi representatives, have an interest of claiming that ensuring sustainability in the Arctic only can be done by or with Sámi people. By doing this, it is possible for the representatives to hold power and to claim ownership of the sustainability conceptualization.

5.2.2 Sustainability: integrated in Sámi identity and self-image

The hypothesis of this analysis was developed based on theories of identity and cultural claims, and through this the aim has been to discover the discourses promoted by Sámi representatives which deals with identity and self-images. Therefore the hypothesis is:

Sámi communities are promoting sustainability in order be able to claim identity and self-images.

Tiina Sanila-Aikio, the current president of the Finnish Sámi parliament, and indigenous skolt-Sámi, has argued in a speech at a UN Forum that the identity, traditions and indigenous ways of Sámi culture is threatened,

"*We have been derived from the right to define our identity or membership in the community in accordance with our own customs and traditions." (Sanila-Aikio 2015)*

Through this, Tiina Sanila-Aikio (2015) argues that Sámi communities are facing a hard time with defining their own identity and protecting their own traditions. The discourse which is facilitated in this strong statement, is that the forces of the 'outsiders' are threatening Sámi culture and their indigenous ways of living. This is highlighted by the use of a rhetoric which points out that there is a clear 'us' and 'them'. A Sámi community who has been deprived of rights, and outsiders who have taken those rights. The regime of truth is that Sámi people are the victims, and the outsiders are the perpetrators. The interest here is to create an argument which have the interest of supporting the Sámi people in winning back these rights.

As earlier quoted, Näkkäläjärvi (2015) argues that Sámi people are culturally and historically linked to the Arctic region. Moreover Näkkäläjärvi (2015) claims that Sámi people always have been living in sustainable ways, and that they now have to struggle to maintain these sustainable lifestyles due to the threats which have been created by the modern, western world. Therefore Näkkäläjärvi (2015) claims that safeguarding Sámi communities is a necessary step towards safeguarding the Arctic. In addition to this, as Näkkäläjärvi (2015) also argues, national states are making it difficult for Sámi communities to keep up their traditional ways of living:

"*Imagine a family that has practiced Saami reindeer herding for centuries and the meaning of their livelihoods for their traditions, identity, heritage and culture. Then imagine a last of his or her kin that is forced to stop reindeer herding or traditional livelihoods. Imagine the responsibility and the decision this young person has to do." (Näkkäläjärvi 2015)*.

Thus, the former president of the Finnish Sámi parliament claims that sustainable living and the key to a sustainable Arctic lies within the know-how of Sámi people. Gad (2016) argues that this identity narrative or storytelling about oneself is an important part of building an identity in relation to the others. Gad (2016) states that these stories, and in this regard the story of sustainable living, must first make sense in the mind of the owner, and hereafter be accepted by others, before it can become an integrated part of reality, because the narratives which involves self and others plays a part in the construction of our individual identities (Gad 2016, 16). Thus, identity is created continuously and contextually in relation to oneself and others, through stories and relationships.

Therefore, we need to take into consideration that sustainability must be viewed as part of how Sámi communities identify themselves in their daily lives. Looking at this from a perspective of construction of identity and self-images, identity becomes an important tool which can be used to ensure that a cultural belonging is maintained (Omura 2002). The discourse in the statement is set within the use of metaphoric rhetoric, which is highlighting the seriousness of the 'modern world' taking over the Arctic, this is the point of view which is promoted by Näkkäläjärvi (2015). Thus the discourse here is to argue that Sámi communities, and their identity, are victims of the western colonization and destruction. However, as with other indigenous communities, Sámi people have also enjoyed some of the privileges which come with modern living and integration with 'the others', such as snow mobiles, internet and modern health care. Therefore, Omura (2002) states that Arctic indigenous people will have a somewhat ambivalent feeling towards the modern culture which threatens this traditional and, in their eyes sustainable, identity; there is a struggle with balancing between assimilation and integration, and this puts great pressure on the present and future generations of Sámi people. On the other hand, according to Gad (2016) identity is constructed within the constant relation between individual and collective understandings, which define each other while also being in opposition to one another. Therefore, when the Sámi communities or groups develop identities which formulates a 'we', it is almost inevitable that disagreements will arise, within the groups and between the 'we' and 'the others'. Gad (2016) states that the identity narrative will never be complete, and it will be constantly develop according to context, therefore the various stakeholders within the Sámi community will seek to promote their own agenda and preference, and creating clashes of

"Who 'we' are, where 'we' are going, and from where 'we' come." (Gad 2016, 17)

However, Gad (2016) also argue that a group can share a point of view on their common identity, whilst still disagreeing about everything else. In the end these constant negotiations of identity becomes part of a political game regarding which truth about identity is correct and can thus be used to create the future of the group.

The growing fear of the 'modern world' gaining territory in the Arctic should, according to Näkkäläjärvi (2015), awake great concern, not only for Sámi communities, but maybe even globally. He argues that:

"*Climate change has already aroused increased economical activity in the North and this will increase. Arctic arouses political and military interests. This will affect to indigenous people, their culture and their possibilities to utilize nature in culturally sustainable way."* (Näkkäläjärvi 2015).

A dark future is promoted with this statement, and a discursive political agenda is facilitated through this; the discourse that it is necessary to leave the Arctic to its original communities, because the indigenous people are those who know how to behave in the Arctic in sustainable ways. According to Omura (2002), when one has the need for it, a cultural trait, in this case the key to sustainable living, can be used as a cultural emblem, and part of Sámi identity. By looking at sustainability from this perspective, it becomes a tool through which Sámi people and communities can be defended as the key to sustaining the Arctic environment and traditional cultures. However, it is also used as a tool to manipulate the debate and by doing so achieving certain goals. Moreover, the process is currently mainly happening within the Sámi communities, experts argue that it could be necessary to support the process with policies and special provisions, according to special rapporteur from the UNric, Tauli-Corpuz:

"Without specific provisions safeguarding the Sami people, the revised Act will significantly weaken the rights of the Sami people, particularly their right to enjoy their own culture and to pursue their traditional livelihoods, and will further limit any recognition of their right to lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired," (Tauli-Corpuz 2015).

Seeing this from an identity perspective, Omura (2002) would argue that identity and self-images have the potential capacity to integrate with new socio-cultural elements, and today this capacity plays an important part of new Sámi generations in their recognition and adaptation between two cultures, and with this; differentiating perceptions of sustainability in their homeland. Omura (2002) argues that indigenous people unconsciously, but flexibly, can resist the western hegemony and still also claim their own identity in everyday life (Omura 2002, 109).

According to Näkkäläjärvi (2015), the future could be looking dark for Sámi people, and he argues that discussions on the future of the Arctic should deal with microlevel-, as well as macro level impacts:

"*Whole cultures could disappear in one or few generations. The climate change cannot only be discussed by global or regional implications. We have to remember the persons, their families and future generations as well as those who will have to survive and live in the changing world." (Näkkäläjärvi 2015)*.

This quote leads me to the story which was told by the interview participant and Sámi representative, Pentti Pieski, who argued that among Sámi representatives themselves, there is a growing fear of their culture disappearing (Pieski 2016). In addition, that Sámi traditions could be

gone within just a few generations, and that Sámi people will be derived their right to determine their own identity (Sanila-Aikio 2015). Foucault argues that power comes with knowledge, but that knowledge can be created and manipulated. Based on this, we should understand that the growing fear, which is repeatedly mentioned among Sámi communities, is partly one which is based on the very re-construction of fear itself, and thus promoting a discourse of a community facing a threat, which may not even exist, or at least maybe not to the extent which it is emphasized. Gad (2016) states that any understanding of identity, should go hand in hand with an understanding of an identity discourse:

"a discourse proceeding from the (often implicit) premise that someone or something is identical" (Gad 2016, 16)

Therefore, there is an ongoing promotion of the claim that sustainability is a part of Sámi culture, and a claim that the key to a sustainable Arctic is integrated in Sámi identity, thus shaping the line between 'us' and 'them'. By using language and identity, through language and identity discourses, sustainability becomes formulated and conceptualized into a political identity agenda.

6. Discussion, Conclusion & Post-research reflections

6.1 Discussion: Agreeing to disagree

Based on the chapters above, it is clear that there are various ways of formulating, conceptualizing and using sustainability, and that it mostly comes down to stakeholder and context. Therefore it may be that the actors, the EU and the Sámi people, in the end has to agree to disagree and then work their way forward from there.

There are cases, in the Arctic policy of the EU, where sustainability is formulated as a tool, which can be used within projects and actions, for example when the EU argues that development should be handled in 'a sustainable way' (EC 27. april 2016, 10). In addition to this, there are examples of the EU promoting sustainability as a goal. One example being the reference to the 17 sustainable development goals, which, by nature, are goals believed to be completed at some point. On the other hand, the EU also refers to sustainability as a method, which only the EU can facilitate, an example of this is that the EU continuously positions themselves as an indispensable Arctic actor.

According to chapter 5.1.1 the EU is promoting sustainability as a tool in a security strategy. What speaks as a confirmation of this, is that within the Arctic policy the EU argues that a safe, sustainable and prosperous Arctic is of both global and European importance. By promoting this discourse, the EU is claiming ownership of the global perspective, and thus leaving the local perspective to the Sámi communities. The EU thus promotes a discourse through which they claim that global protection should be in the hands of the EU. The idea that sustainability is integrated into security and safety was supported by a realist perspective, through which one could claim that states, or state-like actors, will always strive for security and survival above all. However, as the realist perspective argue that states bases their strategies on a fundamental lack of trust, the hypothesis is challenged since the EU, in their Arctic policy, is emphasizing collaboration, unity, dialogue and partnership. When analysing sustainability based on the realism and security perspective, sustainability becomes a tool which is used to achieve influence by the power of the EU and maintained through a European approach to security. Sustainability in this regard is conceptualized through surveillance and security maximising, and it is argued that the EU should lead this process, for the sake of global security.

In chapter 5.1.2 the EU's formulations of sustainability was linked to a European agenda striving for international trade, cooperation and common markets. Numerous times throughout their Arctic policy the EU claims that efforts in the Arctic region should be dealt with through regional and

multilateral cooperation. This argues for the confirmation of this hypothesis, because within their Arctic policy, the EU continually argues for collaboration and international cooperation, and the EU sees the issues of the Arctic as something which should be handled through international partnerships and interdependence. This meets support from a liberal perspective, which argues that states, or state-like actors, will strive for interdependence, cooperation and joint activities, because this is the way to reach the overall aim; open markets which leads to peace. However, this hypothesis is also challenged due to the current situation in the Arctic region, as one cannot ignore the current security issues. The problem is thus, as once claimed by the authors Goldthau and Sitter (2015), that despite the EU being a liberal actor with liberal values, it needs to deal with a realist world and realist agendas. When linking sustainability to interdependence and international cooperation, sustainability becomes a goal which the international society should strive to achieve by working together. However, it is important to note, that in most cases when mentioning sustainability, the EU puts itself forward as being the expert, or the necessary driving force, who alone can assure sustainable ways of working, or goals to be achieved.

The study shows that the indigenous people, who live their everyday lives in the Arctic, have another way of formulating and conceptualizing sustainability. In chapter 6.1 sustainability was formulated as part of a sovereignty game, where Sámi communities use sustainability to gain an increased independence. Based on the findings in the research, this is due to a historical context, as Sapmi (original Sámi territory) for several years has been colonized, and this has had a great influence of how Sámi communities see themselves and the 'outsiders' today. The former president of the Finnish Sámi parliament, Näkkäläjärvi (2015), argued within a speech, that the Arctic region should be understood as a homeland of indigenous people, and that the indigenous communities are closely tied into the nature of the Arctic. In addition to this Näkkäläjärvi (2015) claimed that Sámi communities always have, and still are "living in sustainable ways". Thus, Sámi communities are formulating sustainability as being a way of living, which only they can achieve and maintain, and if the world wishes to see a sustainable Arctic, this must happen based on the terms and conditions of the Sámi people. This perspective strengthen the hypothesis, that sustainability can be used to obtain the power within a sovereignty game. However, challenging the hypothesis is that despite Sámi communities talking about 'us and them', there are also a high level of integration between Sámi communities and the western ways of living, and there is little evidence pointing towards the Sámi people having a goal of creating a sovereign state. When using sustainability in a sovereignty game, sustainability is promoted as being an integrated part of Sámi knowledge, which according to

Sámi communities, cannot be achieved by outsiders. Therefore, sustainability in this regards is a cultural, and political concept, which is neither a goal, nor a specific approach to be implemented through strategies. Sustainability is a way of living and with this comes certain rights and powers, which is then formulated into an argument of why the Sámi communities should gain increased rights and self-governance.

In chapter 5.2.1 sustainability was analysed as being an integrated part of how Sámi people view their own identity and assures their cultural survival. The current president of the Finnish Sámi parliament, Sanila-Aikio (2015), argued that the right of Sámi people to define and shape their own identity had been taken away, and thus Sámi culture and identity is threatened by extinction. This statement told a story of how Sámi people are facing a challenge with sustaining their cultural traits and heritage. This conceptualization of sustainability was emphasized with identity theories which argues that identity is constructed constantly through formulations of 'we' and 'the others', and therefore integrating sustainability as a part of Sámi identity. It becomes a way for Sámi people to create the borders between themselves and the outsiders. The Sámi representatives, who speak of identity and cultural survival, confirms this hypothesis. On the other hand, what challenges the hypothesis is that despite Sámi people having an idea of 'we' and 'the others', one can also find an ambivalent and conflicting relationship between the traditional Sámi ways and the modern 'outsider culture', as some privileges comes with modernity (Omura 2002), *such as snowmobiles, internet and modern healthcare*. When analysing sustainability discourses through identity theory, sustainability becomes conceptualized as personal part of Sámi identity. Roughly speaking, this means that a person either does things, and lives in a sustainable way or not. This formulation help Sámi people to conceptualize the difference between themselves and the outsiders, who are not living in sustainable ways.

Sustainability, as a concept, a goal and a method, is formulated in different ways by the EU and by the indigenous Sámi people in Lapland. However, what the EU and Sámi communities have in common is that they are both formulating and conceptualizing sustainability in a way which benefits their own agenda, while constructing their own identity according to 'the other'. By doing this, sustainability becomes part of a political identity discourse; the EU seeking to formulate their identity as an Arctic actor, and Sámi people formulating their identity as an indigenous people. These discursive interpretations of sustainability enables the actors to use sustainability to gain influence, to be heard, and to claim certain rights. In the end, the formulations become part of deciding which actions can take place in the Arctic region. What is then problematic is that the

actors are failing to reach an agreement concerning sustainability; because what is somewhat paradoxical is the consistent lack of describing what it is that needs to be sustained? Is it the Arctic nature, dealing with activities which puts none or very little ecological pressure on nature? the indigenous culture, by emphasizing justice, equity, welfare? The political cooperation? The economic growth, prioritising that activities should be profitable? It is hard to imagine that neither of the two actors will be capable of ensuring sustainability within all of the above areas at the same time, and without consulting one another when formulating their strategies.

The conflict within the formulations of sustainability, between the EU and Sámi communities, is that the EU views sustainability as a concept and a goal; sustainability can be achieved through strategies, and be fulfilled within specified goals. Sámi communities have a view of sustainability as being an integrated part of their identity; sustainability is integrated into ways of living, of an individual person, and this person, or group of people, therefore has access to knowledge which cannot simply be achieved or understood by outsiders. In addition to this, both actors view themselves as being the 'one and only' to assure sustainability in the Arctic region. The EU promotes a view of the Arctic region being in a crises, which the EU alone can fix. Whereas the Sámi communities promotes a view of the Arctic region as having the risk of a crisis, if the 'outsiders' continues to intrude.

The argument which was presented in the introduction of this research, about sustainability being formulated as a concept, goal or criteria, depends on the stakeholder and context, and the agenda which the stakeholder has. In most cases, those who speak about sustainability, fails to agree on what it is we need to sustain, and why this, and not something else. Sámi communities are emphasizing that their traditional communities and culture should be sustained, while the EU is emphasizing that it is the Arctic environment and Arctic collaboration (Eg. Arctic Council) which should be sustained. However, there is an advantage within the actors having each their own formulations. The room for promoting each their own discourse, leaves space for the stakeholders to formulate, and push forward, their own agenda. Therefore the critical gap, which calls for attention, is to be found within the stakeholders lack of understanding each other's discourse, agenda, and point of view. The discourses in the formulations tells a story of how institutions, stakeholders and representatives formulate sustainability in ways which pushes forward their own agenda. This however, is expected, as anyone would work to strengthen their own agenda. However, when those who argue that they want to work together, and claim that their objective is the same; a sustainable Arctic, fail to agree on what should be understood with this formulation. Then it is likely that the

objective is doomed to fail from the beginning. Needless to say, it is difficult to reach common ground if there is a gap between the stakeholders ideology and perspective behind the formulation. In the end, the gaps between formulations and conceptualizations of the sustainability in the Arctic are likely to create several challenges along the way, and this will inevitably have consequences for the manoeuvrability of the EU and the Sámi communities.

6.2 Conclusion: Discrepancies and discourses in sustainability formulations

Based on the analysis above, it is the conclusion that there are discrepancies between how the EU formulate sustainability, and how Sámi people formulates sustainability.

From an EU point of view, sustainability is discursively constructed as a concept which highlights the role and importance, seen by the EU itself, of the Union. The EU is seeking to promote a discourse within which their own power is acknowledged and accepted as being a legitimate actor within the Arctic region. As mentioned within the study, the EU has been striving for several years to obtain a formal role in the Arctic Council, and therefore it is necessary to see their Policy for the Arctic in the light of this. By formulating a discourse which subjects the EU itself as a powerful Arctic actor, with valuable tools, resources and knowledge, the EU is, not even discreetly, asking the other Arctic actors how they will manage anything, let alone sustainable development, without this self announced expert in the field. On the other hand, maybe it serves right that the EU sees itself as an indispensable partner in Arctic development. Political researchers are claiming that the EU could be one of the new superpowers in the world (Dosenrode 2007), and the EU is promoting this idea further by reproducing the discourse through highlighting their resources, such as wealth and brainpower, to argue for the necessity of their presence in the Arctic region.

Sámi communities are discursively constructing sustainability as a way of acting, living and identifying themselves, and by this they are rejecting the idea that outsiders, such as institutions, NGOs and political representatives, can develop the Arctic in a sustainable manner. By formulating sustainability this way, Sámi communities promotes a discourse, where they alone hold the key to Arctic sustainability, and by this they promote themselves as being indispensable. Through this study, we have come across ‘doomsday’ formulations made by Sámi representatives, arguing that without preservation of Sámi people, there can be no preservation of the Arctic. These strong formulations leaves little room for any ‘outsiders’ to gain influence in Arctic development, or any other Arctic matter, and there is a hidden argument in this, that the Arctic should be left to the indigenous people to maintain. However, as the world in general is becoming more and more global, it is difficult to imagine that the Arctic region can be left by itself without becoming integrated in the globalization process. Moreover, there are global issues, such as climate change

and lack of resources, which create interdependence. Therefore, it is counterproductive if Sámi communities do not recognize this interconnectedness and develop their formulations with this in mind. On the other hand, given the history of colonialism, forced territorial dividing of Sámi communities and the fact that the Arctic communities are forced to deal with climate change from the front row, it is somewhat understandable that their patience with the 'western ways' have run out, and that they are now seeking to deal with the issues in their own way. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine that the outside institutions will ever be able to ensure the so called 'sustainable ways' without thoroughly consulting the people and communities who knows the Arctic region best.

6.3 Perspective: post-research reflections

In a rear view perspective I wish to reflect on the overall process of the research. In the methodology chapter reflections were made upon other theoretical choices, and discussions were made on the pros and cons of both the chosen methods and those who failed to be included. The theories of discourse analysis became a positive challenge throughout the research, which might be natural, since the theories are complex and comprehensive. It was a challenge to remain focused on the chosen perspective of discursive power formulations, because it seemed that every small discovery was a gateway towards yet another new path to take. However, I am glad that I challenged myself through this, because it became an opportunity to stay curious, and thus the process facilitated scientific growth. My primary field of study being international relations, it has been interesting to engage in interdisciplinary reflections and analysis, where a diversity of scientific methods have served as complementary tools, because the multiple dimensions created new way of thinking, hopefully not only for myself, but also for those who read this research.

This study was an extension of a former project, and some of the data was thus collected early as a result of this. The interviews were based on conversational interview techniques. As argued in the methodology section, this has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantage was that I got an opportunity to engage myself in everyday conversations with the participants, which then led to some very honest and open minded conversations, where a structured interview with formal settings might lead to more 'politically correct' answers. However, the conversational interviews became a challenge during the analysis, as very little information was left to directly analyse upon. Therefore instead of only using the interview material, the interviews were used to guide the way through speeches made by the participants, articles and other directly documented formulations. Adding to reflection on interviews, it would have benefitted the study to interview a representative from the EU. However, given the time and resources available, it was not considered possible. A

representative from the EU might have been able to further describe some of the key points in their Policy for the Arctic, and thus had added layers of understanding to the analysis.

Social science is a complex discipline, and there is hardly any wrong or right answer to any given questions, thus the nature of analysing. In addition to this, no researcher is free of bias and therefore it is impossible to reach an objective 'truth'. However, due to the transparency within methods and theories, the validity of data sources, and the ongoing balance between reflections and critique, the reliability and credibility of this study remains high. In addition to this, the open-ended answers to the research questions provoke new questions and new paths of research which are opened. Due to the growing emphasis on sustainability various fields of study remain ready for further exploration. Many questions are yet to be answered, but hopefully this study has contributed to closing part of the gap.

Bibliography

Adler-Nissen, Rebecca, and Ulrik P. Gad. 2014. "Introduction: Postimperial sovereignty games in the Nordic region." *Cooperation and conflict* 49(1): 3–32. http://cac.sagepub.com/content/49/1/3.abstract.

Arribas-Ayllon, Michael, and Valerie Walkerdine. 2008. "Foucauldian Discourse Analysis." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*, eds. Carla Willig and Wendy Stainton-Rogers. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road, London England EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom : SAGE Publications Ltd, p. 91–108. http://methods.sagepub.com/book/the-sage-handbook-of-qualitative-research-in-psychology/n6.xml.

Barentsinfo. 2016. "Indigenous-people: Saami." *www.barentsinfo.org*. http://www.barentsinfo.org/Contents/Indigenous-people/Saami (Accessed September 2016).

Bärlund, Kaj. "Sustainable development - concept and action." *UNECE*. http://www.unece.org/oes/nutshell/2004-2005/focus_sustainable_development.html (Accessed September 14, 2016).

Baylis, J., S. Smith, and P. Owens. 2013. *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. OUP Oxford. https://books.google.dk/books?id=kH0oAgAAQBAJ.

Blatter, Joachim K. 2012. "Case Study." In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Brundtland, Gru et al. 1987. Oxford Paperback Reference *Our Common Future ('Brundtland report')*. Oxford University Press, USA. http://www.bne-portal.de/fileadmin/unesco/de/Downloads/Hintergrundmaterial_international/Brundtlandbericht.File.pdf?linklisted=2812.

Bryman, A. 2016. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press. https://books.google.dk/books?id=N2zQCgAAQBAJ.

Chandler, D. 2007. *Semiotics: The Basics*. Taylor & Francis. https://books.google.dk/books?id=Zq5DhnqLcJUC.

Davis, Christine S. 2012. "Hypothesis." In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Dohrmann, Jørn. 2016. “EU Arctic strategy: what exactly is in it?” *http://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/*. http://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/articles/opinion/eu-arctic-strategy-what-exactly-it (Accessed October 26, 2016).

Dosenrode, Søren. 2007. *Federalism Studies : Approaching the EUropean Federation?* Ashgate Publishing. http://site.ebrary.com/lib/aalborguniv/reader.action?docID=10211175 (Accessed November 15, 2016).

EALÁT. 2013. *REINDEER HERDING, TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND LOSS OF GRAZING LAND*. A project led by Norway and Association of World Reindeer Herders (WRH) in Arctic Council, Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG).

EC. 2016. “A new integrated EU policy for the Arctic adopted.” *http://europa.eu/*. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-1539_en.htm (Accessed October 26, 2016).

EC. 27. april 2016. “An integrated European Union policy for the Arctic.” https://eeas.europa.eu/arctic_region/docs/160427_joint-communication-an-integrated-european-union-policy-for-the-arctic_en.pdf.

European Union. Eurostat. 2015. *Sustainable Development in the European Union: 2015 Monitoring Report of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy*. Publications office of the European Union. http://books.google.dk/books/about/Sustainable_Development_in_the_European.html?hl=&id=z_uIjwEACAAJ.

Gad, Ulrik Pram. 2016. “National Identity Politics and Postcolonial Sovereignty Games.” http://www.forskningsdatabasen.dk/en/catalog/2289623120.

Giddens, A. 1990. “77ie consequences of modernity.”

Giddens, A. 2009. “The politics of climate change.” *Cambridge, UK*. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-540X.2009.00557.x/abstract.

Giddens, A., and C. Pierson. 1998. *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity*. Stanford University Press. https://books.google.dk/books?id=YXDsvo90iZsC.

Given, L. M. 2008. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications. https://books.google.dk/books?id=byh1AwAAQBAJ.

Goldthau, Andreas, and Nick Sitter. 2015. “A Liberal Actor in a Realist World.” https://global.oup.com/academic/product/a-liberal-actor-in-a-realist-world-9780198719595?cc=dk&lang=en& (Accessed November 22, 2016).

Haines, Lily. 2015. “EU bid to become Arctic Council observer deferred again.” *Barentsobserver*. http://barentsobserver.com/en/arctic/2015/05/eu-bid-become-arctic-council-observer-deferred-again-04-05 (Accessed November 4, 2016).

Hunt, E. F., and D. C. Colander. 2015. *Social Science: An Introduction to the Study of Society -- Pearson EText*. Taylor & Francis. https://books.google.dk/books?id=r9NRCgAAQBAJ.

Keller, R. 2012. *Doing Discourse Research: An Introduction for Social Scientists*. SAGE Publications. https://books.google.dk/books?id=JZcQAgAAQBAJ.

Keohane, Robert Owen, and Joseph S. Nye. 2001. *Power and Interdependence*. Longman. https://market.android.com/details?id=book-kt3QtgAACAAJ.

Keohane, R. O., and J. S. Nye. 1987. “Power and Interdependence revisited.” *International organization*. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0020818300027661.

Kruse, Andy. 2012. “THE SÁMI FORM FINLAND’S FIRST NATION.” *www.finland.fi*. http://finland.fi/life-society/the-sami-form-finlands-first-nation/ (Accessed September 2016).

Lantto, Patrik. 2010. “Borders, citizenship and change: the case of the Sami people, 1751–2008.” *Citizenship Studies Vol. 14, No. 5*.

Mills, Melinda C. 2012. “Comparative Analysis.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Näkkäläjärvi, Klemetti. 2015. “Arctic dialogue, Speech by Klemetti Näkkäläjärvi.” https://www.luminpdf.com/viewer/6mYs6wajRXupNKy2k (Accessed September 28, 2016).

Omura, K. 2002. “Construction of inuinnaqtun (real inuit-way): self-image and everyday practices in inuit society.” *Senri ethnological studies*. http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=13710795.

Østhagen, Andreas. 2015. “Arctic Security: Hype, Nuances and Dilemmas.” *The Arctic Institute*.

Palys, Ted. 2012. “Purposive Sampling.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Pieski, Pentti. 2016.

Potter, Jonathan. 2012. “Discourse Analysis.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Poulsen, Birgitte Bjerge. 2016. “Arctic Development: Business opportunities and Indigenous peoples’ rights.” Aalborg University .

Prior, Lindsay F. 2012. “Document Analysis.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Raspotnik, Andreas, and Adam Stępień. 2016. “Is the EU eventually ‘integrating’ the Arctic?” *High North News*. http://www.highnorthnews.com/analysis-is-the-eu-eventually-integrating-the-arctic-new/ (Accessed October 26, 2016).

Roulston, Kathryn J. 2012. “Conversational Interviewing.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*,.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. 2012. “From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals.” *The Lancet* 379(9832): 2206–2211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60685-0.

Samediggi. 2014. “Samediggi - Saamelaiskäräjät - Sámi in Finland.” *www.samediggi.fi*. http://www.samediggi.fi/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=105&Itemid=104 (Accessed September 28, 2016).

Sanila-Aikio, Tiina. 2015. “Tal av Tiina Sanila-Aikio, president of the Sámi Parliament in Finland.” *www.samelandspartiet.se*. https://www.samelandspartiet.se/2015/04/27/tal-av-tiina-sanila-aikio-president-of-the-sami-parliament-in-finlandtal-vid-unpfii-2015-04-27/ (Accessed September 2016).

Sanila-Aikio, Tiina. 2016.

Tauli-Corpuz, Victoria. 2015. “Finland. New bill threatens Sami’s rights to their traditional lands and livelihood.” http://unsr.vtaulicorpuz.org/site/index.php/en/statements/109-finland-sami

(Accessed September 28, 2016).

Tracey, S., and B. Anne. 2008. *OECD Insights Sustainable Development Linking Economy, Society, Environment: Linking Economy, Society, Environment*. OECD Publishing. https://books.google.dk/books?id=IgbWAgAAQBAJ.

UNric. 2016. "The Sami of Northern Europe – one people, four countries." *www.unric.org*. http://www.unric.org/en/indigenous-people/27307-the-sami-of-northern-europe--one-people-four-countries (Accessed September 28, 2016).

Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 1990. "REALIST THOUGHT AND NEOREALIST THEORY." *Journal of international affairs* 44(1): 21–37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24357222.

Waltz, K. N. 1999. "Globalization and governance." *PS, political science & politics*. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1049096500056535.

Wilson, John. 2001. "Political Discourse." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilt, 398–415. Blackwell Publishers.

Appendix: Interview guides and summaries

The conversational interviews were used to gather qualitative, contextual data for the project. The interviews had a flexible balance between open-ended questions and a semi-structured agenda. The aim was to uncover rich, descriptive data on the personal or professional experiences of the participants, and from this develop an analysis of the research question. The interviews have not always been directly used within this study, however, the knowledge which was gained in the interviews has led the way towards new data and other sources.

Interview Guide – Aleksi Härkönen

Objective of the interview was to gain an understanding of Finland's focus areas within Arctic development, and how the Finnish Arctic strategy is used as an everyday guideline.

What would be your areas of focus as the president of the Arctic Council?

How would you put Finland's Arctic Strategy into action?

How do you understand sustainable development in the Arctic?

What is your perspective on the conflicts within development in the Arctic?

Interview Guide – Pentti Pieski

Objective of the interview was to gain some insight to the perspectives from the Sámi communities.

How would you describe the overall current situation of Sámi in Finland?

What can you tell me about the collaboration between the Finnish government and Sámi people?

Are you optimistic or sceptic about the rights of Sámi in the future?

How do you see the rights of the Sámi in Lapland, in the future?

What do you think when you hear about sustainability and Lapland?

Interview Guide - Tiina Sanila-Aikio

Objective of the interview was to gain understanding of the perspectives from a political point of view.

How do you understand sustainability in an Arctic context?

What are the current priority areas of the Finnish Sámi parliament?

Is the parliament engaged in the sustainable development which takes place in Lapland?

Interview summary – Aleksi Härkönen

Aleksi Härkönen is Finland's Arctic ambassador, and he will be the president of the Arctic Council when presidency is turned over to Finland 2017-2019.

Härkönen emphasized during the session that one of the goals of the Finnish government prior to taking over the presidency of the Arctic council, is to meet with as many Arctic partners as possible to ensure coordination and collaboration. In addition to this, Härkönen followed these statements by telling that it is the aim of the government to use its Arctic strategy as the guideline for everything which Finland does in the Arctic. The Finnish government looks positively towards the growing financial collaboration within the Arctic, the latest being the Arctic Financial Council. However, Härkönen highlights that this is still very new, and it is difficult to say what effect such council will have. The overall goal for the Finnish presidency of the Arctic council is to ensure that the Arctic does not turn into a new Eldorado, where resources are exploited and drained. Härkönen argues that a worst case scenario in the Arctic would be the lack of governance during the globalization of the area, as this would turn the region into a wild north, where everyone in the end would lose. Härkönen is confident that the world is wiser and that the protection of the Arctic is in everyone's interest. Tourism, infrastructural development and mining in Lapland, has been the main reasons for conflicts in the area. Härkönen explains that it is the goal for him to continuously working on these challenges, and to ensure that development in the Arctic happens with the consideration of the people who are living there. Sustainability is key when it comes to development in the Arctic, according to Härkönen, and investors in the region has to know their responsibility by prioritizing sustainability within their projects. Sustainability must also be long term, and not solely focus on one purpose, which could make the area in question no longer sustainable for other purposes. According to Härkönen, economic development is part of sustainability in the Arctic, and it is necessary to use the current momentum by engaging in economic partnerships. The economic advantages of the Arctic, is also what has brought so much attention to the area, states Härkönen, and this means that the people who works and live in the region must be prepared for change, by welcoming the new things, without having to push aside the old ways.

The interview summary has been approved by the participant

Interview summary – Pentti Pieski

Pentti Pieski is a communications officer at the Finnish forest administration, working primarily in Lapland; he is chairman at the City-Sámi organization, and he is a fishing guide at Wild Salmon Adventures.

Pieski explained that Sámi in Finland has felt excluded and marginalized for several years, however, within the past years this feeling has been increasing due to experiencing loss of rights and privileges. To add to this, many Sámi also feel as if their heritage is being exploited by the tourist business and by companies wanting to exploit the land in Lapland. Moreover, it is the perspective of Pieski that many Sámi feel as if their channels of participation in the Finnish political system are decreasing. The current situation and the many challenges that Sámi are currently facing was of great concern to Pieski. According to Pieski, the collaboration between Finnish government, politicians and authorities, and the Sámi and their institutions, is more theoretical, than in fact happening. The Sámi do have their representation, and various organisations, however, the opinion of these are rarely taken into consideration, when the political agendas are set. When looking into the future and taking the current strategies of the government into consideration, Pieski sees little hope that these circumstances will change. However, there is a growing resistance within the Sámi communities, and therefore maybe also a growing awareness within Finland in general, and Pieski is hoping that this might affect how the politicians plan the future. The Sámi in Lapland is under a lot of pressure right now, facing lack of rights, economic challenges, climate changes and cultural impacts. However, there is also a new generation, of Sámi who are born outside of Lapland, who are now searching for their lost identity and therefore returning back to Lapland to restore what has been lost. Pieski believes that such streams may help rebuild the traditional culture and identity. When linking sustainability to Lapland, Pieski highlights that Lapland cannot develop sustainably if it means destroying the communities of the indigenous people living there. Moreover, Pieski explains that if one is looking to preserve the forests, the biology and the animal life of Lapland, development in the area must happen together with the Sámi, not despite of them.

The interview summary has been approved by the participant.

Interview summary - Tiina Sanila-Aikio

Tiina Sanila-Aikio, President of Samediggi (Finnish Sámi parliament).

According to Sanila-Aikio, when looking into sustainability in the Arctic, and specifically Finnish Lapland, human rights are crucial. The fact that Finland has not yet succeeded in the ratification of the ILO speaks against sustainable development. Sanila-Aikio argues that if the culture and language of Sámi people is not kept alive it will be a loss for the cultural heritage of the entire world. According to Sanila-Aikio, the EU, Finland and indigenous people's groups should join forces and start negotiations on how they can cooperate towards creating an Arctic region which can be sustainable in all aspects, for people, animals, the environment and the economy. Language and culture are of high importance to Sanila-Aikio, and she empathize that for her, and the Sámi people of Finnish Lapland, the preservation of these is closely linked to sustainability. According to Sanila-Aikio, the best way to work for the preservation of Sámi language and culture will be to improve the cultural self-governance and administration through the Sámi parliament, including the right to determine who is Sámi and who is not. Sanila-Aikio argues that without the necessary legislation and rights, Sámi people are not able to be guardians of their own land and culture, and this is a necessary step towards a sustainable Finnish Lapland, and Arctic region.

No comments were received for the interview notes.

Participation consent

The consent was presented orally to the participants, and delivered as soft or hard copy upon request.

You are being asked to participate in a research concerning opinions about sustainability. You were selected as a participant because you serve as a qualified and reliable representative, with valuable perspectives which can contribute to the study. I ask that you receive this consent information, and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be part of the study. There are no payments for participation.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to participate in an informal interview.

The study has the risk of exposing your opinion; therefore you are free to participate with a name other than your own. The benefit of participation is that your opinion and perspective will serve as valuable and important source of data for the answering of the problem formulation.

This research will be send to those who wish to review it, and it will be evaluated by Aalborg University. The records of this study will be kept strictly confidential. Research records will be kept in a locked file. I will not include any information in any report I may publish that would make it possible to identify you, if you do not wish it so. Upon your request, your identity can be disclosed in the material that is published. However, you will be given the opportunity to review and approve any material that is published about you, before it is done.

The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you. You may refuse to take part in the study at any time without affecting your relationship with the investigator of this study. Your decision will not result in any loss or benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process; additionally, you have the right to request that the interviewer does not use any of your interview material. You have the right to ask questions about this research and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time, feel free to contact me. If you like, a summary of the results of the study will be sent to you.

If you have any other concerns about your rights as a participant that has not been answered you may contact me.