

Arctic Simulation – S'15

Gist

Five states are represented in this simulation: Canada, China, Norway, Russia, and the United States. Each is represented by a two-person delegation, which will express their state's interests in the Arctic and propose, debate, and negotiate the type of governing system that should be used to resolve disputes in the Arctic region. As a delegate, your job is to represent your state's interests as best you can.

Focus

The melting Arctic ice raises the profile of overlapping sovereignty claims¹ and “poses economic, military and environmental challenges to governance of the region.”² The central question at the upcoming Arctic Council ministerial meeting is this: **What type of governing system should be employed in the Arctic?**³ Should governance be through existing multinational frameworks or should a framework be created anew?⁴ If the latter, which states and non-state actors should organize this governing system? Who should have a seat at the table? Should the governing system essentially mean “extending national jurisdictions into the region,” creating a regional agreement, or making a global treaty?⁵ Should the governing system establish and follow “hard” or “soft” international law?⁶

Teaching and Learning Goals – By the conclusion of this module, students should be able to do the following:

1. Explain what makes the Arctic a “contested space”
2. Appreciate the impacts of global climate change in the Arctic region
3. Understand some key issues of global and regional governance
4. Articulate the views of one of the state actors with interests and/or claims in the Arctic

Schedule

- Day one (4/20/15) – Guest speakers: Prof. Maria Dean (Chemistry) and Prof. Terri Donofrio (Rhetoric)
 - » **DUE: (1) Carefully read and digest the Hastedt chapter**
 - (2) Hand in one or more response papers**
- Day two (4/22/15) – Each pair of delegates to the Arctic Council ministerial meeting (i.e., representatives of all five states) sets out their state's (a) interests, concerns, and claims regarding the Arctic and (b) thoughts or preference regarding governance of the Arctic.

Agenda:

- (1) Opening speeches: Each delegate (i.e., each student) should make a **3-4 minute ORAL PRESENTATION**. Think about governance options and what you know about your country's preferences. Keeping your role in mind, be diplomatic about and accurate with regard to your state's positions.
 - To prepare, do some additional research, especially with regard to forms of regional and international governance. (Is a good model available in Antarctica?) Consider dressing for the part.
- (2) Begin discussions/negotiations with delegates from the four other countries, working to advance your state's interests and, depending on which state you represent, common interests.

DUE: (1) Prepared speech
(2) Read the Brigham and Borgerson pieces before class

¹ See Charles K. Ebinger and Evie Zambetakis, “The Geopolitics of Arctic Melt,” *International Affairs* 85:6 (2009) 1222.

² Charles K. Ebinger and Evie Zambetakis, “The Geopolitics of Arctic Melt,” *International Affairs* 85:6 (Nov., 2009) 1217.

³ Glenn Hastedt, Donna L. Lybecker, and Vaughn P. Shannon, *Cases in International Relations: Pathways to Conflict and Cooperation* (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2015) 262.

⁴ Charles K. Ebinger and Evie Zambetakis, “The Geopolitics of Arctic Melt,” *International Affairs* 85:6 (2009) 1223.

⁵ Hastedt et al., *Cases in International Relations* (2015) 263.

⁶ Hastedt et al., *Cases in International Relations* (2015) 259.

- Day three (4/24/15) – All delegates should actively engage in discussions focused on the following: **How should disputes and states' conflicting claims be resolved? What type of governing system should be used to resolve problems?** (For example, should the Arctic Council be strengthened to fulfill its current tasks and/or empowered to address more issues (such as military/security matters)? Should key decisions be left up to the Arctic Five? Should a new multinational organization be established? Who gets a seat at the table (which states, which non-state actors)? (Should, for instance, indigenous peoples be represented apart from (or in addition to) representation by their respective states?) What is the appropriate role for non-Arctic states?) – **Delegates may make short speeches** (1-2 minutes) before the day's negotiations begin.

Additional Information

- **Governance** – Governance concerns “the manner in which authoritative decisions are made and executed.”⁷ In the absence of a world government, international law and regional and global institutions provide a way to foster cooperation and address transnational issues. (Norms play a role, too.) This cooperation comes “with little or no power to enforce compliance.”⁸ One textbook asserts that the notion of global governance “implies that states become too interdependent to act alone and have to accept international norms, rules, and regulations, even at the expense of state sovereignty.”⁹ Is this true with regard to the Arctic? How much “governance without government” is possible (or likely) in the region?
 - » Hastedt, Lybecker, and Shannon discuss whether international organizations (IOs) simply serve states' national interests (especially the interests of the most powerful states?) or “develop value systems, cultures, and outlooks on global problems” that influence states' positions and conduct.¹⁰ Can IOs solve collective action problems?
 - » Realists, Liberals, and Constructivists differ on how successful global (or regional) governance is likely to be in terms of “constraining and determining state behavior.”¹¹
 - » Note that most states abide by international law most of the time.¹² International law tends to be most effective/heeded when it concerns matters of “low politics.”
- **Your state** – Dig into the sources cited in the confidential briefing paper. Search Ebsco. Go to Lexis-Nexis to get updated information from newspapers.

Grading criteria (worth **5%** of final grade)

- **Formal speech**
 - » **Content** – Does the speech exhibit serious thinking and engagement, going beyond superficial discussion of issues? Is it accurate? Is it informative?
 - » **Clarity & Organization** – Are the state's positions clearly articulated (at least as clearly as the state wants them to be)? Is the speech clearly and effectively organized?
 - » **Presentation style:** Voice, eye contact, seriousness/appropriateness for context
- **Participation** – Make frequent and informed contributions to the negotiations. Comments should represent your state well and be appropriate for the diplomatic context.



Source of Map: The Green Market Oracle, <http://www.thegreenmarketoracle.com/2010/03/global-warming-exposes-resources-but.html> (accessed 4/14/15).

⁷ Andy Baker, *Shaping the Developing World: The West, the South, and the Natural World* (2014) 236.

⁸ Eric B. Shiraev and Vladislav M. Zubok, *International Relations*, Brief Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) 313.

⁹ Eric B. Shiraev and Vladislav M. Zubok, *International Relations*, Brief Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) 49.

¹⁰ Glenn Hastedt, Donna L. Lybecker, and Vaughn P. Shannon, *Cases in International Relations: Pathways to Conflict and Cooperation* (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2015) 154.

¹¹ Steven L. Spiegel et al., *World Politics in a New Era*, 6th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) 442.

¹² Keith L. Shimko, *International Relations: Perspectives, Controversies and Readings*, 4th ed. (Boston: Wadsworth, 2013) 225.