

Chapter 11

Findings and Conclusions



Douglas C. Nord

Abstract This final chapter of the volume provides a summary of the key findings and insights that the several contributing authors to the volume offer regarding leadership within the Arctic Council. It presents these within the framework of five interrelated questions. The first of these is what have we learned about the particular contributions of the most recent occupants of the Chair? The second one is, how should we evaluate their efforts? The third is dual in character: What is the overall impact of the “powers of the chair” and what constraints limit their application? The fourth question focuses on what are the “best practices” that can be taken away from this consideration of organizational leadership. The fifth question relates to what are the type of challenges that future Arctic Council Chairs are likely to encounter and how the organization will have to evolve if it is to continue to provide leadership for the North?

Keywords Leadership · Effectiveness · Best practices · Powers of the chair · Vision

This volume has sought to address the question of leadership within the Arctic Council. More specifically, it has endeavoured to examine the role played by successive Chairs of the body in providing focus and direction for its efforts at dealing with ongoing change within the circumpolar North. It has attempted to give some specific attention to the challenges encountered in providing this type of leadership and the various approaches and strategies that recent Chairs of the organization have pursued in addressing regional and institutional needs. The separate chapters of the book have offered some unique insights into the manner in which leadership within the Arctic Council has evolved over recent years. In this final chapter of the volume, an effort is made to address five main questions. The first is what have we learned about the particular contributions of the most recent occupants of the Chair? The second is how should we evaluate their efforts? The third question is dual in nature.

D. C. Nord (✉)

Department of Political Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

e-mail: douglas.nord@umu.se

What is the overall impact of the “powers of the chair” and what constraints limit their application? The fourth question focuses on what are the “best practices” that can be learned in providing effective leadership from this position at the helm of the organization? Finally, we ask, what are the likely roles that Chairs of the Arctic Council will play in the coming decades? This concluding chapter of the volume seeks to provide some answers to each of these important questions.

The authors of the preceding chapters provide a number of insights into the leadership contributions that have been provided by the Chairs of the Arctic Council. In addressing the Swedish Chairmanship, Professor Niklas Eklund reminds us that even a “reluctant” Arctic state can offer important leadership capabilities to such an evolving international organization. He notes that the extensive prior diplomatic experience of the Swedes provided their Chairmanship with the ability to assist the Arctic Council in addressing long-standing needs for internal restructuring and helping to resolve the festering Observer question. He points to the fact that the Swedish Chairmanship was endowed with capable personnel who had learned from previous assignments how to get things done within an international body. Eklund further notes that in addition to experience, the Swedish Chairmanship was able to provide the organization with a clear and focused agenda that was aimed at building cooperation and consensus within the institution. By adopting an “honest broker” strategy, the Swedish Chair was able to advance concrete measures and to establish a desirable balance between proponents of environmental protection and sustainable development. Professor Eklund observes that, in general, the Swedish Chairmanship was advantaged in its position by the fact that the Arctic had not become an important domestic concern of the nation. However, he notes that this lack of domestic constraint does not mean that the country can continue to operate without a more defined vision of its role within the Arctic. He suggests that in planning for future leadership responsibilities within the Arctic Council, Sweden has undertaken the first steps in defining this position. Thus, both hindsight and foresight are useful ingredients to the evolving Swedish leadership role within the Arctic.

The recent experience of Canada at the head of the Arctic Council seems to have been in marked contrast to that of the Swedes. Rather than having learned from its earlier leadership experience, the Canadian government set out to forge a new path and utilize a new approach to its second Chairmanship of the Arctic Council. Professor Heather Exner-Pirot suggests that the Harper Government of the day had very little tolerance for established diplomatic practice within the organization and a clear commitment to leading the body in a new direction and to utilizing a different leadership approach. She notes that at the heart of the most recent Canadian Chairmanship was a desire to focus the organization on the benefits of business enterprise within the circumpolar region. Thus, one of its chief priorities was to encourage establishment of the Arctic Economic Council, and more generally, to encourage new economic opportunities for the “peoples of the North.” These undertakings were seen as efforts to strike a new balance between the advocates of environmental protection and sustainable development—with an advantage going to the latter. Exner-Pirot notes that the Canadian Chairmanship adopted an “entrepreneurial”

approach in advancing its cause and was not particularly interested in seeking support from its fellow Council members. She cites the statement by the Canadian foreign minister of the day that “Canada does not just ‘go along’ to get along.” This attitude was emblematic of its approach to leadership from the helm of the Arctic Council. Canada offered lots leadership but encountered saw few followers. Despite this fact, Professor Exner-Pirot reminds us that several important innovations and accomplishments emerged from the second Canadian Chairmanship. For the first time an indigenous resident of the Arctic and non-foreign minister, Leona Aglukkaq, served as the Chair of the Council. Additionally, the Canadian Chairmanship focused new attention on indigenous concerns and priorities. Most importantly, however, it opened up space within the agenda of the body for consideration of economic development issues that have continued as subjects of conversation during subsequent Chairmanships. Yet in ardently pressing for this consideration of economic development matters, the Canadian Chairmanship came perilously close to “busting” as Exner-Pirot also observes.

The recent U.S. Chairmanship of the Arctic Council also provides some significant insights into how leadership can be exerted within the organization. Like Canada before it, this was the United States second time serving as head of the body. It also went in a different direction from its first leadership term. Professor Heather Nicol notes that in this “second time around” the U.S. federal government was far more engaged. It worked carefully to develop a focused and coherent plan for American leadership of the Council that sought to integrate its national strategic interests with the ongoing concerns of the organization. Contrary to Canada’s efforts, it reemphasized the importance of environmental security in both its national Arctic strategy and in its Chairmanship Program. It too adopted an “entrepreneurial” style in its leadership role but was far accommodating of the views and opinions of other Members States, the Permanent Participants and Observers. Its goal was to build wide support for its agenda and it made full use of the “powers of the chair” to advance this objective. Nicol points out that one distinctive features of the American leadership of the Council was its ability to integrate and direct the views of vast a national bureaucracy and to accommodate wide number of domestic interest groups. While the future of the Arctic was not a broad political concern in the United States as it had been in Canada, the Obama Administration still had to work out a *modus vivendi* with one particular interested community—the State of Alaska. Professor Nicol shows how this effort at both accommodation and the assertion of a federal prerogative in U.S. Arctic policy development took place. She also shows how American leadership responsibilities as the Chair of the Arctic Council not only influenced the organization’s efforts but had an impact on the nation itself. With respect to the latter, Nicol discusses how such responsibilities led to a solid reengagement of the United States in the efforts at Arctic governance and collaboration. She argues that this enhanced position as a central Arctic actor is likely to weather the current political unrest and uncertainty resulting from the coming of the Trump Administration.

The current Finnish Chairmanship also offers new insights regarding the conduct of leadership at the helm of the body. Professor Timo Koivurova suggests that

Finland has preferred to pursue a “professional” style of leadership rooted in the desire to focus on continuity within the organization. Following such a path, Finland has largely eschewed issues that do not already have a substantial foundation of interest and activity within the body. Thus, its Chairmanship agenda reflects thematic initiatives that either have been long-standing concerns of the organization like environmental protection and meteorological cooperation, or represent logical extensions of global initiatives of relevance to the entire circumpolar community such as furthering the Paris Climate Accords and building support for the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Such an approach to organizational leadership avoids projecting too broad a profile of national priorities in the Arctic. This is in stark contrast with the strategy pursued under the second Canadian Chairmanship. However, it is not one that totally avoids acknowledging national interests and capabilities. This can be seen in Finland’s championing the causes of connectivity and teacher education in the North. The Finnish Chairmanship is one that seeks to incorporate acknowledged areas of national expertise into more broadly shared community priorities and concerns. Throughout this effort, Koivurova stresses the fact that Finland as head of the Arctic Council is largely trying to advance existing agendas and priorities rather create its own. Continuity of action seems to be a major concern. From such a perspective; the Chair’s role is primarily to assist the organization in conducting its business in a collegial fashion. Such a “professional” style of leadership is based on extensive consultation and incorporating the views of all participants. Koivurova discusses how this was done during the preparatory stages of the Finnish Chairmanship and throughout its subsequent evolution. He notes also how such a stance is reflective of the normal efforts of a small state within a complicated global environment—a position which Finland has long occupied—and one that offers the potential of facilitating dialogue between current rivals like the Russia and the United States. It is a leadership position that values securing adequate information before acting and promotes the advantages of long-range planning. Koivurova describes Finland’s efforts in all these areas.

Important insights regarding the conduct of the Chair are also provided by Professors Andrew Chater and Diddy Hitchins in their respective chapters on Permanent Participants and Observers. Both note that while their respective players have been limited in performing their roles within the Arctic Council, they still represent significant interests and voices that the Chair must endeavor to accommodate. It is clear that a failure to do so can cause serious problems for the head of the organization and can impede its efforts. Thus, all of the recent Chairs have endeavored to reach out to both the Permanent Participants and the Observers. Their leadership capabilities have been judged, in part, with regard to how successful their approaches have been and what concrete results that have stemmed from such undertakings. Both Professors Chater and Hitchins remind us, as well, that both groups can make their own leadership contributions both in and outside the framework of the Arctic Council.

11.1 Evaluating the Performance of National Chairmanships

Having examined in some detail the conduct of successive Chairmanships of the Arctic Council, it becomes apparent that not all have chosen to follow the same leadership path. Each Chair has utilized a different combination of strategies and approaches in operating at the helm of the organization and chosen to make use of the “powers of the chair” in varying degrees. They also can be distinguished from one another regarding which style of leadership—professional, entrepreneurial or honest broker—they have felt most comfortable in pursuing. Some have chosen to tightly direct the affairs of the Council while others have been content to let the body follow its own course. Some have introduced major new agenda priorities within the organization while others have sought to advance established institutional concerns. Some have decided to leave their own particular brand upon the Council while others have endeavored to foster a spirit of consensus and collegiality. No matter which leadership path that has been pursued they have all had an impact on this most significant and evolving governance platform for the Arctic region.

The question remains, however, of whether these leadership impacts have been of equal importance and benefit to the body. How should we go about attempting to compare and evaluate the effectiveness of each of these Chairmanships? A number of options suggest themselves. One could focus on the image and reputation that each Chair has earned from performing such a leadership role. Was the Chair seen to be prepared, organized and adept in performing its functions? Alternatively, one could consider the actual results and consequences of each Chairmanship. What was actually accomplished and with what benefit? Finally, one could assess the correspondence between Chairmanship abilities and organizational needs at a specific point in time? Was this the right leadership fit for the body at this particular juncture?

As a provisional effort to come up with a common rubric for the assessment of all Arctic Council Chairmanships, the following framework is suggested in Table 11.1 and listed below).¹

Table 11.1 Evaluation Rubric for Arctic Council Chairmanships

Function	Exceptional	Satisfactory	Poor
Organization of meetings and negotiations			
Management of operations			
External communications and visibility			
Consensus-building			

¹The present author is indebted to Professor Heather Exner-Pirot who developed this assessment framework. He is responsible, however, for the particular categorization and placement of the efforts of the four most recent Chairmanships within the template.

It focuses its attention on the key functions that all Chairs of the body need to perform and it is accompanied by a simple scoring assessment of their performance of these tasks.

Such an evaluation tool is fairly easy apply to the four most recent Arctic Council Chairmanships drawing upon the analysis and assessments provided by the authors of the chapters contained in this volume. In so doing, the individual evaluations could be represented as follows. The Swedish Chairmanship would be seen to be quite effective as portrayed in Table 11.2 below.

Table 11.2 Evaluation of the Swedish Arctic Council Chairmanship

Function	Exceptional	Satisfactory	Poor
Organization of meetings and negotiations	X		
Management of operations	X		
External communications and visibility		X	
Consensus-building	X		

The Canadian Chairmanship would be seen as somewhat less effective. This is seen in Table 11.3 below.

Table 11.3 Evaluation of the Canadian Arctic Council Chairmanship

Function	Exceptional	Satisfactory	Poor
Organization of meetings and negotiations		X	
Management of operations			X
External communications and visibility		X	
Consensus-building			X

The United States Chairmanship would be seen as generally effective. This is seen in Table 11.4 below.

Table 11.4 Evaluation of the U.S. Arctic Council Chairmanship

Function	Exceptional	Satisfactory	Poor
Organization of meetings and negotiations	X		
Management of operations		X	
External communications and visibility		X	
Consensus-building		X	

The Finnish Chairmanship, as of the time of this writing, would also rank as being quite effective. This is seen in Table 11.5.

Table 11.5 Evaluation of the Finnish Arctic Council Chairmanship

Function	Exceptional	Satisfactory	Poor
Organization of meetings and negotiations	X		
Management of operations		X	
External communications and visibility		X	
Consensus-building	X		

Such an evaluation tool is heuristic in nature pointing to the particular strengths and shortcomings of each Chairmanship. It is provisional in nature subject to the addition of new categories of assessment and subsequent inquiries into the conduct of each leadership term. However, it does provide us with a common evaluative framework that can be utilized in our common efforts to evaluate both past and future Chairmanships of the Arctic Council.

11.2 The Powers of the Chair and their Limits

The general argument of this volume has been that Chairs matter. It has been suggested that like other international bodies, the Arctic Council is partially the reflection of the leadership that has been provided to it over the years of its operation. It has been demonstrated in the preceding chapters that each of the successive Chairs of the organization have had an impact on the body. They have utilized their separate roles as presiding officer, organizational manager, resolver of conflicts and the representational face of the body to further its efforts. Some, as has been seen, have been more successful in performing these functions than others. However, all have made use of the powers of the Chair to advance their cause.

Nonetheless, one should not go away from this inquiry with the mistaken impression that the Chairs of the Arctic Council operate from a position of *carte blanche* in their leadership capacity. There are a number of important constraints that limit and direct the conduct of the Chair. First among these are the institutional framework and expectations of the body. As has been pointed out regularly throughout the volume, the Arctic Council operates on the basis of consensus. Nothing of lasting significance can be done without the unanimous agreement of the Member States and the effective buy-in of the Permanent Participants. Any national Chairmanship, even a highly motivated and focused one, cannot operate effectively without the commitment and support of its colleagues. This institutional requirement serves as an important constraint on what can be done. To be effective in such a body, a Chair must focus its efforts on consensus building and promoting a sense of collegiality with the organization (Bengtsson et al. 2004).

A second important constraint on the actions of the Chair is the institutional expectation that has existed from the outset of the Arctic Council that the head of the body should not operate too much on an autonomous basis. During the prolonged negotiations that led to the establishment of the Council in 1996 it was made clear by several of the Arctic Eight that the Chair should remain accountable to the Member States and should be responsive to their wishes and needs. The idea of a rotational Chair was deliberately put in place to make sure that each successive national head of the organization would have only a brief period to press their specific views and priorities. Even as the Arctic Council has evolved to incorporate new aspects of an independent international organization, its Chair has remained firmly linked to the collective interests and goals of the members. There is no sign on the horizon that this bond will disappear any time in the near future (Nord 2016c).

A third constraint on the actions of the Chair come from those internal qualities that each leader brings to the position (Odell 2009). As illustrated in several chapters in this volume, the past diplomatic experience and capabilities of those who come to populate the Chairmanship at any particular point in time may be critical to their success. Like many other international organizations, the Arctic Council operates most smoothly when those at its helm have had previous diplomatic experience (Nye 2004). Similarly, personality may be a factor here. Those who tend to develop a rapport with their colleagues seem to have more of an ability to advance their agenda than those who do not have an ability to operate in a collegial fashion. This orientation may be also reflective of the Chair's own national cultural values and expectations. Some are more outwardly oriented in their conduct than others. Some hold to a broad and collectivist vision of the Arctic while other espouse a more narrow national perspective. Each of these variables can be seen, at times, to direct a Chairmanship with regard to what it feels it can and cannot do from its leadership post.

A fourth constraint on the conduct of Chairs, are the external forces that impinge upon their efforts. The global context is constantly changing and may have either a supportive or a detrimental impact on any Chairmanship (Tallberg 2004). As has been discussed in several chapters of the volume, the coming of major climate change within the Arctic and across the globe has been a powerful force behind national efforts to address these needs through the Council. It has also contributed to the increased visibility and importance of the organization itself. On the other hand, the emergence of major power rivalry in international affairs has set some limits on what can be done even in a body that has had a remarkable record of insulating itself from such events. The impact of the new tensions between Russia and the United States have the potential to make Arctic cooperation more difficult to achieve. This new reality is illustrative of how sudden change in the global setting can potentially derail even the most carefully planned Chairmanship agenda.

A fifth and final limit to the independence of the Chair can be seen in the growing desire on the part of Arctic Council participants for continuity in the efforts and vision of the organization. Rather than having the Chair lead the Council in new directions every two years, there has been a growing rejection among participants of a "flavor of the month" approach to leadership within the body in favor of continuity in both planning and operation of the organization (Fenge and Funston 2015). Thus, there has been new emphasis given over the past decade of continuing projects and initiative across Chairmanships and for incoming Chairs to consciously link their particular agendas with that which preceded it and that which is likely to follow. This attitude is also supportive of the current effort to produce a strategic plan for the organization by the end of the current Finnish Chairmanship.

Yet with all these constraints and limitations, the impact of Chair remains significant. The Chair of the Arctic Council retains some degree of flexibility for autonomous action and no small ability to direct the course of the organization's business. With this reality in mind, it seems appropriate to consider the lessons that have been learned from recent Chairmanships regarding their leadership potential and to

outline what might be considered as “best practices” leading to effective leadership from such a position. These will be addressed in the following section.

11.3 Lessons to Be Learned from Recent Chairmanships

Stepping back from the particular studies of the recent Chairmanships of the Arctic Council it is clear that there are leadership lessons to be learned from their experiences. As noted by Professor Lovecraft and Cost in Chap. 2 of this volume, an effective organization of any sort must have a learning capacity. This is particularly the case with international bodies that have complex forms of interaction and rapid turnover in leadership like the Arctic Council. It is essential that an accepted and utilized framework for providing focus and direction to the body be established. In the particular case of the Arctic Council, this can be seen to be constructed from an acknowledged list of “best practices” of leadership that evolved over the past decade or so.

The first of these best practices relates to preparation. It has been observed that good Chairmanships stem from adequate planning and foresight. If a country is to adequately address the challenges and opportunities of both the region and institution, one must allocate adequate time to study and preparation. This is something that successive Chairmanships have come to recognize over time. It is no longer the case that effective leadership cannot be delivered on a “just in time basis.” Most analysts suggest that preparatory work must be begun a number of years ahead of occupying the chair (Nord 2017a). A country, particularly if it has not been a central player within the organization, must become fully familiar with the issues and concerns of the body. It must conduct consultations and seek advice from all participants—Member States, Permanent Participants and Observers. It must learn where potential divisions of opinion may exist, and begin the process of constructing an adequate agenda and program. As a general rule of thumb, such preparatory work should begin at least two leadership terms ahead of one’s own effort. This will allow sufficient opportunity to fully brief oneself and allow for adequate discussions with one’s predecessor at the helm to insure coordination and continuity between leadership terms.

Second, one must assemble an adequate and skillful staff. It need not be a massive group, but it should be a collection of individuals who are focused and committed to the task ahead of them (Nord 2016b). The Chairmanship group, ideally, should have some prior diplomatic experience and contain representatives from two or three key government ministries or agencies that have an interest in Arctic affairs. However, it should not be inclusive of all government departments. There is a danger of getting too many cooks involved in the process of preparing the effort as was witnessed in the latest Canadian Chairmanship. Having a coordinating board to represent and articulate various bureaucratic perspectives is useful as was seen in both the recent U.S. and Finnish Chairmanships. Having a skillful, confident and politically attuned Chair of the Senior Arctic Officials Group is a useful resource as

was seen in the instances of the Swedish and U.S. Chairmanships. The Chair of the SAOs, nor for that matter the rest of the Chairmanship staff, need not have an extensive background in Arctic affairs. The Swedish and Finnish Chairmanships provide good examples of how staff can be educated and informed on Arctic matters. However, it is clearly an asset to have within one's staff, key individuals who are directly familiar with northern communities and circumstances. This was of benefit to both the Canadian and U.S. Chairmanships.

A third "best practice" relates to maintaining focus while operating at the helm of the organization. The Chairmanship must develop a clear and well-organized agenda and program for its leadership term. The head of the body needs to know what its priorities are and that there is sufficient support for them among the members. It should avoid the temptation of over promising or the appearance of trying to solve all problems by itself. The Chair should have a limited number of deliverables that it seeks to secure from the Council and must monitor carefully the progress being made in advancing them. Perhaps the best recent example of this ability to focus, to know what is necessary, and possible, and to see that it is accomplished, comes from the Swedish Chairmanship (Nord 2017a). However, even in that case, not all the promises made could be adequately delivered. One wants to avoid appearing to come to the table with a long shopping list of possible projects and initiatives that may or may not have any chance of being addressed during one's leadership term. The Canadian Chairmanship suffered from this practice, while the Finnish Chairmanship seems to have made the art of the possible one of its signature features.

A fourth element of effective leadership within the Arctic Council is for the Chair to be familiar and respectful of the norms and expectations of the body (Barnett and Finnemore 2004). This means, for instance, that the Chairmanship will thoroughly consult with all participants ahead of the announcement of its program and agenda, as seen in the case of Finland, and will maintain regular interaction with all the Member States, the Permanent Participants and Observers throughout its leadership term. This is particularly important with respect to the latter two groups as Professors Chater and Hitchins have pointed out in this volume. These groups have tended to be somewhat marginalized over the years, and an effective Chair must take steps to reach out to them and to listen to their interests and concerns. All of the four recent Chairmanships can be seen to have taken such steps, but even more efforts may be required in the future. Similarly, an effective Chair must not be viewed as operating autonomously according to its own set of preferences as opposed to the group's priorities. As a body organized and functioning on the basis of consensus, such proclivities are in opposition to established norms and expectations of the organization. One of the major perceived limitations of the Canadian Chairmanship was its tendency to go in its own direction no matter what others thought. Thus, as Professor Exner-Pirot points out there was a lot of leadership behavior on display but few followed in its path.

A fifth good practice for the Arctic Chair is that of being flexible and accommodating of changes in the external environment (Nord 2017c). As noted earlier, the constant evolution of the global system will provide both unexpected and

sometimes unwanted challenges to even the best organized Chairmanship. Clearly, the international setting has changed significantly since the founding of the Council in the final decade of the twentieth century. In this new millennium, both rapid climate change and the re-emergence of great power rivalries pose special problems and some opportunities for an organization like the Arctic Council. The Chair of the body must be aware of these potential threats and be flexible and nimble in responding to them. Chairmanships must avoid the tendency to project their own national foreign and domestic policy priorities within the common work of the organization and to create unnecessary divisions among the participants. Unfortunately, the Harper government did exactly that during the Canadian Chairmanship. A better example of the type of nimble leadership required comes from the current Finnish Chairmanship that has both sought to respond to pressing global concerns in its agenda and has held out the possibility of serving as a communicative bridge between Russia and the United States. This type of leadership stance is the preferable one.

A sixth leadership effort that each incoming Chair of the Arctic should aspire to is to perform effectively the several roles that are required of the head of such a body. This means that in its presiding capacity, the Chair must see to it that all meetings are adequately prepared, focused on agreed agendas, conducted according to established procedure and timelines and adequately recorded. The Swedish Chairmanship represents the model to be followed here (Nord 2016b). It also means that the Chair must be an adept manager of the internal operations of the organization. Working in close cooperation with the Secretariat, this means maintaining an oversight of resources and personnel and developing new internal strategies and routines to foster organizational efficiency and responsiveness. An incoming Chair of the Arctic must also learn to become the “face and voice” of the body. This requires the ability to communicate effectively its goals and priorities to all elements of the circumpolar community and to the broader global audience as well. As the Council gradually acquires additional features of a traditional international organization, performing this representative role will be increasingly important undertaking of the Chair. Both Sweden and the United States during their respective Chairmanships were exemplary in performing such a role.

Similarly, the Chair must learn to master its role as problem solver and conflict manager. It will need to continue to quickly identify possible sources of tension and division within the organization whether this is a question related to the status and role of Permanent Participants and Observers or the ongoing debate between the proponents of environment protection and sustainable development. Building bridges and fostering consensus among the membership remains an important and challenging function to be performed by any Chair of the Arctic Council.

A seventh good practice of a Chairmanship is the ability to make use of the full array of the “powers of the chair” to advance organizational efforts and to promote common accord (Tallberg 2010). While the Chair of the Arctic Council needs to be respectful at all times of the norms and values of the organization, it should not shrink from utilizing resources and capabilities at its disposal to assist the Council in doing its work. This means being in the forefront of promoting and publicizing

the Council's projects and initiatives. The recent U.S. and Canadian Chairmanships did this effectively. It means taking a leading role in assisting the organization to focus its efforts on difficult but necessary undertakings. This is epitomized by the ongoing efforts of the current Finnish Chairmanship to create a long-term strategic plan for the Arctic Council. It also suggests that the Chair should not shy away from using its "good offices" to help resolve a long-term barrier to organizational advancement. This was clearly the case when the Swedish Chairmanship directly intervened to help negotiate a resolution to the Observer crisis. An effective Chair of the Arctic Council is one that is active whether it adopts a professional, honest broker or entrepreneurial style of operation. In the final section of this chapter, an effort will be made to address some of the challenges that will confront future Chairs of the Arctic Council and how the character of leadership from this position must evolve as the Arctic, itself, changes

11.4 Continuing Questions

As noted in Chap. 4 of this volume, there appear to be four continuing challenges that a Chair of the Arctic Council must address and attempt to resolve. These are the institutional requirements for inclusion, consensus, funding, and vision. The individual studies of the recent Chairmanships of the body have discussed the steps taken by successive heads of the organization to come to grips with various aspects of these concerns. However, much still remains much to be done by future leaders. Clearly more of an effort must be undertaken to make all interested parties in the Arctic feel welcomed within the Council. As the Arctic progressively becomes a global concern, room must be found for the interests and contributions of both those who live within the circumpolar region and those who reside outside it (Koivurova 2009). The Arctic Council must continue to operate as a forum and a voice for Arctic peoples. However, at the same time, new space must be found under its institutional umbrella for the efforts of others who would assist in its protection and development. Future Chairs of the Arctic Council must strive to come up with an acceptable balance that does not diminish the status or role of Arctic residents but also provides for new opportunities for the rest of the global community to take part in its efforts (Nord 2017b).

Equally challenging to future Chairs of the Arctic Council will be the need to secure adequate resources to fund the body's operation. It is increasingly apparent that as the Arctic Council evolves as an organization it will no longer be able to function solely on the basis of voluntary, project-oriented contributions. During the first decade of its operation, as the institution worked to establish itself, such limited resource allocations were, perhaps, adequate. Now, however, more than 20 years in existence and becoming more like a maturing international organization, the Arctic Council can no longer operate on limited "allowances" given by its members. Mandatory resource allocations are now required from all its participants to guarantee its ongoing efforts. The initial step in this direction took place under the

Scandinavian Chairmanships when mandatory contributions for support of the Secretariat were accepted. Additional progress down this road must be encouraged by the leadership of the Council (Nord 2017b). Similarly, future Chairs of the Arctic Council must strive to expanding the funding opportunities available specifically to the Permanent Participants. While some limited actions like recent establishment of the Álgu Fund during the U.S. Chairmanship have been taken, much more needs to be done to enable these representatives of the indigenous peoples of the Arctic to take part fully in the various efforts of the Arctic Council. Persuading funders to commit to such support will remain an ongoing responsibility of future Chairs of the body (Nord 2016a).

To the same extent, the challenge of promoting consensus within the Arctic Council will remain a continuing concern of future leadership within the organization. As a concept, the idea of consensus has been regularly supported within the body. However, it has not always been easy to secure in when advancing particular research efforts or policy initiatives (English 2013). This may be particularly evident in coming years as the international environment may become more tense and competitive in character. Future Chairs of the body will need to choose their opportunities for collective action carefully and seek the chance to encourage consensus around initiatives of obvious common benefit that are far from the sharp edge of potential conflict. The recent international accords sponsored by the Council under the Swedish and U.S. Chairmanships may be models of such undertakings. Such efforts will require Chairs who have a fully developed understanding of the global context for their initiatives and sophisticated diplomatic skills and abilities to contribute to such undertakings.

Finally, future Chairs of the Arctic Council must be fully aware and attuned to the need for vision within the organization. They must accept the idea that their best efforts are not short-term in nature but contribute to the much broader and ongoing work of the institution. As has been discussed earlier, continuity of leadership is becoming an increasingly necessary and valued practice within the body. Much of the current work under the Finnish Chairmanship to create a strategic plan for the Arctic Council has its roots in such a perspective. Inspired by the *Vision for the Arctic* document (Arctic Council 2013) that was presented at the Kiruna Ministerial, this effort to couple the needs and aspirations of the region with a concrete plan directed toward action has been subsequently championed by the U.S. and the Finnish Chairmanships. Canada, Sweden and other members of the Council have also contributed to its development. It is hoped that future Chairs of the Council will be provided with a useable document that will assist their efforts to provide focus and direction for the organization. It should be a document that allows future assessment of organizational performance and follow through. It should also be flexible enough for future leaders to adapt it to evolving needs and conditions. Provided with such an instrument, future Chairs can work successively to implement its objectives, processes and strategies.

As noted earlier in this volume, when the idea of having a two-year rotating chair for the Arctic Council was first broached many analysts had severe reservations. Some like the current author had concerns that the fairly quick movement of

leadership from one state to another might inhibit the development of an effective organization and impede progress toward continuity of action on its part (Young 2010). However, evidence from past two decades of the Council's operation suggest that these fears may have been unwarranted. Although the Council during its first rotational cycle did encounter some challenges in the area of coordination between one Chairmanship and another, the benefits derived from having several countries present their own visions and priorities for the Arctic seem to have outweighed these types of initial concerns. Such a rotational arrangement helped to redress the unfortunate, but commonly held belief that the entire Arctic region looks the same. Successive Chairs have demonstrated the differences as well commonalities in its natural and social environments. They have also facilitated the eventual acceptance by all of the participants within the Council that they each had specific contributions to make in addressing the various challenges and needs of the region. Small states as well as large countries can make important contributions. Even "reluctant" Arctic states like Sweden and the United States came to recognize a role for themselves in the region and see the importance of Arctic cooperation on an ongoing basis.

This recognition of differences as well as commonalities points to another particular insight into organizational leadership that can be gained by examining successive Chairs of the Arctic Council. This is an awareness that all leaders need not operate in exactly the same manner to be effective. While it is necessary that each Chair attend to the different responsibilities and functions of the position, they need not do this in exactly the same manner. They can pursue different strategies or styles of leadership. Some states, as has been seen, feel more comfortable in following one path while others may prefer a second or even a third approach. This may be reflective either of their own position in the international context, their own distinctive national priority given to Arctic concerns or their own specific views regarding the nature of leadership itself. Similarly, changing times and circumstances can require different types of organizational leadership. The fact that there may be no single template for successful leadership helps one to better understand the multidimensional character of chairs and the multifaceted contributions that they can make to international organization (Nord 2015).

This volume has also drawn attention to the fact that Chairs, by themselves, may not be the best judge of their own effectiveness. Those who receive direction from the Chairs can also be important assessors of their performance. In the case of the Arctic Council, the views and opinions of fellow Member States, and the sentiments of the Permanent Participants and Observers must be given due consideration. There needs to be a positive acceptance of a Chair's leadership from these groups in order for it to be seen as truly effective. As noted before, there must be willing followers and a sense of participation in the common endeavour to have successful leadership from the Chair. In the case of the current views and limited roles played by the Permanent Participants and Observers this is something that future Chairs of the Arctic Council should seek to enhance. It is also important to consider, as has been done in this volume, how the Permanent Participants and Observers can provide their own contributions of leadership within and outside the organization. The Arctic Council might benefit from greater efforts in these directions.

Today the Arctic is changing and the primary body that addresses its concerns, needs and aspirations must evolve as well. It is most likely that the Arctic Council will continue to grow in profile and influence within both the circumpolar community and the broader international arena. As it does so, its features are likely to come to resemble more closely that of other established international organizations. It is important that a continued effort be made to study the influence and impact of the Chairs of the Council under these changing conditions. For it is they, along with the other participants of the Arctic Council, who will continue to provide needed leadership for the North.

References

- Arctic Council. (2013). *Vision for the Arctic*. Tromsø: Arctic Council Secretariat.
- Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the world: International organizations in world politics*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Bengtsson, R., Elgström, O., & Tallberg, J. (2004). Silencer of amplifier? The European Presidency and the Nordic Countries. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 27(3), 311–334.
- English, J. (2013). *Ice and water: Politics, peoples and the Arctic Council*. Toronto: Allen Lane.
- Fenge, T., & Funston, B. (2015). *The practice and promise of the Arctic Council*. Amsterdam: Greenpeace International.
- Koivurova, T. (2009). The limits and possibilities of the Arctic Council in a rapidly changing scene of Arctic governance. *Polar Record*, 46(237), 146–156.
- Nord, D. C. (2015). The challenge of governance in the Arctic—Now and in the future. In B. Evengård, J. Nymand Larsen, & O. Paasche (Eds.), *The New Arctic*. Brussels: Springer.
- Nord, D. C. (2016a). *The Arctic Council: Governance within the Far North*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Nord, D. C. (2016b). *The changing Arctic: Creating a framework for consensus building and governance within the Arctic Council*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Nord, D. C. (2016c). Lessons to be Learned from three recent chairmanships of the Arctic Council. In L. Heininen (Ed.), *Arctic Yearbook 2016*. Akureyri: Northern Research Forum.
- Nord, D. C. (2017a). Leadership from the chair: The experience of three successive chairmanships of the Arctic Council. In P. W. Lackenbauer, H. Nicol, & W. Greaves (Eds.), *One Arctic: The Arctic Council and Circumpolar Governance*. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.
- Nord, D. C. (2017b). Identifying changing Arctic policy: Canada and the United States compared. In H. Nicol & P. W. Lackenbauer (Eds.), *The networked north: Borders and borderlands in the Canadian Arctic region*. Waterloo: Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism.
- Nord, D. C. (2017c). The challenge of Arctic governance. *Wilson Quarterly*. Summer/Fall <https://wilsonquarterly.com/>
- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Odell, J. (2009). Breaking deadlocks in international negotiations: The WTO in Seattle and Doha. *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(2), 273–299.
- Tallberg, J. (2004). The agenda shaping powers of the EU Council Presidency. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(1), 1–19.
- Tallberg, J. (2010). The power of the chair: Formal leadership in international cooperation. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54, 241–265.
- Young, O. R. (2010). Arctic governance—Pathways to the future. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics*, 1(2), 164–185.