

the book. Burke also misses the diplomatic efforts by Canada to turn the AEPS into a more formal body that would consider all issues, not just environmentally focused ones. Once again, the negotiations between Canada and the United States should have been a critical element of the book but are not included. The focus on 2013–2015 leaves the reader with a sense that the only important developments take place during that time, which is not correct.

One of the most important findings of the book concerns how national politics interact with the effort to develop a collaborative club. A major subtheme is that Canada's opposition to Russian intervention in Crimea and eastern Ukraine, which emerged from the domestic dynamics of Canadian politics, critically wounded the prospects for cooperation on the Arctic Council. It is clear that Burke sees this one act as a major—or to use her term, “harsh”—mistake. Her exclusive focus on this example, however, means that she disregards other instances of national policy influencing the functioning of the Arctic Council. For instance, American national policy on climate change led it to oppose the conclusions of the Arctic Council's 2004 report on climate change—the *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)*—even though the report was very influential in shaping the international narrative on climate change. The ongoing refusal of the European Union to back down from its ban on seal products in the face of the opposition of the Inuit Circumpolar Council (one of the Permanent Participants) is another example. In light of these cases, Canada's boycott of meetings with Russia seems less significant and isolated. Again, the omission of key evidence amounts to a lost opportunity to develop a stronger argument about how national politics affects the functioning council.

In short, this is a book with a very interesting thesis, but it does not achieve its objective. The Arctic Council is indeed a fascinating case study of how different agents (state parties, Indigenous bodies and nongovernment organizations) can organize themselves and function in an innovative and generally cooperative manner. However, the study lacks the necessary historical documentation and related literature to fully explain how such diplomacy actually works.

Response to Rob Huebert's review of *Diplomacy and the Arctic Council*

Danita Catherine Burke, University of Southern Denmark (burke@sam.sdu.dk)

In *Diplomacy and the Arctic Council*, I offer insight into the way the council addresses daily internal and external challenges/pressures and international political events involving its core members, particularly the fallout of the Crimea conflict. I demonstrate that Russia has maintained a high status in the Arctic Council (105–16) and is viewed as essential to the forum's existence and success (44). As such, some interviewees spoken to during the primary research for the book perceived the Government of Canada's stance against Russia while Canada chaired the forum in 2014 as harsh, in the Arctic Council context, because the chair role meant Canada was supposed to help maintain unity between the forum members. Instead, the Government of Canada broke the key forum rule to not discuss military issues (94–100). As a result, Canada's actions were perceived as undermining its civil servants (96), its status as chair and the forum's cohesion (103).

The book is grounded in the international scholarship on Arctic cooperation and does note contextual factors like the legacy of the anti-sealing movement for potential observer membership (144–45) and the impact of American policy in the 1990s on the forum's budget (52) and secretariat (73). The book references leading Arctic scholars such as John English, Heather Exner-Pirot, Douglas Nord, Oran Young and Rob Huebert. The Arctic Council digital archive

is also used as a valuable resource throughout the text to highlight issues and their management, such as institutional memory (79, 181–82) and budgeting (51–62).

The book is not a historical piece focused on the creation of the Arctic Council, nor a Canada-centric one; historical analysis of the Arctic Council's establishment is a well-researched area. Huebert (2021) takes issue with the book's lack of focus on Canada–US Arctic relations, the history of the Arctic Council's formation and the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy. There are ample skilled writers, in addition to Huebert, such as Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel, David Scrivener, Raymond Arnaudo, Adam Lajeunesse and Evan Bloom who cover bilateral Arctic relations between Canada and the United States and the early years of the Arctic Council in their work.

What is evident is that there is a misalignment between what the book sets out to do and what Huebert would prefer that it did. This helps to explain why authors suggested by Huebert such as Jessica Shadian, Franklyn Griffiths and Michael Byers are not focused on in the text, though their works have added to my understanding of the Arctic region. I have used their research in other pieces I have written, which I cite in the book, such as *International Disputes and Cultural Ideas in the Canadian Arctic*, “Debating the Arctic during the Ukraine Crisis,” and my article on Canada's Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, titled “Leading by Example.” By building on rather than reiterating my past work, *Diplomacy and the Arctic Council* is free to cover new ground and add insights from practitioners as they navigate the contemporary dynamics of the Arctic Council.

I am also transparent in the book about its limitations. As a result, the book calls for more work on Indigenous organizations and their role in the Arctic Council and placement within its internal pecking order (176–77). However, to suggest that I undervalue the central importance of the Permanent Participants (PPs) is incorrect and misleading. I stress in the book that PPs inform, legitimize and influence decision making (7, 144). However, PPs lack full independent inclusion on par with the Arctic state members in the formal consensus decision-making process (163–64). Additionally, I acknowledge in the book that there are factors unique to the PP experience, such as challenges in access to Indigenous and national language translation services, limitations in funding support and complexities and power imbalances in state–PP relationships, which impact PP participation in the forum (62–68, 80–81, 105–6, 164–66).

Overall, there are many ways to approach research of the Arctic Council, which influence what is added and emphasized in any publication. Such decisions are ultimately influenced by the research focus, aims and writing styles of individual researchers, as well as the resources they have at their disposal.

Reference

Huebert, Rob. 2021. Review of *Diplomacy and the Arctic Council*, by Danita Catherine Burke. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423920001249>.