

and to the scholar. (William Barr, Arctic Institute of North America, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary AB T2N 1N4, Canada (circumpolarbill@gmail.com)).

References

Barr, W. 2007. *Arctic hell-ship. The voyage of HMS Enterprise 1850–1855*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Cohen, A. 2013. *Lost beneath the ice. The story of H.M.S. Investigator*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.

Great Britain 1855. *Report of the Select Committee on Arctic Expeditions; together with the proceedings of the Committee, minutes of evidence and appendices*. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 20 July 1855 (Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons. Sessional papers, Reports from Committees, 1854–55, v. 7, no. 409).

The new Arctic. Birgitta Evengård, Joan Nymand Larsen and Øyvind Paasche (editors). 2015. Berlin: Springer. xxii + 352 p, illustrated, hardcover. ISBN 978-3-319-17601-7. 129.99€.

doi:[10.1017/S0032247416000139](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247416000139)

I must be brutally honest with the readers of this review: when I first laid my eyes on this volume with the simple title *The new Arctic* I was not utterly impressed. And I can tell you the reason why this is the case. First, the book aligns itself with many other anthologies on Arctic change that I have reviewed over the last few years. Second, the *Introduction* by one of the editors, Birgitta Evengård, unsurprisingly clarifies that the book brings together ‘a variety of Arctic scholars, each with their own scientific background, approach, and understanding of the Arctic, and with their views on what drives change, why, and how, in an effort to create composite picture where insights from different disciplines can be intertwined and woven together’ (page 3). So far so good and certainly nothing groundbreaking. Upon a closer look, however, one element comes to the fore that indeed make this volume stand out: while confined to merely 350 pages, the book contains 24 chapters, all written by well-known and not-so-well-known experts of the Arctic. And one will immediately notice the truly inter- and cross-disciplinarity of this volume, tackling Arctic change from a multitude of angles.

As can be expected by the vigilant reader of this review, a short review like this does not allow for a summary and evaluation of each single chapter, so some degree of cherry-picking as well as broader summarising of the book is necessary. Thus, let us take a step back and take into consideration Evengård’s introductory sentence cited above and the range of topics, or snapshots thereof, covered in this volume: narratives about Greenland, reindeer husbandry in Sweden, fleeting glaciers of the Arctic, the Arctic carbon cycle, the Arctic in fiction, human development and tourism in the Arctic, the ‘race’ for resources, circumpolar health, infectious diseases in the Arctic, or the emerging Arctic humanities. Given the volume’s twenty-four chapters, the list goes on.

And one can argue that in the diversity of the book lies its greatest strength as well as its greatest weakness. Let us start with the weakness-part of the argument and let’s get it over with: it appears as if the book lacks a focus and merely combines a plethora of different elements of Arctic research. One could imagine some chapters just being replaced by different ones dealing with Arctic change without changing the book itself. The absence of a summarising or concluding chapter that weaves the red threads of the book into a comprehensive whole further adds to this point of view. Therefore, one might argue,

the book is a compilation of surely interesting research, but a scattered one, reminding of a music compilation on which it is easy to skip a song that doesn’t interest you.

While I can see this line of argument coming up, my personal view is different – the strength-part of the argument. Because while indeed presenting research snapshots of the ‘new’ Arctic, the book is a fascinating account of the differences in how the Arctic is perceived, evaluated and scientifically approached. Since I am personally utterly interested in a multitude of topics, I found this volume not only incredibly exciting (and worrying at the same time), but it furthermore deepened my understanding of processes in the Arctic which I, as an Arctic governance scholar, would not have come across that easily. Especially the chapters dealing with natural science-phenomena of Arctic change are written in a way easily understandable to those not overly familiar with earth sciences and, luckily for me, do not contain much mathematical data. Surely, some diagrams can be found, but also these are easily understandable for the earth-scientifically untrained. At the same time, the book breaks away from the climate-change-resource-narrative and includes topics that are not commonly covered in Arctic anthologies. Take Nina Wormbs’ chapter on *The assessed Arctic: how monitoring can be silently normative*, for instance. She challenges commonly applied interactions between natural and social sciences and applied political changes based on natural scientific findings. One passage struck me in particular. Wormbs writes: ‘Would it be possible to write about human societies elsewhere [...] defining them as vital and resilient, or on the contrary lame and doomed? Probably not. Imagine a statement on New Yorkers, or inhabitants of the French city Lyon talked about in the same language’ (page 297). She explains this approach with the science-focus the Arctic has had that can still be found today even despite the diversification of research in the north. In terms of ‘decolonising methodologies’ (Tuhiwai Smith 1999) however, Wormbs could have asked whether Arctic communities would talk about themselves as being ‘vital and resilient’? Notwithstanding, Wormbs’ critical contribution is certainly noteworthy and should (both in conjunctive and imperative sense) open up critical pathways of thinking about scientific findings and their application.

Indeed, the absence of a summarising chapter is therefore probably a good thing. Because the book provides doors to many rooms, pathways, and maybe mazes of Arctic research. The well-referenced articles provide solid background literature on specific research topics that *The new Arctic* could serve as a starting point for. It is thus to conclude that the editors have done an outstanding job in putting together a book that is engaging, challenging, eye-opening and somewhat different than other anthologies on the Arctic! This proves, once again, that first impressions are not always what they seem to be. One

or the other typo has found its way into the book – for example, I dare say that the editors refer to ‘indigeneity’ instead of ‘indignity’ (page vii) that the book deals with – but this does not impair the articles’ high quality. *The new Arctic* is thus highly recommendable for those aiming to get a broader picture of Arctic change. But the book goes beyond the notion of ‘Arctic change’ as it provides the reader with insight into the different approaches towards the global north, making it a diverse region

with diverse cultures and discourses. (Nikolas Sellheim, Faculty of Law, University of Lapland, PO Box 122, 96101 Rovaniemi, Finland (nikolas.sellheim@ulapland.fi)).

Reference

Tuhiwai Smith, L. 1999. *Decolonising methodologies. Research and indigenous peoples*. London & New York: Zed Books Ltd.

International relations in the Arctic. Norway and the struggle for power in the new north. Leif Christian Jensen. 2016. London & New York: I. B. Tauris. xii + 208 p, illustrated, hardcover. ISBN 978-1-78453-213-0. £69.00.

doi: [10.1017/S0032247416000140](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247416000140)

From the outset the book *International relations in the Arctic* raises the impression of filling a gap in the Arctic research literature as it is to the knowledge of this reviewer the first comprehensive discourse analysis on the Arctic within an Arctic state – Norway. Jensen thus has embarked on an impressive journey and has analysed 3,043 articles in four different Norwegian newspapers in order to flesh out different narratives and discourses pertaining to the Arctic in Norway. He has structured the book around, what Jensen terms, ‘four of the weightiest foreign policy issues: security; Russia; the environment; and natural resources’ (page 1).

Nicely enough, the author not only presents this challenging findings, but in Chapter 1 delves into the more theoretical elements of discourse analysis. What is actually meant by that term? And who applies it how? In this regard Jensen presents a short but poignant overview of key literature and approaches towards ‘discourse analysis’ and the way he applies it in his book. This reviewer would however disagree with Jensen’s statement that ‘ulterior motives and hidden agendas’ (page 16) behind politically relevant discourses can never be observed. After all, the disciplines of political or legal anthropology try to achieve exactly that (see for example Sarfaty 2012). In how far this is successful of course remains a matter of academic debate.

This notwithstanding, the reader gains deep insight into discourse analysis as a theory and method. Especially Jensen’s detailed description and discussion of his methodology enables the reader keen on her or his own discourse analysis to take Jensen’s methodology as a starting point. This makes moreover also those unfamiliar with the concept gain an understanding of what ‘discourse analysis’ entails in practice.

Before presenting the findings of his analysis, in Chapter 2 Jensen presents a brief overview of the empirical background of Norway’s ‘high north’ and outlines different security concerns in the Barents Sea as well as around Svalbard. Not surprisingly, ‘Norway’s relationship with Russia ranks above most other concerns’ (page 54) and is guided by developments such as the the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR) established in 1992, the delimitation agreement in the Barents Sea of 2010 or the exploitation of hydrocarbons. A wealth of literature exists on these issues, but Jensen appeared to not deem it necessary to cite much of this, and rightfully so, as the empirical backdrop does not constitute the author’s thematic focus.

Chapter 3 is more or less the core of the present volume and presents the author’s findings of his extensive discourse analysis of four Norwegian newspapers – conservative, business-oriented, northern local and leftist – regarding the ‘high north’ between 2000 and 2006. By dividing the time period into three distinct discursive episodes with different dynamics Jensen convincingly shows how in the early 2000s little regard is paid to the north in the Norwegian media and it is rather dealt with under non-coherent narratives similar to those of the 1990s. Yet, from 2004 onwards the ‘high north’ peaks in the media due to an atmosphere of hope and opportunity, especially with regard to the potential of cooperation with Russia concerning the Barents Sea hydrocarbon reserves. Yet, when Russian cooperation did not take place as expected, since 2006 the ‘high north’ discourse gave way to collective feelings of disappointment and disillusionment. Interestingly, Jensen further points to individuals countering the respective prevailing discourse, uttering more critical voices or simply contradicting narratives. Unfortunately without going much into detail, the reactions to these voices in the press appear to have been rather strong. To this reviewer, Jensen could have further emphasised this issue in order to make the continuance and change of discourses better explainable.

Moving from the press to political documents, Jensen presents another core part of his research in the fourth chapter when he analyses how ‘the approaches to the European Arctic [are] framed through the foreign policy discourses in Norway and Russia, and what [...] the discursive nodal points [are that] these discourses evolve around’ (page 79). And it is with great satisfaction to this reviewer that Jensen also covers Russian political discourse on the Arctic with as much thoroughness as he does with the Norwegian one. Of course, one could have hoped for a Russian media analysis as well, but as Jensen states: ‘The Russian alternative to Norway’s intense discursive mobilisation is only conspicuous by its absence’ (page 89). Since Jensen covers only the time period 2000–2006, this reviewer would assume, however, that media discourse on the Arctic in Russia has changed since the infamous 2007 flag planting under the North Pole. This cannot be backed up by empirical data though. Notwithstanding, the difference in the political perception of the north between Norway and Russia becomes very clear in this chapter: while for Norway it appears to be the benefit of cooperation between Russia and Norway, for Russia one country’s gain is the loss of the other. This is not surprising, however, given Russia’s ‘securitised’ approach towards the energy-rich Arctic.

In the fifth chapter Jensen lays out the different discourses pertaining to the question of ‘to drill or not to drill’ in the Barents Sea. An interesting utilisation of narratives has taken place in Jensen’s analysis: the pro-drilling side has used environmental arguments to further press for quick development of