Diverging stakeholder interests in a changing Arctic

* As the Arctic warms there will be both losers (coastal residents, traditional hunters, etc.) and winners (resource extraction, shipping, maybe some fisheries)
* New alliances may form of shared interests
* Some old alliances may be strained, as interests diverge
* People’s attitudes may shift more slowly than the environment. For example:
  + Today many people’s intuition, if not their intellectual understanding, is that things may return to ‘normal’. But the data says that historical norms are out of reach; there is no likely pathway to the past.
* Projecting changes in interests will require a grounding in environmental change.
* But the importance of physical changes can be over-stated by physical scientists.
  + Often social/economic/political change is more important … or
  + The ways that physical/environmental change is felt is by change in social factors.
    - E.g.: Is sea-ice retreat directly impactful? Or is the development following on the heels of sea-ice retreat primary? Or ???

Also interested in the distinction between “local” and “indigenous”.

* Most of my physical scientist friends blend these together, and consider indigenous partners as sources of local knowledge.
* But this leaves the precepts of modern/Euro-American/colonial science unchallenged.
* Is there a way to consider indigenous knowledge as a challenge to ‘western’ science, rather than just as an addition to it?