

‘Future Games’: Enacting Innovation in Greenland

Carina Ren & Rasmus Kjærgaard Rasmussen

This article explores how Arctic Winter Games 2016 (AWG), held in Nuuk, Greenland, enacted possible futures through specific policies and practices pertinent to societal innovation in contemporary Greenland. We see the event as a futuring device which engenders possible futures and ties in with current and emerging political and societal agendas. We use the two-year preparation phase of the AWG to explore how it created effects beyond the event proper. Drawing on various discourses and practices of the event, we analyze three central sites where it i) rehearses capacity building and upskilling models, ii) showcases Arctic competences and iii) attempts to mobilize a new culture of volunteering. We argue that the AWG 2016 can be seen as “future games” playing out an Arctic nation in the making, thus adding a new understanding to events as a locus of societal innovation.

Introduction

In early 2014, work had slowly started with preparing the Arctic Winter Games to be held in Nuuk, Greenland, in 2016. A local secretariat had been established to initiate the planning and executing of what had already by then been termed the largest event of its kind in Greenlandic history. In April 2014, an update by the general manager of the Arctic Winter Games 2016 could be read on Facebook, in which she stated:

Yesterday AWG2016 received an approval of its strategy and communication strategy in the steering committee. I am so looking forward to present it to all of you (...). We are thrilled to gather all of Greenland around this cultural and sport event, where about 2000 people will be coming to Nuuk. But AWG is not only about that week, where everything is launched. It is about those two years, where we as a community will improve and expand our competences, brand Greenland, collaborate in new ways and strengthen the areas of sport and culture in general. (...) I look forward to working with you – because we can do it together ☺ (General Manager Maliina Abelsen, Facebook update, April 2014).

In her update, the general manager makes a number of claims about the event. Contradictory to common understanding of AWG as a one-week youth sport and cultural event, the event is here narrated as being also about ‘those two years’ which precedes it. AWG 2016 does not only take place within the precincts of the host society of Nuuk, but also unfolds in other places, in the

whole of Greenland. The event is about something else. As we shall also see in the following, AWG and its strategy points towards the future of Greenland and to new engagements with collaboration, upskilling, branding and volunteering.

In this article, we take the reader on a journey of those two years that have since passed and discuss the claim – or promise – of AWG as being *something else and more* than a week of sports and culture in Nuuk. We propose to see AWG as a futuring device (Gad & Jensen, 2010) where ‘Little’ and ‘Big’ futures (Michael, 2016) co-exist and entangle in different ways. By proposing to explore AWG as a device ‘spilling over’ its immediate purpose, we build on several interconnected theoretical approaches to what we might call ‘futuring’, which are elaborated further below.

After a presentation of our understanding of events and the concept of futuring devices, we present our methodological approach to studying future in the making. We specifically focus on the network of event policies and practices, which engenders possible and manageable futures, continually adjusting to emerging agendas in contemporary Greenland. In our analysis, we describe three sites within this network where AWG entangles with larger societal discourses and concerns, in this case *upskilling*, *branding* and *voluntariness*. We see how AWG becomes an occasion to prototype and rehearse narratives of desirable futures through a range of speculative bets. By seeing events as futuring devices, we are able to empirically trace and engage with enactments of Greenland in the making.

Futuring Devices: Mapping the Performative Effects of Events

In this section, we unfold how events play the role of futuring devices. The idea of ‘future-generating devices’ originates from Jensen (2010; 2005) who investigates how socio-material actors, like computer systems and policy documents, are able to perform possible futures. According to Jensen ‘future-generating devices’ can facilitate linkages between people, agendas and practices as they “(...) have very little structure, and few material and discursive limits are (as yet) inscribed in them; to the extent that they do generate more lasting futures, such structures will have to evolve” (2005: 247). Such devices are open to multiple interpretations and used by an array of actors as they feed into existing agendas or lend themselves to policy in-the-making. This approach differs from traditional future research which extrapolates tendencies and trends based on statistical material or scenarios (for a tourism example see Yeoman, 2012) and enables us to explore ‘the future’ as much more dynamic and complex (Brown & Michael 2003).

In this article, we explore how the AWG event and a complex web of related policies and activities are mobilized to ‘do something’ in the present. By looking at events as futuring device(s) we seek to draw attention to the overlooked value of events as the receptacle of and vehicle for different actors’ futurist fantasies. Drawing on our previous research on tourism and nation branding policies, respectively, we argue that events stand in a dual relationship to policy as they enact and feed into both existing policy, and policies in the making (Rasmussen, 2017; Ren, 2016). While acknowledging that events have a discursive and narrative aspect e.g. in the form of their textual materials, we study the event as a social-material actor. Drawing on insights from Science and Technology Studies (STS) and, more specifically, from Actor-Network Theory (ANT) (Latour, 2005; Pedersen & Ren, 2015) we focus on the effects and *translations* (Callon 1986) of the event rather than with its explicit goals, concrete execution or hidden meanings. In relation to the present study of AWG we investigate its role as a futuring device and its relations

to Greenlandic development strategies and policies – see next section for details. In unfolding these connections, we follow Michael's (2016: 509) suggestion to map the "ways in which Big Futures are analytically or rhetorically transformed into Little and vice versa."

Methodology

Our constructivist approach subscribes to the view of reality as multiple and as enacted (Mol, 2002) and entails a view of the world as 'messy' (Law, 2004). Reality does not add up; it is not coherent and cannot be studied as a whole. Thus, we do not explore ways or situations in which AWG 'adds up' and we abstain from clearly defining what the AWG 'is'. Rather, by investigating three sites of entanglement, we show how AWG is enacted as more than a sports event – as indicated by the general manager's initial statement.

Seeing futures as enacted, we propose the AWG as a good opportunity to study futuring and its discursive and social-material devices in practice. As a way to operationalize the study of a 'messy' reality, Latour (1999) proposes to "follow the actor," that is to pursue the workings and effects of a particular actor. In this case, we describe how AWG 'travels' through different sites, appropriates different meanings and through this, how it creates, joins and challenges existing future visions.

Staying open to things as potentially multiple does not mean that AWG can be *anything*. Instead, and as argued by Mol, it is more than one but less than many. In order to materialize, reality requires hard and ongoing work continually undertaken by actors, human and non-human. In this article we specifically focus on how the event links to future through research questions concerned with what AWG is about and how it links to Greenlandic futures. We do so by describing three specific sites of upskilling, branding and voluntariness which enable us to understand AWG beyond itself.

In our work on Greenlandic futures at the AWG, we make use of a variety of empirical sources and material gathered over a period of over two years through document studies and fieldwork. For the purpose of generating material on the AWG, both authors travelled to Nuuk, Greenland, five times in total to follow the event preparations during its different stages. During our stays, we presented during workshops with AWG partners, joined a three-day bi-annual business conference in 2015 where AWG played a prominent role, attended the AWG event and took part in different event related activities. We interviewed central stakeholders and sent out surveys with volunteers, sponsors, participants, visitors and Greenlandic non-visitors (see Ren et al., 2016). Media and social media activities related to AWG were also monitored closely.

In order to link the AWG to contemporary Greenlandic development discourses and agendas we compiled a compendium of strategies and policies for the economic and social development of Greenland.¹ The main sampling criteria was to include documents concerned with the questions of "where is Greenland going?" and "how is Greenland getting there?" By linking these narratives of the 'big' (macro) future to the AWG16 strategy and to the fieldwork, we were able to discern three distinct sites of entanglements which, as we show further on, linked 'event effects' in terms of innovation to current ongoing discussions, agendas and policies on upskilling, branding and voluntariness.

Game On – Events & Societal Innovation

As previously mentioned, we see AWG2016 as a device to explore Greenlandic futures. Our initial interest into seeing the games as more than just a sporting event was spurred by the way the games were organized. Looking back on 2002 when Greenland co-hosted the AWG for the first time together with Iqaluit, several involved informants recalled how *execution* was an explicit goal at the time for the AWG team and then general manager, Michael Binzer. AWG 2002 was at the time also seen as a huge event (but only half the size of the 2016 event). It contained logistical challenges of all sorts, from IT and communication, to security, venues, volunteers and much more. Unlike AWG 2016 however, it was not organized along a public-private set-up. Beyond the mere ‘pulling it off’, specific desirable outcomes and values were never explicitly framed or discussed. At an AWG 2016 stakeholder seminar, Binzer stated that *the* most important outcome and long-lasting effect of AWG 2002 was ‘glue’, societal cohesion and being in it together (statement from “Value seminar,” held October 2014, Nuuk), something which he argued only became visible much later.

This time around, the concerns on effects and outcomes of the AWG secretariat were far more explicit. As stated by Abelsen in an email correspondence in March 2013:

we are currently occupied by how to measure the societal results and actually measuring and proving, that AWG is more than a week of celebration. How do we measure for instance if there is more societal cohesion in society, how do we measure if Greenland is actually branded and what is it worth in economic terms? This is something that we will be held accountable for (email correspondence, authors’ translation).

The quote displays an increasing awareness of and interest in working with value creation and might also provide an elucidation of the transformed organizational set-up. One explanation could be the changing roles of the public. AWG’s explicit strategic aim of making it ‘more than a sport event’ is inscribed in an environment of changing public roles and new demands for accountability and thus connects to state-centric theories of contemporary governance and public management (e.g., Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011; see Gad, 2014, for a comprehensive discussion of future Greenlandic statehood and sovereignty). As Cerny (1997) explains, a global search for competitive advantages has led to a situation in which the public or the state, as he terms it, “is no longer able to act as a decommodifying hierarchy (i.e., taking economic activities out of the market). It must act more and more as a collective commodifying agent - i.e. putting activities *into* the market – and even as *a market actor itself*. It is financier, middleman, advocate, and even entrepreneur, in a complex economic web” (Cerny, 1997: 267).

New roles and expectations of the public can be retraced in public event organization in which, as argued by Petersen and Ren (2015: 99), “the rising complexity and the increasing wish to work across sectorial divides on events or other big projects require that public administrators, event organizers, researchers and the many other stakeholders involved in the making and valuation of such activities address, rethink or broaden the outcomes of organizing and executing events.” In their work on the Eurovision Song Contest 2014 in Copenhagen, the authors describe how the work of a public-private host city company created for the occasion entailed not only the financing, preparation and holding of the music mega-event, but also a difficult venue development project, massive outreach initiatives, sponsor collaborations and agreements on public servants volunteering before and during the event. Similar to the AWG, this strongly

contrasted the previous Eurovision event held in Copenhagen in 2001, where the show was organized by the Danish Broadcasting system (DR) in the national sports stadium with little collaboration with any private or public partners.

The parallels in the development of the Eurovision 2001/2014 and the AWG 2002/2016 led us to argue that while Greenland is not (yet) a ‘proper’ sovereign state, new global requirements for a competition state and shifting roles of the public impact on the role of the Greenland public administration. Indirectly, it also influences how events such as AWG are organized and used as devices for doing other things, in our case to showcase or prototype desirable futures. In line with the special issue theme, we might say that AWG works as a vehicle to innovate by offering smaller prototypes of future societal organization, collaboration and value creation. In the following, we take a closer look at this by focusing on three moments in which AWG policies and practices engage with futures in the endeavors to create ‘more than a sports event’. Our first site of entanglement takes us to the higher circles at a business conference in Nuuk in 2015.

First Site of Entanglement: Capacity-Building from Elsewhere or from Below?

In this section, we explore how AWG interferes with policies envisioning big Greenlandic futures at the business conference of Future Greenland (FG) held in 2015 in Nuuk. The FG conference is a biannual event hosted by the Greenland Business Association and enjoys wide support and interest from a range of actors within Greenland’s political, commercial, media and bureaucratic elites. In 2015, the conference had more than 400 participants – mostly from Greenland and Denmark. Out of a total of eight conference workshops covering themes such as mining, investments, entrepreneurship and tourism, one was dedicated to the AWG event to be held the following year.

An explicitly stated aim of the conference was to debate the island’s future and “the goals and direction for the development of Greenland” (Greenland Business Association, 2015). Especially its overt allegiance to scenario-thinking and strategizing evidenced in the heading “Growth and welfare – scenarios for the development of Greenland” supported this choice. A dominant conference theme was Greenland’s dire economic situation and several of the speakers offered interpretations and historical accounts of the current predicament as well as possible solutions. In this respect, the FG conference was ‘more than a conference’ as it played the role of an incubator and test-tube for innovative ideas and policy-making generating new narratives of Greenland and acting as a futuring device for a nation in the making. This set-up and composition of actors make it a privileged site for studying big futures and in our case how AWG entangles into these.

A central solution offered to remedy the difficult conditions of Greenlandic society proposed by numerous speakers and participants, was the building of capacity and a general rise in the level of education and skills in society. In his key note presentation on Greenlandic future perspectives, Professor Minik Rosing argued that “the decisive factor for developing Greenland is research and education” (Minik Rosing, 2015, translated by the authors). While the view on the need to build capacity was shared by Brian Buus, CEO of Greenland’s business association, he however framed the solution somewhat differently, stating that “the more competences and capital we can attract from outside [of Greenland] – the more we can create locally” (Brian Buus Pedersen, 2015, translated by the authors). As the professor not surprisingly focused on education, the

representative of Greenlandic business life focused on attracting skills and other resources from abroad, a discourse which resonates well with the decade long tradition of importing skilled labor to Greenland.

The idea of societal capacity building and up-skilling as a necessity to build desirable futures was echoed in the AWG2016 workshop facilitated by its general manager in which AWG was proposed as a (part of) the solution to resolve the capacity challenge. In her introductory address, the general manager argued that AWG was valuable not only for participants, attendees and the host society but also for business, exactly due to its ability to build capacity by activating and building skills. AWG's vision of "generating pride and joy while developing social voluntariness and societal skills" (AWG strategy) thus aligned with a future narrative on capacity building at the conference and to a wider setting of crafting solutions to the pressing challenges of Greenlandic society at large.

During the workshop, the main assertion was how skills obtained through the planning and holding of the event by sponsors, volunteers and other partners could be used to benefit future public and business projects. To capitalize on and strengthen this ongoing work entailed a realization, the general manager claimed, of the deep need for and dependency on businesses, volunteers and general involvement and on collaboration between all stakeholders. It also meant a realization of how the host society was in fact already 'sitting' on knowledge (Ren & Bjørst, 2016). At a moment during her presentation, the general manager kept insisting on how citizens were sitting on a gold mine, at last asking the participants to look under their seats. Fastened underneath every seat, the workshop participants found a candy bar offering much amusement in the crowd. They were really 'sitting on a gold mine', which metaphorically alluded to how during a time of failed or halted mineral adventure in Greenland, the 'real' gold mine was the one found in people rather than in rocks.

In this first site of entanglement at the Future Greenland conference, the strategy of the AWG event is carefully translated into an ongoing discussion of education and skill development where AWG is offered as a prototype to explore where the Greenlandic society is going. AWG works as a 'boundary object' (Star, 2010; Star & Greisemer, 1989) – a flexible narrative which can engage many actors and agendas. The metaphor of looking for and finding gold 'at home' however challenged the dominant logic present at the Future Greenland conference of skills, taking on a second, less prevailing understanding of capacities as *built in* rather than *brought to* Greenland. By proposing to activate, build and rehearse local skills during the event, AWG interfered with traditional colonial discourses and practices of importing resources and the attraction of necessary capacities from outside of Greenland.

From the business conference, we now move forward in time to a few days before the opening of the games. There, we take a look at how AWGs strategic vision to attract 'global attention' and the linking 'to a larger forward-looking and positive presentation of Greenland' unfolded through an inconvenient storm.

The Second Site of Entanglement – 'Now We Do What We Do Best'

A few days before the opening ceremony of the AWG 2016 in Nuuk, weather reports looked bleak. A spring blizzard was on its way and expected to peak the day prior to the opening ceremony. That very Saturday, 1250 participants were set to fly to Greenland's capital city – the

highest number of civilians arriving in one day by aircraft to Greenland in the island's history. Now, however, bad weather was jeopardizing this milestone in Greenlandic aviation history and, along with that, the successful execution of the upcoming games.

Although the blizzard disrupted the flight from Kangerlussuaq to Nuuk and ended up slightly delaying the AWG 2016 opening ceremony, the event managers were not taken by surprise by this ordinary spring weather phenomenon. As an immediate response, a backup plan was set into effect, changing the traffic program and rescheduling the opening ceremony in order to ensure the smooth execution of the event. AirGreenland, the Danish Defense's Arctic Command, volunteers, and many other actors were brought in to respond to the situation, offering an interesting if nerve-wracking beginning to this year's games.

The dramatic actions and measures display the challenges of operating in an Arctic environment, where planning may fall victim to the weather. Spinning this to their advantage, the organizers explained that the blizzard had provided them with an occasion to, in the words of general manager, "do what we do best." In a press release, the AWG organizers further pointed out that "When weather conditions challenge us, we find solutions and solve it together." One of the main players involved in the flight bride was the main AWG sponsor of AirGreenland. In their social media coverage of the storm, the company posted texts and pictures on their Facebook page celebrating the collaborative efforts, which had enabled a smooth and swift execution in spite of the difficult conditions. As commented by a user on an AirGreenland Facebook post asking to give the Dash 8 a high five: "It's perhaps more in its place to give a high five to the crew, Ground Crew and technicians, who have worked a certain body part off to make it succeed" (*Facebook* comment, 5/3 2016). These statements show how AWG 2016 offers itself as a site to exhibit the Arctic competences necessary to maneuver in unpredictable terrain and as an occasion to demonstrate logistic and collaborative skills.



Figure 1. Flight bridge successfully completed – with a human touch. This AirGreenland Facebook post was liked by 964 people, shared 25 times and commented by 50 enthusiastic users.

As argued by mayor and event owner Asii Chemnitz Narup, the AWG 2016 is "one of many windows of opportunities we shall be aware of in the continuous work for attracting business, tourism and science and media attention. As a region, we can and must profit from that" (Narup, 2016). To her, the well-executed logistics and organization of AWG provide benefits that exceed

the sport event itself. By publically announcing the measures taken to adapt to and make the best of the situation, organizers invited a global audience to experience a big-scale activation of Arctic competencies in working together, in being flexible and in rapidly adjusting to unexpected circumstances.

During the games, some of the most popular media stories in the Greenlandic, Danish and circumpolar press ended up being about this storm. The storm related press released, news articles and communication from partners caught on to the dual strategic aims of AWG to “strengthen social skills” and to focus global attention on Greenland (AWG, 2014). As a policy narrative, AWG was casted as an effective platform to demonstrate and brand the skills, assets and capacities of the host society to participants, visitors, community and global media. The values which it spurred were human values and the futures enacted related to collaboration and Arctic competencies.

Third Site of Entanglement – Volunteering Futures

While the previous site tells of the AWG as a global platform for the display of Arctic competencies, the third and last story, currently evolving in the aftermaths of AWG 2016, is dominated by another narrative on the outcomes of the event related to societal skills, namely volunteering. In this story, we focus on the current municipal initiative of channeling volunteers from AWG to other public projects. Once again little and big futures entangle, as AWG policies and practices overflow beyond the confines of the event proper, this time into the public administration and the core area of welfare and care. At a municipal level, the engagement of a huge amount of volunteers during AWG has specifically created an opportunities to work with volunteer culture.

According to the strategy, a part of the AWG vision is to develop societal voluntariness (AWG, 2014). As the general manager stated in her Facebook update mentioned earlier on “AWG will be making use of volunteers from the whole of Greenland, who will be going through project training. We expect a minimum of 650 persons to go through courses in languages, project management, first aid etc. We will be visiting all larger towns and offer courses on volunteering – which we may use in our local communities”. For AWG, working to attract volunteers was not only an explicit and wishful aim but also an economic prerequisite to keep budgets and hence enable the successful holding of the event. Without volunteers, no games. However, as we will see, this immediate event necessity was linked to similar pressing societal needs.

In spite of the very high number of volunteers needed, by the deadline on 31 January 2016 the AWG secretariat had managed to attract 1750 volunteers, surpassing the initial goal of 1700. It did prove to be hard work getting volunteers through the training programs and initiatives, which had already been specified in the strategy. This confirms the general challenge in volunteer management of securing the interest and motivation of volunteers in order to prevent drop-outs (Wilson, 2000). However, by early January 84 volunteers had gone through courses or seminars of project work and five joint seminars for the 63 voluntary committees had been held. First-aid courses had been conducted with 60 volunteers and English courses with 33. Also, courses in voluntary work had been held with approximately 200 volunteers in six different towns.

The sheer numbers and activities display the efforts and accomplishments in recruiting and upskilling a large number of volunteers across Greenland, the least densely populated nation in the world. On their website, AWG reports from the volunteer courses:

“The training course has now been held in Qaqortoq and Nuuk. Participants were very interested and avidly involved. We could clearly see that many of them truly are passionate about their voluntary work but lack the tools they need. This tells us that the training courses are valuable to voluntary work and therefore also of value to society. This is indeed a field we should acknowledge much more strongly and continue to develop in (the) future” (www.awg2016.org).

The account shows how training courses and other volunteer activities seek to drive the installment of a new culture of voluntariness and to unlock local potential, as also seen during the Future Greenland conference. According to Ren and colleagues (2015: 89), this major and prolonged involvement illustrates how AWG “enters everyday life in a number of powerful ways.” Through the year-long process of planning the event, “connections are forged and requirements are articulated through collaborative efforts of the event actors. Through collaborations with and between civic organizations, educational institutions, the art and music scene and others, new social and public-private configurations are enacted such as citizens-as-volunteers, NGOs-as-partners and companies-as-sponsors” (Ibid.). But the question is whether and how this will turn into longer-lasting effects?

In an interview, the AWG general manager identifies the capturing and anchoring of ‘unlocked’ volunteering capacities - and contact details – as essential to capitalize on a central outcome of AWG. This will entail another actor, the municipality, to take over through a planned volunteer database enabling future contact and re-activation of volunteers for other activities requiring volunteer help. In an interview, Marie Fleischer from Sermersooq municipality argues “we are currently looking at how to make use of these volunteer resources, which is a real strong source of development for our citizens”. While Greenland has previously capitalized on volunteers primarily in the area of sports, the goal is now to broaden the scope of volunteering to support strained welfare service resources. Fleischer confirm that the municipality has “initiated a process where we open up old people’s homes, kindergartens etc., informing about the possibility of joining as a visitor or play bingo with the elders on Sunday, distribute food or go for a walk. So it has provided an opportunity to talk more about volunteering.”

As a project company, the AWG secretariat closed down shortly after the event, in July 2016. At that moment, the many resources, skills and experiences gathered in the secretariat, the 63 event AWG committees and the 1700 volunteers were dispersed. So far, discussions are taking place on how the municipality will be able to transfer volunteer resources to current challenges in building a volunteer culture. In other words, how is the Little future of volunteering in Greenland being translated into a Big volunteering future? Whether this will succeed is an open – but critical – question.

Concluding Remarks: Desirable Arctic Futures

In this article, we have sought to show how the 2016 AWG event worked as a site for enacting and rehearsing possible Greenlandic futures. In the beginning of this paper, we proposed that AWG could be seen as a futuring device, where futures were continually produced, tested - and

contested - within a complex network of policies and practices. We explored this further at three sites of entanglement, where AWG was enrolled in to emerging issues and concerns – of social capacity building, the presentation and branding of Arctic competencies and of the need to strengthen volunteering.

At the first site of entanglement, the Future Greenland conference, AWG worked as a boundary object, connecting its activities to existing upskilling discourses, agendas and practices and offering an alternative bottom-up approach to capacity building. In the second site of entanglement, a ‘perfect storm’ leading up to the event opening provided an occasion for organizers and partners to showcase Arctic competences through their collaboration on logistics. This offered the opportunity to brand Greenland as a ‘competent’ nation by building alternative stories to those typically told about the Arctic nation.

The third site of entanglement showed how AWG provided a test site for rehearsing volunteering practices and for building a large-scale volunteering infrastructure. It is presently unclear whether AWG was the decisive moment for the rise of a new Greenlandic volunteering culture and whether technical support will be developed to support it. However, the volunteering activities connected to AWG as described at the third site of entanglement display a clear attempt to link the need for volunteers at AWG to a larger societal requirement.

The three sites unraveled in the present article encompass multiple stories of Greenlandic futures. Stories that are, we would propose, performative rehearsals of ‘something more’. While AWG values and futures oscillate and are currently not stabilized, the event proposed alternative solution narratives and prototyped new approaches to tackling existing and impending challenges. By bringing together and reshuffling relations between a large number of actors, resources and discourses over a period of two years, AWG interfered with dominant societal discourses and practices pointing towards new, viable reconfigurations of otherwise stable Greenlandic narratives.

Notes

1. The compendium consists of strategic texts on Greenlandic economic development from 2010-2016 and published in official policy documents from the Greenlandic and Danish Governments and in reports from think-tanks and NGOs. The main sampling criteria has been the texts’ explicit reference to i) specific economic development agendas and ii) general more narrative bets on the ‘future’ of Greenland. Based on a close reading of the original 2015 AWG-strategy paper, the three main themes of “upskilling,” “branding” and “voluntariness” was discerned and the following compendium texts was therefore secondarily selected based on their semantic proximity to these three themes:
 - Brookings Institution (2014). *The Greenland Gold Rush. Promise and Pitfalls of Greenland’s Energy and Mineral Resources*, Washington: John L. Thornton China Center at Brookings, 68 pages.
 - Government of Greenland (2010). *Hvordan sikres vækst og velfærd i Grønland? [How can growth and welfare in Greenland be secured?]*, Baggrundsrapport. Nuuk: Skatte- og Velfærdskommissionen, 102 pages.

- Government of Greenland (2014). *Greenland's oil and mineral strategy 2014-2018* (English version). Nuuk: Department of Business and Minerals; Department of Environmental Affairs, 102 pages.
- Government of Greenland (2015). "Strategi 2015-2018" [Strategy 2015-2018], Nuuk: VisitGreenland. Available at <http://corporate.greenland.com/da/nyhedsbrevsarkiv/visit-greenlands-kommende-turismestrategi-for-2015-2018-1/>
- Government of Greenland (2016). *Turismeudvikling i Grønland. Hvad skal der til? National sektorplan for turisme* [Tourism development in Greenland. What does it take? National action plan for tourism]. Nuuk: Department of Ministry of Industry, Labour and Trade, 76 pages.
- Governments of Denmark, Greenland and the Faeroe Islands (2011). *Strategy for the Arctic 2011-2020*. Copenhagen: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 58 pages.
- Government of Greenland, Government of Denmark (2015). *Fremme af kommercielt erhvervsamarbejde mellem Grønland og Danmark* [Optimizing commercial business cooperation between Greenland and Denmark]. Copenhagen: Ministry of Business and Growth, 48 pages.
- Government of Denmark (2016). *Danish Diplomacy and Defence in Times of Change. A Review of Denmark's Foreign and Security Policy*, executive summary in English. Copenhagen: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, 15 pages.
- Greenpeace (2014) "Hvor kan udviklingen komme fra? Potentialer og faldgruber i de grønlandske erhvervssektorer frem mod 2025" [Where can development come from? Potentials and pitfalls in greenlandic business sectors towards 2025], Copenhagen: Rambøll.
- University of Greenland, University of Copenhagen (2014). *To the benefit of Greenland*, Nuuk: Committee for Greenlandic Mineral Resources to the Benefit of Society, 52 pages.

References

- Brown, N and Mike Michael. 2003. A sociology of expectations: retrospecting prospects and prospecting retrospects. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 15 (1): 3-18
- Callon, Michel. 1986. Some elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brioux Bay. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: a new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 196-223). London: Routledge.
- Cerny, Philip G. 1997. Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization. *Government and Opposition* 32 (2): 251-274. doi: 10.1111/j.1477-7053.1997.tb00161.x.
- Gad, Christopher and Casper Bruun Jensen. 2010. On the consequences of post-ANT. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 35 (1): 55-80.
- Gad, Ulrik P Pram (2014). 'Greenland: a post-Danish sovereign nation state in the making'. *Cooperation & Conflict*, 49(1): 98-118.
- Jensen, Casper Bruun. (2005). An Experiment in Performative History: The Danish Electronic Patient Record as a Future-Generating Device. *Social Studies of Science*. 35 (2): 241-67.
- Jensen, Casper B. (2010). *Ontologies for Developing Things Making Health Care Futures Through Technology*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense publishers.
- Latour, Bruno (2005) *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard

- University Press.
- Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. Routledge.
- Michael, Mike (2016). Enacting Big Futures, Little Futures: toward an ecology of futures. *The Sociological Review*, 1-17. DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12444
- Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Duke University Press
- Petersen, Morten K. and Carina Ren. 2015. Much more than a song contest?: Exploring Eurovision 2014 as Potlatch. *Valuation Studies* 3 (2): 97-118. 10.3384/Vs.2001-5992.153297
- Rasmussen, Rasmus K. 2017. Rethinking Counter-Narratives in Studies of Organizational Texts and Practices. Sanne Frandsen, Timothy Kuhn and Marianne Wolff Lundholt (Eds.). *Counter-Narratives and Organization* (pp. 293-332). Routledge, New York and London
- Ren, Carina. 2016. Cool or hot Greenland? Exhibiting and enacting sustainable Arctic futures. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 111: 442-450.
- Ren, Carina, Morten Krogh Petersen and Dianne Dredge. 2015. Guest Editorial: Valuing Tourism, *Valuation Studies* 3 (2): 85-96
- Ren, Carina and Lill Rastad Bjørst (2016) "Situated capacities: Exploring Arctic Winter Games 2016 upskilling initiatives". Knudsen, Rebekka (red.). *Perspectives on skills: an anthology on informally acquired skills in Greenland*. Kapitel 7.4, Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen. 2016. 206-224.
- Star, S. L. (2010). This is Not a Boundary Object: Reflections on the Origin of a Concept. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 35 (5), 601-617. doi: 10.1177/0162243910377624.
- Star, Susan. L., and J. R. Griesemer. 1989. Institutional Ecology, 'Translations' and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19 (3) Aug, 387-420.
- Yeoman, I. (2012). *2050-tomorrow's tourism* (Vol. 55). Channel View Publications.
- Wilson, John (2000) Volunteering. *Annual review of sociology*, 2000, 26(1), 215-240.