

Working Papers on Arctic Security No. 1

Human Security in the Arctic: The Foundation of Regional Cooperation

Heather Exner-Pirot, Ph.D.
University of Saskatchewan

July 2012

MUNK
SCHOOL
OF
GLOBAL
AFFAIRS



ArcticNet
ᐃᐅᐅᓃᑦᑕᓃᑦᑕᐅᑦ ᑕᐅᓯᓂᐱᓃᑦᑕᐅᓃᑦ

The Emerging Arctic
Security Environment

**HUMAN SECURITY IN THE ARCTIC:
THE FOUNDATION OF REGIONAL
COOPERATION**

The contents of this publication are entirely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view or opinions of the Munk-Gordon Arctic Security Program and the ArcticNet project on “The Emerging Arctic Security Environment.”

This publication is available under limited copyright protection. You may download, distribute, photocopy, cite or excerpt this document provided it is properly and fully credited and not used for commercial purposes.

© 2012 Heather Exner-Pirot

Working Papers on Arctic Security

This series seeks to stimulate deeper academic dialogue on Arctic security issues in Canada. Papers fall into three categories. The first includes theoretically—and empirically—driven academic papers on subjects related to Arctic security broadly conceptualized. The second focuses on the impacts of defence and security practices on Arctic peoples, with a particular emphasis on the Canadian North during and after the Cold War. The third category of papers summarizes key Canadian and international policy documents related to Arctic security and sovereignty issues.

This series is supported by the Munk-Gordon Arctic Security Program and the ArcticNet project on *The Emerging Arctic Security Environment*.

Series Editor

P. Whitney Lackenbauer, Ph.D.

Associate professor and chair of the department of history at St. Jerome's University (University of Waterloo). Co-chair of the Arctic Peoples and Security pillar of the Munk-Gordon Arctic Security Program and co-lead for the ArcticNet project on *The Emerging Arctic Security Environment*.

Forthcoming Papers

Wilfrid Greaves

Turtle Island Blues: Climate Change and Failed Indigenous Securitization in the Canadian Arctic

Kylie Bergfalk

A Question of Security? Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Securitization in the Canadian Arctic

P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Ryan Shackleton

When the Skies Rained Boxes: The Air Force and the Qikiqtani Inuit, 1941-64

P. Whitney Lackenbauer, Ryan Dean, and Peter Kikkert

Canadian Arctic Defence and Security Policy: An Overview of Key Documents, 1970-2012

Harry Borlase

Arctic Strategies and Security Questions: A Comparative Analysis

P. Whitney Lackenbauer

Should the Canadian Rangers be Expanded, Enhanced, or Left 'As Is'? : Framing the Issues

P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Peter Kikkert

A Military History of Cambridge Bay, Nunavut

Jessica Shadian

Reconceptualizing Sovereignty and Security: The Inuit Circumpolar Conference/Council and Arctic Governance

Human Security in the Arctic: The Foundation of Regional Cooperation

By: Heather Exner-Pirot, Ph.D.

Human security is a concept that encourages policymakers and academics to see security as more than just the military defense of a state and its territory. It challenges us to identify individuals and communities, and threats to their security and well-being, as equally worthy of attention and protection as the state.

It is also a concept that has seen an inordinate amount of debate regarding its usefulness and scope.¹ Many sources, including important foundational documents such as the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report on New Dimensions on Human Security, have interpreted human security very broadly, from food to health to community security. Others have asked whether identifying such a laundry list of “bad things that can happen” under the rubric of human security issues² have diluted the concept to the point that it means nothing. Within the context of the Arctic, discussions have centred on whether the concept of human security is applicable³ or relevant,⁴ in part because it is so qualitatively different from the physical violence and conflict associated with human security issues in the developing world.

The discussion of whether human security is useful, applicable, or valid as a conceptual framework or policy tool in the Arctic may be missing the bigger point. The importance of human security in the Arctic is not theoretical. It is the bedrock upon which regional cooperation has been built. Unique among the world’s regional organizations, which includes the EU, ASEAN, the African Union, and the Arab League among others, regionalization of the Arctic, and its foremost political forum, the Arctic Council, has been forged not around defense or trade, but around the protection of human security: environmental and cultural threats to the survival of societies, groups and individuals. This paper examines the evolution and significance of this development.

Human Security as a Concept

The roots of the human security agenda developed during the final decade of the Cold War, as disarmament advocates criticized the acceleration of the arms race, the growing threat of nuclear war, and high levels of global military expenditure. Development aid received a pittance compared to the funding attributed to defence, and commentators raised questions about the underlying logic of this distribution and the nature of governmental priorities.⁵ Whose security – the state’s or the individual’s – was most worthy of protection?

¹ See for example Roland Paris, “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?”, *International Security* 26, no. 2 (fall 2001), 87-102; Sabina Alkire, *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*. Working Paper. CRISE (Department of International Development, University of Oxford, 2003; and Taylor Owen, “Human Security - Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition” in *Security Dialogue* 35, no. 3 (September 2004), 373-87.

² Keith Krause, “The Key to a Powerful Agenda, if Properly Defined” in *Security Dialogue*, 35, no. 3 (September 2004), 367-8.

³ Franklyn Griffiths, “Not That Good a Fit? ‘Human Security’ and the Arctic” in *Arctic Security in the 21st Century: Conference Report* (Vancouver: Simon Fraser University School for International Studies, April 2008): 56-60.

⁴ Gunhild Hoogensen, Dawn Bazely, Julia Christensen, Andrew Tanentzap and Evgeny Bojko, “Human Security in the Arctic – Yes, it is Relevant!”, *Journal of Human Security* 5, no. 2 (2009): 1-10.

⁵ The epistemological roots of human security theory and thinking can be traced to the 1982 Palme Commission on Disarmament and Security and its resultant publication *Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament* (London: Pan Books, 1982). Other

The end of the Cold War precipitated significant changes in international relations. As forces of globalization and the end of the bi-polar international system unleashed new kinds of security threats, the security studies field, occupied as it had been up to that point with nuclear deterrence and Cold War strategy, found itself at a crossroads. Calls for a broadening of the field to include non-traditional security issues grew in frequency and amplitude, and by the late 1990s scholars interested in military security had retreated to the sub-field of strategic studies.⁶

While the field of security studies has largely evolved to accept the inclusion of human security –a focus on the individual or community as the referent object of security as opposed to an exclusive concentration on the state –the academic debate continues. Some have argued for a narrow ‘freedom from fear’ distinction, focusing on insecurity arising from political violence, while others have sought a broad ‘freedom from want’ approach focusing on human development, well-being and dignity.

Human Security in the Circumpolar North

The debate about the fit and applicability of human security to the Arctic has arisen in this discursive context. Arctic residents are not particularly vulnerable to state-led physical violence. They are not subject to the fallout from civil war, or targets of ethnic cleansing or genocide. Nonetheless, they face serious threats - ones which require extraordinary and emergency measures to address⁷ – that would be ignored under a traditional, state-centered, Westphalian⁸ model of security. In particular, Arctic residents face serious threats to their environmental and cultural security.

Environmental Security

The scientific community has been aware for decades that a surplus of carbon dioxide and other gases in the Earth’s atmosphere has produced a greenhouse effect which has resulted, among other things, in global warming.⁹ As early as 1979 the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) organized the first *World Climate Conference*. Nine years later, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established under the auspices of the WMO and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).¹⁰ The *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment* (ACIA), commissioned

progenitors include the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs, *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and Military Expenditures*, New York: UN, 1983,

[<http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/ODAPublications/DisarmamentStudySeries/PDF/SS-11.pdf>] which chronicles spending levels and related problems; and *UN Chronicle*, “International Commitment to Reallocate Military Expenditures for Development Reaffirmed,” Nov. 1987: 24, 23-29, which outlines the events and outcomes of the 1987 *International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development*.

⁶ Yueng Foong Khong, “Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?,” *Global Governance* 7 (July-Sept 2001), 231-36.

⁷ This categorization stems from Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde’s analysis in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Colorado: Lynne Reiner, 1998), 21.

⁸ The Westphalian period, which has its origins in the 1648 Treaties of Westphalia, is held to mean the period within international relations dominated by a system or society of states who possess a monopoly of force within their mutually recognized territories. The forces of globalization are seen to be diminishing the preeminence of states.

⁹ See Mark Maslin, *Global Warming: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

¹⁰ WMO Secretary-General Michel Jarraud discusses these events in remarks made at the High-level Roundtable on “*Meeting the needs for information and knowledge for climate change response*” during the COP-15 meetings in Copenhagen, December 15, 2009.

[<http://www.wmo.int/pages/mediacentre/statann/documents/High-levelRoundtableV.2.pdf>]

by the Arctic Council and released in 2004, offered striking evidence that global warming was occurring and that it was being experienced particularly intensely in the polar regions.¹¹

Many negative, and some positive, consequences are expected or are already occurring in the Arctic because of climate change. In its assessment, the ACIA listed:

- changes to vegetation zones, including a northward movement of the tree line, longer growth seasons, insect outbreaks, and an increase in forest fires;
- changes to wildlife ranges and distribution, including the shrinking of marine habitat for ice-faring animals such as polar bears and seals, alterations to breeding grounds and migration routes for species including caribou, northern movement of some fish species, and a higher incidence of disease as new animals and carriers of pathogens move north;
- erosion of coastlines and melting of permafrost, wreaking havoc on infrastructure and transportation networks; and
- the expansion of possible economic opportunities in the north, including oil, gas and mineral extraction, commercial fishing and shipping.¹²

While some observers would constitute the environment or certain animal species as referent objects themselves, for the purposes of this paper (and for the field of security studies in general) the referent object for environmental threats remains the individual or the community -- and, in extreme cases, the state. As a human security issue, the potential havoc that global warming may wreak in the coming decades, including the submersion of coastal cities and small islands, an increase in the frequency and destructive capabilities of storms, and worsening droughts and floods as precipitation patterns change, has been well documented.¹³

In few places are climate changes as immediate and threatening as in the far North. Indigenous communities face an existential threat as their sources of food, shelter and understandings of the land become compromised.¹⁴ Although Arctic indigenous peoples are highly adaptive, and have survived and thrived under extremely difficult conditions for centuries, scientists expect current changes to be more severe and more rapid than those previously experienced.¹⁵ Life will continue in the north, and indigenous populations will survive, but there is a high risk that ways of living currently practiced in parts of the north will change drastically.

Cultural Security

It is hard to separate cultural and environmental security in the circumpolar context, because a significant existential threat to Arctic indigenous culture is a direct and indirect result of climate changes. Certainly other factors come into play, including pressures of modernization, exposure to Western culture, unemployment, social problems arising from drug and alcohol abuse, and what Emile Durkheim called 'anomie'. Nevertheless, it is worth examining cultural security separately, not least because many commentators suggest that the preservation of indigenous culture is the paramount security issue from the perspective of Arctic indigenous groups themselves. As Franklyn Griffiths

¹¹ See in particular chapter 18 of the ACIA scientific report, which provides a summary and synthesis of the findings [http://www.acia.uaf.edu/PDFs/ACIA_Science_Chapters_Final/ACIA_Ch18_Final.pdf].

¹² *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

¹³ M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, eds., *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

¹⁴ See for example Daniel White, Craig Gerlach, Philip Loring, Amy Tidwell and Molly Chamber, "Food and Water Security in a Changing Arctic Climate", *Environmental Research Letters* 2, no. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 2007): 1-4.

¹⁵ ACIA (2004), especially page nine of the Executive Summary.

observes, “climate change and climate changes are perceived by Inuit through a lens of concern for the survival of a beloved way of life.”¹⁶

Societal or cultural insecurity exists when a community defines a development or potentiality as a threat to its survival.¹⁷ Arctic indigenous peoples have clearly identified climate change as a threat to their cultural survival.¹⁸ They have sought to develop tools to defend themselves against the risks to their cultural integrity, using self-determination as the primary vehicle for cultural resilience. Almost all of the land claims, acts and agreements dealing with indigenous self-determination of northern and Arctic peoples, from the Dene and Gwich’in to the Saami and the Inuit, outline objectives of cultural well-being, commitment to traditions, and preservation of languages.¹⁹

Human Security as a Framework for Circumpolar Regional Cooperation

Human security challenges pose real risks to Arctic residents. Have they led to a state-level response? Quite clearly, the answer is yes. From the inception of modern circumpolar relations – Mikhail Gorbachev’s famous Murmansk speech in 1987 – human security has provided the main impetus for regional cooperation.

Gorbachev’s landmark speech in October 1987, calling to establish the Arctic as a “zone of peace,” was a turning point in Soviet politics, an integral part of the *perestroika*, and an important first step towards the demilitarization of the region.²⁰ From a human security perspective, Gorbachev’s speech was notable for articulating a vision for the Circumpolar North based on a broad definition of security that included not only traditional security and economic issues, but also environmental protection, interests of northern indigenous peoples, and scientific cooperation.²¹

Writing back in 1990, before the broadener/narrower debate hit the mainstream in security studies, scholars Raphael Vartanov and Alexei Roginko described the Soviet leader’s speech as “bringing together security, resource, scientific, and environmental issues ...reflect[ing] a broadening of the concept of international security.”²² More concretely, the outcomes of the speech (the *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy* in 1991, and its successor, the Arctic Council, in 1996) developed human security agendas.

The *Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council* (1996) was unique on several fronts. First and foremost, it included the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Saami Council and the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) as Permanent Participants. This kind of inclusion of indigenous representatives remains unparalleled in the international system and recognized the importance of community and local concerns concurrent

¹⁶ Franklyn Griffiths, “Camels in the Arctic?,” *The Walrus* (November 2007), 20.

¹⁷ Buzan et al, (1998), 119.

¹⁸ See for example the Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples Secretariat backgrounder on climate change [<http://www.arcticpeoples.org/backgrounders/climate-change>].

¹⁹ See for example the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (1971); the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement Act (2004); the Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement Act (2008); the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement Act (1993); the Gwich’in Comprehensive Land Claims Agreement (1992); the Home Rule Act (1979); the Act on Greenland Self-Government (2009); and the Saami Parliament Acts in Norway (1989), Sweden (1993) and Finland (1995).

²⁰ Kristian Atland, “Mikhail Gorbachev, the Murmansk Initiative, and the Desecuritization of Interstate Relations in the Arctic,” *Cooperation and Conflict* 43, no. 3 (2008), 290.

²¹ Mikhail Gorbachev’s Speech in Murmansk at the Ceremonial Meeting on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star to the City of Murmansk, Murmansk, 1 October 1987, [http://www.barentsinfo.fi/docs/Gorbachev_speech.pdf].

²² Raphael Vartanov and Alexei Roginko, “New Dimensions of Soviet Arctic Policy: Views from the Soviet Union,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 512 (November 1990), 71.

to those of states. The Gwich'in Council International, Athabaskan Arctic Council, and Aleut International Association have since been added as Permanent Participants.

Second, the mandate of the Arctic Council – to promote cooperation, coordination and interaction on issues of sustainable development and environmental protection – was a break from the conventional pushes for regional cooperation. Regional alliances have traditionally developed around issues of military security or trade; after all, the purpose of the state in the Westphalian system is to ensure physical security and promote prosperity. It is uncommon, if not unprecedented, for a regional political forum to focus exclusively on environmental and sustainability issues. Although recent geopolitical developments have turned the work of the Council from primarily human security issues (such as its landmark *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment* and *Arctic Human Development Report* reports issued in 2004) to other issues, such as search and rescue (SAR) and shipping, the basic mandate of the Arctic Council remains environmental protection and sustainable development for local populations.

A third, but related point, is the Arctic Council's intentional exclusion of discussions on military security. The *Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council* specifically states that the Council "should not deal with matters related to military security,"²³ a unanimous decision on the part of states, which thought that NATO and the Helsinki Process were more appropriate fora for those discussions.²⁴ The effect was significant – that regional cooperation be built around common concerns around human security issues of environmental protection, sustainable development and cultural vitality, and not military security.

The Arctic Council's human security mandate was not an accident. Canada led the push to establish the Arctic Council at a time when the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, under Minister Lloyd Axworthy, was developing a global human security agenda to imbue Canada's foreign policy with meaning and relevance. In 1998, Canada and Norway signed the *Lysøen Declaration*²⁵ which (in addition to formalizing cooperation on conventional human security goals such as banning landmines, establishing an international criminal court, curbing small arms proliferation, and aiding child soldiers) committed the two partners to strengthening Arctic and northern cooperation. The partnership ultimately led to the establishment of the international *Human Security Network*. Similarly, Canada's *Northern Dimension of Canadian Foreign Policy*, issued in 2000 under the guidance of Mary Simon, a prominent Inuit leader then serving as Canada's circumpolar ambassador, identified human security as one of its four core objectives.²⁶

The Conservative government's rejection of both Liberal foreign policy and the very term "human security", and the disinclination of other Arctic governments to embrace the concept as part of their own foreign policy, has meant that it is not found explicitly in Arctic Council documents. Nonetheless, cooperation in the region revolves around common human security concerns and the need to find shared solutions to them.

A Regional Human Security Complex

Does the Arctic constitute a regional human security complex? That is to say, does the security of Arctic actors depend to some degree on the security of their Arctic neighbors when it comes to environmental protection and cultural vitality? The impetus for and outcomes of circumpolar relations during the past 25 years indicate yes.

²³ Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council (Ottawa: 1996) [<http://www.international.gc.ca/polar-polaire/ottdec-decote.aspx?lang=en&view=d>].

²⁴ David Scrivener, *Environmental Cooperation in the Arctic: From Strategy to Council* (1996): 12, as quoted in Carina Keskitalo, *Negotiating the Arctic: The Construction of an International Region*, (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004) 72.

²⁵ *Lysoen Declaration*, 9 October 1998, [http://www.nisat.org/export_laws-regs%20linked/Norway/lysoern.htm]

²⁶ Government of Canada, *The Northern Dimension of Canada's Foreign Policy* (Ottawa: June 2000), [<http://www.international.gc.ca/polar-polaire/assets/pdfs/ndcfp-en.pdf>].

The concept of 'region' is understood as "a limited number of states linked together by a geographical relationship and by a degree of mutual interdependence."²⁷ The Arctic did not really exist as a distinct geopolitical region during the Cold War, as relations between the eight Arctic states were conducted on an East - West basis rather than a circumpolar one, and focused on issues external to the Arctic. There were some efforts to develop regional cooperation and identity at the local and sub-national levels. For example, the Northern Forum, an association of sub-regional governments from eight northern countries including Canada, the United States, China, South Korea, Japan, Finland, Iceland and Russia, was officially established in 1991 but has its roots in the 1970s, with the International Conferences on Human Environment in Northern Regions. The International Arctic Peoples Conference, held in Copenhagen in 1973, provided impetus for more formal cooperation between Arctic indigenous groups, including the establishment of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (now Inuit Circumpolar Council) in Barrow, Alaska, in 1977. The ICC placed Arctic conservation and environmental protection as its primary focus, with additional emphasis on land claims, language, mutual exchange, health, education and village technology - all human security issues.²⁸

While these initiatives were significant in the regionalization of the Arctic, the genesis of a *state-led* Arctic region came with Gorbachev's Murmansk speech in 1987.²⁹ Finland and Canada enthusiastically embraced Gorbachev's call for cooperation, leading to the establishment of the AEPS and the Arctic Council. The commitment to environmental and cultural security issues continue to feature prominently in regional politics, as demonstrated in the Arctic strategies and policies enunciated by the eight circumpolar states over the past five years.³⁰

In 2003, Barry Buzan and Ole Waever introduced their regional security complex theory (RSCT), with the central idea that "since most threats travel more easily over short distances than over long ones, security interdependence is normally patterned into regionally based clusters – security complexes."³¹ In a security complex, states or units are linked sufficiently closely that their securities cannot be considered separate from one another. This is certainly true of the Arctic environment and the many indigenous peoples whose cultural groupings fall across national borders. Virtually all of the Arctic Council's work, from the ACIA and AHDR to the more recent Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (AMSA) (2009) and Search and Rescue agreement (2011), reinforces this idea. The Arctic security complex is noteworthy because, while still addressing traditional security issues, the primary basis for this interdependence is shared human security concerns.

Why would human security issues be of greater significance in the Arctic than is the case in other regions? Two factors stand out: geography and timing.

Geographically, the Arctic is a region which revolves around an ocean. Most geopolitical regions, such as the Middle East, Europe, or South-East Asia, are land-based. Buzan, Weaver and de Wilde (1998) questioned whether the growing importance of environmental issues might promote the development of regional security complexes around oceans, seas and rivers,³² and the Arctic region indicates that their assumption may be correct. In a post-Westphalian system, where territory and borders are less important, the environmental security sector (covering climate change, food and water supply, and pollution) will become increasingly salient, and security complexes will develop in response.

²⁷ Joseph Nye, *International Regionalism: Readings* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), vii.

²⁸ Conference Report, *Inuit Circumpolar Conference*, June 1977, [<http://www.ebenhopson.com/icc/ICCB booklet.html>].

²⁹ Gorbachev's Murmansk Speech, 1 October 1987.

³⁰ See Lassi Heininen, "Arctic Strategies and Policies: Inventory and Comparative Study" (Northern Research Forum, University of Lapland, August 2011). [http://www.nrf.is/images/stories/Hveragerdi/Arctic_strategies_7th_draft_New_20120428.pdf]

³¹ Barry Buzan and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers: the Structure of International Security* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4.

³² Buzan et al (1998), 16.

The second factor is timing. Because the Arctic was frozen both politically and literally until the end of the Cold War, it had no baggage, as a region, to bring forward. (Any enduring Cold War tensions are largely separate from Arctic-specific policy issues.) Consequently, relations can focus on contemporary issues. The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 brought environmental issues to the forefront of international politics for the first time. The international political significance of the environment was reinforced with the Brundtland Commission in 1987, which famously popularized the term “sustainable development”, and the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. Accordingly, environmental issues were top of mind when regional institution-building in the Arctic began in the late 1980s and 1990s.

Concurrently, the influence and capacity of Arctic indigenous peoples increased substantially. The *Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act* of 1971 and the *Greenland Home Rule Act* of 1979 were landmark developments, as were the International Arctic Peoples Conference in 1973 and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in 1977. The Gwich'in settled their land claim in 1992. The Saami established Parliaments in Norway (1989), Sweden (1993) and Finland (1995) at the time that circumpolar relations were being defined. Although Nunavut did not become its own territory until 1999, the negotiations to establish it took place in the 1970s and 1980s. Accordingly, Inuit had tremendous access to, and influence on, the Canadian federal government when Canada was spearheading the push to create an Arctic Council. In a post-materialist world, so-called third generation rights – rights to self-determination, natural resources, a healthy environment and participation in cultural heritage - have emerged in the wealthy and developed countries of the Arctic (with Russia an unfortunate exception). This has affected the form and pace of regional cooperation.

To sum up, both geography and timing made the Arctic region a likely candidate to develop a regional security complex around human security issues in the 1990s. One can expect similar complexes to develop in the future because the issues that states and societies *securitize*, in a post-Westphalian and post-materialist world, will increasingly reflect human security concerns.

The Fit with Traditional Security

The Arctic states have shifted their gaze to sovereignty, territorial control, oil, and gas since 2004. By extension, how accurate is it to say that the region is focused on human security? After all, the Arctic has been inundated with political and media talk of traditional security issues in recent years. After the relative peace and stability of the 1990s, rhetorical tensions arose in the Arctic in the mid-2000s amidst skyrocketing oil prices and newly accessible markets, routes, and resources. Environmental protection and sustainable development mandates were suppressed as resource stakes reached unprecedented heights and states focused their responses to geopolitical developments on military investments.

Nevertheless, it is counterproductive to ask whether an Arctic regional security complex reflects either human security *or* traditional security interdependence. It reflects both. There is no need to dichotomize traditional and human security in the Arctic. What makes the Arctic unique is that the interdependence on human security challenges has been much more important in the Arctic than it has been in other regions, and this remains the case.

Efforts to dichotomize traditional and human security in the Arctic have had a negative effect on Canadian policy. Some Northern commentators and federal Opposition members have criticized the announcements of Arctic military investments as pouring billions into military hardware instead of prioritizing social programs in a region with dismal health and education indicators across the board. While there is merit in drawing attention to environmental and cultural security objectives, and a need for public debate on the optimal allocation of resources, it is also a sovereign requirement to provide basic law and order in the Arctic. Without new investments, Canada and other states might be unable to do so. Expensive acquisitions such as icebreakers are critical to enforce Canada's laws in the region, not least those that relate to environmental protection. Scientific projects require the use of icebreakers to collect data

on wildlife, climate, and the Arctic Ocean itself – valuable information in assessing and responding to environmental threats. Ships and planes operated by the military or Coast Guard are frequently used for SAR operations. In fact, Northerners have complained that the government has invested too little personnel and equipment for SAR.³³

It is difficult to argue that consecutive federal governments have funneled funds to military investments at the expense of social programs. Per capita, the territorial region and its 110,000 inhabitants get more political representation than any other in Canada, and probably more government subsidy than any region in the world. In the 2012-13 fiscal year, for example, Nunavut will receive a federal transfer of \$39,235 per person (an increase of 72% since 2005-06), NWT \$25,318, and Yukon \$23,089. On the other end of the spectrum, Alberta will receive \$956 per person, and BC and Saskatchewan each \$1213.³⁴ The point is not to say that the money transferred to the territories has been unneeded or wasted; the north is a very expensive region in which to operate and its market economy is underdeveloped. The point is to emphasize that states have a responsibility to provide *both* traditional and human security for its citizens, and the Canadian government has made attempts to do both in the Arctic. Focusing on one at the expense of the other is counterproductive. Traditional and human security are not mutually exclusive. In the Arctic in particular, they are linked.

Conclusion

Security concerns in the Westphalian era have been dominated by traditional, military concerns focused on national security. This perspective makes theoretical sense in a competitive, anarchical, and realist world ruled by powerful sovereign states. The end of the Cold War, however, has marked the transition from a Westphalian to a post-Westphalian world which accommodates a change in the referent object of security from the state to the individual and community.

The Arctic is a manifestation of this shift. Security interdependence in the Westphalian era typically revolved around issues of sovereignty, autonomy, resources and power. These issues still exist in the Arctic; what is notable is that human security (environmental protection and the integrity of cultures) has been the main driver for regional cooperation and policy-making.

This is apparent in the origins of Arctic regionalism, from the landmark indigenous land claim deals and self-determination rights achieved in the 1970s and 1980s, to growing concern about the inordinate impact of pollutants and global warming in the Arctic, to Gorbachev's Murmansk speech in 1987 and its broad conception of security. The prominence accorded human security issues in the Arctic has been reinforced through the mandates of the AEPS and Arctic Council, the stated objectives of the circumpolar states' Arctic policies, and the activities of the epistemic community.

Some commentators may question the applicability of human security in the Arctic, or even of broadened concepts of security itself. Nevertheless, it is hard to dispute that human security issues have provided the foundation upon which the Arctic region is built. A closer examination of the events, actors, and issues that have provided an impetus for the regionalization of the area reaffirm that it would be difficult, as well as counter-productive, to examine the Arctic as a geopolitical region without recognizing the integral role that human security issues have played in its evolution.

³³ See for example "Canada Must Speed up \$3 Billion Investment in Search-and-Rescue Aircraft", *Toronto Star*, 24 March 2012 [<http://www.thestar.com/opinion/editorials/article/1151299--canada-must-speed-up-3-billion-investment-in-search-and-rescue-aircraft>].

³⁴ Department of Finance Canada, "Federal Support to Provinces and Territories," [<http://www.fin.gc.ca/fedprov/mtp-eng.asp>].

Bibliography

- Alkire, Sabina. *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*. CRISE Working Paper. Oxford: Department of International Development, University of Oxford, 2003.
- Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Atland, Kristian. "Mikhail Gorbachev, the Murmansk Initiative, and the Desecuritization of Interstate Relations in the Arctic," *Cooperation and Conflict* 43, no.3 (2008): 290-331.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Colorado: Lynne Reiner Publishers, 1998.
- Buzan, Barry and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers: the Structure of International Security*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Griffiths, Franklyn. "Not That Good a Fit? 'Human Security' and the Arctic," in *Arctic Security in the 21st Century: Conference Report*. Vancouver: Simon Fraser University School for International Studies, April 2008.
- Griffiths, Franklyn. "Camels in the Arctic?" *The Walrus* (November 2007).
[<http://www.walrusmagazine.com/articles/2007.11-arctic-global-warming/2/>].
- Heininen, Lassi. "Arctic Strategies and Policies: Inventory and Comparative Study" (Northern Research Forum, University of Lapland, August 2011).
[http://www.nrf.is/images/stories/Hveragerdi/Arctic_strategies_7th_draft_New_20120428.pdf].
- Hoogensen, Gunhild, Dawn Bazely, Julia Christensen, Andrew Tanentzap and Evgeny Bojko. "Human Security in the Arctic – Yes, it is Relevant!," *Journal of Human Security* 5, no. 2(2009): 1-10.
- Keskitalo, E.C.H. *Negotiating the Arctic: The Construction of an International Region*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.
- Krause, Keith. "The Key to a Powerful Agenda, if Properly Defined," *Security Dialogue* 35, no. 3 (September 2004): 367-8.
- Maslin, Mark. *Global Warming: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Nye, Joseph. *International Regionalism: Readings*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968.
- Owen, Taylor. "Human Security - Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition," *Security Dialogue* 35, no.3 (September 2004): 373-87.
- Paris, Roland. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?," *International Security* 26, no.2 (Fall 2001): 87-102.
- Parry, M.L., O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson (eds). *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Vartanov, Raphael and Alexei Roginko, "New Dimensions of Soviet Arctic Policy: Views from the Soviet Union," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 512 (November 1990): 69-78.
- White, Daniel, Craig Gerlach, Philip Loring, Amy Tidwell and Molly Chamber. "Food and Water Security in a Changing Arctic Climate," *Environmental Research Letters* 2, no.4 (October-December 2007): 1-4.
- Yueng Foong Khong, "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?," *Global Governance* 7 (July-September 2001): 231-36.

About the Author



HEATHER EXNER-PIROT earned her PhD in Political Science from the University of Calgary in 2011. She is currently the Graduate and Research Officer at the International Centre for Northern Governance and Development at the University of Saskatchewan. Heather blogs regularly for Radio-Canada's *Eye on the Arctic* website.

MUNK
SCHOOL
OF
GLOBAL
AFFAIRS



ArcticNet

$\triangleright \rho \triangleright^{\text{fb}} C^{\text{fb}} \triangleright \Gamma^b$ $\triangleright \rho \vdash \sigma \triangleleft^{\text{fb}} \Pi^c$

The Emerging Arctic Security Environment