

Welcome to a new era of Arctic Security

As published in the Globe and Mail on August 24, 2010

Ву

Rob Huebert

CDFAI Fellow

and

Associate Director of the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, University of Calgary

August, 2010
Prepared for the Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute 1600, 530 – 8th Avenue S.W., Calgary, AB T2P 3S8 www.cdfai.org
© Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute

Other Publications Written For Or Assisted By: The Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute

China's Strategic Behaviour

Elinor Sloan June, 2010

Reinventing CIDA

Barry Carin and Gordon Smith May 2010

Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept

Paul Chapin, et al March, 2010

The Newly Emerging Arctic Security Environment

Rob Huebert March, 2010

Whatever Happened to Peacekeeping? The Future of a Tradition

Jocelyn Coulon and Michel Liégeois March, 2010

Democracies and Small Wars

Barry Cooper December, 2009

The Canada First Defence Strategy – One Year Later

George Macdonald October, 2009

Measuring Effectiveness in Complex Operations: What is Good Enough?

Sarah Meharg October, 2009

"Connecting the Dots" and the Canadian Counter-Terrorism Effort – Steady Progress or Technical, Bureaucratic, Legal and Political Failure?

Eric Lerhe January, 2009

Canada-U.S. Relations in the Arctic: A Neighbourly Proposal

Brian Flemming December, 2008

President Al Gore and the 2003 Iraq War: A Counterfactual Critique of Conventional "W"isdom

Frank Harvey November, 2008

Canada and the United States: What Does it Mean to be Good Neighbours?

David Haglund October, 2008

Redeployment as a Rite of Passage

Anne Irwin April, 2008

The 2007 Ross Ellis Memorial Lectures in Military and Strategic Studies: Is there a Grand Strategy in Canadian Foreign Policy?

David Pratt March, 2008

Military Transformation: Key Aspects and Canadian Approaches

Elinor Sloan December, 2007

CFIS: A Foreign Intelligence Service for Canada

Barry Cooper November, 2007

Canada as the "Emerging Energy Superpower": Testing the Case

Annette Hester October, 2007

A Threatened Future: Canada's Future Strategic Environment and its Security Implications

J.L. Granatstein, Gordon S. Smith, and Denis Stairs September. 2007

Report on Canada, National Security and Outer Space

James Fergusson and Stephen James June, 2007

The Information Gap: Why the Canadian Public Doesn't Know More About its Military

Sharon Hobson June, 2007

Conflict in Lebanon: On the Perpetual Threshold

Tami Amanda Jacoby

April, 2007

Canada in Afghanistan: Is it Working?

Gordon Smith March, 2007

Effective Aid and Beyond: How Canada Can Help Poor Countries

Danielle Goldfarb December, 2006

The Homeland Security Dilemma: The Imaginations of Failure and the Escalating Costs of Perfecting Security

Frank Harvey June, 2006

An Opaque Window: An Overview of Some Commitments Made by the Government of Canada Regarding the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces; 1 January 2000 – 31 December 2004

David J. Bercuson, Aaron P. Plamondon, and Ray Szeto

May, 2006

The Strategic Capability Investment Plan: Origins, Evolution and Future Prospects

Elinor Sloan March, 2006

Confusing the Innocent with Numbers and Categories: The International Policy Statement and the Concentration of Development Assistance

Denis Stairs December, 2005

In the Canadian Interest? Assessing Canada's International Policy Statement

David J. Bercuson, Derek Burney, James Fergusson, Michel Fortmann/Frédéric Mérand, J.L. Granatstein, George Haynal, Sharon Hobson, Rob Huebert, Eric Lerhe, George Macdonald, Reid Morden, Kim Richard Nossal, Jean-Sébastien Rioux, Gordon Smith, and Denis Stairs October, 2005

The Special Commission on the Restructuring of the Reserves, 1995: Ten Years Later

J.L. Granatstein and LGen (ret'd) Charles Belzile September, 2005

Effective Defence Policy for Responding to Failed And Failing States

David Carment June. 2005

Two Solitudes: Quebecers' Attitudes Regarding Canadian Security and Defence Policy

Jean-Sébastien Rioux February, 2005

In The National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World

David J. Bercuson, Denis Stairs, Mark Entwistle, J.L. Granatstein, Kim Richard Nossal, and Gordon S. Smith October. 2003

Conference Publication: Canadian Defence and the Canada-US Strategic Partnership September, 2002

To Secure A Nation: The Case for a New Defence White Paper David J. Bercuson, Jim Fergusson, Frank Harvey, and Rob Huebert November, 2001

Publications are available at www.cdfai.org or call Sarah Magee at (403) 231-7624

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Rob Huebert is currently a professor of Political Science and Associate Director of the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies at the University of Calgary. He holds a BA Hons. from the University of Manitoba, an MA from Carleton University, and a PhD from Dalhousie University. His areas of interest include international relations, strategic studies, Canadian foreign and defence policies, circumpolar relations, ocean politics, naval studies and foreign policy studies.

He is the co-editor of A Nation's Navy: In Quest of Canadian Naval Identity (1996) and has authored articles in The International Journal; Canadian Foreign Policy; Marine Policy; and Issues in the North. Dr. Huebert's current research includes an examination of the role of Canadian sea power in the Asia Pacific region, Canadian Arctic security and sovereignty, environmental security, and Canadian defence policy.

WELCOME TO A NEW ERA OF ARCTIC SECURITY

A new era of circumpolar security is unfolding. Canadian, American and Danish warships are in the final week of a joint exercise in the Canadian Arctic, part of an annual event known as Operation Nanook. While defence officials are quick to point out they see no military threat to the region, it's still interesting to see these three Arctic friends coming together to improve their naval combat capability in the Far North (something they didn't do during the Cold War), a demonstration of force and solidarity to show the world they're serious about protecting this region.

The participating warships represent some of the powerful destroyers and frigates that each navy has. The USS Porter, an Arleigh Burke-class guided missile destroyer commissioned in 1999, carries an Aegis combat system that is believed by many to be the most sophisticated in the world. HMCS Halifax, a frigate carrying a powerful array of weapons, is the only foreign vessel the U.S. Navy allows to be integrated with its aircraft carrier battle groups. The Royal Danish Navy's Vaedderen is one of the world's few frigates built to be able to operate in Arctic ice; it should be familiar to Canadians as the ship that sailed into disputed waters surrounding Hans Island.

Meantime, the chief of U.S. naval operations, Admiral Gary Roughead, met senior Norwegian defence officials in Oslo. And it's been announced that the U.S. has reached an agreement to train in northern Norway. In return, Washington will sell Oslo advanced air-to-sea missiles for the 48 F-35s that Norway has recently agreed to buy.

Curiously, there seems to be a contradiction between what the four countries are doing and what they're saying. As they take expensive and challenging steps to improve their combat capability in the Arctic, they continue to assert that the region is both stable and peaceful. Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Lawrence Cannon, in a just-released Arctic policy statement, makes it clear that Canada does not "anticipate any military challenges in the Arctic." Norwegian Defence Minister Grete Faremo echoed this view, saying that there's no "race" in the Arctic and that the region is stable. But that, of course, could change as the Arctic opens. Canada also makes it clear that, should its offer to work co-operatively with its Arctic neighbours not be taken, it will indeed defend its Arctic interests.

Is it Russia that the four fear could upset the existing stability? No one is directly pointing fingers. But Defence Minister Peter MacKay was recently quoted as saying that Canada would not be inviting Russia to join in future military exercises in the Canadian Arctic. Likewise, what threat would require the Norwegians to acquire the very capable (and very expensive) combat systems they're buying from the Americans? It's hard to avoid the conclusion that Moscow is the target of these vigorous military exercises in the Arctic. And if it's not Russia, something certainly is poking the four northern NATO allies in the side.

For the past 20 years, none of these four states saw a need to exercise their forces in the Far North. Yet, there's now a very definitive effort by the four to have a much more powerful and coordinated capability in the region. They may be telling their citizens that all is well in the Arctic, but their actions suggest this is not what they truly believe. A new era of Arctic security is arriving whether or not we want to admit it.

Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute

CDFAI is the only think tank focused on Canada's international engagement in all its forms: diplomacy, the military, aid and trade security. Established in 2001, CDFAI's vision is for Canada to have a respected, influential voice in the international arena based on a comprehensive foreign policy, which expresses our national interests, political and social values, military capabilities, economic strength and willingness to be engaged with action that is timely and credible.

CDFAI was created to address the ongoing discrepancy between what Canadians need to know about Canadian international activities and what they do know. Historically, Canadians tend to think of foreign policy – if they think of it at all – as a matter of trade and markets. They are unaware of the importance of Canada engaging diplomatically, militarily, and with international aid in the ongoing struggle to maintain a world that is friendly to the free flow of goods, services, people and ideas across borders and the spread of human rights. They are largely unaware of the connection between a prosperous and free Canada and a world of globalization and liberal internationalism.

In all its activities CDFAI is a charitable, nonpartisan organization, supported financially by the contributions of foundations, corporations and individuals. Conclusions or opinions expressed in CDFAI publications and programs are those of the authors and speakers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute staff, fellows, directors, advisors, or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to CDFAI.