



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

„Security Concerns in the Arctic.
Sweden's and Norway's National Strategies
in the High North“

Verfasserin

Corinna Röver

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master (MA)

Wien, 2013

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 067 805

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Individuelles Masterstudium:
Global Studies – a European Perspective

Betreuerin / Betreuer:

Univ.-Doz. Dr. Paul Luif

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit /Title of the master thesis

Security Concerns in the Arctic Sweden's and Norway's National Strategies in the High North

Verfasser /Author

Corinna Röver

angestrebter akademischer Grad / acadamic degree aspired

Master (MA)

Wien, 2013

Studienkennzahl :

A 067 805

Studienrichtung:

Individuelles Masterstudium:
Global Studies – a European Perspective

Betreuer/Supervisor:

Univ.-Doz.. Dr. Paul Luif

Abstract English

The current discourse on Security issues in the Arctic is dominated by dystopian notions of the circumpolar region as next venue for international power struggles. This is partly due to state-centered concept of security, which is mainly limited to the military realm, and partly caused by a spirit of discovery and conquest of an opening, accessible Arctic Ocean.

The initial impetus for the following analysis is therefore the depiction of the Arctic as arena for future resource-wars, territorial conflicts and environmental catastrophes. For a better understanding of the future international significance of the Arctic, it is necessary to examine the security perceptions of selected Arctic states. Considering the lack of global and regional governance in the High North, nation-states currently remain pivotal actors in this context.

This Thesis explores the security concerns raised in Norway's and Sweden's respective national Arctic strategies. It applies the Copenhagen School of Security Studies' concept of securitization as well as its more recent subconcept of riskification. The analysis focuses upon the Copenhagen School's widened security concept. Norway's and Sweden's strategies are examined in regard to security concerns in the fields of military, political, economic, environmental, human and maritime security. Their strategies demonstrate an overall absence of securitizing rhetoric in the classical sense, but display significant riskification rhetoric in individual security sectors like environmental, human and maritime security.

Abstract German

Der derzeitige Diskurs über Sicherheitsfragen in der Arktis ist durch die dystopische Ansicht geprägt, dass die circumpolare Region der nächste Schauplatz für Konflikte zwischen den internationalen Mächten darstelle. Das basiert teilweise auf Grund des auf Staaten konzentrierten Konzepts von Sicherheit, das vor allem auf den militärischen Bereich limitiert ist, und teilweise in einem Entdecker- und Eroberungsgeist im offenen und zugänglichen Arktischen Meer begründet.

Der ursprüngliche Impetus der vorliegenden Analyse ist daher die Beschreibung der Arktis als Arena für zukünftige Kriege um Ressourcen, territoriale Konflikte und Umweltkatastrophen. Für ein besseres Verständnis der zukünftigen internationalen Bedeutung der Arktis ist es notwendig, die Wahrnehmung von Sicherheit der ausgewählten arktischen Nationen zu beleuchten. Wenn man den Mangel an globaler und regionaler Staatsführung im hohen Norden bedenkt, bleiben Nationalstaaten die hauptsächlichen Akteure in diesem Kontext.

Diese Arbeit untersucht die Sicherheitsbedenken, die in den jeweiligen nationalen Arktisstrategien Norwegens und Schwedens angeführt sind. Sie wendet sowohl das Sicherheitskonzept der Kopenhagen „School of Security Studies“ an, als auch das kürzlich entwickelte Unterkonzept der „Riskification“. Die Analyse fokussiert auf das erweiterte Sicherheitskonzept der Kopenhagen „School of Security Studies“. Die Strategien von Norwegen und Schweden werden in Bezug auf die Sicherheitsbedenken in den Feldern Militär, Politik, Wirtschaft, Umwelt, menschliche und maritime Sicherheit untersucht. Diese Strategien demonstrieren die allgemeine Abwesenheit von Sicherheitsrhetorik im klassischen Sinne, aber zeigen signifikante Riskificationsrhetorik in einzelnen Sicherheitssektoren wie Umwelt, menschliche und maritime Sicherheit.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Research Question	4
1.2 Limitations	6
1.3 Thesis Structure.....	7
1.4 Literature Review	8
2 Theoretical Framework	11
2.1 Security Studies	11
2.2 The Copenhagen School and the Concept of Securitization	14
3 Methodological Approach	19
3.1 The national strategy as subject of analysis.....	19
3.2 Qualitative Document Analysis	22
3.2.1 Validity and Reliability	23
3.2.2 Sampling	25
4 The Arctic as subject of national concern	27
4.1 What is the Arctic?	27
4.2 Challenges and Opportunities in the Arctic.....	30
4.2.1 Environmental Change	30
4.2.2 Economic Use	32
4.2.3 Territorial Disputes.....	35
4.2.4 Social Aspects	37
5 The National Arctic Strategies – Analysis: Norway.....	40
5.1 Structure and Main Themes.....	41
5.2 Political issues and territorial questions	43
5.2.1 The Relations with Russia	44
5.2.2 Institutional bodies for cooperation	47
5.2.3 The Ilulissat Declaration	48
5.2.4 The military and NATO	50
5.3 The Environment	54
5.4 Economic activities.....	59
5.5 Maritime management and safety.....	63
5.6 Preliminary Conclusion.....	64
6 Sweden	66

6.1 Structure and Main Themes	67
6.2 Political Issues: Security Policies in an era of mutual dependence	69
6.2.1 The Arctic Council and other multilateral fora	72
6.3 Climate Change and the Environment	76
6.4 Economic Development	80
6.5 The Human Dimension	85
6.6 Maritime Safety	89
7 Conclusions	90
7.1 Limitations	93
7.2 Further Research	94
Literature	95
Online Sources	98
Institutional Documents	101
Illustrations	102
Abstract German	103
Curriculum Vitae	104

List of Illustrations

Illustration 1: The Arctic	29
----------------------------------	----

List of Abbreviations

A 5	Arctic 5, the Arctic Coastal States
A 8	Arctic 8, the Arctic Coastal States+ Iceland, Sweden, Finland
AC	Arctic Council
ACIA	Arctic Climate Impact Assessment
AHDR	Arctic Human Development Report
BEAC	Barents Euro-Arctic Council
CLCS	Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf
CSIS	Center for Strategic and International Studies
DEW	Distant Early Warning Line
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NWP	Northwest Passage
OPEC	Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
QDA	Qualitative Document Analysis
SCA	Svenska Cellulosa Aktiebolaget
UN	United Nations
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

1 Introduction

Like few other places in the world, the High North remained physically out of reach for centuries. It was largely inaccessible for mankind, with its inhospitable climate hampering all ventures for human enterprise and settlement. The Arctic was a remote and abandoned wilderness except for a handful of adventurers, explorers and its well adapted population. Its seclusion and solitude fuelled people's imagination and enticed explorers to leave for reckless expeditions.¹

These conditions have changed considerably in the course of the twentieth century. During World War II, the Arctic Ocean, along with the Norwegian Sea, served as corridor for allied shipping to Murmansk and thus to the Soviet Union, for instance to supply it with US Lend-Lease provisions.²

Yet, it was the Cold War that generated a downright militarization in the Arctic. The shortest attack route between the two major adversaries was above the Arctic Ocean. Its airspace became the deployment area for strategic bombers and intercontinental missiles, while nuclear submarines operated beneath the water surface.³ The Arctic might have been remote and politically neglected previously, but the Cold War power struggle pulled it on numerous national strategy agendas. The imminent threat of a Soviet attack induced the

¹ The Polar Expeditions, the most famous of which are the attempted explorations of the Northwest Passage (NWP) by James Cook, John Franklin and numerous others, are outlined in Alan Edwin Day's contribution: *Historical Dictionary of the Discovery and Exploration of the Northwest Passage*. Historical Dictionaries of Discovery and Exploration No. 3, Scarecrow Press, Lanham 2006. For a general history of Arctic exploration, see Berton, P.: *The Arctic Grail: The Quest for the Northwest Passage and the North Pole 1818–1909*. New York 1988. The first one to navigate the NWP, however, was Roald Amundsen. See also: Bomann-Larsen, Tor: *Roald Amundsen*. Sutton 2006.

² Cf. Haftendorn, Helga: NATO and the Arctic: Is the Atlantic Alliance a Cold War Relic in a peaceful Region now faced with non-military Challenges? In: *European Security* 20:3, Routledge 2011, p. 337-361, p. 337.

³ Cf. Østreng, Willy: *Extended Security and Climate Change in the Regional and Global Context: A Historical Account*. Presentation at the Calotte Academy 2008 "Climate Change Defining Human Security" in Inari/Finland, Kirkenes/Norway and Murmansk/Russia, May 22-26, 2008. Pdf available at the Northern Research Forum:

http://www.nrf.is/Open%20Meetings/Anchorage/Position%20Papers/Empire%20Club_%D6streng.pdf.

Last Access September 8, 2012.

United States to construct the Distant Early Warning Line (DEW), which was “an integrated chain of more than 50 radar and communication stations stretching 3,000 miles from the northwest coast of Alaska to the eastern shore of Baffin Island opposite Greenland.”⁴ The DEW worked as a control and warning system against air attacks and signified the first US-American security infrastructure in the region.

The end of bipolarity did not resolve the Arctic’s status as a matter of national security and state interests. Throughout the recent decades, the rising temperatures and steadily retreating ice sheets provided for prognoses and speculations about the Arctic’s future. Policymakers and scholars seek to determine the consequences of a warmer and more accessible High North. When the European Space Agency announced that its satellites recorded the lowest Arctic ice coverage in history in September 2007, the area covered by sea ice had shrunk to its lowest level since satellite measurements began in 1978.⁵ For probably the first time in history, the Northwest Passage was fully navigable in September 2007. The following years recorded further record lows of ice coverage, so that a navigable and commercially usable Arctic has not just become a feasible perspective for the future – it has already become reality in several aspects.

The prospects of newly accessible sea routes, natural resources and territories in general brought about questions of ownership, legal rights of use and responsibilities. Various states – the Arctic coastal states in particular – claimed property rights, while environmentalists

⁴ Lackenbauer, P., Farish, M., Arthur-Lackenbauer, J.: The Distant Early Warning Line. A Bibliography and Documentary Resource List, Section 2.2: The DEW Line Story in Brief, extract from the Western Electric Corporation 1960. Published for The Arctic Institute of North America 2005, p.9. This account also picks up the legends and mystification of former exploration: “At other locations our siting engineers had for company the spirits of some of history's greatest explorers. One site is within walking distance of the spot where Sir John Franklin perished in 1847 during his ill-fated expedition to find the Northwest Passage; another looks down on the remains of a ship abandoned by Roald Amundsen in the early 1900's.” Ibid., p. 11.

⁵ “Satellites witness lowest Arctic ice coverage in history”, see the European Space Agency’s website: http://www.esa.int/esaCP/SEMYTC13J6F_index_0.html. Last Access September 10, 2012.

and international organisations voiced their concerns over the effects of Climate Change on the Arctic region. Whereas the former demand exclusive rights for economic use, the latter point at potential environmental degradation in the Arctic, due to Climate Change and increased human activity in the region. Debates on ownership and responsibilities soon became elevated from political to security issues in the Arctic discourse. Sweden's Arctic Ambassador Gustaf Lind stated that 'The Arctic is hot' in early 2011, indicating that the High North has moved to the center of national attention.⁶ Publications like "The Scramble for the Arctic" or "Arctic Doom, Arctic Boom" further fuel the impression that the warming region north of the Polar Circle fosters considerable potential for competition and conflict.⁷

Hence, the public discourse as well as scholarly work on the Arctic has hitherto given much emphasis on the security aspect, and questions of whether an accessible Arctic Ocean threatens the peace or cooperation in the High North have dominated the discourse. Moreover, in the studies of International Relations, the notion of 'security' mainly follows a classically state-oriented interpretation, defining security issues as primarily settled in the military realm. In this understanding, it is the sovereign nation-state who holds the exclusive right and competencies to address security matters, and these matters often involve military or military-related means. A security threat is usually understood as a threat against a state, its sovereignty and integrity. Is this the case for the current discussion of security in the Arctic as well? What security issues are identified in the Arctic, and what rhetoric is used to define and communicate them?

What is perceived as a threat, and what or who is threatened? What does the term 'security' entail in this context? These are the guiding questions of this thesis.

⁶ See Bergh, Kristofer and Oldberg, Ingmar: *The New Arctic: Building Cooperation in the Face of Emerging Challenges*, SIPRI Conference Report, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Stockholm 2011, p.3.

⁷ Cf. Sale, Richard and Potapov, Eugene: *The Scramble for the Arctic. Ownership, Exploitation and Conflict in the Far North*, London 2010 and Zellen, Barry S.: *Arctic Doom, Arctic Boom. The Geopolitics of Climate Change in the Arctic*, Santa Barbara 2009.

1.1 Research Question

The aim is to investigate the security-rhetoric used in two selected national Arctic strategies.

The Norwegian Government's Arctic strategy "Visions and Strategies" and "Sweden's Strategy for the Arctic Region" will constitute the subjects for examination.⁸

Rather than comparing the two, the focus lies on if and how they identify substantial security threats in the Arctic – or if, on the contrary, issues are presented as matters of political decision-making.

In order to understand the formation of security concerns, this thesis employs the concept of 'Securitization' developed by the Copenhagen School of Security Studies.⁹ According to this school of thought, a security issue does not exist *per se*, but is socially constructed – a 'security threat' thus only becomes such a 'threat' when someone actively identifies and labels it as such. The Copenhagen School claims that a securitizing actor has to explicitly *securitize* an issue, i.e. to characterize something as existential threat. Accordingly, 'Securitization' is a speech act, and it is only successful if the audience - to which the threat is presented by the securitizing actor - accepts the securitization and is convinced of the existence of a threat. This concept allows a different approach toward the topic: instead of merely asking 'what threats are there?', it takes into account that a 'threat' does not exist a priori or for its own sake. More attention is directed towards how the perception of a threat is generated. Whereas a *securitization* presents an issue as existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bonds of political procedures, *politicization* stays within the process of regular political decision-making. It handles the issue in question as a part of public policy that requires government decisions. Points in

⁸ In the Norway-case, all 3 currently existing strategies have been considered, of which "Visions and Strategies" is the newest paper, published in 2011.

⁹ Buzan, Barry, Wæver, Ole, De Wilde, Jaap: Security. A New Framework for Analysis, Lynne Rieder Publishers, Boulder, Colorado/London 1998.

question are dealt with as matters of choice and democratic accountability.¹⁰ The aim is to investigate whether Sweden and Norway treat developments (which will be presented in greater detail in the section ‘Challenges and Opportunities’) in the Arctic in a securitizing or politicizing manner. However, since this theoretical approach has to be critically assessed and is only applicable to the following analysis with certain modifications, it will be addressed in more detail in the chapter discussing the theoretical framework.

This thesis seeks to find out *if* the two national actors identify threats in their strategies, *what* they present as those, and *how* they do it rhetorically. This approach does not take the existence of ‘objective’ threat for granted. It rather focuses on the subjective perceptions of the respective states, and it leaves room for the option that these states do not determine any ‘threats’ at all – which would suggest a politicizing approach. This open-ended inquiry thus also considers that the analysis might detect the absence of any securitization.

The examination of the strategies leads to the ensuing question: can the region be classified as an emerging security complex? Following Buzan’s description, such a security complex is

“defined as a set of states whose major security perceptions and concerns are so interlinked that their national security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another.”¹¹

In this context, the concept of a security complex refers to the security interdependences among the Arctic states. “Because most political and military threats travel more easily over short distances than over long ones, insecurity is often associated with proximity.”¹² It is hence also of peculiar interest if and how the strategies address security interlinkages with other Arctic states. If efforts for cooperation are emphasized, this suggests an attitude of

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., p.12.

¹² Ibid., p.11.

amity in a potential Arctic security cluster. If competition and disagreements take up a large portion, an atmosphere of enmity predominates. However, main attention is paid to the securitization/politicization of the national strategies. The question of security complexes is addressed rather briefly and would require a separate, more extensive examination.

1.2 Limitations

By concentrating on Norway and Sweden, this thesis ranges in the European context but does not aim to represent an overall European perspective. With a population of 5 (Norway) and 10 (Sweden) million, both countries are considered small states in relation to their European neighbors as well as to other Arctic States like the US and Russia.

This approach rather demonstrates that the Scandinavian countries cannot be viewed as homogeneous bloc with identical interests.

National Strategies represent declarations of intent, but no policies to be put into immediate practice. They rather reflect major themes, tendencies and intentions, and they are an instrument of self-depiction for the states. Whether their tendencies and intentions are followed by actual policies, and if the displayed positions reflect the genuine position of a country cannot be determined with certainty.

Moreover, nation-states are not the only actors in the Arctic Security discourse. Environmental organizations like Greenpeace and the World Wildlife Fund are probably the best-known NGOs which are engaged in the discourse on Arctic environmental protection.¹³

Multinational Corporations like Royal Dutch Shell, Exxon Mobile, Statoil and Gazprom stress the importance of energy security and drill exploratory wells – either on behalf of state-

¹³ See <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/climate-change/arctic-impacts/>. Last Access September 22, 2012, and for the WWF: <http://worldwildlife.org/places/arctic>. Last Access September 22, 2012.

owned oil companies or of private businesses. Here, the line between state- and non-state actors is blurring. However, nation-states are still the actors with the most extensive capacities to securitize or politicize security concerns.

1.3 Thesis Structure

To explore the security concerns presented in the Norwegian and in the Swedish strategy respectively, the first section already introduced the research question and its limitations.

The literature review assesses the current state of the art and general tendencies of the thematic field. Subsequently, the theoretical section discusses the Copenhagen School's approach in further detail and expounds its benefits and limitations for this study.

This thesis scrutinizes two national Arctic strategies and does hence not conduct research whose findings represent the overall Arctic region. It employs the method of qualitative documents analysis and inevitably carries a comparative component, which will be specified in the third chapter on the methodological framework.

The fourth chapter offers an introductory overview. It aims to grasp what 'The Arctic' stands for, what current challenges and opportunities have to be faced, and who the key actors and stakeholders are in the region. This outline aims to provide some informational background and specifies which issues are likely to be raised in the strategies.

Subsequently, the fifth chapter will pay special attention to the question of what sense of Arctic Security is conveyed in the Norwegian strategy document, the sixth chapter focuses on the Swedish Arctic strategy.

Even if this study cannot offer exhausting and comprehensive explanations and interpretations for the presence or absence of securitizing rhetoric in the strategy papers, the concluding remarks in chapter seven aim to offer explanatory comments and seek to point at further research questions that emerged through the conduct of this analysis.

1.4 Literature Review

Barry Buzan's "Security. A new Framework for Analysis" sets the basic framework for the research question of this thesis.¹⁴ It introduces a new understanding of international security that does not limit the notion of security to the military realm, but also considers economic, social, political and environmental security. Since its concept of securitization in its absoluteness cannot be applied to this thesis without modifications, it is supplemented by Olaf Corry's article on riskification – it implies that security threats do not have to be depicted as existential threats, but can also be regarded as potential dangers, as risks.¹⁵

Security in the Arctic as subject of analysis is not a phenomenon of the recent years, as the introduction already indicated. The renowned Arctic expert Oran Young's article "The Age of the Arctic" and the work "The Age of the Arctic: Hot Conflicts and Cold Realities" from 1989 rang in a debate on the Arctic as geostrategic region of Cold-War muscle flexing.¹⁶ The following publication "Arctic Politics: Conflict and Cooperation in the circumpolar North" addressed a broader range of issues concerning the Arctic: economic, environmental as well as political matters were discussed in this book of the immediate post-Cold War era.¹⁷ Young's numerous publications, however, focus mainly on Alaska or the American Continent.

Many books about the Arctic primarily address it as a region with great potential for conflict. Richard Sale's "The Scramble of the Arctic", Michael Byers' "Who owns the Arctic?" and

¹⁴ Buzan, Barry, Wæver, Ole, De Wilde, Jaap: Security. A New Framework for Analysis, Lynne Rieder Publishers, Boulder, Colorado/London 1998.

¹⁵ Corry, Olaf: Securitisation and 'Riskification': Second-order Security and the Politics of Climate Change, in: Millenium – Journal of International Studies, online publication, 8th November 2011, p. 1-24.

¹⁶ Young, Oran: The Age of the Arctic, in: Foreign Policy No. 61, 1985/86, pp.160-179, and Osherenko, Gail and Young, Oran: The Age of the Arctic. Hot Conflicts and Cold Realities. Cambridge University Press 1989.

¹⁷ Young, Oran: Arctic Politics. Conflict and Cooperation in the Circumpolar North, Arctic Visions Series, Dartmouth 1992.

Roger Howard's "The Arctic Gold Rush: The New Race for Tomorrow's Natural Resources" especially address oil and gas issues.¹⁸ "Arctic Security in an Age of Climate Change" takes a similar approach – it focuses on the Arctic nation states' military security concerns in a changing Arctic.¹⁹ The publications listed above mainly adopt a security-notion that is primarily based on military security, guaranteed by state actors.

Even though this thesis focuses on state actors (and not non-state actors like NGOs or corporations) as well, it seeks to explore notions of security that are either different from or not limited to the military understanding of it. The literature mentioned above does not address this sufficiently.

Helga Haftendorn addresses a possible new aspect of security in the Arctic: In her article "NATO and the Arctic: Is the Atlantic Alliance a Cold War- relic in a peaceful region now faced with non-military challenges?", she brings up the thought that territorial or military aspects might not be the most pressing security issues in the region.²⁰ Instead, Climate Change and increased maritime activity might require military alliance like NATO to modify and adapt to the new political reality. Still, the line of thought stays in the military realm- proposing a military alliance to fight non-military threats.

Carina Keskitalo's "Negotiating the Arctic. The Construction of an International Region" offers an account of an emerging Arctic discourse, but focuses primarily on Canada and its concept of the Arctic.²¹ Besides that, it offers insights into the constructivist approach towards the processes of region-building and international region discourse – hence, it does

¹⁸ See Sale, Richard and Potapov, Eugene: *The Scramble for the Arctic. Ownership, Exploitation and Conflict in the Far North*, London 2010, and Byers, Michael: *Who owns the Arctic? Understanding Sovereignty Disputes in the North*, Vancouver 2009. See Also Howard, Roger: *The Arctic Gold Rush. The New Race for Tomorrow's Natural Resources*, London/ New York 2009.

¹⁹ Kraska, James (ed.): *Arctic Security in an Age of Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press 2011.

²⁰ Haftendorn, Helga: *NATO and the Arctic: Is the Atlantic Alliance a Cold War Relic in a peaceful Region now faced with non-military Challenges?* In: *European Security* 20:3, Routledge 2011, p. 337-361.

²¹ Keskitalo, Carina: *Negotiating the Arctic. The Construction of an International Region*, Studies in International Relations, Routledge, New York/London 2004.

not deal with security concerns or discourses, neither does it focus primarily on Scandinavian Countries.

Keskitalo's other book, "Climate Change and Globalization in the Arctic" applies the study of vulnerability assessment to the context of the Arctic.²² This adds a valuable background to the aspect of social and environmental security in the Arctic.

However, none of these publications address the Scandinavian countries, their security understandings and priorities in the Arctic extensively. Rasmussens' recent report "Megatrends" introduces the main transformations in the Arctic with a focus on the Northern countries, which offers a helpful overview of emerging trends and tendencies of these countries.²³

Heather Conley's contribution "A New Security Architecture for the Arctic" provides a comprehensive account on opportunities and challenges in the Arctic, but does so from a US-american perspective.²⁴

Lassi Heininnen and Alyson Bailes introduce the content of the national strategies in their comparative studies, but these inventories and Rasmussen's report only offer overview and general tendencies without discussing the strategies in depth.²⁵

The up-to-date nature of both Sweden's and Norway's strategy publications entail that there has not yet taken place an extensive discussion of what their strategies reveal about their Arctic Security Concerns.

²² Keskitalo, Carina: Climate Change and Globalization in the Arctic. An Integrated Approach to Vulnerability Assessment, London 2008.

²³ Rasmussen, Rasmus Ole: Megatrends in the Arctic. New Inspiration into current policy strategies, report from the Nordic Council of Ministers' seminar at Nordregio 29th May 2012, Nordregio Working Paper 2012:8, Nordregio 2012.

²⁴ Conley, Heather: A New Security Architecture for the Arctic: An American Perspective. A Report of the CSIS Europe Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington D.C. 2012.

²⁵ Heininen, Lassi: Arctic Strategies and Policies. Inventory and Comparative Study, University of Lapland Press, Akureyri 2011, and Heininen, Lassi and Bailes, Alyson: Strategy Papers on the Arctic or High North: A comparative study and analysis, University of Iceland Press 2012, Reykjavík 2012. Each Strategy is presented within a few pages.

2 Theoretical Framework

In order to investigate the national understanding of Security in the Arctic, this thesis is oriented towards the Copenhagen School of security studies. The following section seeks to differentiate this school of thought from the classical realist approach towards International Relations.

2.1 Security Studies

In the broadest sense, 'security' refers to the freedom from the risk of loss or damage to a thing that is important to survival and well-being: "In its shallowest and narrowest form, which is also its most influential and widespread interpretation, security refers to the security of the nation-state from attack from armed forces."²⁶ Other interpretations do not solely focus on the possibility of military invasion, but on "anything that can quickly degrade the quality of life of the inhabitants of a state, or that narrows the choices available to people and organizations within the state."²⁷ Accordingly, there can be many other risks to security than the risk of military attack.

The question is also *what* is to be secured after all – what is the object that needs to be secured? In classical realist security studies, it is the sovereign nation-state that possesses priority. Wider understandings of security consider cultural, the environmental or human security as equally or even more worth to be protected. It is therefore revealing to see what Norway and Sweden prioritize in their strategies.

²⁶ Cf. Matthew, Richard, Barnett, Jon et.al. (Eds.): Global Environmental Change and Human Security, MIT Press, Cambridge 2010, p. 5.

²⁷ Ullman, Richard: Redefining Security, in: International Security 8, No. 1, MIT Press 1983, pp. 129-153.

Furthermore, what sets up the condition of security – how is the object to be protected, how is security to be achieved? And finally, how do ideas of security emerge after all?²⁸

“Do they arise, as the conventional wisdom might suggest, from objective threats and conditions inherent to an anarchic world? Are they generated within, a consequence of notions about multiple selves and feared others? Or, are they socially constructed, the worst-case dialectic of what is observed and what is imagined?”²⁹

The classical realist approach is to mainly think in terms of state-security, safeguarded by military means. Security threats are not perceived as ‘socially constructed’, but as ‘objective’ or ‘inherent’ and are mainly to be solved by the military.

From a realist’s perspective on International Relations, sovereign nation-states interact with each other in a relationship of anarchy, focusing on their own state security and the pursuit of self-interest and self-help. Anarchy, in this sense, refers to the notion that there is no overarching (supra-national) authority that limits each state’s sovereignty and hence its capacity to act autonomously and without the interference of other states into their internal matters.³⁰ This realist approach focuses on nation states as primary units of analysis, they are considered as the decisive actors in the international sphere.

For realist thinker Stephen Walt, security studies are about “the phenomenon of war and can be defined as ‘the study of the threat, use, and control of military force’”.³¹

Critics argue that this realist position had a strong momentum in the Cold War era – a time when the ideas of mutual deterrence and arms race prevailed – and has now become outdated or even obsolete. Security in the bipolar international system was characterized by

²⁸ Cf. Lipschutz, Ronnie D. (ed.): On Security, Columbia University Press, New York 1998, p.1.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Brown, Chris and Ainley, Kristen: Understanding International Relations, Hampshire/ New York 2005.

³¹ Walt, Stephen: The Renaissance of Security Studies, in: International Studies Quarterly 35, no. 2, 1991, pp. 211-239, p. 212.

either a negative peace between the two superpowers (the absence of open war, but no cooperation between the opposing states and a constant arms race), and a 'stability' in terms of maintaining the status quo and not to make concessions to the 'other side'.³²

In the post- Cold War era, the classic dichotomy 'West versus East' does not exist anymore, neither does a clear-cut division into friends and enemies like in the bipolar world. Peace research institutes record a substantial decline of Classic Inter-state since the end of World War II. Notions of human security and the increasing prominence of the individual's right and priority above state interests challenge the 'traditional' definition of security as too state-centric.

The UN's "High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change" suggests a shift towards more focus on human security. This approach places individual rights and security above state sovereignty – although it does not indicate less importance of state security, it states that the latter must not override human security.³³ Threats to human security are for instance diseases, malnutrition, environmental catastrophes or contaminated drinking water – threats to human security comprise all conditions that jeopardize a human being's physical and psychological integrity. These can include, but are not limited to classical military threats.

These shifting paradigms permit a different approach towards the study of security in the Arctic: What notion of security do Norway and Sweden apply in their Arctic Strategies, a realist or post-realist one? What needs to be protected in their views?

³² Even though there was no 'hot war' between the US and the Soviet Union, proxy wars in Asia and Africa were fought and contradict the statement of non-existent war.

³³ UN-Document: A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, UN Doc. A/59/565, at 8 (2004). Available at <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf>. Last access September 30, 2012. See also Slaughter's brief outline and analysis of the Panel's report: Slaughter, Ann-Marie: Security, Solidarity, and Sovereignty. The Grand Themes of UN Reform, in: The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 99, No. 3/2005, pp. 619-631.

2.2 The Copenhagen School and the Concept of Securitization

The Copenhagen School of Security Studies applies a social constructivist approach towards the notion of security. According to this school of thought, the military element holds primacy in the conceptualization of security. In order to challenge this focus on the military, a widening of the security agenda is necessary.³⁴ Whereas 'traditionalists' insist on the military conflict and the potential for the use of force as defining key to security, Buzan et.al argue that matters can become security issues even if they are not connected to military conflicts.³⁵

'Securitization' is conceptualized as a speech act in which an issue is elevated to the security level and presented as an existential threat. Securitizing actors (in this case, state actors, ie. politicians and state representatives who talk on behalf of and represent the state) make a 'securitizing move', ie. they define a 'referent object' which is, according to the securitizing actors, under an existential threat.³⁶ Successful securitization implies that an issue has successfully been announced and is thus understood and perceived as an existential threat – it is hence elevated to the security agenda. A securitizing actor – for instance a politician – has thus successfully convinced his audience - a considerable amount of people – that there is an existential security threat which has to be addressed without further delay. The securitization hence legitimizes the use of extraordinary means in order to fight the security threat and elevates it from the political to the security realm. A successful securitization thus allows a circumvention of 'normal' democratic procedures, the notion of an emergency case suspends democratic accountability.

³⁴ Buzan et al., Security, p. 1.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

The act of securitization can take place in different sectors: “Thinking about security in terms of sectors simply grew up (...) during the later decades of the Cold War as new issues were added to the military-political agenda.”³⁷ These sectors refer to specific types of interaction.

The five sectors named by Buzan et. al are described as the following:

The military sector refers to forceful coercion, the interplay of armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states and the states’ perceptions of each respective intentions.

The political sector is about the relationships of authority, governing status and recognition. It describes the organizational stability of states, systems of governments and ideologies which give them legitimacy.

Relations of trade, production and finance are addressed in the economic sector. It deals with access to resources, finance and markets which are necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power.

The social dimension is in the focus in the societal sector, which takes up relations of collective identity, sustainability, traditional patterns of language, culture and religious and national identity and custom.

Environmental issues constitute security concerns of the environmental sector, dealing with relations between human activity and the planetary biosphere. The latter is conceived of as essential support system on which all other human enterprise depends.³⁸

The items in a sector do not exist independently, but remain inseparable parts of complex wholes. The use of sectors aims to make inquiries manageable, since “each is looking at the

³⁷ Ibid., p. 7ff.

³⁸ For the categorization of security sectors, see Buzan et al., Security, chapter 3-6.

whole but is seeing only one dimension of its reality.”³⁹ The disaggregation into different spheres or ‘sectors’ of security is helpful to identify the nature of individual security concerns and will be utilized for the analysis of Norway’s and Sweden’s strategies. The following analysis will not just divide security concerns into these pre-existing sectors, but apply them where appropriate and creates new categories if necessary, according to what is indicated in the strategy papers.

Its potential for the detection of newly rising security concerns notwithstanding, the concept of securitization needs to be critically assessed as well. Following the Copenhagen school’s reasoning, the term “Securitization” often leaves a negative aftertaste. The dichotomy of ‘undesirable’ securitization – its understanding as an instrument to undermine democratic procedures – and ‘desirable’ de-securitization remains too simplistic and in many cases inadequate. Even at the peak of the Cold War, desecuritization took place in the Baltic states, and matters that caused huge security concerns were deliberately desecuritized out of the sheer lack of means and instruments to counter the security threats (posed, at that time by the Soviet Union).⁴⁰ The Baltic as well as the Nordic states were very careful not to provoke or offend the Soviet Union, any securitizing move might have put the little cooperation and trade at risk, so any confrontational rhetoric was strictly avoided. This thesis focuses on the security issues Norway and Sweden raise themselves and how they do it, but it does not judge whether the securitization/the lack of securitization is legitimate or not. Further, a comprehensive evaluation of what motives and considerations lead to securitizing rhetoric (or the lack thereof) does not lie within the scope of this thesis.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁰ For de-securitization moves during the Cold War, see Bailes, Alyson: *The European Defence Challenge for the Nordic Region*, in: Bailes, Alyson, Herolf, Gunilla, Sundelius, Bengt (Eds.): *The Nordic Countries and the European Security and Defence Policy* SIPRI-Publication, Oxford University Press 2006, p.5.

Even a normative understanding of the concept of securitization (regarding it as undesirable per se) is barely applicable to the case of Norway and Sweden. In the Democracy Index' report of 2011, Norway scored a total of 9.80 on a scale from zero to ten, ranking as the world's most democratic country. Sweden ranked on place 4 with a score of 9,5.⁴¹ In the UN Human Development Report, Norway holds the top position as well, Sweden is on rank 10.⁴² Both countries hence stand out due to the highest levels of democratic accountability and political stability and embody what is widely called 'strong states'. The idea that they consider their political stability as vulnerable and instable is –in contrast to weak states – unconvincing.⁴³ Would states of such high democratic standards use securitizing rhetoric at all?

To tackle this complication, it is useful to include Olaf Corry's concept of 'riskification'.⁴⁴ It takes up the notion that 'risk is the new security': In contrast to the concept of securitization, this approach suggest that security concepts are less about an imminent, existential threat, but rather about risks, their probabilities and prevention.

"Threat-based security deals with *direct causes* of harm, whereas risk-security is oriented towards the conditions of possibility or *constitutive causes* of harm a kind of 'second-order' security politics that promotes long-term precautionary governance."⁴⁵

Security practices, Corry argues, are increasingly focused on prevention, screening and profiling in order to manage uncertainty and possible future scenarios. The emergence of 'riskification' in the context of Climate Change is particularly prominent, but its dynamics

⁴¹ Cf. the Economist Intelligence Unit: The Democracy Index 2011. Democracy under stress, Pdf available at: https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=DemocracyIndex2011. Last Access Ocotber 5, 2012.

⁴² United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Human Development Report 2011. Sustainability and Equity: A better Future for all, New York 2011. Pdf available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2011_EN_Complete.pdf. Last Access October 5, 2012.

⁴³ Buzan et. al, Security, p. 153.

⁴⁴ Corry, Olaf: Securitisation and 'Riskification': Second-order Security and the Politics of Climate Change, in: Millenium – Journal of International Studies, online publication, 8th November 2011, p. 1-24.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p.1.

may be observable in other sectors as well. A pitfall of the riskification-concept is, however, that its application might 'riskify' a very broad range of issues. Vague and un-precise notions of risk potentials and uncertainties could for this reason lead to far-flung risk-policies:

"Riskification does not involve the same danger of creating unhelpful friend–enemy logics or legitimising exceptional means, but it does run the risk of legitimising extensive governance programmes of the valued reference object itself."⁴⁶

Riskification hence mainly manifests itself in extensive monitoring and surveillance measures. To prevent an issue of high risk from becoming a full-fledged threat, the primary measure is to closely observe it. By creating extensive knowledge about a risk-issue, a state prepares itself for the case of needed counteractions.

Since it is not likely that Norway or Sweden see their existence or the existence of major pillars of the state (like the political system, the economy or the social structures) as existentially threatened, the analysis in the context of the Arctic should not center exclusively on 'existential' threats as suggested by the Copenhagen school, but on the identification of non-existential threats and risks as well.

Besides the investigation of its contents, the strategy-analysis seeks to assess where Norway and Sweden are situated between securitization and riskification.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 23.

3 Methodological Approach

The mere existence of “National Strategies” reveals that the Arctic has been identified as a matter that requires a strategy. It is recognized as an issue of national concern which can only be handled if it is elevated to the national level, hence the highest level it can be elevated to by a sovereign nation-state. A national strategy for a region that lies to a large degree outside each country’s own sovereign territory appears as peculiarity at first sight.⁴⁷ In order to analyze these strategies, it is helpful to first tackle the meaning and purpose of political strategies themselves.

3.1 The national strategy as subject of analysis

Originating in the military context, “strategy” dealt with the application of military force to achieve a major goal.⁴⁸ They functioned as starting point from which more detailed action could be taken.⁴⁹ In recent decades, many states and institutions have adopted public ‘strategies’, which

“resemble the traditional variety in being unilaterally adopted by the state or organization in question, in pursuit of its own ends, and in being politically rather than legally binding. They differ, however, first and foremost in their publicly declared quality which perhaps brings them closer to the concept of a 'statement of intent'. They are also wider and looser in the issues they cover, in how they deal with them, in the nature of the directives they contain and in the range of aims they seek to achieve.”⁵⁰

In contrast to secret military strategies, political strategies are intended to reach the public. On one hand, this can enhance a feeling of transparency and communication between a government and the governed people, on the other hand, it can raise doubts on the genuineness and sincerity of the strategy. It could also lead to stronger public disapproval if

⁴⁷ This refers to the ‘Arctic’ as the Arctic Ocean itself.

⁴⁸ Cf. Bailes, Alyson: Does a Small State Need a Strategy?, Occasional Paper of the Institute for International Affairs/Centre for the Study of Small States at the University of Iceland, Reykjavík 2009, available at: http://stofnanir.hi.is/ams/sites/files/ams/Bailes_Final_0.pdf, p. 2.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p.3.

a government acts differently from what was promised in the strategy. According to Bailes, there are two kinds of strategies: the 'declared' strategy and the 'deep' strategy – while the former refers to public statements of intent, the latter refers to the author's actual or "true" intent, which does not always coincide with the declared one and is not publicly accessible.⁵¹ The two strategies under examination belong to the category of "declared" strategies.

Generally, political Strategies are "Constructs which are based on cross-situational, success-oriented and dynamic goal-measure-environment-calculations".⁵² This rather cumbersome formulation means that political strategies take several aspects into account: in order to reach a desirable result (the goal), the strategy considers what measures can be taken. To assess these "goal-oriented opportunities of action", the context needs to be appraised – who are the actors involved, how do the actors relate to each other, what are the opportunities and limitations of action (ie. what is the situation or 'environment')? The determination of a specific goal is vital for the following calculations. The triangulation of paths of action, applicability of measures and availability of resources determines how a strategic goal can be pursued.⁵³ Political Strategies explicitly set a goal and introduce a flexible and adaptable way of proceeding to reach it. The analyst has to be aware of this particular nature of the documents. Unlike detailed and concrete plans, strategies are still open for change and adjustments.⁵⁴ The Norwegian and Swedish strategies are hence not to be treated like plans of action, what they declare as necessary in their strategies is to a large

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 5.

⁵² Tils, Ralf: Politische Strategieanalyse. Konzeptionelle Grundlagen und Anwendung in der Umwelt- und Nachhaltigkeitspolitik, Wiesbaden 2005, p. 25. Citation in original language: "Politische Strategien sind Konstrukte, die auf situationsübergreifenden, erfolgsorientierten und dynamischen Ziel-Mittel-Umwelt-Kalkulationen beruhen."

⁵³ Ibid., p. 26. „Paths of action” here refer to fields and arenas like the public sphere, parliaments or jurisdiction, through which the strategic goal can be promoted and achieved. 'Measures' stand for variants of of action such as laws, negotiations or campaigns. Resources can be material (personell, money) or immaterial (knowledge, information).

⁵⁴ A strategy is thus nothing like a 5-year policy plan.

extent subject to change and adaption, especially when the strategic environment (like other actors' behavior) changes. At the same time, national strategies are revealing in terms of their authors' assessment of a particular situation – in this context, the conditions in the Arctic. This is why the analysis of these documents is suitable to address the research question of this thesis: Do these state actors perceive certain developments or conditions in the Arctic as threat, and is this perception reflected in their Arctic strategies?

With regard to the two Scandinavian strategies, it is relevant to look at what measures they claim to take: do the strategies mention extraordinary measures that have to be taken, do they talk about vast resources that need to be mobilized in a very short range of time – the rhetoric of a necessary exceptional mobilization and utter urgency connotes securitizing moves.

It is also interest what they aim to achieve – what goal(s) are mentioned in the respective strategy. However, the principal focus lies on whether or not they identify threats and declare the elimination of those as their goal.

Do the strategies speak in favor of extraordinary means (which would point at a securitization act) or do they promote the democratic procedures applied in political processes? According to Tils, the combination of the strategic goal and situational factors leads to prioritizations and calculations on the prospects of success.⁵⁵ Depending on these priorities, the actor's strategic behavior can range from attack over adaption to imitation or circumvention.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 33.

This thesis employs Norway's and Sweden's national Arctic strategies as contemporary objects of analysis. It seeks to examine, assess and evaluate the current strategic approaches by conducting a qualitative document analysis.

3.2 Qualitative Document Analysis

The national strategies have intentionally been made accessible to the public.⁵⁶ They publicly express their respective national perspectives and intentions in the Arctic. The basic assumption for undertaking a qualitative document analysis (QDA) is that documents do not represent a factual reality, but a specific version of realities, a version that has been constructed for certain purposes.⁵⁷

In Lindsay Prior's words, a document is anything but a fixed or objective item:

"If we are to get to grips with the nature of documents then we have to move away from a consideration of them as stable, static and pre-defined artefacts. Instead we must consider them in terms of fields, frames and networks of action."⁵⁸

States that publish an Arctic Strategy claim to have a say in the region, they declare that the Arctic has been put on the national agenda. Such a strategy also informs other actors if and how a specific state envisions its own and the role of others in the region. A national Arctic

⁵⁶ Both strategies are available as pdf-files on their respective government's online presence. For Norway's strategy, see http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/dok/rapporter_planer/planer/2006/regjeringens-nordomradestrategi.html?id=448697, the pdf-link is <http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/ud/pla/2006/0006/ddd/pdfv/302927-nstrategi06.pdf>. Last Access September 25, 2012. For Sweden's Strategy, see <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/14762/a/167993>, the pdf-link is <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/16/79/93/9ff39990.pdf>. Last Access September 25, 2012. The strategies have been analyzed for significant differences between their respective original version (in Norwegian resp. Swedish). Whereas the Swedish strategy's English version is nearly identical with the Swedish one, the Norway's English version is significantly shorter because the Norwegian version discusses the respective matters in greater detail. For reasons of simplicity, the following quotations refer to the English versions. If diverging interpretation possibilities evolve because of language differences, this will be indicated in the analysis.

⁵⁷ Wolff, Stephan: Dokumenten- und Aktenanalyse, in: Flick, Uwe et.al (eds.): Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch, Hamburg 2000, p. 502-513.

⁵⁸ Prior, Lindsay: Using Documents in Social Research. Sage Publications Ltd., London 2009, p. 2.

strategy is thus a medium of communication, rather than a mere “container of information”.⁵⁹ It delivers a national statement on what is considered to be important, what needs to be done in the eyes of the author.⁶⁰ Each document does not exist in isolation, but is always interlinked with other documents of the same topical realm. Hence, there are widely agreed standards on how a document is designed. Due to this intertextuality, documents react to each other: “All documents refer to other documents in the way they construct and record social realities.”⁶¹

Just like the documents under examination, this analysis does not reflect an ‘objective’ reality. The following examination employs the epistemological concept of securitization. Its ontological basis is social constructivism – what is ‘real’ depends on the context in which something is perceived and understood as ‘real’.⁶²

Keywords for securitizing rhetoric can be ‘threat’, ‘hazard’, ‘security/insecurity’, ‘uncertainty’, ‘vulnerability’, ‘danger’, ‘risk’, or adjectives like ‘precarious’, ‘unsustainable’ ‘undesired’, ‘irreversible’ or ‘hazardous’. Apart from that, terms that stress a situations singularity like ‘unprecedented’, ‘singular’, or ‘unparalleled’ can have securitizing effects as well – they indicate that there might not be a currently existing framework or approach available to address them, which bolsters the idea that extraordinary measures are needed.

3.2.1 Validity and Reliability

The concepts of validity and reliability have their origins in positivist quantitative research. In content analysis, they are used to legitimize research in two ways: Validity is reached by providing evidence for the researcher’s findings, for example by giving quantitative proof

⁵⁹ Flick, Uwe: *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung*, 4th Edition, Hamburg 2011, p. 331.

⁶⁰ In this case, the authors are the respective states.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 326.

⁶² Cf. Delanty, Gerard: *Social Science. Philosophical and Methodological Foundations*, Maidenhead 2005.

(like the number of keyword mentions, phrases etc.). Reliability refers to “the extent to which a particular assessment would yield identical result if repeated under the same conditions”, ie. if an independent researcher would reach the same results.⁶³ This notion is described as “inter-subjectivity” and presumes that meanings and information in documents are inherent and just need to be identified. In qualitative research, however, the notion of inherent meaning in documents is widely rejected. Instead, “the meaning invoked by texts need not to be shared” – an individual interpretation is just one of many possible ‘readings’.⁶⁴

Nevertheless, qualitative analysis employs standards and norms to validate their findings and prove reliability as well. These common standards are:

1. Credibility.⁶⁵ To be credible (or ‘valid’ in quantitative research), the analysis has to provide an accurate reading of a particular document and offer a believable interpretation. This analysis aims to do so by applying Mayring’s guidelines for qualitative content analysis.⁶⁶
2. Portability: This is also known as ‘external validity’ in quantitative research and states that findings must offer insight beyond the specific case under study. The examination of Securitizing moves can be applied to many national strategies, but it lies in the nature of this research that the outcomes may differ from case to case. However, the findings show tendencies and attitudes of the state actors in question and reveal which actor may destabilize the political situation in the Arctic by applying aggressive or securitizing rhetoric. Hence, the examination of securitization of

⁶³ Wesley, Jared: Qualitative Document Analysis in Political Science, Working Paper, University of Manitoba 2010, p. 3.

⁶⁴ Krippendorff, Klaus: Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology, 2nd Edition, Thousand Oaks 2004, p. 22f., and Wesley 2010, p. 4.

⁶⁵ For these criteria, see Wesley 2010, p.4-6.

⁶⁶ Cf. Mayring, Philipp: Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken, 8th Edition, Weinheim 2003.

individual state actors offers insights over the prospects of Arctic cooperation or competition.

3. 'Dependability' refers to the need for precise research and the need to conduct it in a transparent manner. The interpretations will be explained in detail and refer to the results of coding and reduction stages to achieve transparency.
4. Impartiality, which can also be described as 'confirmability' – The observations made may be contested or even declared too 'interpretative' by an analysis that takes a non-constructivist approach. The application of the same ontological (social constructivism) and epistemological (securitization) perspectives are likely to yield the same results with the Arctic Strategies of Norway and Sweden.

There is no hypothesis assuming that the two selected states securitize issues in the Arctic. Neither does this thesis presume that there is an emerging security complex characterized by an atmosphere of enmity/amity. This thesis applies an inductive approach. Yet, it outlines the main fields in which security concerns potentially arise in the sector 'Challenges and Opportunities in the Arctic'. This outline gives first indications and serves as broad orientation, but does not imply that securitizing or 'riskifying' moves can occur or are looked for only within these fields.

Where applicable, the content of the strategies will be structured along the Copenhagen School's five sectors of security (the military, environmental, economic, political and social sector). The issues raised in the strategies will be discussed by supplemental consultation of additional sources and relevant research literature in order to put them into the broader context and to allow deeper insights into key areas of concern.

3.2.2 Sampling

All Arctic States have published Arctic Strategies and State Policies. Not all of them can be investigated in the scope of this thesis. Norway and Sweden were selected as subjects of analysis because despite their geographical proximity and the similarity of their political systems, they differ in several important aspects: Norway is an Arctic coastal state and has access to its natural resources in a large scope, Sweden does not. Sweden is in the EU which recently shows increasing interest in the Arctic, a fact that may play out in Sweden's strategy. Furthermore, it holds the Arctic Council's Chairmanship until 2013. Norway, on the other hand, is a NATO-member state, which again may have an impact on its Arctic priorities.

International organizations like the UN, the EU and its 'Northern Dimension' as well as regional institutions (like the Arctic Council or the Barents Euro-Arctic Council) gain importance in the Arctic – decision-making processes are impacted by them. Non-state actors like environmental organizations and the private business sector pursue their Arctic agendas as well – and all of these actors bring in their understandings and priorities. The mix of actors and interests can help to resolve security questions, but has also the potential to exacerbate or create new security problems. Security concerns in the Arctic hence arise in this enmeshment of interests and perceptions. This thesis deals with nation-states, as well. However, their security perceptions might not solely rest on the state itself and is likely to consider the abovementioned actors as well.

4 The Arctic as subject of national concern

4.1 What is the Arctic?

“The Arctic has largely been conceived of as a polar region – the High Arctic where polar bears roam. Perhaps even more so, it has been conceived of as something apart from this world, an area for exploration and exploitation through which one may gain fame and fortune back home. One does not stay in the Arctic: one uses it for something, or ignores it. In short, it is for most people a romanticized and imagined area, not a naturalized place of everyday life.”⁶⁷

With this quotation in mind, the only way to define the Arctic in a fairly accurate manner might be in geographic terms. Hence, the Arctic’s southern limits are located at 66° 32’ north latitude.⁶⁸ Alternatively, the Arctic can be described as a pack ice-covered Ocean surrounded by land, as the area north of the treeline (the northern limit of upright tree growth), or as the region north of the 10°C (50°F) isotherm.⁶⁹ Whereas the northernmost area consists of tundra (treeless plains over frozen ground), the sub-arctic is covered with boreal forests.

None of these descriptions, however, indicate the strategic, environmental, economic and social value ascribed to this geographically rather peripheral region.

Unlike Antarctica, the Arctic is no landmass, but an ocean surrounded by five Arctic coastal states: The United States, Canada, Russia, Denmark via Greenland, and Norway.⁷⁰ Sweden, Iceland and Finland are partially situated above the Arctic Circle, which is why they are classified as ‘Arctic’ States as well. The term ‘Arctic’ is thus not strictly confined to the Ocean and its coastal states. The way it is defined largely depends on the scientific discipline;

⁶⁷ Keskitalo, Carina: *Negotiating the Arctic. The Construction of an International Region*, Studies in International Relations, Routledge, New York/London 2004, p.1.

⁶⁸ These are the coordinates for the Arctic Circle, an imaginary line above which the sun does not rise on the day of winter solstice (usually 21 December) and does not set at summer solstice (21 June).

⁶⁹ The 10°C isotherm demarcates the locations in high latitudes where the average daily summer temperature does not rise above 10° Celsius. Data from the National Snow & Ice Data Center, University of Colorado. Website available at http://nsidc.org/arcticmet/basics/arctic_definition.html. Last Access September 12, 2012.

⁷⁰ Disagreements between these states are unlikely to be settled by a pact like the Antarctic treaty, which prohibits military activity and established Antarctica as nuclear-free zone and as a scientific preservation area. Cf. Antarctic Treaty, signed in 1959, treaty as pdf-file at: http://www.ats.aq/documents/ats/treaty_original.pdf. Last Access September 12, 2012.

geographic and other demarcations rooted in the natural sciences therefore vary greatly from political definitions and those of the social sciences. The latter focuses on a notion of the 'Arctic' that is associated with identity. What identity and characteristics are typically 'Arctic'? The membership in the Arctic Council, a regional organization striving to enhance cooperation and dialogue among its members, is not restricted to the Arctic coastal states. What is classified as 'Arctic' is hence also a matter of (in this context political) discussion. The eight Arctic states (the 'Arctic Eight') agree on a definition of the Arctic that includes the Arctic Ocean as well as the region north of the Polar Circle.

The perception of the Arctic is subject to region-building dynamics: the concept of region-building "assumes that identity developments do not simply happen but require effort and a systematic selection of features that are advocated as being genuine to region."⁷¹

What is 'genuinely Arctic' is a matter of a continuous discourse. The participating actors in this discourse contribute their understanding and perspective, which is why there can hardly be a neutral or apolitical definition. Norway is an Arctic coastal state, which other leading political actors acknowledge as a sufficient justification to have a say in Arctic discussions. Sweden, however, is not connected to the Arctic Ocean. Its northern landmass lies above the Arctic Circle – but does this entitle Sweden to interfere in discussions on the Arctic Ocean and its natural resources? The fact that both countries published Arctic strategies proves that they identify the Arctic as a matter of national concern. But their understanding on how and why they are 'Arctic' differs.

It is worth remembering this when analyzing the respective strategy papers – different perceptions of Arctic identity can lead to different priorities. What is understood as a welcome opportunity for one actor can be perceived as undesired incident for the other.

⁷¹ Keskitalo, *Negotiating the Arctic*, p. 2. Regarding the Arctic as a construction of discourse, Keskitalo only talks of the "Arctic" in quotation marks. This thesis will renounce this for the sake of simplicity.



Illustration 1: The Arctic. Source: National Snow and Ice Data Center

4.2 Challenges and Opportunities in the Arctic

To understand the Arctic's significance to Sweden and Norway, it is helpful to assess the main developments currently taking place in the Arctic. The following section will not provide a comprehensive account of these dynamics, but briefly outline the main themes and tendencies. Projections of the Arctic's future role in geopolitics can be found as early as in 1942: In that year, Canada's Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources Keenleyside compared the Arctic to the most important seas in history:

"What the Aegean Sea was to classical antiquity, what the Mediterranean was to the Roman world, what the Atlantic Ocean was to the expanding Europe of the Renaissance days, the Arctic Ocean is becoming to the world of aircraft and atomic power."⁷²

This held true especially during the Cold War, when soviet nuclear submarines were deployed in the Arctic Ocean and the US-American Distant Early Warning Line stretched across large parts of the Polar Region. Today, the challenges broadly fit into the categories environmental change, economic use, territorial disputes, and social aspects.

4.2.1 Environmental Change

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) report of 2007 not only states that the warming of the climate system is "unequivocal", but also that it is "very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations".⁷³ The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) report reiterates this position, stating that

⁷² Cited after Zellen, Barry C.: Arctic Doom, Arctic Boom, p. 8.

⁷³ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007 - The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Cambridge University Press 2007, p. 5-10.

“Human activities, primarily the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas), and secondarily the clearing of land, have increased the concentration of carbon dioxide, methane, and other heat-trapping (‘greenhouse’) gases in the atmosphere. Since the start of the industrial revolution, the atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration has increased by about 35% and the global average temperature has risen by about 0.6°C. There is an international scientific consensus that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities.”⁷⁴

According to the ACIA report, the average temperature in the Arctic has risen at almost twice the rate as the rest of the world during the past few decades. Consequently, Arctic glaciers as well as sea ice are melting, and permafrost temperatures rise.⁷⁵ This can lead to coastal and soil erosions in several regions. Seasonal permafrost thawing is occurring much more frequently than a few decades ago. The melting of glaciers and of the ice sheets in Greenland result in a freshwater run-off and in a globally rising sea level, threatening to flood low-lying Islands or coastal states. Locally, the reduced sea-ice deprives ice-dependent seals and polar bears of their natural habitat and causes them to migrate. Rising water temperatures cause fish stocks to migrate northwards as well. These changes deeply affect the local population who subsists on these animals and the delicate Arctic ecosystem.

The white surface of the ice-covered Arctic reflects sunlight away from the Earth – if the snow cover retreats, the sun energy gets absorbed by the ocean, due to its darker and permeable surface. This process further accelerates the warming of the Arctic and the Oceans in general, since the absorbed sun energy contributes to further warming. Environmentalists therefore point out that the repercussions of Climate Change in the Arctic will be perceptible on an unprecedented global scale.⁷⁶

⁷⁴Hassol, Susan J.: Impacts of a warming Arctic. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, Executive Summary, Cambridge University Press 2004, p.8.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p.14f.

⁷⁶ See for instance O’Neill, Kate: The Environment and International Relations, Cambridge University Press, New York 2009.

Climate Change could be securitized in the national Arctic strategies because it not only threatens the balance of the ecosystem locally, but also because of “the possible magnitude of the threat posed, and the need to mobilize urgent and unprecedented responses to them.”⁷⁷ At the same time, Environmental Change remains a diffuse issue. Precise predictions are unattainable – Climate Change would therefore provide a typical case for ‘riskification’.

4.2.2 Economic Use

The opening of new economic opportunities in the Arctic is closely linked to the increased thawing in the region. Ice-free passages, longer summers and shorter winters make large parts of the Arctic more accessible than ever before. Its current use comprises shipping, fishing, oil and gas extraction, mining, tourism and state defence activities (the latter demonstrates the national militaries’ significance as economic factor in the region). Forecasting studies envisage potential use in bio-prospecting, aquaculture, deep sea mineral prospecting, carbon capture and storage as well as new renewable energy production within the next 20-30 years.⁷⁸

The Northwest Passage provides a sea route through the Arctic Ocean that links Europe to Asia north of Canada, whereas the Northern Sea Route serves as passage linking the north of Europe to Asia.⁷⁹ If these passages can be established as new commercial sea lanes, this would significantly reduce the shipping distance between Asia and Europe. However, extreme weather events in the Arctic as well as the need for specially equipped vessels (and icebreakers) complicate this endeavor. Current shipping activities are mainly limited to

⁷⁷ Wæver, Ole: *Securitization and Desecuritization*, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Copenhagen 1993, p.13.

⁷⁸ See Williams, Alex et.al: *The future of Arctic Enterprise. Long-term Outlook and Implications*, Smith School of Enterprise and Environment, Oxford 2011.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

either research activities or to supply and resource already existing natural resource extraction venues. Besides, increased shipping would compel the coastal states to intensify border patrols and increase the risk of smuggling and other illegal activities in the long term.⁸⁰ Current and future shipping activities hence raise several security concerns: The unique climatic conditions require ice-suitable vessels and further special equipment. Increased human activity requires an extended infrastructure for crime prevention, marine search and rescue operations, and disaster response. Moreover, in order to conduct research and economic ventures and to deploy marine border patrols, huge material and financial capacities have to be allocated towards these activities. Probably nation states are the only actors capable to mobilize such capacities. Will these activities lead to joint ventures and increased cooperation or provoke more competition among the Arctic states? Economic prospects are therefore expected to play a considerable role in the national High North strategies.

Apart from shipping and marine safety, the extraction of natural resources like oil and gas in the Arctic attracts particular attention. US-American studies estimate that the Arctic holds 13% of the world's undiscovered oil resources and 30% of the gas resources, most of them are expected to occur in offshore areas.⁸¹ Especially oil findings in the Barents Sea raise high expectations towards the Arctic as future additional supply source for the globally rising energy demand. Statoil's oil discoveries in the Havis and Skrugard prospects (both situated in the Barents Sea) are estimated to contain up to 600 million barrels of recoverable oil

⁸⁰ Cf. Conley, Heather: A New Security Architecture for the Arctic. An American Perspective, A report of the CSIS Europe Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington D.C. 2012.

⁸¹ Stauffer, Peter H. (ed.): US Geological Survey, Circum-Arctic Resource Appraisal: Estimates of Undiscovered Oil and Gas North of the Arctic Circle, US Department of the Interior, USGS fact sheet 2008, available at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2008/3049/>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

equivalents.⁸² The Norwegian state is Statoil's major shareholder with a direct ownership interest of 67%. Norway's access to oil and gas in its offshore areas indicate that the opportunities of oil extraction play a much more prominent role in the Norwegian Strategy than in the Swedish one.⁸³

Statoil's Snøhvit gas field in the Arctic Ocean has been in operation since 2007, whereas the Russian Shtokman gas field is expected to commence production in 2016.⁸⁴ At first sight, the Russian explorations in the Barents Sea create the impression of fierce competition between the Norway and Russia. However, technology transfer and cooperation does exist between the two oil and gas extracting countries, and even though Gazprom is the main shareholder in the Shtokman project (holding 51%), Statoil holds 24% of its shares as well.⁸⁵ It would hence be short-sighted to expect blatant muscle-flexing between the two, the companies cooperate out of necessity of technology and know-how.

Nevertheless, the Economic interests motivate the coastal states to strive for sovereign rights and economic impact in the region. None of them would voluntarily renounce these rights and impacts in favor of an international agreement like the Antarctic Treaty, which "holds all territorial claims in abeyance".⁸⁶

Resources in the Arctic and especially Norway as oil extracting country are also seen as future hope for increased independence from the politically instable Middle East and OPEC

⁸² Statoil Stock Market Announcement "Major new Oil Discovery in the Barents Sea" from 9 January 2012, available at: http://www.statoil.com/en/NewsAndMedia/News/2012/Pages/08Jan_Havis.aspx. Last Access September 20, 2012.

⁸³ According to Reuters, Norway is the world's 8th largest oil exporter, the 2nd largest for gas. See Fouche, Gwladys and Dagenborg, Joachim: "Big Statoil Arctic find boosts Norway's oil future", Reuters, January 9, 2012. Available at: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/09/us-statoil-oildiscovery-idUSTRE8080AK20120109>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

⁸⁴ Internet presence of the Shtokman Development AG, available at: <http://www.shtokman.ru/en/about/>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

⁸⁵ Shtokman Review, available at: <http://www.shtokman.ru/en/press/>. Last Access September 20, 2012. 41% of Gazprom's shares are held by the Russian Federation.

⁸⁶ See the Scientific Committee for Antarctic Research's (SCAR) website: The Antarctic Treaty system. An Introduction. Available at: <http://www.scar.org/treaty/>. Last Access September 20, 2012. The Treaty also prohibits military activity and the disposal of nuclear waste.

by some international observers. However, this optimism ignores the remote location and the logistical efforts that would be necessary for extensive Arctic resource extraction, which leaves an economic cost-effectiveness in the near future questionable.

4.2.3 Territorial Disputes

The five Arctic Coastal states (USA, Canada, Denmark via Greenland, Norway and Russia, also referred to as the Arctic 5 or just A5) each have sovereignty claims to its coastal waters. These claims and rights, encompassing both Shelf and High Seas components of the Arctic Ocean, are defined by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).⁸⁷ According to the Convention, territorial sea areas are those within the limit of 12 nautical miles of a country's coast (the 12-mile territorial zone begins at the so-called baseline, which is usually identical with the low tide line).⁸⁸ Likewise, a zone of 200 nautical miles beyond the coast is determined, starting seawards from the baseline. Within this 200-mile zone, the coastal states still obtain full sovereign rights and exclusive access to this area's resources. However, foreign ships have to right to "continuous, expeditious and peaceful passage".⁸⁹ This 200-mile area is each state's "Exclusive Economic Zone" (EEZ) and includes rights to the seabed as well. If a country can prove that its continental shelf (ie., the "submerged prolongation of the land territory of the coastal state") continues beyond these 200 miles, the EEZ will be expanded accordingly. The limits of this zone is determined through complex

⁸⁷ United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, 1982. Full text available at: http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf. Last Access October 5, 2012. UNCLOS gives the A5 10 years after ratification to submit claims for an extension of the EEZ. All of the A5 except for the US have ratified the treaty.

⁸⁸ Williams, Alex et. al: The future of Arctic Enterprise, p. 7.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

measurement processes of continental shelves and deep sea plateaus and its maximum extent can reach a distance of up to 350 miles from the baseline.⁹⁰

A very prominent case in point is the Lomonosov Ridge, an underwater mountain chain crossing through the geographic North Pole. Canada, Denmark, Norway and Russia all have submitted claims, stating that the Lomonosov Ridge is connected to their continental shelf in order to expand their EEZs.⁹¹ Particularly Russia, holding the most extensive EEZ in the region, gives priority to proving the rights to the Lomonosov Ridge. In the first crewed expeditious descent (called “Arctica”) to the seabed under the North Pole, the Russian submersibles planted a flag on the bottom of the Arctic Ocean.⁹² The expedition was not, however, an attempt to ‘claim’ the North Pole region in a unilateral action as depicted by the media.⁹³ It was an expedition to collect stone material from the seabed – Russia aims to prove that this material is the same as in the rock formations in Siberia. The submission of the rock samples is intended to bolster their claim to UNCLOS. It certainly was an unfortunate and provocative move, but the ratification of UNCLOS by all actors except for the United States (where a soon ratification is judged to be likely as well) demonstrates each Arctic coastal state’s willingness to adhere to international law.

⁹⁰ Humrich, Christoph: Ressourcenkonflikte, Recht und Regieren in der Arktis, in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 5-6/2011, Bonn, 31st January 2011, pp. 6-13, p. 8f.

⁹¹ Each state has 10 years after ratification in order to submit its claims. The increased state attention to the Arctic is hence not necessarily an “Arctic race”, but efforts to meet the UNCLOS-deadline.

⁹² Lovett, Richard: Russia plants Underwater Flag, Claims Arctic Seafloor, in: *National Geographic News*, August 3, 2007. Available at: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/08/070802-russia-pole.html>. Last Access October 5, 2012.

⁹³ See also Struck, Doug: Russia’s Deep Sea Flag Planting at North Pole Strikes a Chill in Canada, in: *Washington Post*, August 7, 2007. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/06/AR2007080601369.html>. Last Access October 5, 2012.

Furthermore, in 2011, Norway and Russia reached an agreement and ratified the “Treaty on Maritime Delimitation and Cooperation in the Barents Sea and the Arctic Ocean”.⁹⁴ The treaty clearly established both land and maritime borders of the two countries and adhered to the standards of international law. A securitization of sovereignty in Norway’s strategy is therefore much less likely, since all actors stress their willingness to adhere to the UNCLOS framework. However, not all claims have been submitted yet. Denmark claims the Ridge to be a part of Greenland, Canada claims it is part of its own continental shelf.

Further territorial disputes like over Hans Island (disputed between Canada and Denmark), the Beaufort Sea (where Canada and the US disagree about the boundaries) and the Northwest Passage (which is claimed by Canada, whereas the US regards it as international water) remain open – yet, a violent conflict does not seem viable in any of these cases.

4.2.4 Social Aspects

The Arctic Human Development Report from 2002 draws the following sketch of the social situation in the Arctic:

“Arctic societies have a well-deserved reputation for resilience in the face of change. But today they are facing an unprecedented combination of rapid and stressful changes involving environmental processes (e.g. the impacts of climate change), cultural developments (e.g. the erosion of indigenous languages), economic changes (e.g. the emergence of narrowly based mixed economies), industrial developments (e.g. the growing role of multinational corporations engaged in the extraction of natural resources), and political changes (e.g. the devolution of political authority).”⁹⁵

The social dimension is often discussed in reference to vulnerability, the “capacity to be wounded”.⁹⁶ The Arctic population is especially vulnerable to the changes listed above because their capacities to cope with the rapid changes are limited. Traditional businesses

⁹⁴ See Norway’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ website, available at: http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/press/news/2011/maritie_delimitation.html?id=646614. Last Access October 5, 2012.

⁹⁵ Young, Oran, Einarsson, Niels et.al (Eds.): Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR), Stefansson Arctic Institute, Akureyri 2002, p. 10.

⁹⁶ Keskitalo, Carina: Vulnerability and adaptive capacity in forestry in northern Europe: a Swedish case study, in: Oppenheimer, M., Yohe, G. (Eds.): Climatic Change Vol 87, no. 1-2, 2008, pp. 219-243.

like reindeer herding (mainly performed by indigenous people), fishing and forestry are the firsts to be exposed to the volatile Arctic environment. The lower a community's capacities to mitigate and adapt to changes, the higher its vulnerability. An aging and generally decreasing population can lead to a loss of the Arctic region's cultural assets, since fewer people maintain them. Indigenous languages and habits might disappear and epitomize a loss of cultural diversity.

At the same time, social aspects do not exist in isolation (as none of the above listed aspects does), but are closely intertwined with economic conditions. Keskitalo's findings in the forestry sector suggest that the current market-driven globalization requires growing production and decreasing costs at a faster pace than before.⁹⁷ People in the High North are not cut off from the rest of the world and just exposed to Climate Change or the repercussions of increased human activity in the region, but to global (market) dynamics as well.

Climate Change, according to Keskitalo's study, can have both unfavorable as well as beneficial effects on the local businesses: warmer temperatures can lead to increased forest growth and higher productivity, but could lead to lower quality of the wood as well. The more frequent occurrence of extreme weather events can cause severe damage, and the altered living environment would have damaging effects on reindeer herding as well.⁹⁸ Fish stocks have already started to migrate further northwards and might deprive the local populations of the basis for their livelihood and staple, while yielding bigger revenues in regions situated further north.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Cf. Keskitalo, Carina: Climate Change and Globalization in the Arctic. An Integrated Approach to Vulnerability Assessment, London 2008.

Another “real threat” in the social realm may be to “treat the Arctic as colony” – as a place that only serves as Arctic drilling field, a site merely for natural resource extraction, regardless of losses.⁹⁹

In regard to this, Sweden and Norway might have contrary positions, since Norway is an Arctic littoral state that benefits considerably of the offshore oil and gas fields, whereas Sweden does not. The large liquefied natural gas site close to Hammerfest caused an economic boom and significant job creation in “the northernmost city of the world”.¹⁰⁰ Proponents argue that the gas extraction can reverse the trend of population decrease in the North, while critics argue that traditional businesses and livelihoods get displaced. With this in mind, a possible scenario is that Norway securitizes energy security, putting effort in legitimizing resource extraction and ‘treating the Arctic as a colony’, while Sweden might make use of securitizing rhetoric when talking about environmental or social hazards.

⁹⁹ Cf. Zellen, Barry S.: Arctic Doom, Arctic Boom. The Geopolitics of Climate Change in the Arctic, Santa Barbara 2009.

¹⁰⁰ Hammerfest is not the northernmost city anymore since Honningsvåg achieved town status in 1996.

5 The National Arctic Strategies – Analysis: Norway

The production of „The Norwegian Government’s High North Strategy” of 2006 was coordinated by “an inter-ministerial committee, headed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs”.¹⁰¹ An “external committee of experts”, chaired by the Rector of the University of Tromsø, Jarle Aarbakke, has provided further expertise. This information in the introduction and the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ emblem on the front page, together with the document’s presence on the government’s official website, displays an undisputable origin of the document.¹⁰² It is a publicly accessible, contemporary official governmental document. Its content does not contain distortions that would raise doubts on its credibility and authenticity, but being publicly accessible, it can be categorized as ‘declared’ strategy which is unlikely to disclose all actual government positions. The contents are typical for this type of document, which is why it can be viewed as representative as High North strategy.¹⁰³ It is available in Norwegian, English, Russian, French and German.

The strategy is, however, not Norway’s latest strategic announcement. In 2009, the government published “Nye byggesteiner i nord” (English: New Building Blocks in the North. The next step in the Government’s High North Strategy”) as follow-up strategy.¹⁰⁴ It aims to further develop and deepen Norway’s objectives in the Arctic. The most recent strategic publication is the white paper “The High North – Visions and Strategies” which was

¹⁰¹ The Norwegian Government’s High North Strategy, 2006, pdf available at: <http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/ud/pla/2006/0006/ddd/pdfv/302927-nstrategi06.pdf>, Introduction. In the following: Norway’s Strategy 2006.

¹⁰² Besides, the Foreign Ministry as leading coordinator indicates that the High North is not just a matter of domestic policy (and hence not just restricted to Norway’s territorial Arctic region) – it holds great significance in its linkages to international neighbours and partners.

¹⁰³ These first categorizations are made in reference to John Scott’s criteria for the selection of documents: Authenticity, Credibility, Representativity, and Meaning. Cf. Scott, John: A Matter of Record. Documentary Sources in Social Research, Cambridge 1990.

¹⁰⁴ New Building Blocks in the North. The Next Step in the Government’s High North Strategy, 2011, Pdf available at: 05_02_Norway_new_building_blocks_in_the_north.pdf. Last Access September 30, 2012. In the following Norway’s strategy 2009.

presented to the Norwegian parliament, the Storting, in November 2011.¹⁰⁵ The Strategy of 2006 offers a comprehensive account of Norway's concerns and objectives. . While the latest version of 2011 serves as core document, all three strategy papers have been taken into consideration for the analysis.

5.1 Structure and Main Themes

What is most striking about Norway's strategic papers in terms of securitization is the lack thereof in large parts of the documents. Even though the Arctic's significance is elevated "one of the Government's most important priorities" (in 2006) to "Norway's most important strategic priority area" (2009) and finally "Norway's number one foreign policy priority" (2011), the overall tone of the strategic papers is utterly optimistic.¹⁰⁶

The main emphasis lies on the opportunities the Arctic region offers and which have to be "take[n] advantage" of.¹⁰⁷ Developments in the Arctic are depicted as causing far-reaching implications:

"This is more than just foreign policy, (...) We are not talking about a project for the High North alone, but a project for the whole country and for the whole of northern Europe, with consequences for the whole continent."¹⁰⁸

In all three High North strategies, three major ambitions are mentioned and reiterated: these are "Knowledge", "Activity", and "Presence". Norway underscores its goal to become a leader in the field of knowledge in the High North, since "knowledge is defined as being at

¹⁰⁵The High North. Visions and Strategies, 2011, Pdf available at: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/UD/Vedlegg/Nordomr%C3%A5dene/UD_nordomrodene_EN_web.pdf. Last Access September 30, 2012. In the following referred to as Strategic paper 2011. The full version of all 134 pages is only available in Norwegian, short versions of 44 pages also in English, Russian, Sami, and French (there is hence no German version anymore, but a Sami version instead).

¹⁰⁶ Norway's strategies 2006 and 2009, as well as its Strategic paper 2011, forewords.

¹⁰⁷ Norway's High North Strategy 2006, Foreword.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

the core of Norway's High North Policy".¹⁰⁹ At the same time, it stresses its claim to be at the forefront of economic activity – while striving to be “the best steward of the environment and natural resources in the north.” The presence-assertion in the Norwegian territory is said to be achieved “through policies to encourage settlement, value creation, nature management, employment and culture in North Norway, both by using civilian capacities and by maintaining a military presence”.¹¹⁰ The main themes occurring throughout the strategies 2006-2011 comprise six broad thematic areas:

1. The primacy of knowledge and research activities to enhance Norway's role as a leading actor in the Arctic
2. Political issues, including territorial questions and international cooperation
3. The Environment, especially in connection to economic activity like petroleum activities
4. Economic activities, both offshore (oil and gas exploitation, fishing) as well as onshore (local enterprises unrelated to natural resource extraction, traditional and indigenous businesses)
5. Social aspects, both in regard to the Norwegian population (including indigenous people), their economic and societal wellbeing as well as the promotion of “people-to-people-cooperation” between Norwegians and Russians
6. Maritime management and safety (this field is, however, mainly represented in the newest High North white paper of 2011).

The issues raised in theme 2,3,4 and 6 are particularly informative in terms of securitization/riskification. The following paragraphs hence explore them in more detail.

¹⁰⁹ Norway's Strategic Paper 2011, p. 25.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

5.2 Political issues and territorial questions

Territorial disputes take up a prominent position in the discourse on the Arctic. In terms of security sectors, they can be allocated to the political realm since it concerns the areas in which a state can exercise its sovereign rights.

The UNCLOS-framework for the delimitation of the EEZ and the Lomonosov-Ridge as issue that needs to be resolved are mentioned in the strategy without securitizing language.¹¹¹

Svalbard (formerly Spitzbergen) is described as 'undisputed' Norwegian territory 2011 after being referred to as 'not undisputed' in 2006. Svalbard's status and Norway's implementation of a fish protection zone has been internationally contested, especially by Russia, Iceland and Spain.¹¹² The 2006 version hence underscores Norway's claim of Svalbard as integral part of Norwegian territory and reiterates that Norway's position has "a firm basis in international law" and that it has "the right to unilaterally establish maritime zones around Svalbard."¹¹³

The Strategy of 2006 displays hence several unsettled territorial discords. It reports that Norway had submitted documentation to the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf on the extent of its continental shelf in order to delimit the borders between Russia and Norway in the Barents Sea.¹¹⁴ The delimitation is described as "an essential basis for the exploration and exploitation of petroleum deposits in the area of overlapping claims, which

¹¹¹ See Visions and Strategies, Norwegian Version, p. 56-61. For the Lomonosov-question, see chapter 4 of this thesis.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 56, for the Spitzbergen/Svalbard discord, see Ingimundarson, Valur: Die Kartierung der Arktis: Bodenschätze, Großmachtpolitik und multilaterale Governance, in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte 5-6/2011, Bonn, 31st January 2011, pp. 14-23, p.16.

¹¹³ Norway's High North Strategy 2006, p.14, 17f.

¹¹⁴ Norway's High North Strategy 2006, p. 16. The "Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf" (CLCS) is a UNCLOS-agency.

covers an area of 175 000 square kilometers.”¹¹⁵ The delimitation is necessary to determine “which state has jurisdiction over an area for specific purposes” and the agreement of such a delimitation line “will thus make it possible to establish the predictable framework that is necessary for economic and other actors, and also for cross-border cooperation schemes in the petroleum sector.”¹¹⁶ Norway’s claims under the UNCLOS process have gained support, and an agreement with Russia on these delimitations has been reached in 2011 – this political development will be elaborated on in more detail after a brief introduction into the general relations with Russia as depicted in Norway’s strategy papers.

5.2.1 The Relations with Russia

The relations with the neighboring state Russia, with which Norway shares the Barents Sea, explicitly form the “central bilateral dimension of Norway’s High North Policy.”¹¹⁷ The 2006 strategy heavily emphasizes Norway’s will for cooperation and utters its support of Russia’s development from Soviet time-confrontation towards international cooperation. However, it also clearly articulates its concern in terms of Russia’s future developments regarding the respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and human rights.¹¹⁸

Russia’s development is said not to affect Norway’s policies according to the strategy, but it is made clear that Norway regards close cooperation with Russia as absolutely necessary for successful and – this is reiterated several times – sustainable use of the resources and economic activity. Hence, Russia and the unclear territorial question was at no point securitized by Norway. Yet, the rhetoric includes a crucial aspect of riskification: Russia is

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 18.

depicted as a source of uncertainty and unpredictability. It is not depicted as opponent or enemy by any means, but the rhetoric used –“it is unclear how Russia will develop”- sketch Russia’s development as risk.¹¹⁹ Following Corry’s logic of ‘riskification’, a threatening enemy is absent in this case – yet, Russia’s development “will be followed closely and measures adapted accordingly.”¹²⁰ The 2006 strategy talks about Russia’s future development in terms of risk – and risks “cannot be eradicated, only managed”.¹²¹

Issues like human rights and the freedom of expression do not have anything to do with Arctic cooperation in the Barents Sea at first sight. But the reference to these problems shows Norway’s concern for the “underlying constitutive causalities” – i.e., the conditions of risks, their background factors and structures.¹²² The rationale behind this might be that domestically highly democratic countries tend to be more cooperative on the international level, whereas democratically less responsive countries might be more inclined to unilateral action or less cooperation. More importantly, Russia openly displays its strife to be the leading country in the Arctic and has considerably increased its military presence in the High North. Norway hence sees a need to ‘manage’ this risk through close observation.

The strategy of 2006 rhetorically links Russia’s unpredictability to the issues of “sustainable use of resources” and “sound environmental management”.¹²³ It refers to two bilateral bodies, the Joint Norwegian-Russian Commission on Environmental Protection and the Joint Norwegian-Russian Fisheries Commission, both indicating the previous achievements of cooperation. These achievements are at stake in Norway’s view, and if Russia develops towards an undesired direction, they might become ineffective. By referring to

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Corry, Riskification, p. 12.

¹²² Ibid., p. 13.

¹²³ Norway’s High North Strategy 2006, p.18.

environmental stewardship and the regulation of fishing activities, Norway's strategy shifts the focus away from its individual national interest (the economic use of the Barents Sea's resources) towards issues of international interest. Environmental degradation in the Arctic as well as overfishing would cause international repercussions.

This rhetoric lifts Norway's concerns to the international level.¹²⁴ It delineates Norway as a country committed to sustainability and predictability whose hands are tied in the face of a neighbor with an 'unclear' future agenda. The keywords "predictable/predictability" are mentioned 14 times in the 2006 strategy and 8 times in the 2011 paper¹²⁵, "sustainable" 24 times (2006 strategy) and 18 times (in 2011), whereas "unpredictable" is not used in the two documents at all and "unclear" only once (in 2006), in reference to Russia.¹²⁶

Norway's expressed commitment to predictability is heavily emphasized throughout all three Arctic strategic documents. It raises the impression of Norway's self-confidence and – awareness as key actor in the region who carries a great share of responsibility.

The skepticism towards Russia gives way to a certain relaxation in 2011. It is pointed out that "the mistrust that marked the Cold War years" has now been replaced by "normal, good neighbourly relations" to a great extent.¹²⁷

However, despite "steadily improving" relations, Norway sees itself as encountering "demanding challenges because of differences between our respective political and administrative cultures."¹²⁸ Like in its previous strategies, Norway here refers to the issues of

¹²⁴ Cf. Ibid.

¹²⁵ Both wordcounts refer to the English versions.

¹²⁶ The follow-up strategy of 2009, however, uses the term "unpredictable" in reference to climatic conditions in the region.

¹²⁷ Norway's Strategic Paper 2011, p.9.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human rights in Russia as challenges Norway “has to deal with”.¹²⁹ Russia’s development is not described as “unclear” like in the 2006 strategy anymore. Instead, it is emphasized in the very same sentence that the “even closer cooperation” with the “major power to the East” is an important Norwegian objective.¹³⁰ This rhetoric suggests a decline of riskification of Russia’s development and a development towards increased pragmatism. Norway’s strategy emphasizes opening borders, joint research activities with Russia and an exchange of know-how in Arctic oil-drilling operations. Norway as small state which relies on economic cooperation with Russia – especially in the Arctic - is very unlikely to seek confrontation with Russia. Its deliberate relaxed rhetoric rather bears de-securitizing elements and seeks to avoid confrontational language. The de-securitization in this context becomes a rather political and strategic act than a genuine appraisal of the powerful neighbor.

5.2.2 Institutional bodies for cooperation

The Barents Cooperation and the Arctic Council are described as important meeting points for the two countries.¹³¹ Their real impact is subject to controversial debates, since for instance the military realm and border issues are strictly excluded from the matters these institutions deal with. The Arctic Council mainly focuses on environmental protection, sustainable development and indigenous peoples. From its founding in 1996 up to today, its

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ The ‘Barents Cooperation’ refers to the institutionalized cooperation in the Barents-Euro Arctic Region, including the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC), which is an intergovernmental and interregional forum for cooperation. It includes Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia and the European Commission. The Arctic Council is a high-level intergovernmental forum for cooperation and coordination, constituted of the 8 Arctic States, Arctic indigenous peoples’ representatives and observer states. Neither of the two can impose legally binding obligations on their members. See www.beac.st and www.arcticcouncil.org, last Access October 10th, 2012.

area of cooperation management has expanded to the areas of “shipping, integrated management of resources, oil and gas, tourism, education, research, health, and economic and cultural issues in addition to climate change and the environment.”¹³²

These forums cannot impose legally binding obligations on its members, but the continuous discussion, the steady exchange of different viewpoints and information are crucial for gradual adjustments of policies. Arctic intergovernmental institutions as governance instruments hence facilitate the way to reach agreements considerably.¹³³ They have great potential in preventing unilateral, isolated decision-making, even if they are ‘just’ governance instruments. The constant exposition to other states’ perspectives can hence contribute to the broad lack of securitizing rhetoric in the Arctic.¹³⁴ The Norwegian strategic white paper of 2011 emphasizes the value of intergovernmental organizations, since they are regarded as central instruments for circumpolar cooperation.

5.2.3 The Ilulissat Declaration

The essential milestone reached in 2011 was the delimitation of Norway’s and Russia’s respective marine borders. The 2011 white paper hence proudly declares that “Norway is the first of the Arctic states to have had the outer limits of its continental shelf clarified in accordance with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea”.¹³⁵ By this, the “the full extent of the geographical scope of the Kingdom of Norway” is fully known for the first time.¹³⁶ The

¹³² Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 10.

¹³³ Cf. Schram Stokke, Olav, and Honneland, Geir (Eds.): *International Cooperation and Arctic Governance: Regime Effectiveness and Northern Region Building*, Routledge 2010.

¹³⁴ It is, however, very difficult to find ‘hard evidence’ supporting this assumption.

¹³⁵ Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 11.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p.13. In another still open case in the Northeast Atlantic – the so called ‘Banana hole’ -, a decision is expected after the neighbouring states Iceland, Denmark and the Faroe Islands have received their final recommendations on the outer limits of their continental shelves from the UNCLOS-Commission.

paper refers to the Ilulissat Declaration of 2008, in which all five Arctic littoral states agreed to adhere to the UNCLOS framework in order to resolve border issues.¹³⁷

“The Ilulissat Declaration corrected the notion held by certain key actors that the Arctic was an unregulated area where open conflict on resources could be expected. Its emphasis on the applicability of the Law of the Sea in the Arctic Ocean lays the foundation for orderly, predictable relations between the coastal states, while at the same time signalling to the rest of the world that the coastal states are taking their responsibility seriously.”¹³⁸

For Norway, this indicates the existence of a sufficient legal framework for border delimitations. The officially declared adherence to the UNCLOS-framework renders the option of open territorial conflicts among the Arctic littoral states unrealistic – a securitization of border integrity or of the maintenance of sovereign rights in the Arctic Ocean has been made equally unlikely.

For other arctic states, the Ilulissat meeting leaves an aftertaste. The declaration was adopted by the Arctic 5, i.e. the Arctic coastal states Denmark, the USA, Canada, Norway and Russia. The other Arctic States Sweden, Finland and Iceland were not invited to the meeting. Although the meeting did not breach an existing circumpolar agreement, it circumvented the Arctic Council and constitutes a clear dismissal of the call for an international Arctic treaty. Political leaders outside the region – especially European parliamentarians – have called for new international rules for the region, following the model of the Antarctic Treaty. The foreign minister of the United Kingdom and Germany were at the forefront of these calls.¹³⁹ The Ilulissat Declaration decidedly rejects the appeal for new international legislation on the Arctic. It underlines the A5’s self-understanding as holding the dominant role in the region

¹³⁷ The Ilulissat Declaration, adopted at the Arctic Ocean Conference in Ilulissat, Greenland, held 27-29 May 2008, 28 May 2008. The declaration is available as Pdf at: http://www.oceanlaw.org/downloads/arctic/Ilulissat_Declaration.pdf. Last Access October 10, 2012.

¹³⁸ Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 13. UNCLOS can give recommendations to the parties of dispute after reviewing their respective claims, but concrete decisions have to be taken by the states themselves and cannot be imposed by UNCLOS. With the Ilulissat declaration, the A5 agreed to adhere to UNCLOS’ recommendations.

¹³⁹ Cf. Yeager, Brooks B.: The Ilulissat Declaration: Background and Implications for Arctic Governance, Paper for the Aspen Dialogue and Commission on Arctic Climate Change , Aspen 2008.

and excludes outside actors from participation in Arctic decision-making processes. What is a source of political relaxation for Norway, in this case, can thus reverberate adversely in other countries – particularly in the EU, which has repeatedly shown its interest in the Arctic, adopted an Arctic policy and publishes resolutions and joint documentations on a regular basis.¹⁴⁰

5.2.4 The military and NATO

The focus of Norway's armed forces has moved northwards, but it is stressed that "this is not a response to a military threat".¹⁴¹ Instead, it is described as "natural way of underscoring the responsibility Norway has in the north".¹⁴² The Norwegian version, however, refers to potential digital or terrorist attacks as well as natural or man-made disasters.¹⁴³ Even though the increased military presence is not directed towards another state, according to the white paper, it epitomizes that Norway uses military presence to safeguard its interests. In the Norwegian version, it is said that these interests have to be 'defended' – a term that is never mentioned in the English versions.¹⁴⁴ Although this thesis does not examine linguistic characteristics between different languages, it is worth noting that the outcome of such interpretations is tied to the language in which it was written. The notion that something has to be "defended" is much stronger than the statement of "underscoring responsibility".

¹⁴⁰ Cf. the European Union's External Action website: http://eeas.europa.eu/arctic_region/index_en.htm. Last Access October 10, 2012.

¹⁴¹ Norway's Strategic Paper 2011, p. 19.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ See The Norwegian 2011 Paper's full Norwegian version, p.64.: "Sverige og Finland er i ferd med å knytte seg til NATOs system for luftovervåking (Air Situation Data Exchange), som vil gi de nordiske land et langt bedre felles luftbilde i vår region. Den nordiske solidaritetserklæringen som ble vedtatt av utenriksministrene 5. april 2011, uttrykker landenes vilje til å assistere hverandre ved natur- eller menneskeskapte katastrofer, digitale angrep og terrorangrep."

¹⁴⁴ See Ibid., p. 64: „Forsvarets nærvær er ikke rettet mot noen annen stat, men er et uttrykk for at vi har viktige verdier og interesser å forsvare.“

Despite the countless reiteration of cooperation and the government's catchphrase "High North – low tension", the military remains the last resort when it comes to sovereignty claims.¹⁴⁵ Whereas the English version remains soft in its rhetoric and only refers to NATO as helpful for providing "stability and predictability" in the region, the Norwegian paper is much more explicit about the purpose of NATO in the Arctic.¹⁴⁶ Here, it is stated that the High North remains a region of great strategic significance, and especially Russia's strength of its nuclear weapons is closely observed. The perceived militarization and increased Russian submarine patrols are a clear matter of concern. The NATO-membership is therefore an essential feature for Norway. The alliance of western countries has always been a source of suspicion for Russia, which is why Norway has to perform a balancing act between the two. The border with Russia is also the border to the Schengen Area, border control is hence regarded as necessary in order to "combat cross-border crime and illegal migration" and to fulfill "Norway's obligations to the Schengen acquis".¹⁴⁷ This does, however, by no means entail restrictions on the local populations' freedom of movement. In May 2012, both countries agreed to implement a visa-free zone in their border areas, triggering a significant increase of border crossings from both sides.¹⁴⁸ This once again demonstrates that security concerns in the arctic – including those dealing with cross-border crime or migration – cannot be reduced to classical state dichotomies or mutual suspicion. The new security

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁴⁶ See for example the full Norwegian version 2011, p.17: "Fortsatt har de nordlige områdene militærstrategisk interesse, blant annet gjennom lokalisering av deler av den russiske atomvåpenstyrken og som øvingsområde for viktige fly og marineenheter. Norge har i NATO arbeidet for at alliansen igjen har oppmerksomhet på sine nærområder – herunder de som ligger i nord."

¹⁴⁷ See Norway's follow-up Strategy 2009, p. 39.

¹⁴⁸ According to the agreement, Russians and Norwegians living within 30 kilometers of the border can apply for the border zone resident permit that allows visits of up to 15 days at a time. See Nilsen, Thomas: Doubling of Norwegians visiting Russia in north, in: The Barents Observer, 1st November 2012, available at: <http://barentsobserver.com/en/borders/doubling-norwegians-visiting-russia-north-01-11>. Last Access November 2nd, 2012.

challenges are not met by attempts to fence off the new developments, but rather by measures of resilience and adaptation.

Its NATO-membership notwithstanding, military cooperation with Russia is a priority issue for Norway.¹⁴⁹ Even if NATO's northern members focus on guarding their sovereignty, this is not the sole purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the Arctic. Like Norway, NATO is involved in a balance act as well: More voices call for a reformation of NATO's primary duties. In the Arctic, a new task would be the protection of the volatile natural environment.¹⁵⁰ In order to be successful, this would require close cooperation with Russia as well – the organization would have to blend military preparedness with enhanced cooperation with Non-NATO members, and it would have to grapple with non-military challenges such as like climate change and growing activities in the High North (i.e., more potential for accidents and pollution).¹⁵¹

Hence, its traditional “hard capabilities” needed for power projection would have to be supplemented by “soft capabilities” in order to address issues like climate change, cyber criminality, search and rescue, disaster response and humanitarian assistance.¹⁵² For Norway, NATO remains a cornerstone of its security. When the Northern Sea route becomes navigable for longer periods, the shortest route from Rotterdam to East Asia will be along the Norwegian Coast – this will pose new security and environmental risks. Kirkenes, Norway's northernmost port could become an important transit harbor. Since the country

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p.66.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Haftendorn, Helga: NATO and the Arctic: Is the Atlantic Alliance a Cold War Relic in a peaceful Region now faced with non-military Challenges? In: European Security 20:3, Routledge 2011, p. 337-361.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid. These new challenges and possibilities were discussed on a NATO-seminar in Reykjavík in January 2009.

will probably not be able to guarantee safety with regard to these developments, NATO as military alliance remains a key instrument for Norway.¹⁵³

NATO conducts military exercises in the Arctic on a regular basis already and is thus prepared in the realm of disaster response as well as search and rescue activities. Norway and Russia have carried out joint military exercises as well. In August 2012, Norway, the US and Russia conducted the 'Northern Eagle 2012' joint military exercise, focusing on anti-terror and anti-piracy as well as search and rescue- operations.¹⁵⁴

Coming back to the question of securitization, what do these developments reveal? First of all, the classical military purpose of power projection and the safeguarding of sovereignty claims remain. Nevertheless, this is no longer the only task for the armed forces –for Norway, generating intelligence and knowledge in the region is an important task for the military as well. The military sector – including NATO – is increasingly confronted with non-military tasks and challenges. In the Arctic, the most prominent of them are climate change and marine safety. Even though there is no explicit securitization, Norway's references to its armed forces, Russia and NATO demonstrate a changing structure and scope of tasks for the military – the potential of interstate conflict is very low, mainly thanks to the UNCLOS framework and the Ilulissat declaration. Other tasks which do not fit into the classical military realm emerge, so that military forces will increasingly have to face non-military tasks.

All in all, the political realm does not show a language of securitization, and a relatively minor rhetoric of riskification with regard to Russia in 2006 has declined in 2011 as well.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ See Pettersen, Trude: Exercise 'Northern Eagle' has started, in: Barents Observer, 20 August 2012, available at: <http://barentsobserver.com/en/security/exercise-northern-eagle-has-started-20-08>. Last Access October 30th, 2012.

Several territorial disputes have been resolved between 2006 and 2011, and the remaining outstanding decisions will –according to the Ilulissat declaration – adhere to the framework of international law.

Intergovernmental institutions most likely have contributed to the environment of mutual exchange and discussion, which in turn lowers the potential of securitization or riskification – ie., the creation of an image of the ‘other’, an ‘opponent’ or even ‘enemy’. Further bodies of cooperation are the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, the Arctic Council and the Northern Dimension as connection to the EU. Moreover, the Nordic countries have set up guidelines for a cooperative foreign and security policy, outlined in the 2009 “Stoltenberg Report”.¹⁵⁵

However, Norway’s participation in exclusive meetings and declarations like the one in Ilulissat may raise the image of unreliability and unresponsivity for non-Arctic actors. Norway claims to welcome a “broad-based High North Diplomacy” with Arctic and non-Arctic states alike, a statement that appears as a lip-service to some observers after Ilulissat.¹⁵⁶

5.3 The Environment

The environment affects security matters on different levels. Environmental security in the narrowest sense refers to the environment that has to be protected for its own sake. A more common interpretation, though, is the view of environmental security as indispensable basis for human enterprise. If this basis is destroyed, the very existence of humanity is threatened. ‘Environmental Security’ hence mainly refers to the consequences of environmental conditions to humans and human activity.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 13.

¹⁵⁶ for the citation, see Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 9, for the criticism, see Yeager’s background paper.

The Norwegian Arctic Strategies' major objectives are an environmentally sustainable development, international cooperation for environmental protection, and important role of the Arctic as research area on Climate Change and environmental change. Especially the Arctic Council as forum for cooperation to counter climate change, as well as Svalbard as major research-venue are highlighted in the Norwegian documents.

The environment is somehow difficult to securitize. On one hand, the consequences of environmental degradation are expected to be enormous - and of global scale. On the other hand, there can only be assumptions on what the consequences may look like – exact predictions are impossible to make, a concrete 'threat' is often difficult to determine. The dangers hence remain diffused, which impinges on the generation of a securitizing speech act. Securitization is about the declaration of an imminent, concrete threat – this causes a dilemma in terms of environmental threats.¹⁵⁷ Their existence as widely acknowledged, but their concrete nature is hard to define. Changes like rising temperatures and rising sea levels are visible, but an indisputable prove that they are due to Climate Change is hard to get. These changes are gradual, and even though extreme weather events occur more often, it remains difficult to mobilize people in face of environmental threats. 'The environment' is hence depicted as referent object to be protected, but often without concrete cases in point.

Norway abstains from a rhetoric of doomsday-scenarios, but it explicitly raises environmental concerns to a level of high importance. The Strategy of 2006 describes the Arctic Environment as "unique and vulnerable", the term 'environment' shows 129 hits, and

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Buzan, Barry, Wæver, Ole, De Wilde, Jaap: Environment, Economic and Societal Security, Working Papers, no.10, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Copenhagen 1995.

58 in 2011.¹⁵⁸ In most of the cases, it is mentioned in connection with natural and marine resources (like fish stocks) or environmental management. Furthermore, it is mainly connected to the terms ‘cooperation’ and ‘monitoring’.¹⁵⁹ The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is mentioned only once in the 2009 and the 2011 document respectively, stating that the Arctic Council assessment of climate change in the Arctic provided an important contribution to its Assessment Report of 2007.¹⁶⁰ The Kyoto Protocol is mentioned twice in the 2006 strategy, not at all in 2009 and once in 2011 – it is declared that climate issues are set on the national agenda.¹⁶¹

The applied rhetoric exemplifies a riskification of climate change. Since a declaration of it as immediate, existential threat is unlikely to convince the audience and since the hazards of climate change remain rather diffuse in the future from a Norwegian perspective –despite longer summers, shorter winters and other visible environmental changes –, climate change is depicted as something that has to be “managed”.¹⁶² The expressed goals are to increase knowledge on climate change (especially in Svalbard as research platform and the “world’s best managed wilderness areas”,) and to manage resources.¹⁶³ By this, the Norwegian strategy applies “politics of permanence and long-termism”.¹⁶⁴ The abundance of the term ‘environment’ (see above) and ‘monitoring’ (28 times in 2006, 9 times in 2011, mostly in reference to the environment) indicates that the risks of environmental degradation – despite the lack of open securitizing rhetoric – is treated like a multiplication of securitization: since the threat cannot be eradicated, it has to be monitored and surveyed

¹⁵⁸ Norway’s High North Strategy 2006, p. 5, and throughout the whole document.

¹⁵⁹ See Norway’s Strategic Paper of 2011, pp.

¹⁶⁰ See Ibid., p. 10 and Norway’s Strategy 2009, p. 51.

¹⁶¹ See Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 10, the 2006 strategy, pp. 14 and 46.

¹⁶² See for example Norway’s Strategic Paper, p.7, and for Svalbard also the 2006 version, p.14.

¹⁶³ Norway’s High North Strategy 2006, p.63.

¹⁶⁴ Corry, Olaf, *Securitization and Riskification*, p. 12.

constantly.¹⁶⁵ The risk is identified; then, the security-assumption of the need for exceptional countermeasures is coupled with routine bureaucratic surveillance and governance techniques under an overarching “risk dispositive”.¹⁶⁶

Since Norway stresses its willingness to take advantage of the natural resources in the Arctic, environmental protection has to be tailored around these ambitions. It is hence declared that Norway intends “to be the best steward of the environment”, “strict environmental standards” are meant to “reduce environmental pressures.”¹⁶⁷ The intention to ‘monitor’ the environmental development is repeated numerous times, furthermore there will be “comprehensive protection measures” and “surveys”.¹⁶⁸

Apart from the reiterated declaration to closely observe, monitor and survey the region, much emphasis is put on the need for international cooperation. Here, the Arctic Council is one cooperation body among many others. In Svalbard, there is an “integrated Arctic Earth Observing System (SIOS), a unique system in which almost 20 countries are involved.”¹⁶⁹ The comprehensive surveillance hence cannot be carried out unilaterally but requires internationally combined efforts, since climate change “has an impact on the security of countries and peoples all over the world”.¹⁷⁰ Norway pledges to apply a “precautionary principle”, and even the armed forces’ major task in the region is surveillance and intelligence generation on climate change.¹⁷¹ The commissioning of armed forces with this surveillance comes close to an act of securitization. The “last large wilderness-like areas are to be found in the High North”, it is furthermore described as “unique heritage”,

¹⁶⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 12-14.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁷ Norway’s High North Strategy 2006, p.8f.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8-14.

¹⁶⁹ Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p.27.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16-19.

“vulnerable” and there is said to be a high “need to protect” it, to “halt the loss of biodiversity”.¹⁷² Especially “transboundary environmental problems” cause a “serious concern”.¹⁷³ Here, Norway refers to the Russian part of the Arctic, where heavy industry- and military activities on the Kola peninsula have released environmentally hazardous substances. The number of pollutants are said to be “alarmingly high”.¹⁷⁴ The problem of radioactive waste is described in securitizing terms and is called a “substantial risk”, a “particular concern” and “serious problem” which is why “it is essential to give high priority to nuclear emergency response”.¹⁷⁵

The matter of environmental security hence experiences the highest level of securitizing language in Norway’s strategic documents. Nevertheless, in many parts of the papers, it is rather attached to the intended economic activity in the area than an independent issue. The focus rather rests on “stewardship” than on the priority of protection. However, Norway demonstrates a high awareness of the vulnerability of the Arctic ecosystem and claims that environmental policy needs to be integrated into all sectors of Arctic activities. The strategies rather mention indigenous peoples in passing, but do not pay deeper attention to what environmental change entails for them. The social aspects rather refer to ‘value creation’ in the form of economic activity and diversification, but to a lesser extent to traditional lifestyles – including hunting, fishing, reindeer herding, which are expected to be severely affected by environmental change.

¹⁷² Ibid., pp. 27, 28, 45f.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p.47.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p.48.

5.4 Economic activities

The business-section does not mention existential security threats but utters concerns about socio-economic prospects and stability in the region by looking at employment opportunities and regional economic vitality. Even though some of these concerns can be regarded as showing risks of socio-economic imbalances due to high unemployment rates or structural changes in some markets, there is no securitizing rhetoric. Furthermore, the business-outlook has no exclusively domestic perspective but takes up international cooperation opportunities – again, especially with Russia.

Great importance is given to business development in the North, and this explicit priority directs the focus to other than petroleum-related businesses. A “well functioning (...) business sector” is described as “essential in order to ensure economic development and prosperity in the north”.¹⁷⁶ Particularly the 2006 Strategy stresses that “it is important for the northern parts of the country to develop a diversified business sector that is less vulnerable to cyclical and structural changes in individual markets.”¹⁷⁷ This statement is followed by a detailed elaboration on the different fields for “value creation” in the High North.¹⁷⁸ It encompasses the oil and gas industry and the contractor-industry which is tied to it, the extraction of mineral deposits, coal mining, wind energy, fisheries and aquaculture, tourism and maritime transport and logistics. The competitive advantage in both maritime businesses as well as energy-intensive industries is among other things highlighted by the reference to specially equipped vessels that are “well suited to operate in northern waters.”¹⁷⁹ Furthermore, knowledge-based industries are said to be continuously promoted,

¹⁷⁶ Norway’s High North Strategy 2006, p. 63.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p.63.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p.65.

and space-related activities constitute yet another economic branch in the Norwegian Arctic region. Agriculture is described to be worth being promoted in order to secure settlement and robust local communities in the region.¹⁸⁰

In terms of security questions, Norway's emphasis and elaborate description of its "diversified economy" depicts the country's self-confidence in the economic sector. A diversified economy means that the country's economic welfare does not rest on few pillars – where a downturn in one sector would have the potential to have great impact on all macroeconomic factors. In a diversified economy, the economic stability does not stand or fall by one industry. By this, Norway seeks to keep its vulnerability to changes in certain economic realms low and maintains a broad range of economic activity in the North – however, the most profitable economic activities are linked to the oil and gas industries. The reference to its comparative advantage demonstrates that Norway considers itself as highly competitive actor in the international market, sees itself as vulnerable to structural changes to a very low degree, and does not detect substantial weaknesses in its economic structures. The oil industry constitutes the crucial pillar of Norway's economy.¹⁸¹ Norway's strategies mention this sector's significance, but do not create an image of absolute dependency. Other branches - including manufacturing industries – are said to be fostered as well. According to the strategy, Norway's economy is unlikely to succumb to the so-called 'Dutch Disease', in which a country focuses too much on the booming sector and neglects others, which leads to a decline of international economic competitiveness.¹⁸² The economic

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ In 2012, the oil industry's share of GDP in Norway reached 21%, and stood for 47% of Norway's total exports. See the Norwegian Petroleum Directorate, Facts 2012, available at: <http://www.npd.no/en/Publications/Facts/Facts-2012/Chapter-3/>. Last Access October 30th, 2012.

¹⁸² Elsenhans, Hartmut: Globalization or Dutch Disease: Its Political and Social Consequences, in: Singer, Hans Wolfgang, Hatti, Neelambar et.al (Eds.): Technological Diffusion in Third World. New World Order Series, Volume 16 (Part-I) New Delhi 1999, pp. 425-469. The 'Dutch Disease' would stand for the worst-case scenario in terms of economic stability.

diversification is also closely linked to the strategies' strong emphasis on sustainability and support of local communities, which indicates that the Norwegian High North is not perceived as a colony that is to be exploited and to generate revenue for external actors.¹⁸³ The repeated reference to efforts of diversification can be read as a kind of de-riskification, an effort to dissolve concerns about the Norwegian reliance on oil.

Throughout the strategy documents, Norway emphasizes the inclusion of the indigenous population in the decision-making processes – also with regard to indigenous economic activities. If the fostering of economic activity was securitized, the democratic patterns of inclusive decision-making processes would not be emphasized the way it is in the documents. Norway's expressed openness shows an absence of securitizing measures.

Whereas the 2006 Strategy focuses more strongly on diversification, the 2011 white paper puts more weight on the oil and gas industry.¹⁸⁴ Norway does not depict the prospected huge oil and gas reserves in the Arctic as future guarantors for energy security, neither does it refer to itself as solely fully democratic oil-exporting country that could guarantee more independence from non-democratic oil exporters like the OPEC-states.¹⁸⁵ It is stated that "oil and gas deliveries from this region can improve European energy security and make an

¹⁸³ This concern was uttered in Barry Scott Zellen's book "Arctic Doom, Arctic Boom" and invalidated by Carina Keskitalo's "Negotiating the Arctic", where she points at the differences between the Canadian and the European Arctic discourses. Whereas the Canadian Arctic does not seem to be perceived as equally integrated part of the country, the European Arctic countries largely do not have the problem of a perception of the Arctic as 'colony to be exploited', since indigenous peoples' rights and traditional lifestyles have always enjoyed a high level of protection and the population structure in the European north has always been a mix of indigenous and non-indigenous people. Apart from that the Arctic regions are largely perceived of as integral parts of the state and not as something like an uninhabited wasteland. There are thus considerably different levels of sensitizations with regard to these perceptions between Europe and North America.

¹⁸⁴ This does not mean, however, that other business sectors are neglected in the 2011 policy strategies. The 2011 white paper focuses more on future challenges and focal points, while previous efforts, according to the strategy, will be continued.

¹⁸⁵ Norway and Mexico are often referred to as only strongholds of democracy in the circle of the world's top ten oil-exporting countries, whereas countries like Russia "demonstrate a mere semblance of freedom." Schubert, Samuel: Revisiting the Oil Curse: Are Oil Rich Nations Really doomed to Autocracy and Inequality?, in: Bakhtizin, R. (Ed.): Oil and Gas Business Journal 2/ 2006, pp. 1-16, p. 1.

important contribution to global energy supplies”.¹⁸⁶ It is also acknowledged that gas from the Barents Sea “may become an important European energy resource”.¹⁸⁷ However, “can” and “may” is a rather careful language. Aside from that, a new Norwegian study dismisses earlier utterly optimistic oil and gas prospects as exaggerated.¹⁸⁸ “New reserves are located offshore, far from markets and where conditions are tough, particularly during winter time. In spring and fall floating ice can create problems for the industry” - the drilling for oil and gas in the Arctic is both extremely difficult and expensive, it requires very specialized knowledge and equipment.¹⁸⁹ A “Scramble” for Arctic Resources is hence not to be expected in the near future, and the role of the Arctic as new source to meet the rising global demand for energy will not be as big as previously expected.

A straightforward rhetoric is used with regard to the fishing sector: “The Norwegian and Russian authorities have made a concerted effort to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Barents and Norwegian Seas in recent years”.¹⁹⁰ Unreported and illegal exploitation of this marine resource has been an issue in the years prior to 2011. Although it probably has not been a substantial risk to Norway’s economic security, the losses due to unreported catches must have caused a damage that made Norway ‘combat’ it.

Economic security in the Arctic is closely linked to marine and natural resources for Norway, but the strategies do not indicate an absolutely existential dependence on one single industry. Accordingly, it is not a multilateral ‘scramble’ for resources that poses a risk to

¹⁸⁶ Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, pp. 14f.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ For the original document, see Peters, G. P., Nilssen, T. B., Lindholt, L., et.al: Future emissions from shipping and petroleum activities in the Arctic, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, Oslo 2011, pp. 5305-5320.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Norway’s Strategic Paper 2011, p. 11. The illegal fishing-issue has also been addressed in the strategies of 2006 and 2009.

Norway's economic security in the High North, but criminal activities like illegal fishing. Disputes for resources among nation-states are rather unlikely to occur, disturbances rather stem from conflicts between state and non-state actors. Classical approaches like the reassertion of sovereign rights do not solve this asymmetrical conflict, and the pursuit of economic state interests have to be adjusted to these new conditions.

5.5 Maritime management and safety

Increased maritime activity in the Arctic region, especially transport shipping has increased already (especially along the North east Passage).¹⁹¹ This increased activity entails risks like shipping accidents, oil spills and the risks posed by the volatile climatic surrounding in which the vessels operate. The growing accessibility of the Arctic Ocean hence creates a dilemma for Norway – it opens new possibilities, Norway can expand its infrastructure along the coast and provide services to the ships. China, Japan, South Korea and Singapore already have shown interest in using Arctic Sea routes, which opens “a new window of opportunity” for Norway.¹⁹² At the same time, it poses risks and marine safety measures need to be improved.¹⁹³ More regulation is needed, search and rescue mechanisms have to be developed, and oil pollution emergency response systems need to be implemented.¹⁹⁴ Norway's remarks on the field of maritime management display a moderate level of riskification. The difficulties that may be raised by increased activities are not depicted as serious threats, but as risks which need to be managed and may need “regulation”.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p.17.

¹⁹² Ibid. These countries have also implemented their own research facilities in the Arctic.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., p.18.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

There are no signs of time pressure or great urgency to set up these regulations immediately or outside the common judicial framework. The regulations will hence not evolve as emergency measures, but from regular judicial procedures.

5.6 Preliminary Conclusion

The focus of Norway's strategy papers does not depict scenarios for 'Scrambles' for the Arctic or open territorial disputes. It concentrates on domestic economic concerns in the High North as well as new security concerns like illegal fishing, environmental degradation and the need to enhance the safety of marine and shipping activity in the environmentally volatile Arctic surrounding. This is not just vital for marine scientific research activities, border patrols or environmental surveillance, but also for economic activities like maritime transport and logistics. Extreme weather events and pack ice require special equipment and safety precaution. These are security concerns that do not fit into the conception of state rivalry and the classical military realm, but new problems that require increased cooperation as well as knowledge and competence building.

Nevertheless, Russia's strong ambitions in the Arctic and the regions geopolitical significance prompt Norway to increase its military presence as well. Its NATO membership remains crucial to Norway. While environmental changes are described in terms that tend to securitizing rhetoric, the military realm lacks securitizing moves, which is contradicted by Norway's increased deployment of military personnel in the region. Norway seemingly seeks to avoid the impression of tensions in the Arctic region and promotes a picture of cooperation in its strategies – it applies a de-securitizing approach.

Social aspects and the indigenous population are referred to various times throughout the strategy papers, but it remains rather vague and does not become clear what Norway's policies look like. There is no section exclusively dedicated to social issues.

6 Sweden

The Swedish “strategi för den arktiska regionen” is publicly accessible on the Swedish government’s website.¹⁹⁶ Unlike the Norwegian strategy, it does not provide more detailed information about who was involved in the development of the strategy. Nevertheless, its position on the government’s chancellery’s website represents an undisputable origin of this official governmental document. Like the Norwegian strategy, doubts on its authenticity or credibility may only arise from its nature as ‘declared strategy’. Its clear and comprehensible contents are coherent with the overall Swedish policies.¹⁹⁷ The strategy is available in Swedish and English.

Sweden’s Arctic Strategy of 2011 is the country’s first strategic document about the Arctic, and its purpose is to “present Sweden’s relationship with the Arctic, together with the current priorities and future outlook for Sweden’s Arctic policy, proceeding from an international perspective.”¹⁹⁸ The country was the last Arctic state to publish an Arctic strategy, and it was pushed to do so by the commencement of its chairmanship of the Arctic Council.

Sweden does neither present its interest in the Arctic as self-evident nor as a natural step of defining its own priorities. Instead, its strategy serves as first milestone in the process of self-positioning. Its interests are seemingly not taken for granted, but are considered to require certain justification: The strategy hence first introduces Sweden as Arctic country and then

¹⁹⁶ Sveriges strategi för den arktiska regionen (Sweden’s Strategy for the Arctic Region), Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Arctic Secretariat, Stockholm 2011, Pdf available at: <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/16/79/93/9ff39990.pdf>. Last Access September 25, 2012. In the following: Sweden’s Arctic Strategy.

¹⁹⁷ These categorizations are following John Scott’s criteria for the selection of documents: Authenticity, Credibility, Representativity, and Meaning. Cf. Scott, John: A Matter of Record. Documentary Sources in Social Research, Cambridge 1990.

¹⁹⁸ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p.4.

answers the self-posed question “why a strategy for the Arctic region?” These introductory remarks clearly distinguish Sweden from the Arctic coastal states – apparently, there is a need to justify – or maybe even preventatively defend - the own objectives on the international level.

6.1 Structure and Main Themes

The Strategy describes itself as “starting-point for further development of cooperation in the region” and calls for a “robust regulatory framework” for emerging activities in the Arctic.¹⁹⁹

Sweden’s chairmanship of the Arctic Council may have been a major impetus for the publication of its Arctic strategy – and offers an opportune moment to call for a stronger Arctic Council. The document explicitly proceeds from an international perspective, which is epitomized by the short summaries of all other Arctic states’ strategic objectives in the beginning of the Swedish strategy. The strategies of Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Russia, the US and Canada are briefly presented, and even the EU and its work on an Arctic policy is introduced. The EU is hence not regarded as an outside actor (like Norway’s strategy indicated), but rather as integral stakeholder in Arctic issues:

“The Arctic and the EU are not only closely interlinked in terms of the geographical proximity of EU Member States and the Arctic region. In addition, EU policies on environment, climate, energy, research, transport hunting and fishing all have a direct bearing on the Arctic region.”²⁰⁰

Sweden’s EU membership plays out in the country’s promotion of a common EU-policy on Arctic Issues – a position that is mainly rejected by Arctic coastal states (including Norway), which consider the UNCLOS-framework a sufficient legal framework. The strategy’s major three priority areas are climate and environment, economic development and the human

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 10.

dimension. It is reiterated several times that Sweden seeks to promote “economically, socially and environmentally sustainable development throughout the Arctic.”²⁰¹ In addition to the three priority areas, the strategy refers to a “broad security concept” – the concrete nature of such a concept is not further elaborated on, but it is mentioned that civil instruments are to be preferred to military means.²⁰² The Swedish strategy hence deliberately declares its propensity to a security concept that is not confined to militarily safeguarded state security. The strong focus on “the human dimension” indicates the consideration of human security-conceptions.²⁰³

Sweden goes on by introducing its historical ties to the Arctic region. Whereas the references to 16th and 17th century-linkages seem to have little use except of the justification of current interest by a claimed historical connection, the mentioning of the more recent history reveals Sweden’s particular stance with regard to classical security interests. During the Cold War, Sweden “lay between the two spheres of interest of NATO and the Warsaw Pact”.²⁰⁴ Even though the tensions of the bipolar world do not exist anymore, Sweden as a neutral Non-NATO state is still situated (together with Finland) between the two major – and most active - Arctic coastal states Russia and Norway, which both have put the Arctic, its resources and strategic values on the top of their respective agenda.

Like Norway, Sweden does not resort to blatant securitizing rhetoric. The strategy does not suggest the existence of existential security threats of utter urgency – but it does identify

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 4.

²⁰² Ibid.

²⁰³ As already mentioned before, The Norwegian strategy also included a section on “the culture and livelihoods of indigenous peoples”. It seems however to be interwoven into the overall priorities of economic development and does hence not stand as single, independent priority to such a large degree as it does in the Swedish strategy.

²⁰⁴ Sweden’s National Strategy, p. 14.

areas of strong concern and mentions several areas of risk. The strategy strongly refers to European interdependence and focuses strongly on the European Union. After introducing its political concerns in the region, it addresses three main areas of attention (as mentioned above: climate and the environment, economic development and the human dimension). These four topical areas will be focused upon in greater detail in the following sections.

6.2 Political Issues: Security Policies in an era of mutual dependence

With regard to Norway and Russia, Sweden (like Finland) finds itself situated between countries which both are very active in Arctic economic activities, which were opponents during the Cold War and whose political systems continue to be very different. The memory of this precarious Cold War-situation is still fresh, and Sweden still identifies the relationship between the US and Russia, the former superpowers of the bipolar system, as having a decisive impact on the “overall security policy” in the Arctic.²⁰⁵

Nevertheless, the strategy refers to the willingness to cooperation on both sides and states that “the current security policy challenges in the Arctic are not of a military nature.”²⁰⁶ Norway’s and Russia’s settlement of border disputes in the Barents Sea 2011 and the Ilulissat Declaration of 2008 are mentioned as cases in point and underscore the primacy of international law in the Arctic. There is hence no securitization in the political and military

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 14. As Christoph Humrich points out, both states nowadays have a strong interest in the avoidance of conflicts in the Arctic. Russia’s military means can no longer be compared to those it had during the Cold War, while the US maintains its nuclear deterrence. Besides that, numerous fora for cooperation are geared towards diplomatic conflict settlement between the former two blocks of interest. Humrich, Christoph: Ressourcenkonflikte, Recht und Regieren in der Arktis, *ApuZ* 2011, p. 8.

²⁰⁶ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p. 14.

realm in the Swedish strategy, but it expresses concerns about other powerful state actors by whose actions the overall security in the Arctic would be affected.

In terms of Sweden's security policy position, the high degree of integration into the EU-security policies is particularly emphasized.²⁰⁷ Sweden supports a stronger EU-involvement, fully agrees with and promotes the EU's policy on Arctic issues.²⁰⁸ References to the EU throughout the document show its considerable impact and entanglement with Swedish policies. Additionally, the "Nordic Declaration of Solidarity" displays the country's close cooperation with the other Nordic countries.

"On the basis of common interest and geographical proximity it is natural for the Nordic countries to cooperate in meeting the challenges in the area of foreign and security policy in a spirit of solidarity. In this context Ministers discussed potential risks inter alia natural and man-made disasters, cyber and terrorist attacks. Should a Nordic country be affected, the others will, upon request from that country, assist with relevant means. The intensified Nordic cooperation will be undertaken fully in line with each country's security and defense policy and complement existing European and Euro-Atlantic cooperation."²⁰⁹

The EU and the cooperation and solidarity with the Nordic countries shape Sweden's security policy, and it is within these two frameworks where Sweden sees its major responsibilities. Sweden's unilateral declaration of solidarity reveals a strong sense of mutual dependence. The strong focus on the group of Nordic states raises the question if they could

²⁰⁷ As an EU member state, Sweden has adopted the EU's *Acquis Communautaire* (ie. the body of European Union law), including the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), its policies are hence aligned with EU policies.

²⁰⁸ For the EU's stance on the Arctic, see European Union's External Action website, EU Arctic Policy: http://eeas.europa.eu/arctic_region/index_en.htm. Last Access October 10, 2012.

²⁰⁹ Parties to the declaration are Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway. The declaration was made on the 5th April 2011 and is available online: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/UD/Vedlegg/Nordisk%20samarbeid/The_Nordic_declaration_on_solidarity.pdf. Last Access October 31st, 2012.

constitute a regional security complex of mutual support.²¹⁰ Sweden's unilateral declaration of solidarity clearly refers to the scenarios of military attacks.

The fact that the declaration is mentioned and cited in its Arctic strategy displays two things: First, Sweden demonstrates its readiness to intervene in a conflict on behalf of another Nordic country, and second, it points out that it expects other Nordic countries to intervene on its behalf in case of an attack. Thus, even though Sweden does not expect military attacks, classical security conceptions stemming from the state-dominated and military realm persist.

Sweden signals to other countries that it will take an active role in the Arctic as well, especially in the case of conflicts. There are no references to concrete threats, but the inclusion of the declarations of solidarity in the Arctic strategy do not merely show the country's continuously maintained awareness and preparedness, but it also makes sure to publicly communicate its position in its official Arctic strategy.

At the same time, the Swedish assessment of the geopolitical situation in the Arctic is characterized by a rather tranquil tone. Despite some "alarmist stories in the media", it emphasizes that "Arctic cooperation is characterized by a low level of conflict and broad consensus."²¹¹ Like the Norwegian strategy, Sweden states that it wants to keep the Arctic as "an area of low political tension."²¹² The term "threat" is mentioned three times: Once in the context of Sweden's unilateral declaration of solidarity, and twice in the context of

²¹⁰ Sweden's declaration of solidarity: "Sweden will not remain passive if a disaster or attack were to befall another EU Member State or Nordic country. We expect these countries to act in a similar fashion should Sweden be under threat." Regeringskansliet, Government Offices of Sweden, Government Bill 2008/09:140, A functional defence – Defence Policy Bill. See <http://regeringen.se/sb/d/3103/nocache/true/a/116839/dictionary/true>. Last Access October 31st, 2012.

²¹¹ Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p. 19.

²¹² Ibid., p. 18.

environmental change (relating to threatened biodiversity and areas).²¹³ There is hence no explicit identification of an imminent threat. Sweden stresses its support and active contribution for an EU Arctic Policy and seeks to strengthen the Arctic Council, the Barents cooperation and the Nordic Council of Ministers as multilateral fora for Arctic-related issues.²¹⁴

Since Norway and Sweden have different positions on the mandate they are willing to grant the Arctic Council, and since this institutional body plays a substantial role for the representation of indigenous peoples, the following section will take a closer look at multilateral bodies, with special regard to the AC as intergovernmental forum.

6.2.1 The Arctic Council and other multilateral fora

As maintained in the strategy, the multifaceted nature of challenges in the Arctic requires “efficient, multilateral cooperation”.²¹⁵ Sweden especially accentuates the value of the Arctic Council (AC) and describes it as “unique among international cooperation bodies” because it includes representatives for six different indigenous peoples’ organizations.²¹⁶ These organizations, however, possess the status of ‘permanent participants’ and cannot vote on the issues discussed in the AC – the entitlement to vote is limited to the eight Arctic member states (the A8). Additionally, non-arctic states, NGOs and intergovernmental bodies or

²¹³ Ibid., p. 15 and p. 28.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid., p. 19.

²¹⁶ Ibid., p. 19. The six organizations are the Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC), the Aleut International Association (AIA), the Gwich’in Council International (GGI), the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC), the Russian Arctic Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), and the Saami Council (SC). Cf. the Arctic Council’s online presence: <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/>. Last Access October 31, 2012.

institutions can gain observer status in the Council. These observers may have an impact in the six working groups of the Council, but they cannot vote.

Due to reservations from the US, the AC is not able to pass binding resolutions. It is a high-level intergovernmental forum, and its main fields of attention are environmental protection and sustainable development – security and military issues are (also mainly due to US-reservations) banned from its agenda. Sweden acknowledges the AC as valuable institution and utters its support for a broadening of the Council’s mandate to “important strategic issues such as joint security, infrastructure and social and economic development.”²¹⁷ The current capacities of the AC are hence not regarded as sufficient, and Sweden promotes a politically stronger Arctic Council. By the same token, the strategy includes a critical remark on the A5-meeting in Ilulissat 2008: Even though Sweden does not make territorial claims to the Arctic Ocean and welcomes the A5’s will to adhere to the UNCLOS framework,

“an energized Arctic Council could reduce the need for the coastal states to drive forward issues in the Arctic Five format. It is important for Finland, Iceland and Sweden to be able to participate in decision-making in cases where they have legitimate interests and that the status of the Arctic Council is maintained.”²¹⁸

The Ilulissat meeting and its subsequent declaration are hence regarded as separate and unconcerted action of the A5 – a situation that Sweden and the other Arctic, non-coastal states seek to avoid in the future. Since Sweden regards the AC as central forum for international Arctic governance, separate A5-meetings outside of the Council framework undermine its legitimacy and counteract Sweden’s efforts to strengthen and broaden its mandate.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ Ibid., p. 22.

The strategy further refers to the Nordic cooperation, the Barents cooperation and the United Nations as arenas for multilateral governance. However, it does not explicitly call for an overarching, binding legal regime for the Arctic (which might for instance follow the precedent of the Antarctic treaty).²¹⁹ Its support for an EU arctic policy does not automatically imply that this should constitute a supranational legal framework (which would not be possible without the consent of the other states anyway).

The coexistence of multiple fora and institutional bodies can lead to overlaps and redundancies, but a comprehensive legal regime would entail several drawbacks: There is currently no willingness of the Arctic coastal states to implement such a comprehensive regime. On the contrary, the Ilulissat Declaration rejects any further efforts for legislation and regards the existing legal framework as sufficient. Even if the states agreed to the development of an overarching legislation, the processes of development would take a very long time and require considerable resources. The resulting convention could then prove to be too static and not flexible enough to adjust to the continuously changing conditions in the Arctic.²²⁰

The Arctic Council is often highlighted because of its inclusive character. Since the indigenous communities in the Arctic are considered to be the most vulnerable people in the region, the AC offers a platform where they can voice their paramount concerns. Through the Council, they are enabled to present what they identify as threats to their wellbeing and security – in short, the AC offers the indigenous people a forum where they can raise

²¹⁹ Despite apparent similarities between the two poles (geographical remoteness, sparse population, similar climate and the UN classification as ‘common heritage of mankind’), a treaty like the one on the Antarctic would not work for the Arctic – see chapter 4: The Arctic is not a continent, but an ocean surrounded by countries which each have territorial claims to parts of the ocean, and certain legal regulations (UNCLOS) exist already. See Lennon, Erika: *A Tale of two Poles: A Comparative Look at the Legal Regimes in the Arctic and Antarctic*, in: *Sustainable Development Law and Policy*, (2008) 3, S. 32-36.

²²⁰ For the criticism, see Humrich, Christoph: *Ressourcenkonflikte, Recht und Regieren in der Arktis*, p. 11.

attention to the issue of human security.²²¹ The concept of human security emphasizes that the local population –in this case, the circumpolar indigenous communities – knows best what is needed to mitigate the effects of environmental changes. According to human security proponents, instead of sending outside ‘experts’ in to identify and ‘fix’ the problems, the indigenous people can, should and must speak for themselves. They are the ones who are exposed to the changes, they know the local conditions and hence they should be the first to be consulted.²²² From this perspective, a stronger Arctic Council would be a welcome development at first sight – but on closer inspection, a broadened mandate for the AC might in fact counteract the inclusion of the indigenous communities.

Despite the criticism on the Arctic Council’s lacking capacity to enforce binding obligations (“its recommendations just fizzle out and remain ineffective”), its informal character might be its greatest asset at the same time – it provides the Council with flexibility and allows for a relatively high level of inclusion.²²³ A stronger legal position would probably entail fewer opportunities for participation for the indigenous peoples’ organizations, since states are generally unwilling to grant legal claims and entitlements to indigenous peoples’ organizations – it is more likely that these organizations would be excluded in the case of the implementation of an overall legal regime.²²⁴ States usually are very hesitant to grant substantial and legally binding entitlements to indigenous peoples’ organizations.

Sweden’s call for a stronger Arctic Council hence needs to be discussed under consideration of the indigenous peoples’ representation platforms – currently, the AC offers them

²²¹ For the concept of human security, see chapter 2, as well as the UN-Dokument: A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, and Matthew, Richard, Barnett, Jon et.al. (Eds.): Global Environmental Change and Human Security, p.9f.

²²² see Matthew, Global Environmental Change and Human Security.

²²³ Humrich, Christoph: Ressourcenkonflikte, Recht und Regieren in der Arktis, p. 11.

²²⁴ Ibid.

favorable conditions for participation, and it is not clear if this could be maintained if the AC obtains more power. Despite its imperfections, the Arctic Council in its current form might offer the greatest room for manoeuvre for indigenous peoples' representatives and the best option to foster the sensitivity for the concept of human security.

6.3 Climate Change and the Environment

Similar to the Norwegian strategy, Sweden's Arctic strategy displays the highest degree of securitizing rhetoric in the realm of climate change and the environment. Besides the intention to work for reduced greenhouse gas emissions and the promotion of increased awareness of climate change in the Arctic in international climate negotiations, the Swedish strategy displays a stronger rhetoric in the field of environmental concerns than the Norwegian one. Sweden seeks to establish a network of "protected areas for flora and fauna" in order to "combat environmental degradation".²²⁵ "Combat" is not an unusual term in this context, but it is still derived from belligerent rhetoric and creates the image of a defensive act in the face of a threat. The strategy draws particular attention to the effects of climate change on the indigenous population –since these are usually most severely affected – but it declares the whole Arctic region as "one of the world's most vulnerable areas".²²⁶ The rapid changes in the Arctic are suspected to have "dramatic effects on Arctic ecosystems" and "can reduce their resilience".²²⁷ A reduced resilience means that the environment will not be able to cope with the changes from a certain point onwards – this statement hence refers to the potential of environmental changes to become existential threats, it refers to irreversible losses. An environment whose resilience is exhausted at a

²²⁵ Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p. 24.

²²⁶ Ibid., p. 25.

²²⁷ Ibid.

certain point has to succumb to the changing forces at that point. It is difficult to determine whether this statement is an act of securitization or riskification – the rhetoric of the environmental section may be situated between the two, sometimes swinging more towards the one, sometimes to the other end. There is mention of “irreplaceable” ecosystems services that may be lost in the long-term, and of a “greater risk” of the exceeding of “critical thresholds”.²²⁸

On one hand, Climate Change is an imminent threat, because consequences are visible and can be felt already. Yet, at the same time, the threat remains diffuse, since it is impossible to know beforehand what exactly the consequences will look like, or what their magnitude will be, or where they are the most harmful. And even the magnitude, character and point of time can be estimated in more concrete terms, no single state can halt these processes unilaterally (which is why all states call for concerted, international countermeasures and mitigation), and states are generally hesitant to introduce painful and unpopular policies to counteract environmental degradation. The feeling of powerlessness (why should one single state act alone if others don't follow along?) and the tendency to prioritize economic growth and high living standards over environmental protection (even though the two do not always necessarily conflict with each other) tend to hamper decisive action. The strongest acts of securitization/riskification occur hence in the realm where most states agree that immediate action is needed, but where actual measures can be delayed, limited or circumvented because it is a matter of discussion which measures actually help, or because the needed measures are not feasible in financial/logistic terms. Climate Change may easily be securitized, but to implement countermeasures is a huge challenge. Furthermore, it may be tempting to remain inactive if other states do so, too. There is no silver bullet for the Climate

²²⁸ Ibid.

Change issue, and the determination of what are sufficient mitigation efforts lies in the estimation of each respective state.²²⁹

Moreover, no single state can be blamed individually for the environmental change. It is hence easier to securitize this realm of security concerns. The securitization does not automatically oblige the state to implement large-scale countermeasures, or to allocate vast resources – the globality of the threat and the lack of consensus about what measures need to be taken (or the mere impossibility to mitigate the environmental developments unilaterally) help the states to wriggle themselves out of actual responsibility. Even if states agree on necessary measures, their implementation may still not be granted priority because Climate change is still perceived as vague, diffused issue by many people – the majority of those who are not directly confronted with its consequences would not support unpopular policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. On the other hand, Norway and Sweden are both in the top 10 in the Environmental Performance Index.²³⁰ If there were no intentions to take an active stance against environmental degradation, Climate Change and environmental problems would not be emphasized in the strategies to such a high degree. Even though there are general references to problems and priorities rather than concrete action plans in their strategies, both countries have proven to be highly responsive in the environmental protection and efforts for climate change mitigation.²³¹

²²⁹ Summits on Climate Change (like Copenhagen 2009, Doha 2012) or Agreements like the Kyoto Protocol may result in reduction aims and declarations of intent, but it is not uncommon that these aims and intentions are not reached by the agreed due dates. There are for instance neither enforcement mechanisms nor legal consequences for the failure to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.

²³⁰ Norway is ranked on the third, Schweden on the 9th place in 2012. Environmental Performance Index (EPI), Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, Yale University 2012, available at <http://epi.yale.edu/epi2012/rankings>. Last Access October 31st, 2012.

²³¹ As Ralf Tils point out, strategy papers are not to be confused with detailed action plans but rather serve to present general intentions. See Tils, Ralf: Politische Strategieanalyse.

Sweden refers to the unsettling nature of uncertainty. It backs up its assertions by referring to “plenty of research findings” to legitimize its claims.²³² Furthermore, the strategy provides concrete examples to make the issues more comprehensible and tangible, for instance by giving the example of permafrost changes. Thawing permafrost does not only result in soil erosion, but is also part of a self-accelerating global warming process: large amounts of greenhouse gases that are currently contained in the permafrost will be released and further fuel the warming of the region.²³³

Another concrete concern is the anticipated increase in precipitation caused by global warming, which would result in greater water flows and changes in soil conditions like soil erosion.²³⁴ The Swedish strategy also repeatedly refers to the indigenous population’s vulnerability to climate change in the Arctic. The Sámi population, whose “identity is inextricably linked to this environment” in the Arctic region is said to be “particularly vulnerable” to the changing environmental conditions.²³⁵ Like in other Scandinavian countries, minorities enjoy a high level of protection in Sweden, which is why a responsive approach to indigenous peoples’ concerns can be expected.²³⁶

Furthermore, the strategy points at the magnitude of adverse effects if the changes are ignored: “As a result of climate change, security may well become more of a question of public crisis management in extreme weather situations”.²³⁷ In the face of these risks and uncertainties, Sweden applies the means of monitoring and knowledge generation. A threat may begin to appear less threatening (or more manageable) once one familiarizes oneself

²³² Ibid., p.26. Scientific assessments can help to legitimize the claimed need for stronger protection – scientists are used as authorities speaking on the behalf of the securitizing actors.

²³³ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p. 26.

²³⁴ Ibid., p. 16.

²³⁵ Ibid., p. 16f.

²³⁶ For the level of protection for minorities, see for instance the United Nations Development Programme’s(UNDP) Human Development Report 2011.

²³⁷ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p. 14.

with it – like states spy out their enemies. Science Communities and Observing Networks are hence considered as vital means to learn more about the threat of climate change.²³⁸

The rhetoric in the environmental section of Sweden's strategy is dominated by expressions like "major problem" (referring to pollution in the region), "substantial importance" (the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions), "serious exposure" (of the Arctic people to mercury depositions), "serious impact", "indirect threats" and "risks of disturbances and accidents" (the latter terms refer to the increase of accessible open water areas in the Arctic).²³⁹ While the threats are listed elaborately, the account on countermeasures remains rather vague and consists mainly of the focus on knowledge generation, monitoring and research activities. It is notable that Climate Change issues account for the majority of identified risks, whereas man-made disasters like oil spills do not take a prominent role in the environmental section of the strategy.

6.4 Economic Development

Sweden attributes "considerable economic potential" to the Arctic, referring to "fresh transport routes" that "have opened the door for new types of strategic and security policy opportunities and challenges".²⁴⁰ Its major economic activities in the Arctic range from the commercial mining industries, fishing and forestry to traditional indigenous activities like reindeer herding and hunting.²⁴¹ Other sectors mentioned are research and development,

²³⁸ Ibid., p. 27.

²³⁹ Ibid., p.28. "Risk" is mentioned 22 times, mostly referring to the environment, but also to marine safety, oil spills, and health effects due to pollution (this will be addressed in the section on the human dimension in greater detail).

²⁴⁰ Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p.14.

²⁴¹ Ibid., p.15. Especially for the Sámi population the combination of reindeer husbandry, hunting and fishing constitutes its "mixed economy" – see also p.38 of the strategy. The mining industry includes ore and mineral extraction. base metal, iron and titanium projects.

the space industry and tourism. The economic sector is depicted as stable and sufficiently diversified in order not to be very vulnerable to changes in the arctic business environment. “Economically, socially and environmentally sustainable development” is stressed as major priority several times throughout the document.

Sweden defines its competitive advantage in the Arctic as based on the Swedish businesses’ “willingness to adhere to the principles of human rights, labour law, social responsibility, sound environmental and sustainability efforts and anti-corruption”.²⁴² This statement indicates two things: first, it implies that the Arctic region is not regarded as some sort of colony whose resources are to be exploited but which can be neglected in social terms. According to the strategy, it is treated as integral part of Sweden, and its high social standards are applied in the sparsely populated North as well. Second, the provision of a reliable and predictable business environment which fulfills all the abovementioned criteria is an attractive location for investments. The reference to its principles hence portrays Sweden’s economic surrounding as well-founded and safe for business actors like investors or business founders. To further strengthen this image and to stress the close cooperation with the EU, financing investment opportunities linked to the EU Cohesion policy are mentioned as well.²⁴³ The strong bond to the EU further affirms Sweden’s self-portrayal as a country with sound economic conditions – the EU and the cohesion policy work like a back-up and an insurance of economic well-being, guaranteed by the European multilateral community. The country’s economic stability is hence no subject of securitization, and

²⁴² Ibid., p. 31.

²⁴³ Ibid., p. 31. The EU Cohesion Policy provides support to EU member states in order to reduce disparities in wealth and economic opportunities. See the European Commission’s factsheet on Regional Policy : European Regional Policy. The Basic Essentials, January 2007, Pdf available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/basic/basic_2007_en.pdf. Last Access October 31, 2012.

Sweden emphasizes the importance of free trade for “peace and prosperity”.²⁴⁴ Sweden’s cooperation within the EU/EFTA frameworks functions as a guarantor for the long-term inclusion in the European market. Instead of a “gold rush” for resources, Sweden’s economic sector is hence characterized and shaped by the established EU-structures, which further reduces the incentive to securitize the country’s economic stability – it is not only internally stable, but this stability is guaranteed by the EU-embedding as well.²⁴⁵

Even though Sweden “has no direct national energy interest in the Arctic”, the country’s economy is involved in the oil and gas extracting businesses, as “Swedish petroleum companies can mostly be found in the sub-contractor chain of goods and services.”²⁴⁶ Additionally, Sweden expects growing need for air, land and sea transportation due to the extraction of natural resources. There are hence salient Swedish economic interests in the resource extraction in the Arctic regardless of the lack of coastal access.

In contrast to Norway, Sweden openly expresses the potential significance of the Arctic oil and gas deposits with regard to the currently high oil prices due to “unrest and uncertainty in North Africa and the Middle East.”²⁴⁷ There are hence implied expectations of more energy independence and price stability once these resources can be fully accessed and extracted: “Large volumes of fuel produced in the Arctic may therefore affect European security of supply and prices on several markets.”²⁴⁸ Regarding Sweden’s and the EU’s conjunction of interests, an increased security of energy supply through Arctic resources would accommodate the “EU Energy Acquis” which strives for the security of supply and for

²⁴⁴ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p. 31.

²⁴⁵ The strategy explicitly dismisses such a ‘gold rush’ on resources on page 37.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., p.32, p. 37 – involvement is also mentioned in the fields of ice-breaking, sea transport and consultancy.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., p.37.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

free competition in the energy sector (i.e., less dependence from Russia as major energy supplier, where Gazprom maintains rather monopolist structures).²⁴⁹

As forestry is mentioned in the Swedish strategy as a major economic branch in the High North, it is worth taking a closer look at the forestry business in Sweden's Arctic region as well. The following paragraphs are drawn from Carina Keskitalo's case studies on forestry in northern Sweden – the following example is hence not mentioned in the Swedish strategy itself, but offers an extremely valuable insight into the economic effects of the rapidly changing Arctic climate conditions on the local economy.

In Keskitalo's case study area, the Pite River valley, the international forest corporation SCA (Svenska Cellulosa Aktiebolaget) and the state-owned Sveaskog AB own large-scale production units with which smaller forestry businesses rarely are able to compete with.²⁵⁰

Rationalisation and mechanization steps have not only reduced the total number of forestry-related businesses, but also the number of jobs in this sector. Vulnerability is hence not just an issue for indigenous people who live from subsistence reindeer herding or hunting, but also for the non-indigenous population.

Moreover, increased vulnerability is not exclusively linked to climate change and environmental changes in the Arctic, but also to economic structural, global changes in the modes of production. It is important to realize that the Arctic population does not exist in economic isolation, but that local businesses in the High North are closely entangled with the global market structures – not just in the more obvious globally relevant sectors of oil and gas extraction and mining, but also in forestry, fishing and other businesses. It would

²⁴⁹ Hadfield, Amelia: Energy Security in Europe: Economic and Political Perspectives, part of the lecture series "European Dialogues" at the University of Iceland, 2nd November 2012.

²⁵⁰ Keskitalo, Carina: Vulnerability and adaptive capacity in forestry in northern Europe: a Swedish case study, in: Oppenheimer, M., Yohe, G. (Eds.): Climatic Change Vol 87, no. 1-2, 2008, pp. 219-243.

therefore be shortsighted to blame the precarious situation of parts of the Arctic population only to the environmental change that plays out regionally.

This notwithstanding, regional environmental changes do have a significant impact on local businesses as well – the treeline has begun to move northwards, and trees grow faster due to longer growing periods (longer summers, shorter winters). But consequently, the quality of the wood might be lower and might hence only achieve lower prices on the international markets. Due to the warmer weather, insects like moths and the pine sawfly that have not existed in the region now begin to harm the tress – but the use of pesticides is not allowed. Besides of that, thawing permafrost grounds might severely complicate the transportation of goods – insufficient road stability due to soil erosion has already become a problem.²⁵¹ The sparse and aging population in the region does not attract investments, but these are necessary to remain competitive.

More extensive forestry might exacerbate the conflict between the logging industry and the Sami population which uses forests for reindeer herding. These developments are outlined in Keskitalo's case study and not in the Swedish strategy, but it is included in this section because it offers a valuable real-life insight into the socio-economic challenges Sweden and other Arctic countries are facing, and they show how closely the economic and the social dimensions of security are intertwined.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

6.5 The Human Dimension

The dedication of a whole section to the “Human Dimension” distinguishes the Swedish Strategy from other Arctic Strategies.²⁵² Approximately four million people live in the Arctic region, 400,000 of which are considered as indigenous population.²⁵³ The strategy’s “Human Dimension” centers on issues of human security. As maintained by the document, the greatest challenge – like in all other areas as well – is posed by the processes of climate change:

“Indigenous peoples and other groups with a traditional lifestyle or who earn a living from biological natural resources, such as reindeer herders, hunters, fishermen and craftsmen, are dependent on high biodiversity and intact ecosystems. Climate change means that many traditional customs and livelihoods will be more difficult to maintain.”²⁵⁴

Sweden’s objective is to strengthen the knowledge about traditional lifestyles and necessary adaptations to the changing conditions. The country further supports indigenous peoples’ active participation in decision-making processes and intends to utilize its experiences from the Nordic Sámi Convention.²⁵⁵ The inclusion of Sweden’s Sámi population in decision-making processes is seen as vital for enabling the indigenous peoples “to meet future challenges”.²⁵⁶ Despite of the labeling as “particularly vulnerable”, they are hence not deemed to be a dependent or incapable minority which needs a patriarchal protector. Instead, the aim is to establish regulatory frameworks that allow them the greatest possible

²⁵² Cf. Heininen, Lassi: Arctic Strategies and Policies.

²⁵³ Numbers according to the Arctic Council. The Indigenous Peoples’ Secretariat even estimates the number of indigenous people to be 1.5 million out of 10 million Arctic inhabitants. Cf. The Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples’ Secretariat’s Brochure “Shaping Change, Adapting to Change: Indigenous Peoples and the Arctic Council”, published by the Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples’ Secretariat, 2002, available at: <http://www.arcticpeoples.org/Newsletter/Documents/brochure.pdf>. Last Access October 31, 2012.

²⁵⁴ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p. 41.

²⁵⁵ See Åhrén, Mattias, Scheinin, Martin, Henriksen, John B.: The Nordic Sami Convention: International Human Rights, Self-Determination and other Central Provisions, in: Gáldu Čála, Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights No 3/2007, Kautokeino/ Norway 2007, pp.8-96. The drafting of the Nordic Sami Convention was initiated at the Nordic Council meeting in Reykjavík 1995, a first draft was presented in 2005. Information from the Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples Secretariat.

²⁵⁶ Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p. 41.

autonomy and the possibility to take care of themselves – without as little interferences from outside their community as possible.²⁵⁷ The Nordic Sámi Convention aims to serve as new international instrument and human rights convention in order to safeguard the Sámi language, culture, livelihoods and “way of life with the least possible interference by national borders.”²⁵⁸ The abstinence of interference includes the Sámi’s nomadic existence: the national governments of the Nordic countries usually allow the Sámi population to move freely between the borders of Norway, Sweden and Finland.²⁵⁹

Ratification negotiations in Sweden, Finland and Norway have commenced in spring 2011.²⁶⁰ In addition to the Convention, Sweden’s treaty of accession to the EU recognize the obligations in relation to the Sámi people and display a notable commitment to the preservation of indigenous peoples’ rights.

This basic approach towards indigenous issues provides an important background for understanding Sweden’s perception of Sámi human security – it is not confined to the mere existence and survival of the indigenous population, but it acknowledges their right to self-determination.²⁶¹

Albeit there is no securitization in the sense that some threats are identified as existential hazards, the strategy’s human dimension spots several areas of great concern, most of them relating to health indicators. Sweden’s strategy points out that people living in the Arctic area have a slightly lower average life expectancy than the population as a whole. Infant mortality is slightly higher as well, and the physical isolation which is typical in the High

²⁵⁷ Ibid., p.42.

²⁵⁸ Åhrén et. al, Preface.

²⁵⁹ The first legal framework for this freedom of movement was the so-called Lapp Codicil from 1751. See Sweden’s Arctic Strategy, p.17.

²⁶⁰ The convention is hence limited to the Scandinavian countries with a sami population. Although Russia does have a sami population as well, it does not recognize them as indigenous people and they are hence not granted specific rights and protection there.

²⁶¹ This is anchored in the Nordic Sami Convention’s draft as well.

North can lead to associated morbidity.²⁶² The prevailing darkness during wintertime and long summer days affect people's circadian rhythm, and longlasting cold may increase the risk for cardio-vascular disease. Even though the Arctic conditions rarely affect people's health in a direct way, the climate conditions to have an impact on the people's everyday life and can pose risks to their human security.

Changing climate conditions do not only play out in a physical or practical matter (hunters who now longer find prey, migrating fish stocks and subsequent changes in indigenous people's diet), but also cause social and mental stress to those who are affected.²⁶³ The same applies to the increased occurrence of pathogenic microorganisms and contaminated drinking water (caused by changes in the permafrost) in the region – they are not only risks to people's health, but also put them under increased psychological stress situations.²⁶⁴

Organic pollutants like polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) and heavy metals like mercury pose actual health risks in the region.²⁶⁵ Other reports explain how persistent organic pollutants (POPs) reach the Arctic from non-Arctic Sources and enter the Arctic marine ecosystem and subsequently poison humans through food.²⁶⁶ However, the health issues do not set off securitizing rhetoric in the Swedish strategy. Sweden's objective is to "combat the negative health and social effects of climate change" – the health issue is acknowledged and has been put on the agenda, but the following elaborations on the planned measures do not indicate

²⁶² Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p. 43. However, it is stated that the rising degree of urbanization limits the size of this risk category.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Among the pathogenic microorganisms are those causing tick-borne encephalitis (TBE)/meningitis, microorganisms that previously did not occur in the Arctic environment. Cf. Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p. 43f.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

²⁶⁶ Hoogensen, Gunhild: Security at the Poles. The Arctic and Antarctic, in: Brauch, Hans G.: Facing Global Environmental Change, Berlin 2000, pp. 951-960.

any deviations of regular procedures.²⁶⁷ Sweden plans to work for a minimization of the emissions of polluting substances in a joint effort with Russia and the Barents cooperation. The latter is also a suitable forum for pushing forward remediation efforts in contaminated areas.

The impacts of climate change on reindeer husbandry are another Swedish concern. Warmer and wetter winters are expected to have adverse effects on the animals' food supply.²⁶⁸ The changing weather conditions are likely to change the overall economic patterns in the region, and increased forestry activities will probably cause a conflict of interests between nomadic reindeer herders and forestry businesses. It is hence not just climate change itself that poses a challenge, but also the socioeconomic changes that occur as a consequence. Sweden ratified the UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage to keep the impacts on the indigenous population as low as possible, but the changing environment will alter the economic and social conditions for all stakeholders in the region.²⁶⁹

Sweden's objectives in the realm of the human dimension display an absence of securitization, but a distinct awareness of the risks and problems in this realm. The strategy dedicates much attention to the protection and empowerment for self-determination of its indigenous population.

²⁶⁷ Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p. 41.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 45.

²⁶⁹ For the UNESCO Convention, see page 45 of Sweden's strategy.

6.6 Maritime Safety

It was mentioned before that the section on the environment in Sweden's strategy does not address the issue of oil spills and other immediate man-made disasters extensively. These matters are dealt with in the sub-section of maritime security in the strategy. Similar to the Norwegian documents, Sweden sees an accessible arctic as a double-edged sword: it welcomes the emerging economic opportunities like resource extraction, increased shipping and new shipping routes, but simultaneously recognizes the risks that come with these opening of economic activities. On one hand, maritime security is affected by the natural surrounding: "In autumn, spring and winter, it is dark and extremely cold most of the time. Such an environment places tough demands on both crews and equipment."²⁷⁰ On the other hand, it is accidents, technical and human failure that poses challenges to safe maritime operations: "Poor safety routines or vessel construction can have devastating consequences for seafarers, marine flora and fauna and those who depend on the sea for their livelihoods."²⁷¹

Since all Arctic states seek to participate in the evolving economic enterprises in the Arctic Ocean and no state can bear the entailing risks on its own, maritime security is a field where multilateral cooperation is rather easy to achieve. At the Ministerial Meeting in Nuuk/Greenland 2011, the first legally binding international agreement on search and rescue operations in the Arctic region was achieved.²⁷² Although the efforts were initiated by the Arctic Council, the Declaration was not made within the framework of the AC but under its auspices. By this, another international agreement was achieved in the Arctic region.

²⁷⁰ Sweden's Arctic Strategy, p. 34.

²⁷¹ Ibid., p.35.

²⁷² Nuuk Declaration, On the Occasion of the Seventh Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council, 12 May 2011, Nuuk/ Greenland, Pdf available at: 07_nuuk_declaration_2011_signed(1).pdf. All Arctic States including the Faroe Islands and Greenland participated and signed the agreement.

7 Conclusions

The previous examination demonstrates that Norway and Sweden have many objectives in common in the Arctic. Nevertheless, substantial differences became visible as well – the Scandinavian countries do not represent a monolithic bloc with regard to their Arctic interests. Neither strategy securitizes ongoing developments in the Arctic, but both identify security concerns in certain areas. According to Olaf Corry's concept, the strategies particularly 'riskify' environmental change and maritime safety. Whereas the reaction to the former is mainly constituted of surveillance and monitoring and therefore a form of risk-management, the latter will – as it was decided in the Nuuk declaration - be handled by multilateral shared responsibilities in search and rescue operations.

'Threats' are only mentioned in relation to Climate Change. The prospects of a fully accessible Arctic Ocean is seen as enormous opportunity for future economic activities, and concerns about international conflicts over resources or territories were disproved in the strategies. With regard to Norway's relations with Russia, it remains unclear whether the expressed relaxation of former tensions is a genuine governmental view or a strategic de-securitization in order to improve the relations to the powerful neighbor in the East.

Both strategies describe the Arctic as area of low tension, but display a certain level of preparedness for conflicts at the same time - Norway through increased military presence, Sweden through its emphasis on the declarations of solidarity, which clearly refer to military threats or attacks. Classical security perceptions rooted in the state-centered and predominantly military realm are hence still visible in the strategies and will persist in the future. However, the military presence in the region is not a reaction to an emerging military threat, but a way to show sovereign presence in the region. Resource wars in the Arctic

appear as implausible scenario with regard to the Scandinavian countries' positions.²⁷³ Yet, globalization as a structuralist force does not just touch upon local national security concerns, but on security issues on a global scale. Even though interstate conflicts in the westphalian logic are improbable, the Arctic strategies demonstrate that new security issues are emerging. The most prominent one is environmental change, which takes up a very prominent position in both strategies.

Norway and Sweden thus do not solely focus on the Arctic's geopolitical and strategic role. Both pursue their own national interests, but at the same time, they strongly orient themselves towards international cooperation. Partly because some challenges like Environmental Change or cross-border criminality cannot be addressed individually, and partly because of the understanding that a partial concession to other states' interests paves the way for valuable cooperation – as for instance in the field of natural resource extraction, where Russia and Norway cooperate.

Concerns on increased illegal activities and piracy demonstrate that the Arctic is subject to asymmetrical challenges and conflicts between state- and non-state actors just as many other places in the world. Measures for increased security need to be adapted to these challenges of the 21st century. The new threats do not follow the westphalian nation-state logic. They are partly due to the dynamics of globalization, such as increased cross-national mobility and highly advanced information technology. Specialized know-how about the Arctic is not necessarily limited to the Arctic coastal states, as increased interest from the

²⁷³For an elaborate discussion of new security threats, see also Mittelman, James: *Hyperconflict. Globalization and Insecurity*, Stanford University Press 2010, pp.29-49. However, Mittelman draws a rather fatalistic picture of a rising 'hyperconflict' due to what he depicts as uncontrolled neoliberal globalization. This evaluation notwithstanding, his books introduces new, post-westphalian security issues of the 21st century.

Asian countries demonstrate. China and several other countries have already established their own research institutions in the Arctic.

The Arctic is hence no isolated area and the Arctic states are by far not the only actors which have a vital interest in the region. The security concerns like environmental degradation, marine safety and the sustainability of economic activities are part of global dynamics that play out in the Arctic as well. Global environmental change is first felt in the Arctic, and in reverse Arctic environmental changes will cause global repercussions. Newly accessible shipping routes in the Arctic will alter global commercial connections and trade routes between the continents. Increased human activity will also entail increased illegal activities such as piracy, illegal resource extraction, unregulated fishing or the trafficking of goods and people.

The references to international institutions like the UN, the EU, and the Arctic Council indicate that, even though state actors may continue to be the actors with the most general freedom and capacities to take action, international organizations are granted increased significance. They are considered to be important connecting and mediating links, and both countries signal their willingness to consult and cooperate with these international organs.

Even though the concept of security was split into different sectors in this examination, each sector does not exist in isolation, but is inextricably linked to the others. The disaggregation into sectors like economic, environmental, political, military and human/social security is helpful to understand the different aspects and characteristics of security. But social security cannot be guaranteed without its economic underpinnings, for which in turn a reliable political framework is necessary. Environmental security cannot be divided from social aspects and human security, either, and so forth. Therefore, it is necessary to take a holistic

view on the concept of security that is not confined to military aspects. As the strategies under examination demonstrated, this approach mirrors the multifaceted character of security and helps to come to grips with the emerging challenges in the Arctic.

7.1 Limitations

Both strategies can be labeled 'declared strategies' – they are publicly accessible and serve as a means of self-depiction. The intentions mentioned in those public governmental documents do not necessarily coincide with those of the 'deep' strategy – the government's actual intentions and concerns. The latter strategic documents are, however, mostly inaccessible both to researchers and the public, mainly due to state security considerations.

This thesis does not aim to represent a comprehensive account on Security concerns in the overall Arctic region. The findings are based on what Sweden and Norway perceive and subsequently depict as security challenges in their respective strategy. Even though the two Nordic states depict the circumpolar region as area of low tension, this view may differ considerably with regard to actors like the US and Russia, whose major military and strategic confrontation area is the Arctic region.²⁷⁴ Given the complexity of each sector of security, the present analysis did not analyze each security concern in depth, but was limited to the presentation of what the two Arctic states identified as matter of concern. The examination paid more attention to the expressed security concerns and the way they are pronounced than to what solutions or measures are proposed to solve them. The focus on national strategies implies a state-centric approach that hardly leaves room for non-state actors.

²⁷⁴ Cf. Bailes, Alyson: Tuning European Security upside down? The future Significance of the Arctic, in: Dis-Politika, Foreign Affairs Institute, Ankara 2013 (forthcoming).

7.2 Further Research

Since both states emphasize the Arctic region's position as an area of low tension, but especially Norway displays an increased military presence in the region, further research could be conducted on the coherence or the disparities between the Arctic strategies – as governmental declarations of intentions – and actual ensuing policies.

A comparative analysis of the declared strategies and the countries' security strategies could shed light on whether disparities appear, how large they are and in which areas they arise. However, this would require existent single security strategy papers – but in the case of Sweden, there are several strategic documents dealing with state security. Problems would not only arise regarding the choice of documents, but also from the recurrent question of authenticity and clarity – some documents do not clearly identify the country's state interest and remain too imprecise and vague in their policy intentions.

Norway's involvement in NATO and Sweden's EU-membership bring intergovernmental and supranational organizations into the Arctic discourse which may have an increasing effect on security policy-making in the Arctic. NATO and the EU embody organizations on which there exist very different, sometimes contrary positions and opinions between the Arctic states. The discourse on these organizations as well as an assessment of their impact in current and future decision-making processes would therefore constitute a field of further examination as well.

Literature

- Åhrén, Mattias, Scheinin, Martin, Henriksen, John B.: The Nordic Sami Convention: International Human Rights, Self-Determination and other Central Provisions, in: Gáldu Čála, Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights No 3/2007, Kautokeino/ Norway 2007, pp.8-96.
- Bailes, Alyson: The European Defence Challenge for the Nordic Region, in: Bailes, Alyson, Herolf, Gunilla, Sundelius, Bengt (Eds.): The Nordic Countries and the European Security and Defence Policy, SIPRI-Publication, Oxford University Press 2006.
- Bailes, Alyson: Turning European Security upside down? The future Significance of the Arctic, in: Dis-Politika, Foreign Affairs Institute, Ankara 2013 (forthcoming).
- Berton, Pierre: The Arctic Grail: The Quest for the Northwest Passage and the North Pole 1818–1909. New York 1988.
- Bomann-Larsen, Tor: Roald Amundsen. Sutton 2006.
- Brown, Chris and Ainley, Kristen: Understanding International Relations, Hampshire/ New York 2005.
- Buzan, Barry, Wæver, Ole, De Wilde, Jaap: Security. A New Framework for Analysis, Lynne Rieder Publishers, Boulder, Colorado/London 1998.
- Buzan, Barry, Wæver, Ole, De Wilde, Jaap: Environment, Economic and Societal Security, Working Papers, no.10, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Copenhagen 1995.
- Byers, Michael: Who owns the Arctic? Understanding Sovereignty Disputes in the North, Vancouver 2009.
- Conley, Heather: A New Security Architecture for the Arctic: An American Perspective. A Report of the CSIS Europe Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington D.C. 2012.
- Corry, Olaf: Securitisation and 'Riskification': Second-order Security and the Politics of Climate Change, in: Millenium – Journal of International Studies, online publication, 8th November 2011, p. 1-24.
- Day, Alan Edwin: Historical Dictionary of the Discovery and Exploration of the Northwest Passage. Historical Dictionaries of Discovery and Exploration No. 3, Scarecrow Press, Lanham 2006.
- Delanty, Gerard: Social Science. Philosophical and Methodological Foundations, Maidenhead 2005.

- Elsenhans, Hartmut: Globalization or Dutch Disease: Its Political and Social Consequences, in: Singer, Hans Wolfgang, Hatti, Neelambar et.al (Eds.): Technological Diffusion in Third World. New World Order Series, Volume 16 (Part-I) New Delhi 1999, pp. 425-469.
- Flick, Uwe: Qualitative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung, 4th Edition, Hamburg 2011.
- Hadfield, Amelia: Energy Security in Europe: Economic and Political Perspectives, part of the lecture series "European Dialogues" at the University of Iceland, 2nd November 2012.
- Haftendorn, Helga: NATO and the Arctic: Is the Atlantic Alliance a Cold War Relic in a peaceful Region now faced with non-military Challenges? In: European Security 20:3, Routledge 2011, p. 337-361.
- Hassol, Susan J.: Impacts of a warming Arctic. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, Executive Summary, Cambridge University Press 2004.
- Heininen, Lassi: Arctic Strategies and Policies. Inventory and Comparative Study, University of Lapland Press, Akureyri 2011.
- Heininen, Lassi and Bailes, Alyson: Strategy Papers on the Arctic or High North: A comparative study and analysis, University of Iceland Press 2012, Reykjavík 2012.
- Hoogensen, Gunhild: Security at the Poles. The Arctic and Antarctic, in: Brauch, Hans G.: Facing Global Environmental Change, Berlin 2000, pp. 951-960.
- Howard, Roger: The Arctic Gold Rush. The New Race for Tomorrow's Natural Resources, London/ New York 2009.
- Humrich, Christoph: Ressourcenkonflikte, Recht und Regieren in der Arktis, in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte 5-6/2011, Bonn, 31st January 2011.
- Keskitalo, Carina: Climate Change and Globalization in the Arctic. An Integrated Approach to Vulnerability Assessment, London 2008.
- Keskitalo, Carina: Negotiating the Arctic. The Construction of an International Region, Studies in International Relations, Routledge, New York/London 2004.
- Keskitalo, Carina: Vulnerability and adaptive capacity in forestry in northern Europe: a Swedish case study, in: Oppenheimer, M., Yohe, G. (Eds.): Climatic Change Vol 87, no. 1-2, 2008, pp. 219-243.
- Kraska, James (ed.): Arctic Security in an Age of Climate Change, Cambridge University Press 2011.
- Krippendorff, Klaus: Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology, 2nd Edition, Thousand Oaks 2004.

- Lackenbauer, P., Farish, M., Arthur-Lackenbauer, J.: The Distant Early Warning Line. A Bibliography and Documentary Resource List, The Arctic Institute of North America 2005.
- Lennon, Erika: A Tale of two Poles: A Comparative Look at the Legal Regimes in the Arctic and Antarctic, in: Sustainable Development Law and Policy, (2008) 3, S. 32-36.
- Lipschutz, Ronnie D. (ed.): On Security, Columbia University Press, New York 1998.
- Matthew, Richard, Barnett, Jon et.al. (Eds.): Global Environmental Change and Human Security, MIT Press, Cambridge 2010.
- Mayring, Philipp: Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken, 8th Edition, Weinheim 2003.
- Mittelman, James: Hyperconflict. Globalization and Insecurity, Stanford University Press 2010.
- O'Neill, Kate: The Environment and International Relations, Cambridge University Press, New York 2009.
- Osherenko, Gail and Young, Oran: The Age of the Arctic. Hot Conflicts and Cold Realities, Cambridge University Press 1989.
- Østreng, Willy: Extended Security and Climate Change in the Regional and Global Context: A Historical Account. Presentation at the Calotte Academy 2008 "Climate Change Defining Human Security" in Inari/Finland, Kirkenes/Norway and Murmansk/Russia, May 22-26, 2008. Pdf available at the Northern Research Forum: http://www.nrf.is/Open%20Meetings/Anchorage/Position%20Papers/Empire%20Club_%D6streng.pdf. Last Access September 8, 2012.
- Peters, G. P., Nilssen, T. B., Lindholt, L., et.al: Future emissions from shipping and petroleum activities in the Arctic, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, Oslo 2011, pp. 5305-5320.
- Prior, Lindsay: Using Documents in Social Research. Sage Publications Ltd., London 2009.
- Rasmussen, Rasmus Ole: Megatrends in the Arctic. New Inspiration into current policy strategies, report from the Nordic Council of Ministers' seminar at Nordregio 29th May 2012, Nordregio Working Paper 2012:8, Nordregio 2012.
- Sale, Richard and Potapov, Eugene: The Scramble for the Arctic. Ownership, Exploitation and Conflict in the Far North, London 2010.
- Schram Stokke, Olav, and Honneland, Geir (Eds.): International Cooperation and Arctic Governance: Regime Effectiveness and Northern Region Building, Routledge 2010.

- Schubert, Samuel: Revisiting the Oil Curse: Are Oil Rich Nations Really doomed to Autocracy and Inequality?, in: Bakhtizin, R. (Ed.): Oil and Gas Business Journal 2/ 2006, pp. 1-16.
- Scott, John: A Matter of Record. Documentary Sources in Social Research, Cambridge 1990.
- Slaughter, Ann-Marie: Security, Solidarity, and Sovereignty. The Grand Themes of UN Reform, in: The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 99, No. 3/2005, pp. 619-631.
- Tils, Ralf: Politische Strategieanalyse. Konzeptionelle Grundlagen und Anwendung in der Umwelt- und Nachhaltigkeitspolitik, Wiesbaden 2005.
- Ullman, Richard: Redefining Security, in: International Security 8, No. 1, MIT Press 1983, pp. 129-153.
- Walt, Stephen: The Renaissance of Security Studies, in: International Studies Quarterly 35, no. 2, 1991, pp. 211-239.
- Wæver, Ole: Securitization and Desecuritization, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Copenhagen 1993.
- Wesley, Jared: Qualitative Document Analysis in Political Science, Working Paper, University of Manitoba 2010.
- Williams, Alex et.al: The Future of Arctic Enterprise. Long-term Outlook and Implications, Smith School of Enterprise and Environment, Oxford 2011.
- Wolff, Stephan: Dokumenten- und Aktenanalyse, in: Flick, Uwe et.al (eds.): Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch, Hamburg 2000, p. 502-513.
- Yeager, Brooks B.: The Ilulissat Declaration: Background and Implications for Arctic Governance, Paper for the Aspen Dialogue and Commission on Arctic Climate Change, Aspen 2008.
- Young, Oran: The Age of the Arctic, in: Foreign Policy No. 61, 1985/86, pp.160-179.
- Young, Oran: Arctic Politics. Conflict and Cooperation in the Circumpolar North, Arctic Visions Series, Dartmouth 1992.
- Zellen, Barry S.: Arctic Doom, Arctic Boom. The Geopolitics of Climate Change in the Arctic, Santa Barbara 2009.

Online Sources

Arctic Council: <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/>. Last Access October 31, 2012.

Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat's Brochure "Shaping Change, Adapting to Change: Indigenous Peoples and the Arctic Council", published by the Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat, 2002, available at: <http://www.arcticpeoples.org/Newsletter/Documents/brochure.pdf>. Last Access October 31, 2012.

Bailes, Alyson: Does a Small State Need a Strategy?, Occasional Paper of the Institute for International Affairs/Centre for the Study of Small States at the University of Iceland, Reykjavík 2009, available at: http://stofnanir.hi.is/ams/sites/files/ams/Bailes_Final_0.pdf. Last Access December 15, 2012.

Barents Euro-Arctic Council: www.beac.st. Last Access October 10, 2012.

Bergh, Kristofer and Oldberg, Ingmar: The New Arctic: Building Cooperation in the Face of Emerging Challenges, SIPRI Conference Report, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Stockholm 2011.

Environmental Performance Index (EPI), Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, Yale University 2012, available at <http://epi.yale.edu/epi2012/rankings>. Last Access October 31st, 2012.

European Commission, Factsheet on Regional Policy : European Regional Policy. The Basic Essentials, January 2007, Pdf available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/basic/basic_2007_en.pdf. Last Access October 31, 2012.

European Space Agency (ESA): Satellites witness lowest Arctic ice coverage in history, available at: http://www.esa.int/esaCP/SEMYTC13J6F_index_0.html. Last Access September 10, 2012.

European Union's External Action website, EU Arctic Policy: http://eeas.europa.eu/arctic_region/index_en.htm. Last Access October 10, 2012.

Fouche, Gwladys and Dagenborg, Joachim: Big Statoil Arctic find boosts Norway's oil future, Reuters, January 9, 2012. Available at: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/09/us-statoil-oildiscovery-idUSTRE8080AK20120109>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

Greenpeace's Initiative "Save the Arctic": <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/climate-change/arctic-impacts/>. Last Access September 22, 2012.

Ilulissat Declaration, adopted at the Arctic Ocean Conference in Ilulissat, Greenland, held 27-29 May 2008, 28 May 2008. The declaration is available as Pdf at: http://www.oceanlaw.org/downloads/arctic/Ilulissat_Declaration.pdf. Last Access October 10, 2012.

Lovett, Richard: Russia plants Underwater Flag, Claims Arctic Seafloor, in: National Geographic News, August 3, 2007. Available at: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/08/070802-russia-pole.html>. Last Access October 5, 2012.

National Snow & Ice Data Center (NSIDC), University of Colorado, available at http://nsidc.org/arcticmet/basics/arctic_definition.html. Last Access September 12, 2012.

Nilsen, Thomas: Doubling of Norwegians visiting Russia in north, in: The Barents Observer, 1st November 2012, available at: <http://barentsobserver.com/en/borders/doubling-norwegians-visiting-russia-north-01-11>. Last Access November 2nd, 2012.

Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs' website, available at: http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/press/news/2011/maritie_delimitation.html?id=646614. Last Access October 5, 2012.

Norwegian Petroleum Directorate, Facts 2012, available at: <http://www.npd.no/en/Publications/Facts/Facts-2012/Chapter-3/>. Last Access October 30th, 2012.

Pettersen, Trude: Exercise 'Northern Eagle' has started, in: Barents Observer, 20 August 2012, available at: <http://barentsobserver.com/en/security/exercise-northern-eagle-has-started-20-08>. Last Access October 30th, 2012.

Scientific Committee for Antarctic Research (SCAR): The Antarctic Treaty system. An Introduction. Available at: <http://www.scar.org/treaty>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

Shtokman Review, available at: <http://www.shtokman.ru/en/press/>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

Shtokman Development AG, available at: <http://www.shtokman.ru/en/about/>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

Statoil Stock Market Announcement "Major new Oil Discovery in the Barents Sea" from 9 January 2012, available at: http://www.statoil.com/en/NewsAndMedia/News/2012/Pages/08Jan_Havis.aspx. Last Access September 20, 2012.

Stauffer, Peter H. (ed.): US Geological Survey, Circum-Arctic Resource Appraisal: Estimates of Undiscovered Oil and Gas North of the Arctic Circle, US Department of the Interior, USGS fact sheet 2008, available at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2008/3049/>. Last Access September 20, 2012.

Struck, Doug: Russia's Deep Sea Flag Planting at North Pole Strikes a Chill in Canada, in: Washington Post, August 7, 2007. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/06/AR2007080601369.html>. Last Access October 5, 2012.

The Economist Intelligence Unit: The Democracy Index 2011. Democracy under stress, Pdf available at: https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=DemocracyIndex2011. Last Access October 5, 2012.

World Wildlife Fund: <http://worldwildlife.org/places/arctic>. Last Access September 22, 2012.

Institutional Documents

Antarctic Treaty, signed in 1959, treaty as pdf-file at: http://www.ats.aq/documents/ats/treaty_original.pdf. Last Access September 12, 2012.

IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Climate Change 2007 - The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I. Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Cambridge University Press 2007.

New Building Blocks in the North. The Next Step in the Government's High North Strategy, 2011, Pdf available at: [05_02_Norway_new_building_blocks_in_the_north.pdf](#). Last Access September 30, 2012.

Nuuk Declaration, On the Occasion of the Seventh Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council, 12 May 2011, Nuuk/ Greenland, Pdf available at: [07_nuuk_declaration_2011_signed\(1\).pdf](#).

Regeringskansliet, Government Offices of Sweden, Government Bill 2008/09:140, A functional defence – Defence Policy Bill. Available at: <http://regeringen.se/sb/d/3103/nocache/true/a/116839/dictionary/true>. Last Access October 31st, 2012.

The High North – Visions and Strategies, White Paper of the Norwegian Government 2011, published by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Pdf available at: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/UD/Vedlegg/Nordomr%C3%A5dene/UD_nordomrodene_EN_web.pdf.
Norwegian version: Meld. St. 7 (2011-2012), Melding til Stortinget: Nordområdene. Visjon og virkemidler, Det Kongelige Utenriksdepartement 2011, pdf at: <http://www.regjeringen.no/pages/35878716/PDFS/STM201120120007000DDDPDFS.pdf>. Last Access September 30, 2012.

The Norwegian Governments' High North Strategy 2006, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2006, Pdf available at: <http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/ud/pla/2006/0006/ddd/pdfv/302927-nstrategi06.pdf>. Last Access September 24, 2012.

Sveriges strategi för den arktiska regionen (Sweden's Strategy for the Arctic Region), Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Arctic Secretariat, Stockholm 2011, Pdf available at: <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/16/79/93/9ff39990.pdf>. Last Access September 25, 2012.

United Nation Convention on the Law of the Sea, UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, 1982. Full text available at: http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf. Last Access October 5, 2012.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Human Development Report 2011. Sustainability and Equity: A better Future for all, New York 2011. Pdf available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2011_EN_Complete.pdf. Last Access October 5, 2012.

United Nations Document: A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, UN Doc. A/59/565, at 8 (2004). Available at: <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf>. Last Access September 30, 2012.

Young, Oran, Einarsson, Niels et.al (Eds.): Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR), Stefansson Arctic Institute, Akureyri 2002.

Illustrations

Illustration 1: The Arctic, National Snow and Ice Date Center, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado USA: National Snow and Ice Data Center. DOI, available at: <http://nsidc.org/>. Last Access October 31st, 2012.

Abstract German

Der gegenwärtige Arktis-Diskurs wird weitgehend von dystopischen Vorstellungen beherrscht, die die Nordpolarregion als Austragungsort internationale Machtkämpfe darstellt. Dies liegt zum einen an einem staatenzentrierten Sicherheitskonzept, das stark auf den militärischen Aspekt von Sicherheit ausgerichtet ist. Zum anderen scheint ein erneuter Entdeckerehrgeiz und Eroberungsgeist angesichts eines mehr und mehr zugänglichen Arktischen Ozeans für besorgniserregende Zukunftsszenarien zu sorgen.

Die Darstellung der Arktis als Schauplatz für Ressourcenkämpfe, territoriale Konflikte und Umweltkatastrophen dient daher als Anstoß für die folgende Analyse. Um den zukünftigen internationalen Stellenwert der Arktis besser einschätzen zu können, untersucht die folgende Arbeit die Sicherheitswahrnehmung zweier ausgewählter arktischen Staaten. Durch den Mangel an globalen und regionalen Governance-Strukturen kommt den Nationalstaaten derzeit weiter eine Schlüsselrolle im Kontext der Arktis zu.

Die vorliegende Arbeit untersucht Sicherheitsfragen, die aus der jeweiligen Arktisstrategie Norwegens und Schwedens hervorgehen. Als theoretischer Rahmen dient das in der Kopenhagener Schule begründete Konzept der 'Securitization', der Versicherheitlichung, das durch den auf ihr aufbauenden Ansatz der 'Riskification' erweitert wird.

Die Kopenhagener Schule arbeitet mit einem erweiterten Sicherheitsbegriff; untersucht werden daher Sicherheitswahrnehmungen in den Bereichen militärischer, politischer, wirtschaftlicher, umwelt-, sozialer sowie maritimer Sicherheit. Norwegens und Schwedens Arktisstrategien enthalten weder Untergangsrhetorik noch kämpferisch geäußerte Machtansprüche. Beide Strategien enthalten keine Darstellung existenzieller Bedrohungen, weisen jedoch auf besorgniserregende Sicherheitsrisiken in vereinzelten Sicherheitsbereichen wie Umweltsicherheit, sozialer und maritimer Sicherheit, hin.

Curriculum Vitae

Corinna Röver

Reykjavík, 31 October 2012

Personal Details

Full Name: Corinna Röver
Nationality: German
Address: Nordermoor 35
26931 Elsfleth
Germany
E-mail: corinna_roever@web.de
Mobile Phone: 0049 18 39 159
Date/ Place of Birth: 17 July 1987/ Oldenburg (Oldb)

Education

Oct 2010 – Dec 2012: Erasmus Mundus European Master's Course: 'Global Studies – A European Perspective' at the University of Leipzig, University of California at Santa Barbara, and the University of Vienna

Oct 2006 – Mar 2010: Bachelor of Arts in Modern History/ Scandinavian Studies at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany
Bachelor Thesis: Exile Experiences in Sweden after 1933. A Case Study about Kurt Tucholsky

Aug 2008 – Jul 2009: Erasmus-Exchange Program at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Aug 2000 – Jun 2006: Gymnasium Brake
Abitur (General Qualification for University Entrance)

Work Experience/ Internships

Oct – Dec 2012: Internship at the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Reykjavík, Iceland.
Areas of Responsibility: Assistance in consular work (passport applications, etc.), drafting of speeches and position papers, writing of reports for the Federal Foreign Office's headquarter and writing of internal notes, participation in Ambassadors' meetings at the EU-Delegation in Iceland as well as in meetings with Icelandic Ministries.

June 2010: Internship at the Federal Institute for Culture and History of the Germans in Eastern Europe.
Areas of Responsibility: Research in the Study Project 'Flight and Expulsion of Germans from the Eastern Territories', editing and processing of reports from contemporary witnesses for an online-database, preparation of the annual publication.

April and May 2010: Internship at the German Emigration Centre Bremerhaven.

Areas of Responsibility: Research assistance for future publications, guided tours, research, preparation and realization of a thematic tour about labour migration from a historical and contemporary perspective

Skills and Qualifications

Languages

German: Native Speaker

English: Expert - IELTS Certificate, Master's Studies in English

French: Fluent - DELF-Diplomas (Diplôme d'Etudes en Langue Française), level C1

Swedish: Fluent - TISUS Certificate (Test i Svenska för Universitets- och Högskolestudier), level C 1

Spanish: Basic Knowledge, level A2

Danish: Basic Knowledge, level A 2

Icelandic: Basic Knowledge, level A 1

Computer Skills

Microsoft Office: Familiar with Microsoft Office 2007 and 2010, Open Office
Familiar with Typo 3

Grants and Scholarships

Aug 2008 - Jul 2009: Erasmus-Scholarship for Studies abroad in Gothenburg, Sweden

Sept 2011 – Mar 2012: Fulbright-Travel Grant for Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara

Publications

“Ich bin für Tendenz - feste, gib ihm.“ Kurt Tucholskys Arbeit für den *Pieron* 1920, in: Yearbook of the Federal Institute for Culture and History of the Germans in Eastern Europe 19, Oldenburg 2011. (Research Paper about the writer Kurt Tucholsky's work for a Silesian anti-Polish propaganda magazine 1920)

Social Engagement and other Activities

June 2009: Volunteer Work at the UEFA European Under-21 Football Championship in Gothenburg, Sweden

Dec 2006 – Feb 2007: Research project of the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg in association with various archives in Freiburg.
Research subject: The Supply Situation for the civil population in the southern Baden area after 1945