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Focus

- Definitions, factors of change and the New Arctic.
- Capacity to manage border issues.
- Military strategic considerations.
- The Nordics and Russia – challenges, defense postures and defense spending.
A New Arctic.

Das Eismeer, Caspar David Friedrich, 1823/24.
A new and geopolitically more important Arctic is emerging.
The new Arctic can not be seen in isolation from the rest of the world.
The factors of change develop according to their own pace and inner logic.
Developments will be hard to predict.

Most of Sweden is in the Arctic.
Some of the factors of change in a new Arctic:

- Increased military strategic importance
- New SLOCs
- Energy extraction
- Indigenous populations
- Overlapping territorial claims
- Climate Change
- Multilateral organisations
- NGO’s
- Greenpeace
Issues of overlap: territorial claims and ”new” SLOCs

- Overlapping claims handled according to UNCLOS.
- Extensive oceanographic data collection and mapping is ongoing.
- Most territorial issues will be resolved according to existing international legal regimes and rules.
- High demand for specialist resources to manage notifications at CLCS (International law, oceanography). Will these be sufficient? Is there a risk of a weakening of the regime over time?

Swedish icebreaker Oden on operations in the Arctic.
Military strategic issues

- Who will "own" and control the new Arctic?
- National aspirations can lead to friction.
- More of sovereignty assertion.
- The Arctic as a nuclear strategic arena.
- Developments of missile defence will affect the Arctic.
- Increased military presence seems likely, but does not necessarily lead to increased risk of conflict.
Military strategic issues 2

- Sovereignty support.
  - Ice-capable patrol ships and/or Icebreakers
  - Area surveillance, air and sea
  - Signalling of intent and interest
- Nuclear strategic considerations of the “top-table actors”,
  - SSBNs and ICBMs
  - Impact of Arctic ice-melt on strategic systems?
  - “Cordon” for these resources – a driver for military presence in the Arctic.
- Missile defence
  - More sea-based than land-based?
  - Where do we discuss matters of “hard” security in the Arctic?
The Nordics and the new Arctic: Challenges

- A changing northern neighbourhood – three examples
- Changing defence postures, defence spending
- Russian defence posture and defence spending
Denmark and Greenland – a slow-motion divorce?

- Greenland is heading for full independence over the longer term.
- Constitutional arrangements for extended self-rule are now in place.
- Expressed political will of the Greenlanders for independence.
- Economic development is central.
- How much oil, gas and minerals is there in Greenland?
- Speed and character of the process?
- What character will an independent Greenland have?

 Territory: 2,17 million km² (Sweden 0,45 million km²)
 Population: 57 000.
Iceland’s three crises

- Severe economic crisis.
- National security – is today’s solution out of step with developments in the region?
- ’’Stress of modernisation’’.
- Iceland’s has applied for EU-membership.
- Iceland’s crises are long-term.
The Barents sea region is a "nexus" for the new Arctic.
Towards full independence

Long-term crises

Nexus of factors
Nordic Defence Postures

• **Norway** Disappearance of Soviet threat meant a re-focus to international crisis management followed by a re-focusing of efforts to the north. 24/7 presence in the north now first priority above Int’l PSO and crisis management.

• **Denmark** “De-territorialisation of defence”. Focus on high-end PSO’s. AVF-reform. Changed naval stance with new frigates. Expeditionary tasks in focus. Modernised resources for Greenland patrols.

• **Finland** Cold-War defence structure mostly intact. Conscription is retained and some modernisation is taking place. Investments to the most modern units, older territorial units wither away. Still sizable reserves are shrinking. Could increasing costs cripple modernisation?

• **Iceland** Keflavik naval air-station closed 2006. No permanent mil. assets based on Iceland. Intermittent air-policing by Nato MS. Increase in frequency of excercises.

• **Sweden** Territorial defence stance dismantled. SWE AF focus on int’l crisis management and NWC-concept development. Framework nation for one EU-Battlegroup. Conscription replaced by AVF 2010. Return of focus to ”the near abroad” since Russo-Georgian war in 2008.
General recovery from “free-fall” decline in the 1990s – but far from the USSRs capabilities.

New SSBN-class (Borei) and SLBM-missile development (Bulava). Kola base complex increasing in importance.

Nuclear weapons capabilities are retained, but at lower levels.

One “Arctic” motor-rifle brigade for the Kola peninsula. More to follow?

Purchase of Mistral-class LPD/LPH from France, UAVs from Israel, APCs from Italy.

Exercise patterns: More frequent and large-scale. Focus on conventional forces.

Integrated air-defence systems are being upgraded.

Declared plans for armaments probably exaggerated.

Personnel reform.

Development hampered by corruptions, inefficiencies and high defence inflation.
Norway – stable, but probable raise in coming years.

**Norway: Military Expenditures,**
Millions of US Dollars, 2005 Prices [blue columns] -/- Share of GDP (%) [black line]

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
Denmark – stable ME, gradual decline as GDP grows.

**Denmark: Military Expenditures**

Millions of US Dollars, 2005 Prices [blue columns] /– Share of GDP (%) [black line]

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
Finland – fluctuation in 1990s, ME on par with growth since early 2000s.

**Finland: Military Expenditures.**
Millions of US Dollars, 2005 Prices [blue columns] /-/- Share of GDP (%) [black line]

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
Sweden – steady decline since early 2000s.

Sweden: Military Expenditures, Millions of US Dollars, 2005 Prices [blue columns] /- Share of GDP (%) [black line]

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
Russia – GDP growth fed into ME since 1999

**Russian Federation: Military Expenditures, Millions of US Dollars, 2005 Prices [blue columns] /- Share of GDP (%) [black line]**

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
GDP and Military Expenditures

GDP for Selected Countries, Billions of US Dollars, Current Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database

Military Expenditures for Selected Countries, Billions of US Dollars, Current Prices
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Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
Military Expenditures – Trends

- NO, DK, SWE, FIN, CAN now lower ME:GDP share than before thanks to economic growth.
- Russian ME:GDP stable since ca. 2000 and > than other countries.

Source: Data adapted from FOI Database
Summary

- Long-term risk of weakening of UNCLOS regime due to lack of resources to manage notifications.
- The military strategic development indicates more activity in the Arctic. The military activities and units in the Arctic have to be categorised separately to be properly understood. Where should these issues be discussed?
- Defence spending is fairly similar among the Nordics, including Canada, while Russia follows a different long-term pattern.
Thank You!
The Nordics should not be seen as a monolith.
The Nordics can and do cooperate in a myriad of ways, including on security.
They will emphasise the role and importance of the New Arctic differently in developing national policies.
Historical experience matters and will play a role in policy development.
World Values Survey 2010

• Values colour perceptions: Implications for the New Arctic?
• The Arctic eight are different.
• External actors in the Arctic – how do they fit in?

Inglehart and Welzel, "Changing Mass Priorities: The Link Between Modernization and Democracy." Perspectives on Politics June 2010 (vol. 8, No. 2).
The Nordic region is both too small and too large

• The Nordics have a lot in common; history, likeness of language, ”ethos”, comparable in size and not least the region.

• Nordic long-term security patterns allows for extensive cooperation in many fields including security. External shocks and strategic change (f.ex. WW1 & 2, Cold War) drew the Nordics apart.

• Strategic calculations differ. Cold-War ”Nordic Balance”-model no longer valid. What next?
The Nordics and the New Arctic

• Geopolitics and history will matter
  • Norway, Denmark and Iceland are Arctic ”beach-front” property owners.
  • Sweden and Finland are both Arctic nations.
  • Historical experience will be a factor in national policy development.
• The New Arctic will give impulses for Nordic cooperation:
  → Environmental protection
  → Indigenous populations
  → Multilateral regimes – protect and develop.
  → Support for International legal regimes
  → Scientific research
• The New Arctic will draw the Nordics apart:
  → Energy extraction
  → Differing solutions to security problems
  → Different economic interests
  → Solutions to special issues in more or less temporary ”clubs”.
  → Differing international memberships complicates exchange and discussions.