



Rethinking the Top of the World: Arctic Security Public Opinion Survey

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to:

The Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation

And

The Canada Centre for Global Security Studies at the Munk School of
Global Affairs

EKOS RESEARCH ASSOCIATES INC.

January 2011

EKOS RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Ottawa Office

359 Kent Street, Suite 300

Ottawa, Ontario

K2P 0R6

Tel: (613) 235 7215

Fax: (613) 235 8498

E-mail: pobox@ekos.com

Toronto Office

181 Harbord Street

Toronto, Ontario

M5S 1H5

Tel: (416) 598 8002

Fax: (416) 533-4713

E-mail: toronto@ekos.com

www.ekos.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	iii
Sommaire	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Methodology	xvi
Survey Highlights	xix
1. Quality of Life and Health	3
1.1 Quality of Life	3
1.2 Expected Quality of Life Over Time	5
1.3 Rated Health	6
2. Issues Facing the Arctic	8
2.1 Primary Issues in Canada	8
2.2 Primary Issues In Arctic	10
3. Arctic Security	13
3.1 Definition of Security (Unprompted)	13
3.2 Definition of Security (Prompted)	15
3.3 Importance of the Military in the Arctic	17
3.4 The Arctic as an Element in Canada’s Foreign Policy	19
4. Priorities in the Arctic	21
4.1 Opinions	21
4.2 Importance of Different Elements of Infrastructure in the Arctic	24
4.3 Adequacy of Different Elements of Arctic Capabilities	27
4.4 Ranking Priorities – Trade Off	29
4.5 Support for Expanding the Canadian Rangers	33
5. International Cooperation in the Arctic	35
5.1 Preferred Partner in Dealing with Arctic Issues	35
5.2 Least Preferred Partner in Dealing with Arctic Issues	37
5.3 Nuclear Weapons in the Arctic	38
5.4 Approach to Beaufort Sea Dispute with US	39
5.5 Preferred Approach to Resolving Disputes over Arctic	41
5.6 Northwest Passage – Whose?	43
6. International Views on the Arctic Council	47
6.1 Awareness of Arctic Council	47

6.2	Support for Arctic Council	49
6.3	Support for an Expanded Arctic Council Mandate	50
6.4	Support for Inclusion of Non-Arctic States	52
7.	Conclusions	54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Increasingly, issues of Arctic security are the focus of public attention and debate. Whether it is media attention to Russian bombers, the recent announcement of moving forward on the Mackenzie Pipeline, or scholarly work suggesting nothing less than a radical geopolitical reconfiguration based on the growing clout of the northern rim countries, the Arctic is receiving unprecedented attention from policy makers, media academics, and political leaders. Amidst this new prominence, there is a growing need to understand the preferences and priorities of citizens themselves.

The current study provides a timely empirical perspective on one of the salient emerging issues of the 21st century. How is the issue of Arctic security understood by various publics? What are the most important ingredients of public understanding and what guidance would the public offer decision makers as to the preferences and principles and they would emphasise in moving forward with both public policy and private sector decision making?

The research covers an ambitious range of issues which are examined from the comparative perspective of several overlapping societies and publics. Approximately 9,000 randomly sampled interviews were conducted in nine separate populations. The study begins with an in depth examination of the issues from the perspective of a large representative sample of north of 60 residents. It then looks at some of these same issues from the perspective of the rest of Canada (the South). The study has the unusual advantage of also offering comparative public opinion data from the eight member nations of the Arctic Council. The picture which emerges is both complex and important. It provides clear guidance about the importance of these issues to various publics, and the areas of consensus and contradiction in the various publics examined. The current analysis provides only a preliminary sense of the implications of this rich data base.

The research vividly underlines the enormous salience of this issue in Canada. It also reveals a more multidimensional and human-oriented understanding of Arctic Security while, at the same time, showing why top of mind imagery tends to be dominated by a more “classic” or traditional conception of security rooted in notions of sovereignty, defence, and geo-political tensions. Perhaps the most important finding of the research is just how important the Arctic is to Canadians’ conceptions of themselves and their future, and how that prominence is ultimately focussed on the human-environmental dimension.

In this overview, we will highlight some of the key themes which emerge from the research. We begin with the overall substantive highlights which focus on the public salience, the impressive level of consensus within Canada on these issues, and the surface and deeper understanding of Arctic security. We also consider attitudes to international cooperation and foreign policy.

Substantive Highlights

a) Arctic Salience

Given that for most Canadians images of the Arctic are almost entirely vicarious, it is remarkable that the Arctic is seen as such a corner stone of national identity and sovereignty. Although the view is somewhat more strongly held in Southern Canada, this salience expresses itself in a surprisingly clear lean to see the Arctic as nothing less than our number one foreign policy priority and one which should be resourced accordingly (most favour shifting military resources here from all other places). The Arctic is seen as a crucial ingredient to our sense of national identity and an under-resourced area of critical importance to our future.

The depth of public commitment to Arctic sovereignty, and its strong connection to national identity and sovereignty, renders this a politically charged issue, rife with opportunity and risk. In addition to complex issues of territorial jurisdiction and international law, the Arctic contains a cornucopia of natural resources precariously positioned in a region of fragile environmental and sociocultural risks. The survey provides direct guidance on these complex issues but one needs to scratch beneath the surface of classic security and sovereignty to gain a true picture of public priorities. The combination of complementary methodologies (top of mind versus attitudinal preferences versus hard trade-off analyses) allows us to disentangle this superficial simplicity into a more useful picture of true public preference and the contrasts across key comparative publics.

b) A Common Canadian Mind on the Arctic

The tremendous symbolic and public policy significance of the Arctic is perhaps the most striking feature of Canadian public outlook on the Arctic. What is also notable is the high degree of consensus that exists within Canada. There is far more consensus than division within Canada on the key study issues. Canadians, regardless of where they live, tend to see the Arctic as highly important and feel that it should be our dominant foreign policy priority. Environmental issues consistently rank as the pinnacle concern and there is also broad agreement that the Arctic requires considerably more public resources in the future.

There are, nevertheless, some significant differences in emphasis depending whether one lives in the North or South and depending on which region of the North or South. The more impressive feature, however, is the relative consensus across a broad range of Arctic issues. This common ground is particularly notable given the vast distances separating North and South and the fact that the large majority of Canadians have never even visited the Arctic. In fact, on virtually all comparative issues, residents living around 100 miles apart on the Canada-US border look dramatically different on all issues compared, whereas Canadians arrayed along the US border share common ground on virtually all key issues with the

fellow citizens of the North, despite the geographic and social distances involved. It is rare to find such common ground on issues of such prominence to Canadians.

This relative consensus may be a refreshing and healthy feature of Canadian public opinion, but it also has more ominous implications when contrasted with international public opinion of citizens of other Northern Rim countries. Canadians may all be on the same page, but there are some huge clashes between Canadian views on the Arctic and those of our northern neighbours.

c) Deconstructing Arctic Security: The Surface and Structural Views

For North Americans, security has taken on enormous significance. The first decade following September 11th was truly the security decade and an aging population and astute political marketplace elevated the “normal” equilibrium of security well beyond its typical balance points with other priorities such as civil liberties and the economy. Thus entrenched security ethic is still largely in place and it definitely permeates public imagery of the Arctic. Recent renewed interest in continental perimeter will heighten attention to the huge Northern stretch of the North American perimeter. Even conservative estimates of climate change point to a much more active and challenging Arctic perimeter.

Without reflection, the top-of-mind imagery of Arctic Security is dominated by “classical” security. Terms like “threats”, border disputes, integrity, and sovereignty are most common cited by respondents. Linked to a more fearful or risk-dominated perception, Canadians unsurprisingly summon up images of military presence and potential conflict. This sort of imagery is somewhat more common in the South than the North and it coexists with images of the environment (both looming threats but also traditional iconic images of Northern beauty as conveyed through the lens of the Group of Seven, for example).

The study challenged Canadians to elaborate these top-of-mind images with a more “reflected” consideration. This was done through more detailed rating exercises, including hard trade-off analyses, which force respondents to make explicit decisions. The reflected view of security, and the policy hierarchy it entails, is quite different than the top-of-mind imagery. Sovereignty and threat are still public priorities, but it is the environment which overwhelmingly dominates reflected concerns of almost equal significance (and more so among Northerners), particularly human capital infrastructure. This dominance of the environment and climate change is a common feature of international outlook on the Arctic.

The View From the Top: Perceptions of Far Northerners

The study has produced a large random sample of far Northern citizens which is intended to be the foundation of an ongoing “Northern Panel”, which will be a future resource for researchers and policy makers. The survey materials were also administered in Inuktitut and qualitative focus groups were also conducted to bolster our understanding.

The findings are clear and, in some cases, surprising. As noted already, there is a surprising similarity of outlook on Arctic security issues among the far North and the other 99 per cent of the population to the South. There are, however, some significant differences as well, both across North and South and within the North itself. In general, Northerners put a still stronger accent on the salience of the environment and “classical” security, sovereignty, and military presence tend to be relatively less important to the Northern sample.

Perhaps the most striking of Northern public opinion is the relative emphasis on infrastructure, particularly human-economic-environmental infrastructure. Given their relative competence and experience as residents, only Northern respondents were asked to rate the quality of Arctic infrastructure. The picture which emerges here is nothing short of alarming. Infrastructure was rated as absolutely crucial to the future of the North. The adequacy of infrastructure, be it housing, schools, roads, or environmental response, however, was judged woefully inadequate by those living there. In particular, Arctic residents are virtually unanimous in their view that environmental and disaster response capacities are profoundly inadequate. An interesting policy response here might be the extremely strong consensus that a much invigorated Northern Ranger service could help redress some of these glaringly exposed flanks.

Many researchers are interested in not only objective wellbeing and standard of living, but also subjective wellbeing and quality of life. The research examined both rated health and quality of life (which were highly interdependent). There is near universal agreement in Canada that quality of life (and health) should be equal regardless of where one lives. Yet the consensus about the desired parity of Northern and Southern quality of life and health may well be based on a belief that there are indeed disparities. These undoubtedly do exist at the level of basic infrastructure and dissatisfaction with the human and environmental infrastructure is one of the key findings of the Northern survey. It is therefore surprising to find that, in terms of how they rate their lives and their health, residents of the North are modestly more likely to see themselves as healthy. Even more impressively, denizens of the North are significantly more likely to rate their quality of life as excellent than those to the South, and to be very optimistic about future wellbeing. This resilience and happiness premium was one of the more iconoclastic study findings.

There are, of course, differences in these ratings according to one's socioeconomic status (ses). As in the South, there is a strong, straight-line relationship between ses and wellbeing (and health). One important regional finding was that citizens of Nunavut were less likely to feel the overall sense of health and happiness that permeated Northern residence. There was evidence of other problems in

Nunavut (on infrastructure and housing ratings) and Nunavut citizens showed a lower sense of identification with Canada than citizens of the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

A few final points on the North-specific features of the survey. Sociocultural identity and preservation of traditional ways of life (language and culture) was a special priority for the North. The overall more tepid support for military presence and sovereignty-related issues was also evident in near universal support for the Arctic as a nuclear-free zone. As already mentioned, there was extremely strong support for a “professional” and more muscular Northern Ranger cadre to (partially) deal with what are seen as shocking holes in infrastructure – particularly for environmental and disaster response.

The View from Below: Southern Perspectives

As noted, Southern public opinion is largely consistent with Northern public opinion. The main area of difference with the North is that sovereignty and security issues are relatively more prominent for the South and that infrastructure (and environment to a lesser degree) is relatively more important to the North. There are some regional and demographic variations. Quebeckers are less supportive of stronger military presence and are more pro-environment. Fluency and engagement levels with the Arctic are less pronounced in the maritime provinces (most likely for reasons of geography and lower vested interests). Albertans tend to be more concerned with issues around sovereignty, security, and military presence. Anecdotally, it is interesting to note that Alberta is the epicentre of happiness in Canada (most likely linked to higher economic well being).

The trade-off analysis shows that when making hard choices infrastructure and human capital investment are the clear winning choices. Despite agreement that military resources should be shifted to the Arctic, in the trade-off analysis, increased military presence was a very low priority for the South and the lowest priority for the North. A similarly low trade-off ranking for mining and exploration suggests that current Canadian outlook is more in line with “don’t drill baby don’t”.

As noted, the international outlook of Canadians, despite subscription to the bromide of cooperation, is decidedly intransigent. Americans tell us they are extremely comfortable dealing with Canada and strongly favour cooperative solutions. Canadians are much more guarded towards Americans and are much less receptive to compromise and negotiation on Arctic issues.

The View Outside our Borders: International Public Perspectives on the Arctic

Typically, Canadians see themselves as champions of consensus and cooperation. Indeed, Canadians line up with other Arctic countries on the side of cooperation and strong support for the Arctic Council. Yet there are many tensions underlying this somewhat superficial international commitment to

cooperation. Given the clash of huge vested national interests, these differing national outlooks are not surprising. What is surprising is that it is Canadian public opinion which seems to have the hardest edge and which is least protean. Whether it is our unique view of the sovereign sanctity of the Northwest passage, our overall allergy to an Antarctic-like governance, treatment for the Arctic, or our world-lagging support for negotiation and compromise on these issues, the Canadian public are clearly the least flexible and accommodating when it comes to the Arctic. This blend of strong internal consensus and a stark offside position with other council country publics may pose significant challenges for the future.

We may well ask who is the American now? Despite extremely low levels of interest or fluency in the Arctic, the American public are enormously friendly and accommodating in their outlook on solving disputes with Canada. Canadians are, on the other hand, rather churlish in their views of US-Canada disputes and rate Americans on the same level as Russians in terms of comfort levels. We know from past research that this antipathy is fairly weakly rooted and narcissistic in nature.

The comparative international perspectives of public in other Arctic Council countries provide valuable and interesting comparative perspectives. It shows a broad, if somewhat superficial commitment to cooperation and to the Arctic Council. Notably, outside of Canada (and to a lesser degree, Scandinavia, and in particular, Iceland and Norway), these views are loosely connected to low levels of literacy on the basic issues. There may be an incipient northern rim geopolitical reorganization in progress, but it is largely unselfconscious to citizens of this new northern rim.

Perhaps the most noteworthy and troubling conclusion of this research is that Canada stands relatively alone on many issues. We are overwhelmingly convinced that the Northwest Passage is a sovereign, Canadian waterway; no one else shares this view. In terms of preferred negotiation and international governance, we are, by far, the least committed to cooperation, let alone on an Antarctic-like international model. We want the Arctic Council to remain a pretty closed club, whereas other Council member countries are more open on this front.

There is broad international public support for making the Arctic a nuclear-free zone. In this case, Americans (in particular) and Russians are less committed to this; undoubtedly, as these countries are the ones whose nuclear missiles would be removed. Americans are most opposed to missile removal (although still lean supportive). It is the Russians, however, who overall are the most militaristic. They are far more likely to support military security as part of an expanded Arctic security mandate (Finland and Iceland are least supportive). After Canada, Russia is the most hard-line on border and resource sharing disputes.

The survey also shows how Arctic rim countries view each other (and China as a potential new member). First of all, there is broad agreement that China is the least attractive partner to all current Council countries (save Russia, who put the United States at the bottom of the list). In general, the United States and Russia are tied as the second least attractive partners. In the reverse popularity sweepstakes, Scandinavia is the clear gold medal winner, followed by Canada in silver.

SOMMAIRE

Introduction

La question de la sécurité de l'Arctique retient de plus en plus l'attention du public et attise la discussion. Qu'il s'agisse de l'intérêt médiatique suscité par les bombardiers russes, du feu vert annoncé récemment quant au Projet de pipeline de la vallée du Mackenzie ou d'une étude sérieuse qui préconise rien de moins qu'une radicale reconfiguration géopolitique reposant sur le pouvoir grandissant des pays du cercle arctique, cette région du monde reçoit une attention sans précédent de la part des artisans de la politique, des universitaires qui s'expriment dans les médias ainsi que des leaders politiques. Devant cette nouvelle célébrité, le besoin se fait sentir de connaître les préférences et les priorités des citoyens eux-mêmes.

La présente étude procure une perspective empirique bienvenue sur l'un des grands enjeux émergents du 21^e siècle. Que pensent de la sécurité de l'Arctique les divers publics? Quels sont les éléments les plus importants de l'opinion publique et quels conseils la population a-t-elle à offrir aux décideurs quant à ses préférences et aux principes qu'elle soutiendrait au moment d'établir les politiques gouvernementales et, pour le secteur privé, de prendre certaines décisions?

La recherche recouvre une gamme étendue de sujets qui sont examinés dans une perspective comparative où s'entrecroisent plusieurs sociétés et publics. À l'issue d'un échantillonnage aléatoire, environ 9000 entrevues ont été menées auprès de neuf populations distinctes. L'étude commence par un examen approfondi des questions vues dans la perspective d'un vaste échantillon représentatif de personnes vivant au nord du 60^e parallèle. Quelques-unes de ces questions sont ensuite examinées dans la perspective des citoyens du reste du Canada (le Sud). L'étude jouit de l'illustre avantage de pouvoir compter sur des données comparatives de l'opinion publique des huit pays membres du Conseil de l'Arctique. Il s'en dégage un tableau aussi complexe qu'important. On y voit une nette indication de l'intérêt que ces questions revêtent pour les publics en cause et de celles qui font l'objet d'un consensus parmi ces publics ou qui soulèvent la contradiction. La présente analyse ne fait que donner une idée préliminaire des incidences qu'aura cette riche base de données.

La recherche souligne de façon frappante le caractère fondamental de la question au Canada. Elle révèle également une perception de la sécurité de l'Arctique plus multidimensionnelle et axée sur la personne, en même temps qu'elle montre pourquoi les images qui nous viennent spontanément à l'esprit tendent à être empreintes d'une conception plutôt « classique » ou traditionnelle d'une sécurité enracinée dans les notions de souveraineté, de défense et de tensions géopolitiques. L'observation la plus significative à laquelle la recherche a donné lieu réside peut-être dans l'importance de l'Arctique dans la conception que les Canadiens se font d'eux-mêmes et de leur avenir, et dans la manière dont cette prépondérance se reporte finalement sur la dimension humaine et environnementale.

Dans l'aperçu que voici, nous soulignons quelques-uns des grands thèmes qui émergent de la recherche. Nous verrons d'abord les principaux faits saillants qui se concentrent sur le caractère fondamental de la question aux yeux du public, puis l'impressionnant consensus qui se manifeste au Canada en la matière et le sens qu'on prête aussi bien en surface qu'en profondeur à la sécurité de l'Arctique. Nous relevons également certaines attitudes touchant la coopération internationale et la politique étrangère.

Les faits saillants fondamentaux

Prépondérance de l'Arctique

Étant donné que la plupart des Canadiens ont à propos de l'Arctique des images qui leur viennent surtout par procuration, il est remarquable que l'Arctique soit perçu aussi vivement comme pierre angulaire de notre identité et de notre souveraineté nationales. Bien que cette impression soit un peu plus répandue dans le sud du Canada, elle s'exprime avec force dans la tendance étonnante à concevoir l'Arctique comme la toute première priorité de la politique étrangère du Canada et, par conséquent, dans la nécessité de doter cette région de ressources adéquates (la plupart voudraient y rapatrier toutes les ressources militaires déployées ailleurs). L'Arctique est perçu comme un élément essentiel de notre identité nationale et un territoire d'une importance cruciale pour notre avenir, mais dont on s'occupe mal.

Le profond attachement du public envers la souveraineté de l'Arctique, fortement associée à l'identité et à la souveraineté canadiennes, donne à cette question une teneur hautement politique où se côtoient risques et possibilités. Mises à part les difficiles questions de compétence territoriale et de droit international, l'Arctique regorge de ressources naturelles précieusement situées dans une région fragilisée par les risques environnementaux et socioculturels. L'étude nous indique certes comment s'orienter dans le dédale de ces questions, mais il faut gratter sous la surface des idées traditionnelles de sécurité et de souveraineté pour découvrir les véritables priorités de la population. Le recours à des méthodes complémentaires (images spontanées, préférences dans les attitudes, analyse rigoureuse des compromis à faire) nous permet d'aller fouiller sous cette simplicité superficielle pour y découvrir un tableau utile des véritables préférences de la population et des divergences entre les publics de l'étude.

Point de vue canadien sur l'Arctique

L'énorme intérêt attribué à l'Arctique du point de vue du symbole et de la politique publique constitue sans doute la caractéristique la plus frappante de la perspective des Canadiens à cet égard. Il importe aussi de mentionner le haut degré de consensus qui existe au Canada. Ce consensus est beaucoup plus significatif que les quelques divisions sur les principales questions à l'étude. Les Canadiens,

quel que soit leur lieu de résidence, tendent à accorder beaucoup d'importance à l'Arctique et à penser qu'il faut en faire la toute première priorité de notre politique étrangère. Les enjeux environnementaux sont partout au premier rang des préoccupations et l'on s'accorde aussi à dire que l'Arctique aura besoin à l'avenir de ressources publiques beaucoup plus considérables.

Des divergences assez significatives se dénotent cependant dans la force de l'opinion selon qu'on vit dans le Nord ou dans le Sud et selon la région du Nord ou du Sud où l'on se trouve. La caractéristique la plus impressionnante réside toutefois dans le consensus relatif qui s'exprime à propos d'une vaste gamme de questions touchant l'Arctique. Cette entente est particulièrement digne d'intérêt compte tenu des énormes distances qui séparent le Nord et le Sud et vu que l'immense majorité des Canadiens ne sont jamais allés dans l'Arctique. En fait, sur presque toutes les questions faisant l'objet d'une comparaison, les citoyens qui vivent à une centaine de milles de distance le long de la frontière canado-américaine ont une opinion radicalement différente sur toutes les questions comparées, alors que les Canadiens répartis le long de la frontière avec les États-Unis sont du même avis que leurs concitoyens du Nord sur à peu près toutes les questions clés, indépendamment des distances d'ordre géographique et social. Il est rare de voir les Canadiens s'entendre aussi bien sur des questions qui leur tiennent autant à cœur.

Ce consensus relatif a sans doute quelque chose de sain et de rafraîchissant en matière d'opinion publique au Canada, mais il soulève aussi des inquiétudes quand on le compare à l'opinion publique internationale qu'entretiennent les citoyens des autres pays du cercle arctique. Si les Canadiens se rangent tous du même bord, il y a de fortes contradictions entre les points de vue canadiens sur l'Arctique et ceux de nos voisins des pays nordiques.

Déconstruction de la sécurité de l'Arctique : points de vue superficiels et structurels

Pour les Nord-américains, la sécurité a acquis une énorme signification. La première décennie suivant le 11-Septembre fut assurément celle de la sécurité, et une population vieillissante de même qu'un marché politique astucieux ont haussé l'équilibre « normal » de la sécurité bien au-delà des poids habituels en ajoutant dans la balance des priorités comme les libertés civiles et l'économie. Si bien que l'éthique de la sécurité semble s'être installée à demeure et qu'elle imprègne très certainement l'image de l'Arctique aux yeux du public. L'intérêt récemment renouvelé pour le périmètre continental va accroître l'attention portée à l'étendue nordique du périmètre nord-américain. Les estimations même prudentes quant aux changements climatiques laissent entrevoir un périmètre arctique beaucoup plus actif et redoutable.

Les images spontanées que fait naître la notion de sécurité de l'Arctique sont dominées par l'idée « traditionnelle » de sécurité. Les répondants emploient couramment des expressions comme « menaces », différends frontaliers, intégrité et souveraineté. Il n'y a rien d'étonnant à ce qu'en lien avec

des impressions de crainte et de risque, les Canadiens évoquent des images de présence militaire et de conflit potentiel. Les thèmes de ce genre apparaissent toutefois plus souvent dans le Sud que dans le Nord et ils coexistent avec des thèmes environnementaux (fait aussi bien de menaces qui planent à l'horizon que d'images de la splendeur du paysage nordique vu, par exemple, à travers la lunette du Groupe des sept).

Les Canadiens de l'étude étaient ensuite invités à plus de réflexion afin d'approfondir ces impressions spontanées. On leur a proposé des exercices d'évaluation détaillés, y compris des analyses difficiles obligeant les répondants à décider des compromis qu'ils seraient prêts à faire. Le point de vue ainsi obtenu sur la sécurité ainsi que l'ordre des priorités qui en ressort diffèrent beaucoup des images spontanées. La souveraineté et les menaces à son égard demeurent des priorités, mais l'environnement l'emporte haut la main comme en témoignent diverses préoccupations toutes jugées importantes (et davantage encore par les habitants du Nord), en particulier l'infrastructure du capital humain. La prédominance de l'environnement et des changements climatiques est une constante des perspectives internationales sur l'Arctique.

Vu d'en haut : perceptions des habitants du Grand Nord

L'étude a produit un vaste échantillon aléatoire d'habitants du Grand Nord qui deviendra vraisemblablement la base d'un « panel nordique » et sera mis à la disposition des chercheurs et des décideurs politiques. Les instruments du sondage ont aussi été administrés en inuktitut et des discussions de groupe qualitatives ont aussi été menées en vue d'approfondir notre compréhension.

Les observations sont claires et, dans certains cas, étonnantes. Ainsi qu'on l'a mentionné, la similarité des perspectives sur les questions de sécurité de l'Arctique est grande entre les habitants du Grand Nord et ceux du Sud qui représentent 99 p. 100 de la population totale. Il existe néanmoins quelques divergences significatives, aussi bien entre le Nord et le Sud qu'entre les citoyens du Nord eux-mêmes. De façon générale, les citoyens du Nord attribuent encore plus d'importance à la primauté de l'environnement, et les questions « traditionnelles » de sécurité, de souveraineté et de présence militaire tendent à perdre de leur importance au sein de l'échantillon du Nord.

Dans le Nord, l'opinion peut-être la plus frappante réside dans l'accent relatif mis sur l'infrastructure, notamment sur l'infrastructure humaine, économique et environnementale. Compte tenu de leur compétence et de leur expérience relatives en tant qu'habitants de ce territoire, seuls les répondants du Nord ont été invités à se prononcer sur la qualité de l'infrastructure dans l'Arctique. La situation qui nous est révélée est carrément alarmante. L'infrastructure est jugée absolument cruciale pour l'avenir du Nord. Qu'il s'agisse de logement, d'écoles, de routes ou de mesures environnementales, l'infrastructure fait cruellement défaut aux yeux des habitants du Nord. En particulier, les personnes qui vivent dans l'Arctique sont à peu près unanimes à qualifier de profondément inadéquats les moyens de réagir aux catastrophes naturelles et environnementales. Comme solution politique intéressante et qui suscite un consensus des plus solides, on

pense qu'un service de « Rangers » revigoré dans le Nord pourrait contribuer à combler ces besoins criants.

Beaucoup de chercheurs s'intéressent non seulement aux questions de bien-être et de niveau de vie objectifs mais aussi à celles d'un bien-être et d'un niveau de vie subjectifs. La recherche comportait une évaluation tant de la santé que de la qualité de vie (qui sont apparues fortement interdépendantes). On reconnaît de manière presque universelle au Canada que tous, où que l'on vive, devraient jouir de la même qualité de vie (et de santé). Pourtant, le consensus entre le Nord et le Sud sur la parité souhaitée en ce qui concerne la qualité de vie et la santé peut fort bien émaner de la conviction qu'il y a, effectivement, des disparités. Celles-ci existent sans aucun doute au niveau de l'infrastructure de base, et l'insatisfaction au sujet de l'infrastructure humaine et environnementale est l'une des observations clés de l'étude sur le Nord. Il est par conséquent étonnant de constater que d'après l'évaluation qu'ils font de leur vie et de leur santé, les résidents du Nord sont un peu plus susceptibles de se dire en bonne santé. Fait plus impressionnant encore, les citoyens du Nord sont beaucoup plus susceptibles de qualifier leur qualité de vie d'excellente que ne le sont ceux du Sud et de se montrer très optimistes quant à leur futur bien-être. Cette prime à la résilience et au bonheur est l'une des observations les plus iconoclastes de l'étude.

Ces évaluations comportent, bien sûr, des différences en fonction du statut socioéconomique des gens. Comme dans le Sud, il existe un lien solide et direct entre le statut socioéconomique et le bien-être (ainsi que la santé). Une importante observation régionale tient au fait que les citoyens du Nunavut se sont révélés moins susceptibles d'éprouver le même sentiment général de bonne santé et de bonheur associé au fait de résider dans le Nord. On a pu constater au Nunavut d'autres problèmes (découlant de l'évaluation de l'infrastructure et du logement), et les citoyens du Nunavut ont affiché un sentiment d'appartenance au Canada plus faible que celui des citoyens du Yukon et des Territoires du Nord-Ouest.

Il reste certaines choses à préciser sur les caractéristiques propres au Nord émanant du sondage. L'identité socioculturelle et la conservation du mode de vie traditionnel (la langue et la culture) constituent pour le Nord une priorité toute spéciale. Le soutien plus tiède en général accordé à la présence militaire et aux questions de souveraineté se manifeste également dans l'appui quasi-universel en faveur d'une zone arctique dénucléarisée. Ainsi qu'il a été mentionné, on note un très ferme appui à un service de Rangers du Nord ayant reçu un entraînement professionnel et plus musclé, afin de combler les trous béants dans l'infrastructure – notamment en vue d'intervenir en cas de catastrophe naturelle ou environnementale.

Vu d'en bas : perspectives du Sud

On l'a dit, l'opinion publique dans le Sud ressemble en grande partie à celle du Nord. La principale différence d'avec le Nord tient au fait que les questions de souveraineté et de sécurité sont relativement plus présentes dans le Sud et que celle de l'infrastructure (et, dans une moindre mesure, de l'environnement) importe relativement plus aux citoyens du Nord. Il existe des variations d'ordre régional et

démographique. Les Québécois sont moins en faveur d'une plus forte présence militaire et se préoccupent plus de l'environnement. Le degré de connaissance et d'engagement concernant l'Arctique est moins prononcé dans les provinces maritimes (probablement pour des raisons d'éloignement et de plus faibles intérêts matériels). Les Albertains tendent à se préoccuper davantage des questions de souveraineté, de sécurité et de présence militaire. Soit dit en passant, il est intéressant de mentionner que l'Alberta est l'épicentre du bonheur au Canada (fort probablement grâce à une meilleure situation économique).

L'analyse des compromis montre que lorsqu'il y a des choix difficiles à faire, l'investissement dans l'infrastructure et le capital humain l'emporte haut la main. Malgré l'accord au sujet du redéploiement des ressources militaires dans l'Arctique, l'analyse des compromis nous apprend qu'une présence militaire accrue constitue une très faible priorité dans le Sud et la priorité la plus faible dans le Nord. Le rang inférieur attribué dans l'échelle des compromis à l'exploration et à l'exploitation minières laisse entendre que le point de vue actuel va à l'encontre du forage à tout prix.

On a pu constater que même s'ils souscrivent à la rengaine de la coopération, les Canadiens se montrent décidément intransigeants dans leurs perspectives internationales. Les Américains se disent très à l'aise pour traiter avec le Canada et appuient fermement les solutions de coopération. Les Canadiens demeurent beaucoup plus réservés à l'égard des Américains et beaucoup moins réceptifs quant au compromis et à la négociation sur la question de l'Arctique.

Vu de l'extérieur de nos frontières : perspectives publiques internationales sur l'Arctique

Les Canadiens se perçoivent normalement comme les champions du consensus et de la coopération. Il est vrai que le Canada se range aux côtés des autres pays arctiques en matière de coopération et qu'il soutient fermement le Conseil de l'Arctique. De nombreuses tensions se cachent derrière cet engagement international quelque peu superficiel en faveur de la coopération. Compte tenu des énormes intérêts nationaux en jeu, ces perspectives nationales divergentes n'ont pas de quoi surprendre. Ce qui étonne, c'est que l'opinion publique canadienne soit celle qui semble être le plus nettement délimitée et la moins changeante. Que ce soit à cause de notre conception unique en soi de la sacro-sainte souveraineté du Passage du nord-ouest, de notre absolue allergie à un régime semblable à celui de l'Antarctique pour l'Arctique ou de notre manque d'appui à la négociation et au compromis qui n'a pas son pareil au monde, le public canadien est sans contredit le moins souple et le moins accommodant à propos de l'Arctique. Cette combinaison faite d'un ferme consensus interne et d'une rigoureuse position de hors-jeu à l'égard des autres populations du Conseil de l'Arctique pourrait entraîner de lourds défis à relever à l'avenir.

On peut se demander où en est maintenant le public américain. Malgré d'extrêmement faibles niveaux d'intérêt ou de connaissance au sujet de l'Arctique, le public américain se montre des plus amicaux et accommodants dans son opinion sur la résolution des différends avec le Canada. Quant aux Canadiens,

ils sont plutôt revêches dans leurs points de vue sur les différends entre le Canada et les États-Unis et ils placent les Américains au même niveau que les Russes pour leur aise à traiter avec eux. D'autres travaux de recherche nous ont appris que cette antipathie n'est pas très solidement enracinée et qu'elle est de nature narcissique.

Les perspectives internationales des populations des autres pays membres du Conseil de l'Arctique nous permettent de dresser de précieuses et intéressantes comparaisons. On y trouve un engagement généralisé, quoique superficiel, envers la coopération et le Conseil de l'Arctique. En particulier, à l'extérieur du Canada (et, dans une moindre mesure, de la Scandinavie, notamment de l'Islande et de la Norvège), ces points de vue se rattachent légèrement à de faibles niveaux de connaissance concernant les questions de base. S'il se dessine une réorganisation géopolitique du cercle arctique, c'est en grande partie à l'insu des citoyens de ce nouveau cercle arctique.

La conclusion peut-être la plus digne d'intérêt et la plus troublante de la présente recherche est de constater que le Canada demeure relativement esseulé à l'égard de bien des enjeux. Nous sommes absolument convaincus que le Passage du nord-ouest est une voie maritime qui relève de la souveraineté canadienne, alors que personne d'autre n'est de cet avis. En matière de négociation et de gouvernance internationale, nous sommes de loin les moins enclins à coopérer, sans même parler d'un régime international comme celui de l'Antarctique. Nous tenons à ce que le Conseil de l'Arctique reste un club plutôt sélect tandis que les autres pays membres du Conseil se montrent plus ouverts à cet égard.

Il existe un vaste soutien international en faveur de faire de l'Arctique une zone dénucléarisée. En l'occurrence, les Américains (en particulier) et les Russes y sont moins favorables, nul doute parce que ce sont ces pays qui devraient se départir de leurs missiles nucléaires. Les Américains sont ceux qui s'opposent le plus à l'enlèvement des missiles (bien qu'en faveur d'une diminution). Ce sont les Russes, par contre, qui sont dans l'ensemble les plus militaristes. Ils sont beaucoup plus susceptibles d'appuyer une sécurité militaire dans le cadre d'un mandat visant à accroître la sécurité de l'Arctique (la Finlande et l'Islande y sont le moins favorables). Après le Canada, la Russie est la plus rigoureuse au sujet des différends frontaliers et touchant le partage des ressources.

Le sondage révèle aussi comment les pays du cercle arctique se perçoivent les uns les autres (et perçoivent la Chine en tant que nouveau membre potentiel). Tout d'abord, il est généralement admis que la Chine est le partenaire qui attire le moins l'ensemble des pays actuels du Conseil (sauf la Russie qui place les États-Unis au bas de la liste). De façon générale, les États-Unis et la Russie prennent ex-aequo la deuxième place en tant que partenaires les moins attrayants. À l'inverse, c'est la Scandinavie qui remporte la médaille d'or au concours de popularité, tandis que le Canada remporte l'argent.

METHODOLOGY

Definitional Clarity

The term “Arctic” is a contested one. To some, the Arctic is anywhere above the tree-line. For others, it is anything above the Arctic Circle and for a last group, it refers to the average seasonal winter temperature. No definition of “Arctic” was given to survey respondents. They were left to imagine and conceptualize the Arctic in their own way. Therefore, where the term “Arctic” is used in this paper, it should be taken to mean to encompass all of the standard conceptualizations.

While respondents were asked about the Arctic, it is not possible to categorize the group as “Arctic Canadians” versus “non-Arctic Canadians”, as the units of comparison that are used to generate this data compare those who live in Canada’s three territories (Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut) to Canadians who live in the ten provinces (British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island). However, while the territories are geographically located North of the provinces, not all of their land mass is located in the Arctic using any of the definitions listed above. Therefore, categorizing as Arctic Canadians versus non-Arctic Canadians is not appropriate. Employing “Canadians living in the Territories” versus “Canadians living in the Provinces” as the distinction between the two groups seems to overemphasize the constitutional arrangements and make that appear as the reasons for the differences, instead of geographical location. Also, “Canadians living in the Territories” and “Canadians living in the Provinces” is too cumbersome and does not reflect established practises.

Consequently, the terminology used in this report is “North” versus “South”. While some conceptualize “North” as cottage country, the term is meant to refer to those who live in the three territories. “South” refers to those who live in the provinces. There are obviously some flaws to this definition; for example, Northern Manitoba is decisively more “North” than the south of the Yukon, but given that the survey data was collected along jurisdictional lines, this is the simplest way to conceptualize the delineation between the two data sets.

Methodology

This study involved nine separate surveys across eight countries. The methodology for each component of the study is described below.

a) Northern Canada

A telephone survey of 744 members of the general population in the Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Nunavut was conducted. Respondents were 18 years of age and older and were randomly

selected (through random digit dialling). The survey was administered in both charter languages, as well as in Inuktitut. The sample was stratified using quotas to ensure adequate representation of key population segments (e.g. territory, age, gender). The margin of error associated with a sample of this size is +/- 3.6 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

b) Southern Canada

This portion of the study involved a bilingual survey of 2,053 Canadians over the age of 18 using *Probit*, EKOS' hybrid telephone/online panel. This panel offers exhaustive coverage of the Canadian population (i.e., Internet, phone, cell phone), random recruitment (in other words, participants are recruited randomly, they do not opt themselves into our panel), and equal probability sampling. All panellists were recruited by telephone using random digit dialling and are confirmed by live interviewers. Survey results are generalizable to the broader Canadian population, and allow for margins of error to be associated with results. The margin of error for a sample of this size is +/- 2.2 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

c) United States

Respondents to this portion of the study were randomly selected using *Knowledge Networks'* probability-based online panel, *KnowledgePanel*. Panellists are randomly chosen using address-based sampling and the panel provides complete coverage of the population. Recognising that almost three in ten households in the United States do not have home Internet access, households that do not have internet access are provided with a free netbook computer and Internet service. A total of 1,012 American citizens ages 18 and over responded to this survey. All interviews were conducted online. The margin of error for a sample of this size is +/- 3.1 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

d) Russia

The Russian component of this study was conducted through *Levada* and involved face to face interviews with 835 Russian citizens ages 18 and over. Interviews were conducted in the homes of the respondents. Major cities with a population of over one million were treated as self-representative units. In the rest of the country, settlements were randomly selected, each with probability proportional to its population (as determined by the 2002 Census). Approximately 7-13 interviews were conducted in each settlement.

Within the household, the respondent with the nearest birthday was invited to complete the survey. Each selected household/respondent was visited up to three times on different days of a week (in the evening or on weekends) to maximise response rates.

The margin of error for a sample of this size is +/- 3.4 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

e) Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden

This portion of the study was conducted through *Norstat*, which is the largest panel owner in the Nordic and Baltic region. The panels consist of more than 350,000 people ages 15 and over throughout Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland. Panellists are randomly recruited through computer assisted telephone interviews using random digit dialling and respondents were randomly selected from this panel. The panel is rigorously maintained to ensure that it adequately reflects the general population and it is routinely purged of inactive respondents (i.e. those who have not responded to a survey in the last 12 months). The sample sizes, as well as the associated margins of error, are summarized below.

Regional Distribution		
	Sample Size	Margin of Error (19 times out of 20)
Denmark	n=835	± 3.4%
Finland	n=824	± 3.4%
Norway	n=1,000	± 3.1%
Sweden	n=1,000	± 3.1%

f) Iceland

Since internet use is almost universal in Iceland (approximately 96 per cent of the population has internet access), an online survey was used to cover the Icelandic portion of this study. A random sample of 783 Icelandic citizens were drawn from the *Capacent Gallup* online panel, which consists of approximately 15,000 people and is carefully maintained to represent the population in Iceland. Panellists were selected by random sampling from the National Register, which covers all citizens of Iceland. They received an introductory letter followed up by a phone call from a recruiter if they were interested in joining the panel (therefore eliminating self-selection). The margin of error for a sample of this size is +/- 3.5 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

Background and Methodology

This study provides an empirical perspective on the issue of Arctic Security. In particular, this study analyzes how the issue of Arctic Security is understood by various publics, determines the most important ingredients of public understanding, and looks at what guidance the public would offer decision makers as to the preferences and principles they would emphasise in moving forward with both public policy and private sector decision making.

The study covers a wide range of issues which are examined from the perspectives of several countries. The study began with an examination of the issues from the perspective of a large representative sample of residents of Northern Canada (residents of the Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut). It also looks at some of these same issues from the perspective of the rest of Canada. This study also offers comparative public opinion data from the eight member states of the Arctic Council. The study offers guidance about the importance of these issues, and the areas of consensus and contradiction in the various publics examined.

This study involved nine separate surveys conducted across the eight member nations of the Arctic Council: Canada, Denmark (Greenland), Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States. Canada was subdivided into two regions: Northern Canada, which comprises the three territories, and Southern Canada, which comprises the ten provinces. In total, the study involved 9,083 randomly-selected respondents interviewed in ten languages. The specific methodologies used vary by country and are described in detail later in this report.

Quality of Life / Health

When asked to rate their overall quality of life, respondents from Northern Canada are more likely to rate their quality of life as good (75 per cent), compared to respondents from Southern Canada (67 per cent). Concordantly, Northern Canadians are less likely to rate their overall quality of life as average (22 per cent versus 28 per cent) or poor (3 per cent versus 5 per cent).

When asked how they believed their quality of life would change over time, half of respondents from Northern Canada (50 per cent) say they expect their quality of life to improve over the next ten years, compared to 39 per cent of Southern Canadians. Additionally, 35 per cent of Northerners believe their quality of life will stay the same, compared to 40 per cent of Southern Canadians. One in ten respondents from Northern Canada (12 per cent) expect their quality of life to deteriorate, a figure that rises to one in five among Southern Canadians (19 per cent).

When asked to rate their overall health, respondents from Northern Canada appear to see themselves as marginally healthier, with 69 per cent rating their health as good, compared to 61 per cent of respondents from Southern Canada. Accordingly, Northerners are less likely to rate their health as average (27 per cent, compared to 30 per cent of Southern Canadians) or poor (4 per cent versus 9 per cent).

In general, residents of the Yukon are particularly optimistic regarding their health and quality of life. The perceived quality of health and of life increase progressively with education and income.

Issues Facing the Arctic

Residents of Southern Canada were asked, unprompted, to name the most important issue facing the country as a whole. Responses point to the economy as a leading priority, with 34 per cent of these respondents naming concerns such as jobs and economic growth as the most important issue. Governance issues are also seen as a highly important issue, mentioned by 15 per cent of respondents. Other important issues include the environment (8 per cent) and health care (8 per cent). Nine per cent of respondents offered no response.

Respondents were asked, unprompted, to name what they considered to be the most important issue facing the Arctic region of Canada. A clear plurality of respondents (33 per cent of Northern Canadians and 39 per cent of Southern Canadians) sees the environment as the most important issue. This perception was shared by respondents across the eight Arctic Council states. One in ten Northern Canadians identifies housing and community infrastructure (9 per cent) and economic issues (7 per cent), as top priorities (compared to 1 per cent and 4 per cent of Southern Canadians, respectively). In contrast to their Northern counterparts, however, Southern Canadians see threats to Canadian sovereignty as a top concern (19 per cent, compared to just 6 per cent of Northern Canada residents).

Arctic Security

Respondents were asked to name the first issue that comes to mind when thinking about security and the Canadian Arctic. A small plurality of respondents from both Northern and Southern listed protecting Canada's borders from international threats (27 per cent in each case). One in ten Northern respondents said that Arctic security brings to mind the Arctic sovereignty debate (11 per cent) or the increased commercial traffic associated with the opening of the Northwest Passage. Responses from Southern Canadians, however, centred more on the Arctic sovereignty debate (14 per cent) and challenges that come with protecting the North (10 per cent).

Respondents were also asked to rate the importance of five different aspects of security when it comes to protecting the Canadian Arctic. At the top of their list of priorities is environmental security (91 per cent of Northerners and 86 per cent of Southerners) and social security (90 per cent and 82 per cent). Roughly three-quarters say economic security is important (78 per cent and 72 per cent) while two-thirds

feel cultural and language security is important (66 per cent and 61 per cent). There is a greater division on national security issues, with 69 per cent of Southern Canadians rating it as important, a figure that falls to just 56 per cent among Northern Canadians.

When it comes to military security, a majority of Canadians feel that the Canadian Arctic should be a top priority, even it means reducing Canada's military presence in other parts of the world (59 per cent of Northern Canadians and 56 per cent of Southern Canadians). Similarly, just over half of Canadians say that the Arctic should be the most important focus of Canada's foreign policy (55 per cent and 53 per cent).

Priorities in the Arctic

Respondents were presented with a series of statements pertaining to the Canadian Arctic and asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each one. The vast majority of respondents agree that all Canadians should be able to experience the same quality of life (90 per cent of Northern Canadians and 81 per cent of Southern Canadians). A clear majority also agree that the best way to protect Canada's interests in the Arctic is to have people living there (81 per cent and 71 per cent); that strengthening Canada's climate change policies is a critical step in ensuring the security of Arctic residents (78 per cent and 71 per cent); that Indigenous traditional culture should always be taken into account in public decisions making (77 per cent and 77 per cent); and that the Arctic should be a nuclear weapon free zone (76 and 78 per cent). Canadians are somewhat more divided on whether the Canadian Arctic is a key part of Canada (77 per cent of Northern Canadians indicate they consider it be a key part, compared to just 63 per cent of Southern Canadians) and Northerners are somewhat less enthusiastic regarding the prospect of strengthening Canada's military presence in the North (52 per cent of Northern Canadians agree that Canada should strengthen its military presence, compared to 60 per cent of Southerners).

When asked to rank the importance of various elements surrounding life in the Canadian Arctic, capacity to provide good quality health care, education, and drinking water is a top priority among Canadians (98 per cent of Northern Canadians and 86 per cent of Southern Canadians rate it as important). Other elements that are seen as highly important are capacity to respond to disasters (92 per cent and 90 per cent say important), capacity to respond to emergencies (91 and 85 per cent), improving basic public infrastructure (90 per cent and 82 per cent), and strong policies to combat climate change and prevent pollution and environmental disasters (89 per cent and 83 per cent). Strong policies to preserve traditional ways of life are particularly important to residents of Northern Canada (76 per cent, compared to 65 per cent of residents of Southern Canada), while Southerners are slightly more likely to support strong security services to respond to international threats (64 per cent and 69 per cent).

Respondents in Northern Canada were asked to rate the adequacy of different elements in the Arctic. The results show a widespread perception that the policies and infrastructure in the North are highly inadequate. Approximately four in ten respondents feel that the Canadian Arctic is well equipped to preserve

traditional ways of life (43 per cent), respond to emergencies (40 per cent), and provide good access to health care, education, and drinking water (38 per cent). One-third say the Arctic's basic public infrastructure is adequate (32 per cent) while one in five say the Arctic is well equipped to respond to international threats (19 per cent) and to combat climate change (16 per cent). Just one in ten respondents (11 per cent) are confident that the Arctic is equipped to adequately respond to disasters.

Respondents were also presented with the scenario of being in charge for a day and asked which of a range of policy options they would choose to invest in. The findings reveal that Canadians from both the North and the South see health care, infrastructure, and education as top priorities. Residents of the North are considerably more likely than their Southern counterparts to prioritize housing and culture, which is perhaps reflective of the differing levels of familiarity with Arctic issues between the two groups. Southerners place substantially more importance on military security.

The Canadian Rangers are a mostly Indigenous militia force and a part of the Canadian Forces Reserves. Results suggest that Canadians are particularly supportive of giving the Rangers an expanded role. Fully 82 per cent of Northern respondents and 71 per cent of Southern respondents say the Canadian Rangers should be given an expanded role with additional personnel and resources, compared to just one in ten (12 per cent of Northern Canadians, 13 per cent of Southern Canadians) who say it would be too expensive. Support is particularly high among those over 60.

International Cooperation in the Arctic

Respondents in each of the eight member states of the Arctic Council were presented with a list of countries and asked which one they would be *most* comfortable dealing with and which one they would be *least* comfortable dealing with on Arctic issues. Results show a clear preference for working with Scandinavian countries, as this was the most common response in eight of the nine regions examined (Northern Canada, Southern Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden). Canada, meanwhile comes out as a clear second choice, as it was ranked as one of the top two choices in six of the seven other Arctic nations. Perhaps not surprisingly, the United States selected its closest ally and neighbour (i.e., Canada) as its preferred partner in dealing with Arctic issues. Meanwhile, China was identified as the least desired partner by every nation except Russia, who expressed the most discomfort in working with the United States.

Respondents from the eight member states of the Arctic Council were asked whether they feel that the Arctic should be a nuclear weapons free zone like Antarctica. Results show a clear preference for removing these weapons in seven of the nine regions examined. Norway is the most supportive of removing these weapons (82 per cent say they agree), followed by Southern Canada (78 per cent), Finland (77 per cent), Northern Canada (76 per cent), Iceland (75 per cent), and Denmark (74 per cent). Perhaps not surprisingly, respondents from the two nuclear weapons states – Russia and the United States – are more hesitant to agree that these weapons should be removed (56 per cent and 47 per cent, respectively).

Respondents were asked how they would like their government to handle border and/or resource sharing disputes in the Arctic. Results vary heavily by country. In Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, there is very strong support for either negotiating a compromise with other countries (selected by 64 per cent, 50 per cent, 49 per cent, and 35 per cent, respectively) or transforming the Arctic into an international territory like Antarctica (24 per cent, 37 per cent, 35 per cent, and 48 per cent, respectively). In Northern Canada, Southern Canada, and Russia, however, respondents are divided between pursuing a firm line in defending their sections of the Arctic (selected by 41 per cent, 43 per cent, and 34 per cent, respectively) or negotiating a compromise with other nations (46 per cent, 39 per cent, and 33 per cent, respectively). Iceland is heavily divided, though a small plurality (36 per cent), would prefer a more assertive role in defending their portion of the Arctic. The United States shows moderate support for a compromise (30 per cent) or creating an international territory (25 per cent), though the plurality of respondents are undecided (35 per cent).

The issue concerning the Beaufort Sea is that the maritime boundary between Canada and the United States is in dispute. When asked how they feel their government should work to resolve the issue, Canadians were divided; half (50 per cent of Northern Canadians and 49 per cent of southern Canadians) say that Canada should assert its full sovereign rights over the area, while two-fifths (43 per cent in each case) feel that the two countries should work together to come to an agreement. Respondents from the United States, however, are much more keen on the concept of compromise, with 62 per cent saying that their government should work with Canadian officials. Just ten per cent say they would prefer their government assert its full sovereignty over the area and one-quarter (28 per cent) did not respond (perhaps a reflection of the differing levels of awareness between the two the residents of the two countries on this issue).

Respondents from each of the eight members of the Arctic Council were asked whether they feel that the Northwest Passage is within Canadian water or an international waterway. Perhaps not surprisingly, the only region where the majority see the Passage as belonging to Canada is Canada itself (regardless of their geographical region). Other countries see it as an international waterway or as a territory whose ownership is in dispute. It is important to note, however, that the proportion of respondents in other countries that did not respond is extremely high, which may suggest relatively low levels of literacy on the issue of the Northwest Passage.

International Views on the Arctic Council

Respondents from all eight countries were given a brief description of the Arctic Council and asked if they had heard of it. Awareness appears to be highest in Northern Canada (61 per cent say they are either clearly or vaguely aware of the Arctic Council) and Iceland (61 per cent). Roughly half of respondents from Southern Canada (51 per cent), Denmark (51 per cent), and Finland (47 per cent) say they have heard of the Arctic Council. Awareness of the Arctic Council is relatively lower in Norway (40 per cent) and Sweden (27 per cent) and is lowest in Russia (21 per cent) and the United States (16 per cent).

Respondents were prompted with a description of the Arctic Council and were asked whether they “support the idea of an Arctic Council so that the eight Arctic nations can work together on common Arctic issues”. Northern Canadians are the most supportive of the Council, with 91 per cent saying they support the idea. Eight in ten residents of Southern Canada (82 per cent) and Sweden (81 per cent), as well as three-quarters of respondents from Finland (77 per cent), Denmark (76 per cent), and Norway (72 per cent) support the concept. Support for the Arctic Council drops to 63 per cent in Iceland and further to just over half of respondents from the United States (56 per cent) and Russia (55 per cent).

Respondents were asked if they feel that the Arctic Council should also cover areas such as peace-building and military security. Fully eight in ten respondents from Russia (85 per cent), Iceland (85 per cent), Southern Canada (82 per cent), Finland (81 per cent), and Northern Canada (80 per cent) say they would support expanding the Arctic Council's role to include military security. Similarly, two-thirds of respondents from Sweden (70 per cent), the United States (69 per cent), and Norway (66 per cent) endorse such a role. This idea receives a somewhat more lukewarm response in Denmark, where just 57 per cent would support expanding the Council's role.

The prospect of expanding the Arctic Council's role to include military security, however, is greeted with a higher degree of scepticism. While Russia is highly supportive of expanding the Council's role to include security (81 per cent), receptivity is much lower in other countries. Six in ten respondents from Southern Canada (62 per cent), Sweden (61 per cent), and Northern Canada (59 per cent) and half of respondents from Norway (51 per cent), the United States (51 per cent), and Denmark (48 per cent) are supportive of the idea. Support drops to just 44 per cent in Iceland and 39 per cent in Finland.

Respondents who support the concept of the Arctic Council were asked whether they feel that non-Arctic states like China or organizations like the European Union should be invited to join the Arctic Council and have a say in Arctic affairs. The results suggest that Sweden is the most open to including non-Arctic states, with 64 per cent saying they should have a say. Roughly half of respondents from Russia (49 per cent), Finland (48 per cent), Denmark (46 per cent), and Norway (45 per cent) believe that non-Arctic states should be included, a figure that drops to one in four in Iceland (24 per cent), the United States (23 per cent), and Northern Canada (22 per cent). Just fifteen per cent of respondents from Southern Canada believe that non-Arctic states should have a say in Arctic affairs.

Study findings are described in more detail in the remainder of this report.

1. QUALITY OF LIFE AND HEALTH

In this chapter, we compare the self-rated health and quality of life of Northern and Southern Canada. Interestingly, respondents from Northern Canada see themselves as healthier and better off than those from Southern Canada. Residents of the Yukon are particularly optimistic regarding their health and quality of life. Perhaps not surprisingly, perceived health and quality of life increase progressively with education and income.


1.1 QUALITY OF LIFE

Respondents were asked to rate their overall quality of life. Interestingly, respondents from Northern Canada are more likely to rate their quality of life as good (75 per cent, compared to 67 per cent of respondents from Southern Canada). Concordantly, Northern Canadians are less likely to rate their overall quality of life as average (22 per cent versus 28 per cent) or poor (3 per cent versus 5 per cent).

- In Northern Canada, residents of the Yukon provide the most positive assessment of their quality of life (84 per cent say good), while residents of Nunavut are less upbeat (65 per cent). Perceived quality of life increases progressively with income (91 per cent of those with a household income of over \$120,000, compared to just 54 per cent of those earning less than \$40,000), education (87 per cent of university graduates, compared to 56 per cent of those limited to a high school education), and age (82 per cent of those over 60, compared to 56 per cent of youth).
- In Southern Canada, self-rated quality of life is highest in Alberta (74 per cent) and lowest in Quebec (61 per cent). Quality of life also increases progressively with income (92 per cent of those with a household income of more than \$120,000, compared to just 44 per cent of those earning less than \$40,000) and education (76 per cent of university graduates, compared to 56 per cent of those limited to a high school education).

Quality of Life

“How would you rate your overall quality of life?”




1.2 EXPECTED QUALITY OF LIFE OVER TIME

Respondents were asked whether they felt that their quality of life would get better or worse over the next ten years. Interestingly, respondents from Northern Canada are considerably more optimistic regarding their future quality of life than their Southern counterparts. Half of respondents from Northern Canada (50 per cent) say they expect their quality of life to improve over the next ten years, compared to 39 per cent of Southern Canadians. Additionally, 35 per cent of Northerners believe their quality of life will stay the same, compared to 40 per cent of Southern Canadians. One in ten respondents from Northern Canada (12 per cent) expect their quality of life to deteriorate, a figure that rises to one in five among Southern Canadians (19 per cent).

- In Northern Canada, those ages 25-39 and residents of the Yukon are the most likely to think that their quality of life will get better over the next ten years (61 and 54 per cent, respectively). Those over 60 are somewhat more blasé regarding their future prospects (just 29 per cent say their quality of life will improve).
- Among residents of Southern Canada, optimism decreases progressively with age, starting with a high of 73 per cent among youth and falling to just 19 per cent among those over 60. Likelihood to say that quality of life will improve is also higher among Albertans (49 per cent), those with a household income of over \$120,000 (47 per cent), and Quebeckers (43 per cent).

Quality of Life Over Time

“Do you expect that your overall quality of life will get better or worse in the next 10 years?”



1.3 RATED HEALTH


Respondents were asked to rate their health.¹ Once again, respondents from Northern Canada appear to see themselves as marginally healthier than their Southern counterparts, with 69 per cent rating their health as good, compared to 61 per cent of respondents from Southern Canada. Accordingly, Northerners are less likely to rate their health as average (27 per cent, compared to 30 per cent of Southern Canadians) or poor (4 per cent versus 9 per cent).

- In Northern Canada, self-rated health is highest among residents of the Yukon (79 per cent rate it as good) and lowest in Nunavut (61 per cent). Perceived quality of life also increases progressively with income (80 per cent of those with a household income of more than \$120,000, compared to just 57 per cent of those earning less than \$40,000) and education (78 per cent of university graduates, compared to 59 per cent of those limited to a high school education).
- In Southern Canada, rated health increases progressively with income (75 per cent of those with a household income of over \$120,000 say they are in good health, compared to 50 per cent of those earning less than \$40,000) and education (68 per cent of university graduates, compared to 50 per cent of high school graduates). Meanwhile, rated health decreases with age (76 per cent of youth, compared to just 52 per cent of those over 60).

¹ Note that this indicator measures self-rated health, not actual health.

Rated Health

"How would you rate your health?"



2. ISSUES FACING THE ARCTIC

Responses show that Canadians have vastly different perceptions of the needs of the Arctic region compared to the needs of Canada as a whole. The economy is seen as the dominant issue facing Canada today, while the environment ranks as the leading issue in the Arctic. There are also some interesting North-South divides. While Northern Canadians are relatively more likely to see infrastructure, the economy, and standards of living as the most important issue facing the Arctic, Southern Canadians are much more likely to prioritize threats to Canadian sovereignty.


2.1 PRIMARY ISSUES IN CANADA

Residents of Southern Canada were asked, unprompted, to name the most important issue facing Canada as a whole. Responses point to the economy as a leading priority, with 34 per cent of these respondents naming economic issues such as jobs and growth as the most important issue. Governance issues are also seen as a highly important issue, mentioned by 15 per cent of respondents. Other important issues include the environment (8 per cent) and health care (8 per cent). Nine per cent of respondents offered no response.


- Regionally, residents of Ontario are relatively more concerned with economic issues (41 per cent) while governance issues is the most common response among Quebeckers (25 per cent). Atlantic Canadians are significantly more likely to mention health care issues (16 per cent).
- Economic issues are perceived as relatively more important by those with a household income of more than \$120,000 (42 per cent), those ages 40-59 (40 per cent), and men (39 per cent).

Most Important Issue Facing Canada

“What would you say is the most important issue facing Canada?”



Only items with 2% or more shown on slide



n=2053

WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

2.2 PRIMARY ISSUES IN ARCTIC

Arctic respondents were asked, unprompted, to name what they considered to be the most important issue facing the Arctic region of Canada. A clear plurality of Northern Canadians (33 per cent) sees the environment as the most important issue. One in ten identifies housing and community infrastructure (9 per cent), economic issues (7 per cent), or threats to Canadian sovereignty as top priorities (6 per cent). Other common responses include education (5 per cent), standard of living (5 per cent), and protection and development of natural resources (5 per cent). An additional eleven per cent did not offer a response.

- Residents of the Yukon are more likely to see the environment as the most important issue facing the Arctic (46 per cent) than residents of Territories. Nunavummiut, meanwhile, are relatively more concerned with issues such as housing and community infrastructure (19 per cent) and education (11 per cent).
- Those in the highest income bracket are relatively less concerned with environmental issues (26 per cent of those with a household income of over \$120,000) and place greater importance on issues such as the economy (10 per cent) and education (8 per cent). This is consistent with the views of Canadians in the South.
- It is important to note that response rates are considerably lower among youth, those limited to a high school education, and those earning less than \$40,000 (28 per cent, 24 per cent, and 21 per cent, respectively, did not offer a response).

In the focus groups in Cambridge Bay, Nunavut, participants a number of participants indicated that they did not feel that the current issues, debates, and policies related to Arctic sovereignty and security were being consistently or adequately explained to them either by the media or governments themselves. While they expressed an interest in these kinds of issues, they cited a lack of information as a barrier to their presentation.


Similarly, residents of Southern Canada also see the environment as the most important issue facing the Arctic (39 per cent). In contrast to their Northern counterparts, however, threats to Canadian sovereignty are also a top concern, named by one in five respondents (19 per cent). Other common responses include the protection and development of natural resources (7 per cent) and the economy (4 per cent).

- Residents of Atlantic Canada and Quebec are more likely to see the environment as a top priority (48 per cent and 46 per cent, respectively). Meanwhile, residents of Alberta, British Columbia, and Alberta (23 per cent, 23 per cent, and 22 per cent, respectively) are most likely to list threats to Canadian sovereignty.


- Women are relatively more concerned with environmental issues (41 per cent, compared to 37 per cent of men) while men are more likely to see threats to Canadian sovereignty as a top issue (24 per cent, compared to 15 per cent of women).
- Those in the lowest income brackets are more likely to perceive the environment as a leading concern (45 per cent of those with a household income of \$40,000-\$79,000 and 43 per cent of those earning less than \$40,000). In contrast, those with a household income of over \$120,000 are more likely to see threats to Arctic sovereignty as a top priority (27 per cent).

Primary Issues in Arctic

“What would you say is the most important issue facing the Arctic region of Canada?”



NORTH: Only items with 2% or more shown on slide



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

3. ARCTIC SECURITY

Results show that Canadians – both North and South – see environmental security and social security as key elements to protecting the Canadian Arctic. National security, while still seen as important, does not seem to be a leading priority. Nevertheless, Canadians from all regions say that the Arctic should be the primary focus of Canada’s military and foreign policy. Therefore, while Arctic security is an issue that respondents believe needs to be addressed, they do not want it to be done at the expense of these other priorities.

3.1 DEFINITION OF SECURITY (UNPROMPTED)

Respondents were asked, unprompted, to name the first issue that comes to mind when they think about security and the Canadian Arctic. Responses vary heavily, with a small plurality of respondents listing protecting Canada’s borders from international threats (27 per cent). One in ten say that Arctic security brings to mind the Arctic sovereignty debate (11 per cent) or the potential of increased commercial traffic associated with the opening of the Northwest Passage. Other common responses include the difficulties and challenges that come with protecting the North (6 per cent), protecting the environment against climate change (5 per cent), and the need to protect resources from exploitation (2 per cent). An additional three per cent are undecided and 23 per cent offered no response.

- Response rates increase progressively with age, education, and income. The proportion of respondents who offered no response is highest among those with a household income of less than \$40,000 (48 per cent, compared to just 13 per cent of those earning over \$120,000), those limited to a high school education (43 per cent, compared to 11 per cent of those with a university degree), those under 25 (39 per cent, compared to 17 per cent of those over 60), and residents of Nunavut (30 per cent).

Respondents from Southern Canada appear to share a similar definition of security. The plurality of these respondents name protecting Canada’s borders from international threats as the first thing that comes to mind when it comes to Arctic security. One in seven (14 per cent) think of the Arctic sovereignty debate, while one in ten (10 per cent) think of the challenges that come with protecting the Arctic. Other common responses include protecting the environment against climate change (5 per cent), protecting resources from exploitation (4 per cent), and increased commercial traffic (3 per cent). An additional three per cent mentioned other elements and 22 per cent did not respond.

- Residents of Alberta, men, and those over 60 are more apt to think about international threats when the issue of Arctic security arises (33 per cent, 30 per cent, and 30 per cent, respectively).

- Residents of Quebec are the most likely to mention environmental issues such as climate change (11 per cent) while Atlantic Canada residents are more likely to list difficulties that come with protecting the North (16 per cent) and protecting resources from exploitation (9 per cent).

Responses from focus group participants, however, were more centred on issues that are much closer to home. When asked what they felt was meant by the term “Arctic security”, one respondent explained:

“I think that in a sense – security – in a broad way, we want to... protect ourselves and our wishes and our goals for the future.”


Another respondent said:

“Security in the Arctic, for me that would be like, that my culture is still being alive and being able to stay alive. That’s a really big issue in the North..”

While traditional security concerns were mentioned in the focus groups, comments were mostly centred on search and rescue capabilities and customs, rather than on military confrontation.

Definition of Security (Prompted)

“How important are each of the following to your own definition of security when it comes to protecting the Canadian Arctic?”



3.2 DEFINITION OF SECURITY (PROMPTED)

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of five different aspects of security when it comes to protecting the Canadian Arctic. Responses indicate some modest differences in the way residents of Northern and Southern Canada perceive security. Northern Canadians are relatively more likely to see domestic issues (social, economic, environmental, and cultural security) as the most important. Southern Canadians, however, place more importance on traditional national security issues.

Fully nine in ten respondents from Northern Canada see environmental security and social security as crucial issues in protecting the Canadian Arctic (91 per cent and 90 per cent, respectively). Three-quarters (78 per cent) say economic security is important while two-thirds (66 per cent) believe cultural and language security are important. Just over half (56 per cent) feel that national security is important.

- Compared to other territories, residents of Nunavut place relatively more importance on economic security (84 per cent) and cultural and language security (74 per cent).
- Women appear relatively more concerned with social security (92 per cent, compared to 87 per cent among men) and cultural and language security (70 per cent versus 62 per cent).
- Those over 60 are somewhat more concerned with national security issues (64 per cent).
- Respondents limited to a high school education are significantly more likely to see national security as important (71 per cent, compared to just 46 per cent of those with a university education).


More than eight in ten respondents from Southern Canada rate environmental security and social security as important when it comes to protecting the Canadian Arctic (86 per cent and 82 per cent, respectively). Seven in ten underscore the importance of economic security (72 per cent) and national security (69 per cent). Six in ten (61 per cent) say cultural and language security are important.

- Regionally, residents of Quebec are relatively more concerned with environmental issues (92 per cent) while respondents from Ontario place more importance on economic security (75 per cent).
- The perceived importance of national security, economic security, and cultural security appears to increase progressively with age. Those over 60 are more likely to emphasize the importance of social security (86 per cent, compared to 79 per cent of youth), economic security (79 per cent versus 66 per cent), and national security (77 per cent versus 49 per cent).

- Women consistently see each of the prompted security issues as important, with the exception of national security. For instance, 70 per cent of women rate cultural security as important, compared to just 51 per cent of men.
- National security is more often seen as important by those with a high school education and those with a college degree (75 and 74 per cent, respectively, compared to 65 per cent of university graduates).
- Those in the lowest income cohort (annual household income of less than \$40,000) are more likely to see social security (86 per cent) and cultural security (69 per cent) as important.

Definition of Security (Prompted)

“How important are each of the following to your own definition of security when it comes to protecting the Canadian Arctic?”



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

3.3 IMPORTANCE OF THE MILITARY IN THE ARCTIC

Respondents were asked if they feel that Canada should devote more military resources to the Arctic, even if it entails diverting resources from other parts of the world. A narrow majority of Northern Canadians (59 per cent) agree with this idea. In contrast, one in three respondents (32 per cent) says that Canada should not be diverting military resources away from conflict zones in other countries. An additional three per cent prefer neither of these options and five per cent offered no response.

- High school graduates and men are the most keen on putting more military resources towards the Canadian Arctic (65 per cent and 64 per cent, respectively).

Southern Canada is equally supportive of prioritizing the Arctic, with over half of these respondents (56 per cent) saying that more military resources should be diverted to the Arctic, even at the expense of conflicts in other parts of the world. Just fourteen per cent feel that we should not divert resources from other countries. An additional 22 per cent selected neither of these options and eight per cent are uncertain.

- Men, high school graduates, those over 60, and those ages 40 to 59 show the most support for increasing Canada's military presence in the Arctic (62 per cent, 62 per cent, 62 per cent, and 60 per cent, respectively).

During the focus groups, participants were asked what they believe is meant when the government uses the term "Arctic security". One respondent stated that:

"When they are talking about security in the Arctic, they are basically talking about sovereignty and I myself believe that we don't have enough military bases up here and we need more resources in order to protect our security and sovereignty in the Arctic."

At the same time, one of the other respondents explained:


"I would like some officials other than military that are trained to be custom officers... they would at least have a little more knowledge about the ports and what the law says in terms of foreign policies."


These statements suggest that residents of Northern Canada are not unanimous in how best to deal with the security challenges that are facing the Arctic. Some Northern respondents prefer a more militarily-focused policy, while others recommend an increased civilian presence. While it is agreed that there needs to be more resources to deal with the security and sovereignty challenges facing the Arctic,

there remains some debate among Northerners as to whether the military is the best tool for responding to these issues.

Importance of Military in Arctic

“Which is closer to your own point of view?”



 EKOS Research Associates Inc.

WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

3.4 THE ARCTIC AS AN ELEMENT IN CANADA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Respondents were asked whether they feel that the Arctic should be the most important focus of Canada's foreign policy or whether the government should concentrate on parts of the world beyond the Arctic. Responses suggest a strong belief among Canadians that the Arctic should be the focal point of Canada's foreign policy. Just over half of respondents from Northern Canada (55 per cent) say that the Arctic should be the most important focus of Canadian foreign policy, compared to 34 per cent who feel that Canada's foreign policy should extend beyond just the Arctic. An additional eleven per cent offered no response.

- Regionally, residents of Nunavut are more keen on setting the Arctic as the centre of Canada's foreign policy (65 per cent).
- University graduates are more likely to argue that Canada's foreign policy should focus on areas other than the Arctic (41 per cent).


Similar to Northern Canada, a slim majority of Southern Canadians (53 per cent) feel that the Arctic should be the heart of Canada's foreign policy. By comparison, three in ten (29 per cent) argue that Canada should concentrate on parts of the world beyond the Arctic. An additional eighteen per cent are uncertain.

- Youth, men, and university graduates are more likely to say that Canada's foreign policy should concentrate on parts of the world beyond the Arctic (41 per cent, 35 per cent, and 35 per cent, respectively).

The relatively high level of non-response on this issue may reflect the conflicting messages that Canadians are receiving about the threat level in the Arctic. There is much debate among scholars about whether the Arctic is entering a "new Cold War" – a perception which is flamed by the Russian flag-planting on the North Pole in October 2007 and by the continued over-flights by Russian bombers. On the other hand, there are those who argue that this viewpoint is perhaps a bit reactionary and that the Arctic has the potential to be a "zone of peace" in the fashion that Mikhail Gorbachev proposed in Murmansk in 1987. They cite the Ilulissat Declaration by the five Arctic Coastal nations (Canada, the United States, Russia, Norway, and Denmark on behalf of Greenland), which states that outstanding border disputes will be resolved in a manner consistent with international law and calls for the continued cooperation of the Arctic states in the intergovernmental Arctic Council, as evidence that disagreements can be resolved peacefully. The existence of these two "schools" of thought and the lack of consensus about the Arctic's future could account for the high non-response rates on these two questions.

Importance of Military in Arctic (II)

"Which is closer to your own point of view?"



4. PRIORITIES IN THE ARCTIC

In both Northern and Southern Canada, the ability to experience the same quality of life as Canadians living in other jurisdictions is seen as a basic human right. Both regions of the country consistently rank areas such as health care and education as top priorities in the Arctic. Relative to their Southern counterparts, Northerners attach a much greater sense of importance to infrastructure and preserving culture, while military security consistently ranks last on their list of priorities. Southern Canadians, in contrast, favour a more bellicose approach and are more keen on diverting additional military resources to the Arctic.

4.1 OPINIONS

Respondents were presented with a series of statements pertaining to the Canadian Arctic and were asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each one. Among Northern Canadians, equal quality of life is perceived as essential, with nine in ten respondents (90 per cent) agreeing that all Canadians should be able to experience the same quality of life. Eight in ten (81 per cent) agree that the best way to protect the Arctic is to have Canadians living there, while a similar proportion (78 per cent) say that strengthening Canada's climate change policies is essential to Arctic security. Three-quarters of these respondents (77 per cent) *disagree*² that the Canadian Arctic is not a key part of Canada (that is, they agree that the Canadian Arctic is a key part of Canada). Meanwhile, the same number say that traditional ways of life should be factored into decision making (77 per cent) and the Arctic should be a nuclear weapon free zone (76 per cent). Just half of Northern Canadians (52 per cent) believe that Canada should strengthen its military presence in the North.

- Regionally, residents of Nunavut are most likely to agree that the Arctic is not a key part of Canada (21 per cent, compared to 14 per cent on average). Yukon residents are the most likely to agree that strong climate change policies are critical to Arctic security (85 per cent).
- Women are more like to agree that traditional ways of life are important in shaping public policy (82 per cent) and that climate change policies are crucial in the Arctic (81 per cent). Men, in contrast, are more likely to suggest that the best way to protect Canada's interests is to have Canadians living there (85 per cent) and that Canada should strengthen its military presence there (56 per cent).

² This statement was intentionally worded as a negative statement so as to test for and guard against acquiescent response sets, which occur when respondents select the same response for each statement in order to complete the survey as quickly as possible. The fact that the majority of respondents say they disagree with this statement (whereas they agree with most other statements) is strong evidence that the consistently "pro-Arctic" attitudes are indeed a reflection of public opinion, and not simply a product of "yay-saying".

- University graduates are much less likely to agree than Canada should bolster its military resources in the Arctic (43 per cent, compared to 64 per cent of high school graduates and 62 per cent of college graduates).

Southern Canadians exhibit somewhat different opinions than their Northern counterparts, particularly when it comes to culture and military security. Eight in ten of respondents from Southern Canada say that all Canadians should be able to experience the same quality of life (83 per cent), that the Arctic should be a nuclear weapon free zone (78 per cent), and that traditional ways of life should be factored in to public decisions (77 per cent). Seven in ten respondents say that the best way to protect Canada's interests is to have Canadians living there (71 per cent) and that strengthening Canada's climate change policy policies is critical to Arctic security (71 per cent). Six in ten respondents (63 per cent) *disagree* that the Arctic is not a key part of Canada and a similar proportion (60 per cent) say Canada should strengthen its military presence in the North.

- Regionally, Quebeckers are more likely to say that all Canadians should enjoy the same quality of life (88 per cent), that the Arctic should be a nuclear weapon free zone (83 per cent), and that climate change policies are important to ensuring Arctic security (80 per cent), while they are the least keen on strengthening Canada's military presence (51 per cent). In a stark contrast, Alberta residents are much less likely to say that the Arctic should be free of nuclear weapons (67 per cent) or that strong climate change policies are essential (57 per cent).
- Relative to men, women are more likely to suggest that all Canadians are entitled to the same quality of life (89 per cent, compared to 76 per cent of women), that traditional ways of life are important in decision making (84 per cent), that the Arctic should be a nuclear weapons free zone (81 per cent), and that fighting climate change is a crucial step in securing the Arctic (77 per cent). Men are more likely than women to say that Canada should expand its military presence in the Arctic (64 per cent, compared to 56 per cent of women).
- Older age groups are more likely to agree that the best way to protect Canada's interests in the Arctic is to have Canadians living there (78 per cent of those over 60, compared to 56 per cent of youth) and that Canada should strengthen its military there (69 per cent versus 34 per cent). Indeed, agreement with these statements increases progressively with age.


Echoing this theme, when asked "what is the most important issue facing the Arctic today?" one of the focus group participants stated:

"I have concerns – lack of resources up North that some of Southern Canada – Canadians are taking for granted that I feel that there should be development here, as well, just as much".


This statement further illustrates that the idea that all Canadians should experience the same quality of life resonates strongly with many of Canadians.

Opinions

"To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"



* % Disagree - Negative statement



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

4.2 IMPORTANCE OF DIFFERENT ELEMENTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE ARCTIC

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of various elements surrounding life in the Canadian Arctic. In Northern Canada, nearly all respondents (98 per cent) rate the capacity to provide access to quality health care, education, and drinking water to residents as important. Similarly, nine in ten respondents place a great deal of importance on capacity to respond to disasters (92 per cent), capacity to respond to emergencies (91 per cent), basic public infrastructure (90 per cent), and policies to combat climate change (89 per cent) as important. Strong policies to preserve traditional ways of life in the North are treated as important by three-quarters of respondents (76 per cent). Military security, while still seen as important, does not rank as highly as other elements (64 per cent).

- Relative to men, women attach more importance to issues such as public infrastructure (95 per cent) and climate change (92 per cent).
- University graduates are more likely to see strong climate change policies as important (92 per cent) while those who are high school or college educated place a greater sense of importance on military security (76 and 75 per cent, respectively).

Southern Canadians appear to share a similar set of values to their Northern counterparts in that they rank these issues in a similar order, though they treat each issue with a somewhat lesser degree of importance. Nine in ten of Southern Canadian respondents say that capacity to respond to disasters (90 per cent), capacity to provide good access to health care, education, and drinking water to residents (86 per cent), and the capacity to respond to emergencies (85 per cent) are important. Eight in ten respondents attach a strong sense of importance to strong policies to combat climate change (83 per cent), and basic public infrastructure (82 per cent). Roughly two-thirds feel that military security (69 per cent) and strong policies to preserve traditional ways of life in the North (65 per cent) are important.

- With the exception of military security, women and those over 60 are significantly more likely to rank these issues as important. For instance, capacity to provide good access to health care, education, and drinking water is seen as important by 92 per cent of women, compared to 81 per cent of men.
- Military security appears to be a much higher priority among those over 60 (78 per cent), those limited to a high school education (76 per cent), and college graduates (75 per cent).

Social and infrastructure issues were also raised in the focus groups. For example, one respondent in the focus groups explained:


"One of the major issues in every community – that you hear everywhere – is social issues". Another respondent suggested that there was a *"lack of resources, like proper transportation for Search and*

Rescue. Those resources should be based up here instead of in the South. They should be based up here to get closer, rather than flying from Yellowknife'.

These comments further illustrate the public's concern with social issues and infrastructure deficits.

Importance of Different Elements of Arctic

“How important are each of the following in the Canadian Arctic today?”



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

4.3 ADEQUACY OF DIFFERENT ELEMENTS OF ARCTIC CAPABILITIES

Respondents in Northern Canada were asked to rate the adequacy of different elements in the Arctic. Results reveal a particularly grim assessment of the Arctic's capacity to meet the needs of its residents. In particular, capacity to combat climate change and capacity to respond to disasters such as oil spills are seen as gravely inadequate.

Approximately four in ten respondents feel that Canadian Arctic is well equipped to: preserve traditional ways of life (43 per cent), respond to emergencies (40 per cent), and provide good access to health care, education, and drinking water (38 per cent). One-third say that the Arctic's basic public infrastructure (32 per cent) is adequate, while one in five say that the Arctic is well equipped to respond to international threats (19 per cent) and to combat climate change (16 per cent). Just one in ten respondents (11 per cent) are confident that the Arctic is equipped to deal with disasters.

- In nearly every case, residents of the Northwest Territories, youth, those limited to a high school education, and those in the lowest income cohort (i.e. those with a household income of less than \$40,000) are more likely to perceive these elements as adequate. For instance, the Canadian Arctic is deemed well equipped to preserve traditional ways of life by 57 per cent of youth, 50 per cent of high school graduates, 47 per cent of Northwest Territories residents, and 46 per cent of those earning less than \$40,000.


The results also show some dramatic gaps in the importance placed on these elements and their perceived adequacy. For instance, 92 per cent of respondents rated capacity to respond to disasters as important, but only 11 per cent say the Arctic is well equipped to deal with such an event (yielding a gap of 81 per cent). Similarly, responses show a 73-point difference in the importance placed on the ability to combat climate change and the Arctic's capacity to actually do so. Other significant gaps are present in providing good access to health care, education, and drinking water (60 points), basic public infrastructure (58 per cent), capacity to respond to emergencies (52 per cent), capacity to respond to international threats (45 per cent), and policies to preserve traditional culture and ways of life (33 per cent).

Responses from focus groups also suggest that capacity to respond to disasters is a top concern for those living in the North. One respondent in Cambridge Bay noted:

"I know last summer we had two major ships that had some problems over our Northwest Passage and it worries me... One of them was an oil tanker actually delivering fuel. If there had been a disaster there it would have been a catastrophe for our environment – if there had been an oil spill.. that's what worries me, you know "

Adequacy of Different Elements of Arctic

“How well equipped do you think the Canadian Arctic is today to be able meet current needs in each of the following areas?”



4.4 RANKING PRIORITIES – TRADE OFF

Respondents were presented with a hypothetical scenario where they could decide how to allocate one billion dollars in government funding over the next ten years. They were then presented with pairs of choices (randomly selected from a list of twelve potential options) and asked to choose between the two. In a world where wants are infinite but resources are limited, this indicator provides a highly accurate picture of respondents' priorities, as it effectively forces them to order their preferences, rather than provide an arbitrary rating. A score of over 50 indicates that the option was selected over other options the majority of the time and is therefore a relative "winner". Conversely, a score of under 50 suggests a relative "loser".

Responses show that Canadians from both the North and the South see health care, infrastructure, and education as top priorities. Residents of the North are considerably more likely than their Southern counterparts to prioritize housing and culture, which is perhaps reflective of the differing levels of familiarity with Arctic issues between the two groups. Southerners place substantially more importance on military security.

In Northern Canada, the findings reveal that providing better health care was selected most often (chosen 66 per cent of the time over the other options tested), followed closely by building better infrastructure (65 per cent), building better houses (64 per cent), and increasing access to post-secondary education (63 per cent). Providing more protection for the environment, increasing capacity to respond to disasters, and developing programs to preserve culture and language were also selected by a majority or a near majority of respondents (53 per cent, 52 per cent, and 48 per cent, respectively). Increasing capacity for search and rescue, providing a program to train and employ local residents, increasing the development of natural resources, and developing tourism were given lower priority by Canadians (selected 38 per cent, 37 per cent, 35 per cent, and 33 per cent of the time, respectively) ranked in the middle. At the bottom of the list of tested items was increasing the military presence to secure the Arctic (selected just 24 per cent of the time).


- Residents of the Northwest Territories are more likely to select increasing the development of natural resources over other options (42 per cent).
- Men are more likely to choose increasing access to post-secondary education (69 per cent) and increasing the development natural resources (40 per cent). Women, in contrast, are more likely to opt for providing better health care (72 per cent), providing more regulations to protect the environment (60 per cent), and providing programs to employ local residents (43 per cent).
- Compared to other age groups, those over 60 are much more likely to choose increasing the military presence in the Arctic (36 per cent).

In Southern Canada, the findings reveal that building better infrastructure was selected most often (chosen 69 per cent of the time over the other options tested), followed by providing better access to health care (60 per cent), providing better policies to protect the environment (58 per cent), and increasing access to post-secondary education (56 per cent). Increasing capacity to respond to disasters was selected about half the time (49 per cent). Building more and better houses, providing a program to train and employ local residents, and implementing programs to preserve culture were given lower priority by Canadians (selected 40 per cent and 37 per cent, and 36 of the time, respectively). Increasing the military presence to secure the Arctic was selected 34 per cent of the time. Towards the bottom of the list of tested items was increasing capacity for search and rescue (33 per cent), increasing the development of mining of natural resources (33 per cent), and increasing the development of tourism in the Arctic (33 per cent).

- Regionally, residents of British Columbia are more likely to select developing tourism in the Arctic (44 per cent). Residents of Alberta, meanwhile, see a greater importance increasing the military presence there (43 per cent). Residents of the Prairies are particularly keen on developing the Arctic's natural resources (46 per cent), while residents of Quebec are more likely choose protecting the environment (69 per cent) and increasing the capacity to respond to disasters (58 per cent). Atlantic Canadians are more likely to opt for providing a program to train and employ local residents about half the time (49 per cent).
- Men are more likely to choose increasing the military security in the Arctic (40 per cent) and increasing the development of natural resources (37 per cent). Women, meanwhile, are more likely to select providing better health care (63 per cent) and preserving culture and language (41 per cent).
- As seen in Northern Canada, those over 60 in Southern Canada are more likely to prioritize increasing military security in the Arctic (40 per cent).
- Perhaps not surprisingly, university graduates are more likely to prioritize increasing access to post-secondary education (59 per cent). These respondents are also more likely to choose protecting the environment (62 per cent). College graduates, meanwhile, are more likely to select increasing the military presence in the Arctic (40 per cent) while those limited to a high school education are more keen on providing programs to train and employ local residents (45 per cent).


Ranking Priorities – Trade Off (North)

“Suppose you were in charge for a day and you had to choose how to invest one billion dollars over the next 10 years to help the Canadian Arctic prepare to face its future challenges. Which of the following investments...?”



Ranking Priorities – Trade Off (South)

“Suppose you were in charge for a day and you had to choose how to invest one billion dollars over the next 10 years to help the Canadian Arctic prepare to face its future challenges. Which of the following investments...?”



4.5 SUPPORT FOR EXPANDING THE CANADIAN RANGERS

The Canadian Rangers are a mostly Indigenous militia force and a part of the Canadian Forces Reserves. They form local patrols to carry out surveillance and search and rescue tasks in the Arctic. The Rangers are volunteers and are given some basic training by the Canadian Forces, a Lee Enfield rifle and a red sweatshirt. The Canadian Rangers have been put forward as exemplary for promoting cooperation between Arctic residents and the Canadian Forces.


Respondents were asked whether they feel that the Canadian Rangers should be given an expanded role with additional personnel, resources, and training or whether they feel that it would be too expensive to do so and that Canada should rely more on existing equipment and personnel from the South. Responses suggest very strong support for expanding the Canadian Rangers, particularly in Northern Canada. Fully 82 per cent of Northern respondents say the Canadian Rangers should be given an expanded role, compared to just twelve per cent who say it would be too expensive. An additional five per cent are undecided.


- Support for expanding the role of the Rangers is particularly strong among those over 60 (90 per cent).

Support for expanding the Canadian Rangers is somewhat more tepid among respondents from Southern Canada. This difference is due primarily to a much lower response rate, suggesting that Southern Canadians are less familiar with this organization. Seven in ten of these respondents (71 per cent) say they support expanding the Canadian Rangers, compared to just thirteen per cent who are opposed. Sixteen per cent are uncertain.

Support for Expanding Canadian Rangers

"Which is closer to your own point of view?"



 EKOS Research Associates Inc.

WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

5. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ARCTIC

Responses suggest that Canadians would like their government to take a more assertive stance in the dispute over the Beaufort Sea and the Northwest Passage. While Americans show a strong willingness to work with Canadians to strike a deal over the Beaufort Sea, Canadians appear to be entrenched in their view that this area is within their jurisdiction and that the Northwest Passage falls within Canadian territorial waters.


5.1 PREFERRED PARTNER IN DEALING WITH ARCTIC ISSUES

Respondents in each of the eight member states of the Arctic Council were presented with a list of countries and asked which one they would be *most* comfortable dealing with on Arctic issues. Results show a clear preference for working with Scandinavian countries, as this was the most common response in eight of the nine regions examined (Northern Canada, Southern Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden). Canada, meanwhile, comes out as a clear second choice, as it was ranked as one of the top two choices in six of the seven other Arctic states. Echoing their view on the Beaufort Sea boundary dispute (see section 6.4), Americans selected their closest ally and neighbour (i.e., Canada) as their preferred partner in dealing with Arctic issues.

Preferred Partner in Dealing with Arctic Issues

“Which of the following countries would you be most comfortable with (your country) dealing with on Arctic issues?”

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Northern Canada	Scandinavia	The United States	Russia
Southern Canada	Scandinavia	The United States	Russia
Denmark	Scandinavia	Canada	The United States
Finland	Scandinavia	Canada	The United States
Iceland	Scandinavia	Canada	The United States
Norway	Scandinavia	Canada	The United States
Russia	Scandinavia	The United States	Canada
Sweden	Scandinavia	Canada	Other Europe
The United States	Canada	Scandinavia	Other Europe



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

5.2 LEAST PREFERRED PARTNER IN DEALING WITH ARCTIC ISSUES

Respondents in each of the eight member states of the Arctic Council were presented with the same list of countries and asked to identify which one they would be *least* comfortable in dealing with on Arctic issues. The results overwhelmingly point to China as the least desired partner, as this was the most common response in eight of the nine regions examined. Russia, in contrast, appears to be least comfortable in dealing with the United States, perhaps a reflection of lingering sentiments from the Cold War.

Least Preferred Partner in Dealing with Arctic Issues

“Which of the following countries would you be least comfortable with (your country) dealing with on Arctic issues?”


	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Northern Canada	China	The United States	Russia
Southern Canada	China	Russia	The United States
Denmark	China	The United States	Other
Finland	China	Other Europe	The United States
Iceland	China	The United States	Russia
Norway	China	The United States	Other Europe
Russia	The United States	Scandinavia	China
Sweden	China	The United States	Other Europe
The United States	China	Russia	Other Europe

5.3 NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE ARCTIC

Respondents from the eight member nations of the Arctic Council were asked whether they feel that the Arctic should be a nuclear weapon free zone like Antarctica. Results show a clear preference for removing these weapons in seven of the nine regions examined. Norway is the most supportive of removing nuclear weapons (82 per cent say they agree), followed by Southern Canada (78 per cent), Finland (77 per cent), Northern Canada (76 per cent), Iceland (75 per cent), and Denmark (74 per cent). Perhaps not surprisingly, respondents from the two nuclear superpowers – Russia and the United States – are more hesitant to agree that these weapons should be removed (56 per cent and 47 per cent, respectively).

Nuclear Weapons in the Arctic

“To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The Arctic should be a nuclear weapons free zone just like Antarctica is, and the United States and Russia should remove their nuclear weapons from the Arctic?”



5.4 APPROACH TO BEAUFORT SEA DISPUTE WITH US

The boundary between Canada and the United States in the Beaufort Sea is in dispute. Differences on interpreting from which point each country's two hundred mile territorial sea extends from, result in a pie-shaped piece of water in the Beaufort Sea claimed by both countries. This area is believed to be rich in natural resources, including oil and gas.

Residents of Canada and the United States were asked whether they feel that the two countries should work together to strike a deal to resolve their dispute over the Beaufort Sea or whether they would prefer to see their government assert its full sovereign rights over the area. The results show two starkly different views between the two countries. While Canadians appear to lean towards the option of asserting their full sovereign rights over the area, Americans appear to be more open to the idea of striking a deal between the two countries.

Half of respondents from Northern Canada (50 per cent) say that Canada should assert its full sovereign rights over the Beaufort Sea while 43 per cent say they would prefer to work with the United States to come to an agreement. Six per cent are undecided about this issue.

- Respondents from the Northwest Territories are more likely to suggest that Canada should assert its full sovereign rights (55 per cent).
- Those over 60 and those with a university degree are more keen on the idea that Canada should work with the United States to come to an agreement (51 and 48 per cent, respectively).

Similarly, half of Southern Canadians (49 per cent) would prefer to assert their full sovereign rights over the Beaufort Sea, compared to 43 per cent who would rather strike a deal. Eight per cent offered no response.

- College graduates are more likely to say that Canada should assert its full sovereign rights (57 per cent).
- Once again, those over 60 and those with a university degree would prefer to work with the United States (50 and 46 per cent, respectively).

A clearly majority of respondents from the United States (62 per cent) say they would like their government work with Canada to strike a deal regarding the Beaufort Sea, while just ten per cent say they would prefer that their government try to assert full sovereign rights over the area. It is important to note that the proportion of American respondents who did not offer a response is significantly higher than in Canada

(28 per cent). This difference may reflect differing levels of awareness of this issue between the two countries.

- Similarly to the demographic patterns in Canada, those over 60 and university graduates favour the concept for the two governments working together (77 per cent and 65 per cent, respectively).
- Youth are more apt to say that the United States should assert its full sovereignty rights (20 per cent).


In one of the focus groups, one person stated:

“What they want to know from you is if Canada should stand up for that and for the fact that they believe that the water should be divided. There is oil there. There is gas. There are lots of minerals. These are our mineral rights, because that’s what we’ve got left at the end of the day. For the people of the North they are very, very important. Compromises can always be made, but if you start from a weaker point of starting with compromises, then God only knows where you will end up!”

This statement reflects the level of importance that the inhabitants of the Arctic place on this issue and prevalence of the sentiment that Canada should try to assert full sovereignty over the area.

Approach to Beaufort Dispute with US

“Canada currently has a border dispute with the United States over a territory in the Beaufort Sea. Would you rather see Canada...?”



* US respondents asked about dispute with US



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010


5.5 PREFERRED APPROACH TO RESOLVING DISPUTES OVER ARCTIC

Respondents were asked how they would like their government to handle border and resource sharing disputes in the Arctic. Results vary heavily by country. In Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, there is very strong support for either negotiating a compromise with other countries (selected by 64 per cent, 50 per cent, 49 per cent, and 35 per cent, respectively) or transforming the Arctic into an international territory like Antarctica (24 per cent, 37 per cent, 35 per cent, and 48 per cent, respectively). In Northern Canada, Southern Canada, and Russia, however, respondents are divided between pursuing a firm line in defending their sections of the Arctic (selected by 41 per cent, 43 per cent, and 34 per cent, respectively) or negotiating a compromise with other nations (46 per cent, 39 per cent, and 33 per cent, respectively). Iceland is heavily divided, though a small plurality (36 per cent) would prefer a more assertive role in defending their sections of the Arctic. The United States shows moderate support for a compromise (30 per cent) or creating an international territory (25 per cent), though a plurality of respondents are undecided (35 per cent).

- In Northern Canada, those limited to a high school education (52 per cent) and males (45 per cent) are more likely to say that Canada should pursue a firm line in defending its section of the Arctic. University graduates, in contrast, appear to prefer negotiating a compromise with other countries (46 per cent).
- In Southern Canada, a more aggressive role is favoured by Albertans (50 per cent), college graduates (49 per cent), and men (48 per cent). University graduates are more likely to say Canada should negotiate a compromise with other countries.

Preferred Approach to Resolving Arctic Disputes

"Thinking about border and/or resource sharing disputes in the Arctic, what statement is closest to your point of view?"



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

5.6 NORTHWEST PASSAGE – WHOSE?

The Northwest Passage has long been the stuff of legend. The early explorers came to this part of the world to find a quicker trading route to Asia. Their imaginative stories of the inhabitants of this land and the challenges they faced to survive, including stories of resorting to cannibalism, led to a widespread interest in the Northwest Passage and a proliferation of stories about the stretch of water. At the same time, because the Northwest Passage is embroiled in such storytelling, many are left with a sensationalized view of the Passage. While explorers searched for the Northwest Passage, there are actually several routes which are called by this name. The changes brought about by climate change, specifically the intensified melting of the sea ice, have again cast eyes towards the passage. There has increasingly been talk of using this route for shipping goods between Europe and Asia.

However, the legal status of the passage remains in dispute. Canada feels that the Passage is its internal waters, having drawn baselines around the Arctic Archipelago and claiming that all waters that lie within it are internal to Canada. The United States, the European Union, China, and indeed as the data-set reveals many respondents outside Canada believe that the Northwest Passage is an international waterway and thus there exists a right to freedom of navigation through these waters.

Respondents across the eight Arctic Council member states were asked whether they thought that the Northwest Passage is within Canadian water or an international water way. Perhaps not surprisingly, the only respondents out of whom the majority see it as belonging to Canada are Canadians themselves (regardless of their geographical region). Other countries see it as an international water way or as a territory whose ownership is in dispute. It is important to note, however, that the proportion of respondents in other countries that did not respond is extremely high, which may suggest relatively low levels of literacy on the issue of the Northwest Passage.

Three-quarters of Northern Canadians (78 per cent) say the Northwest Passage falls within Canadians waters, compared to eleven per cent who say it is an international water way and four per cent who say that its ownership is under dispute. Seven per cent are uncertain.

- Residents of Nunavut, college graduates, those over 60, and men are considerably more likely to insist that the Northwest Passage falls within Canadians waters (87 per cent, 85 per cent, 84 per cent, and 81 per cent, respectively).
- High school graduates (70 per cent), those with a household income of less than \$40,000 (70 per cent), residents of the Yukon (68 per cent), and youth (62 per cent), are somewhat more hesitant to say that the Northwest Passage falls within Canadians waters.


Similarly, three in four respondents from Southern Canada (74 per cent) say the Northwest Passage is Canadian, compared to just fourteen per cent who see it as an international water way. An additional twelve per cent have no opinion on the matter.

- The perception that the Northwest Passage falls within Canadian waters is more common among those with a household income of over \$120,000 (81 per cent), those with an income of \$80,000-120,000 (81 per cent), men (81 per cent), those over 60 (79 per cent), residents of Ontario (78 per cent), and university graduates (76 per cent).
- Residents of Quebec are more likely to argue that the Northwest Passage is an international water way (19 per cent).

Internationally, a clear plurality of respondents from Finland (45 per cent), Denmark (37 per cent), Norway (37 per cent), Russia (29 per cent), the United States (20 per cent), and Sweden (17 per cent) say that the Northwest Passage is an international water way. In contrast, a plurality of respondents from Iceland says that the Northwest Passage is in dispute (31 per cent). Only Norway (23 per cent), Denmark (19 per cent), and Finland (13 per cent) show any significant support for Canada's claim to the Northwest Passage.

Northwest Passage – Whose?

“The Northwest passage is a sea route through the Arctic islands, along the northern coast of North America, that connects the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. It is of interest to many nations because it significantly reduces the shipping distance from Asia to Europe. From what you know or have heard, is the Northwest passage...?”



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

6. INTERNATIONAL VIEWS ON THE ARCTIC COUNCIL

The Arctic Council is a high-level intergovernmental forum that addresses common issues and concerns faced by Arctic governments and Indigenous peoples of the High North. It is the most active intergovernmental forum concerned with the Arctic and the only one to be comprised of all eight Arctic nations: Canada, Denmark (Greenland), Finland, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the United States. The Arctic Council is primarily concerned with the promotion of environmental protection and sustainable development of the region.

Respondents from the eight member states that comprise the Arctic Council were asked a series of questions regarding the Arctic Council. The results show that compared to other nations, Canadians are the most supportive of the idea of an Arctic Council and are among the most biggest supporters of expanding the Council's role to include peace-building and military security. Interestingly, Canadians are the least open to allowing non-arctic states (such as China) or organizations (like the European Union) to join the Arctic Council.


6.1 AWARENESS OF ARCTIC COUNCIL

Respondents from all eight countries were given a brief description of the Arctic Council and were asked if they had heard of it. Awareness appears to be highest in Northern Canada (61 per cent say they are either clearly or vaguely aware of the Arctic Council) and Iceland (61 per cent). Roughly half of respondents from Denmark (57 per cent), Southern Canada (51 per cent), and Finland (47 per cent) say they have heard of the Arctic Council. Awareness of the Arctic Council is relatively lower in Norway (40 per cent) and Sweden (27 per cent). It is lowest in Russia (21 per cent) and the United States (16 per cent).

- In both Northern and Southern Canada, awareness rises progressively with age, education, and income. In both regions, awareness is also relatively higher among men than among women.

Awareness of Arctic Council

“Have you ever heard of an intergovernmental forum or group called the Arctic Council that is made up of eight countries with Arctic regions?”




6.2 SUPPORT FOR ARCTIC COUNCIL

Respondents were asked whether they support the idea of an Arctic Council so that the eight Arctic states can work together on common Arctic issues. Northern Canadians are the most supportive of the Council, with 91 per cent saying they support the idea. Eight in ten residents of Southern Canada (82 per cent) and Sweden (81 per cent), as well as three-quarters of respondents from Finland (77 per cent), Denmark (76 per cent), and Norway (72 per cent) are supportive of the concept. Support for the Arctic Council drops to 63 per cent in Iceland and to just over half of respondents from the United States (56 per cent) and Russia (55 per cent).

Support for Arctic Council

“Do you support or not the idea of an Arctic Council so the 8 Arctic nations can work together on common Arctic issues, instead of each one working independently?”



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

6.3 SUPPORT FOR AN EXPANDED ARCTIC COUNCIL MANDATE

Respondents were asked if they feel that the Arctic Council should also cover areas such as peace-building and military security in addition to its current focus on environmental matters. Responses show very strong support for peace-building initiatives, though expanding the Council's role to include military activities garners much less support.

Fully eight in ten respondents from Russia (85 per cent), Iceland (85 per cent), Southern Canada (82 per cent), Finland (81 per cent), and Northern Canada (80 per cent) say they would support expanding the Arctic Council's role to include military security. Similarly, two-thirds of respondents from Sweden (70 per cent), the United States (69 per cent), and Norway (66 per cent) endorse such a role. This idea receives a somewhat more lukewarm response in Denmark, where just 57 per cent would support expanding the Council's role.


- In Northern Canada, support is highest among residents of Nunavut (89 per cent), university graduates (85 per cent), and women (85 per cent).
- In Southern Canada, Quebeckers are more likely to support peace-building initiatives being undertaken by the Arctic Council (87 per cent).

The prospect of expanding the Arctic Council's role to include military security, however, is greeted with a much more pronounced degree of scepticism. While Russia is highly supportive of expanding the Arctic Council's role to include security (81 per cent), receptivity is much lower in other countries. Six in ten respondents from Southern Canada (62 per cent), Northern Canada (59 per cent), and Sweden (61 per cent) and half of respondents from Norway (51 per cent), the United States (51 per cent), and Denmark (48 per cent) are supportive of the idea. Support drops to 44 per cent in Iceland and 39 per cent in Finland.

- In Southern Canada, residents of Quebec are the most supportive of expanding the Arctic Council's role to include military security (70 per cent).

Support for Expanded Council Mandate

“Do you think that the Arctic Council should also cover areas like ... in the Arctic?”



 EKOS Research Associates Inc.

WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010



6.4 SUPPORT FOR INCLUSION OF NON-ARCTIC STATES

Respondents who support the concept of the Arctic Council were asked whether they feel that non-Arctic states like China or organizations like the European Union should be invited to join the Arctic Council and have a say in Arctic affairs. The results suggest that Sweden is the most open to including non-Arctic states, with 64 per cent saying they should have a say. Roughly half of respondents from Russia (49 per cent), Finland (48 per cent), Denmark (46 per cent), and Norway (45 per cent) believe that non-Arctic states should be included, a figure that drops to one in four in Iceland (24 per cent), the United States (23 per cent), and Northern Canada (22 per cent). Just fifteen per cent of respondents from Southern Canada believe that non-Arctic states should have a say in Arctic affairs.

- In Northern Canada, support for including non-Arctic states is highest among youth (36 per cent) and Yukoners (27 per cent), while opposition is strongest among those with an annual household income of over \$120,000 (83 per cent) and college graduates (82 per cent)
- In Southern Canada, support is highest among Quebeckers (28 per cent), youth (28 per cent), those with a household income of less than \$40,000 (23 per cent), high school graduates (20 per cent), and men (19 per cent). Opposition is higher among Ontarians (82 per cent) and those over 60 (80 per cent).

Support for Inclusion of Non-Arctic States

“Do you think non-arctic states, like China or organizations like the European Union, should be invited to join the Arctic Council and have a say in Arctic affairs?”



WDGF Canadian Arctic Survey – North/South, 2010

7. CONCLUSIONS

Canadians see the Arctic in a much different light than they do the rest of the country. While the economy is seen as the most important issue facing Canada as a whole, it is seldom listed as a top priority in the North. The most important issue facing Northern Canada is, according to respondents, the environment.

The results show the concept of Arctic security no longer carries its traditional Cold War definition of guarding against international threats. Rather, protecting the environment and maintaining a healthy, educated population are seen as central components of Arctic security. Health care, education, and infrastructure consistently rank among the top priorities while military security usually finds itself at the bottom of the list.

The results also illustrate some interesting differences in the way Canadians from different regions perceive the issues facing the North. Northern Canadians are relatively more concerned about housing, infrastructure, standards of living, and preserving traditional ways of life. Southern Canadians, in contrast, are considerably more concerned with threats to Canadian sovereignty in the area.

Women are more likely to underscore the need for social and cultural security while men are more concerned about economic issues. Quebec is consistently more supportive of introducing measures to combat climate change while Albertans, men, those over 60, and those without a university degree are consistently more concerned with military security.

Results show very strong support for the Arctic Council, particularly among Canadians. A majority of respondents in all countries would like to see the Council's role expanded to include peace-building, but there are strong divisions over whether it should cover military security. Support for including non-Arctic states in talks over Arctic affairs is tepid at best, and Canadians in particular are strongly opposed.

While Canadians say they are open to working with other countries, at the same time a clear majority of Canadians from all regions of the country want to increase Canada's military presence in the Arctic. Canadians also agree that the Arctic should be the focal point of their government's foreign policy. Therefore, they appear to be of two minds about the potential for conflict in the Arctic. The vast majority of Canadians insist that the Northwest Passage falls within Canadian waters (a view that is not widely shared by any other member of the Arctic Council with the exception of Russia) while a plurality would like their government to assert its full sovereignty rights over the Beaufort Sea (Americans, meanwhile, prefer a more diplomatic approach). Ironically, when it comes to Northern sovereignty, Canadians seem to look more like the stereotypical American and Americans are cast in the more cooperative "Canadian" approach.