“Premier Partners?”
Canadian-American Relations in the Early Cold War Arctic

Overview

The Government of Canada’s 2010 “Statement on Arctic Foreign Policy” explained that “the United States is our premier partner in the Arctic.” US Arctic policies also emphasize the “unique and enduring partnership” between the two countries in defence cooperation (US Navy Arctic Roadmap 2014: 7). This positive appraisal is warranted, despite scholarship that emphasizes bilateral friction and sovereignty disputes between the two allies. After the end of the Second World War, new strategic assessments placed Canada’s Arctic on the frontlines of a potential “superpower” conflict with the USSR. American pressure for access to Canada’s North to build airfields, weather stations, and conduct other military activities, alarmed Canadian officials and led some journalists to begin describing a looming sovereignty crisis.

The central debate over the sovereignty-security equilibrium in Canada-US Arctic relations has led some scholars to track past and present popular media coverage and statements by political activists who allege sinister American intentions for Canada’s Arctic. According to this line of thinking, Canadian apathy and American aggression threatened our sovereignty. Other historians paint a more benign portrait of bilateral cooperation, suggesting that American security imperatives did not undermine Canadian sovereignty and that postwar negotiations and Arctic operations balanced (and even strengthened) our country’s sovereignty and security interests.

This project, led by Whitney Lackenbauer, critically re-evaluate Canada-US Arctic relations in the early Cold War through three book projects that bring unique theories and fresh evidence to the debate.

The first book, co-authored with Peter Kikkert, focuses on Canadian diplomatic and security policy-making between Canada and the US from 1946-55. Building upon securitization theory and systematically analyzing Canada and American archival sources, this book will develop a theory of “sovereigntization” to explore how securitizing and sovereigntizing moves influenced the development of policy tools and instruments related to defence, diplomatic engagement, and international law.

The second book, co-authored with Adam LaJeunesse, will provide the first systematic analysis of U.S. naval task force activities in the Canadian North from 1946-60. These modern “exploratory” voyages charted new passages, yielded ground-breaking scientific information, and shaped logistic, transportation, and settlement patterns. They also led Canada and the US to collaborate and manage disagreements over Arctic sovereignty. Focusing on US sources previously unexplored by historians, this book will shed new light on why the joint defence relationship was so successful.

The third book, co-authored with Daniel Heidt, critically interrogates the Canada-US Joint Arctic Weather Stations (JAWS) program that operated in the High Arctic from 1946-72. Drawing upon extensive archival evidence and interviews with former JAWS employees, this study will go beyond the diplomatic record and examine how technicians and maintenance personnel from both countries mediated Canadian-American relations on the ground.

Our research program has both academic and policy relevance. Changes in the Arctic, which have elicited unprecedented political and media attention over the last decade, present both challenges and opportunities for Canada. The knowledge generated by our critical assessment of historical Canada-US security and sovereignty practices will contribute to stakeholder decision-making and stimulate ongoing dialogue about Canada’s Northern strategies.
Program Objectives

Our research program seeks to clarify the nature and practice of Canada-US relations in the early Cold War by applying new theoretical approaches and archival evidence to re-assess the interplay between sovereignty and security in the Arctic. The interrelationship between sovereignty and security continues to evolve, but the distinction between the two concepts – and the precise nature of their interaction – is seldom systematically explained in a manner attentive to historical experience. Our three book projects critically assess how Canadian and American stakeholders at various levels identified, defined, perceived, and managed issues and relationships in changing political, operational, and historical contexts.

Through three detailed case studies grounded in mixed qualitative evidence (government documents, scholarly and popular literature, archival material, and oral interviews) we will examine the intersections of sovereignty, security, science, and technology in international and domestic contexts. How and why did various political, diplomatic, military, media, academic, and other actors perceive and construct threats? Does existing theory adequately explain these securitization processes, and how does this interact with our model of sovereignization? How were threat images diffused or translated to new (inter)national contexts? How were challenges managed in practice, and did cooperation or antagonism characterise Canada-US relationships across the various scales (from the high-level political to local interactions at joint stations and aboard icebreakers)? How did modernist assumptions and inter-personal relationships facilitate or hinder the performance of sovereignty and security in isolated places? How did advancements in science and technology influence operations and perceptions of sovereignty and security? What lessons can be derived from the early postwar period to inform contemporary Canadian decision-making and strengthen bilateral cooperation?

Although most of the current debate over Arctic sovereignty and security anticipates the future, history continues to inform perceptions of Canada’s legal position, relationships, and priorities. Our work on the Cold War Arctic is engaged research because we connect it to contemporary issues without abandoning the primacy of historical context or forsaking the ideal of seeking to understand the past “on its own terms.” In our view, the challenge is to learn from history and inform better policies that balance domestic and international interests, justify appropriate and sustainable roles for the military and other instruments of the state, and reflect the priorities of Canadians.

Context

The Canadian-American relationship since the Second World War has generated much scholarly debate. Historian Donald Creighton (1976) lamented Canada’s decision to take the “forked road” into the American embrace, laying a basis for the “sell-out school” who describe the country’s transition from British colony to nation to colony within the US empire during the Cold War (see discussion in Lackenbauer 2002). Other historians have intimated a less deliberate Canadian path, encapsulated by J.L. Granatstein’s thesis that Britain’s weakness forced Canada into the arms of the US. This school of thinking highlights both conflict and cooperation in the bilateral relationship, emphasizing Canada’s limitation as a modest “middle power” and implying limited Canadian agency. To Norman Hillmer (1989), Canada and the United States were “partners nevertheless,” hardly an inspiring phrase but consistent with his and J.L. Granatstein’s interpretation that the relationship existed “for better or for worse” (1991). John Sigler and Charles Doran (1985) were less doubtful and employed the phrase “enduring friendship, persistent stress,” while Stephen Randall and John Herd Thompson (1994) characterize them as “ambivalent allies.” Sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset (1990) struck a more resolute and confident tone when he said that the two countries’ ideological differences represented a “continental divide.” Another school emphasizes mutual understanding and cooperation instead of conflict, with Robert
Bothwell emphasizing the “politics of partnership” (1992), Greg Donaghy depicting the North American neighbours as “tolerant allies” (2002), and Steven Azzi (2014) emphasizing the countries’ “reconcilable differences.”

These competing interpretations are reflected in historians’ debates about bilateral relations in the Canadian Arctic. During the Second World War, Northwestern defence projects generated official anxieties in Ottawa about potential threats to Canadian sovereignty (Coates and Morrison 1992). As the war progressed, however, the Canadian government expressed its concerns and officials in Washington acknowledged that they had to respect their northern neighbour’s interests and chronic insecurities about sovereignty. Accordingly, Canada emerged from the war with its sovereignty intact, and senior decision-makers in Ottawa had learned valuable lessons about the need to monitor and/or participate in Northern development (Lackenbauer 2002; Lackenbauer and Kikkert 2014).

The onset of the Cold War tested this burgeoning continental relationship. As relations between the Soviet Union and the United States deteriorated, North American defence analysts replaced Mercator projections with polar projection maps. Looking at the world from the perspective of the North Pole made the United States’ proximity to the Soviet Union strikingly obvious. Strategists started to make nightmarish predictions of hostile bombers flooding over the northern approaches to wreak havoc on the continent’s urban and industrial heartlands. Accordingly, US defence planners contemplated ambitious projects to serve the broader interests of continental defence, seeing the Arctic as an undefended roof rather than a natural defensive barrier (Eayrs 1980; Eyre 1987; Jockel 1987; Richter 2003). When the US pushed for immediate access to Canada’s Far North to build airfields, weather stations, and conduct naval exercises, Canadian officials were apprehensive and cautious while journalists began to talk about a looming sovereignty crisis. These developments set the stage for a central debate about the sovereignty-security equilibrium that has persisted ever since.

Two dominant schools of thought regarding Canada-US Arctic relations have each produced distinct “lessons learned” and contributed to the (re)shaping of bilateral relations. The first cites early Cold War Arctic relations as key evidence that the Americans were willing to encroach on Canadian sovereignty to achieve their ends. Contributors such as Bernd Horn (2002) and Adam Lajeunesse (2007) support Creighton’s suggestion that Canada took the wrong fork in the road when it allowed the Americans to enter the Canadian North. Shelagh Grant’s influential work (1988, 2010) echoes early postwar media coverage and political activists’ statements about allegedly sinister American intentions and makes the strongest case that the US disregarded Canadian sensitivities and sovereignty to secure its own national interests. By extension, these interpretations suggest that Canada must adopt activist strategies to entrench and protect its Arctic interests against American challenges. Unless the United States concedes to Canada’s legal arguments, the logic holds, the US poses a threat to Canadian sovereignty and forces Ottawa to take unilateral action to protect its interests.
The second school paints a more benign portrait of bilateral cooperation, supporting the current official depiction of Canada and the US as “premier partners” in the Arctic (Canada 2010; United States Navy 2014). Building on more general work by Ken Eyre (1980, 1987), Joseph Jockel (1987), David Bercuson (1990, 2011), and Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel (1998), Whitney Lackenbauer leads a new generation of historians who contend that Canadian and American Arctic interests were generally compatible, and that bilateral cooperation since the Second World War has bolstered Canadian security and sovereignty interests. Quiet diplomacy and practical, bilateral problem-solving allayed most of the Arctic “crisis” concerns that arose. Accordingly, decision-makers today might seek to perpetuate a long tradition of cooperation with the United States that respects legal differences and seeks practical agreements without prejudicing either country’s national or international interests (eg. Coates et al 2008; Lackenbauer 2002, 2013; Lackenbauer and Kikkert 2011, 2014; Kikkert 2009, 2011; Heidt 2011; Lajeunesse 2012).

Like scholars and commentators who assess today’s sovereignty and security concerns, both of these schools tend to focus on high-level bilateral negotiations and press debates. By labelling something a sovereignty or security crisis, an actor elevates an issue from the realm of low politics (bounded by democratic rules and decision-making procedures) to the realm of high politics (characterized by urgency, priority, and life and death decisions). When this labelling occurs, the line between risk management – preventing potential problems from developing into acute concrete threats – and managing “actual” threats to sovereignty and security becomes blurred (Buzan and Hansen 2009). Our work seeks to examine how decision-makers in both countries perceived, understood, and framed sovereignty and security considerations. Moving beyond a typical fixation on sovereignty “crises” at the highest political levels, our work also looks at how representatives from both countries managed risks and mediated sovereignty and security concerns “on the ground” to establish and sustain practical cooperation.

The three monographs that our research team will produce will be co-authored by Lackenbauer and a postdoctoral fellow. Each of the co-authors has extensive background in Arctic history and Canada-US relations. All three books address sovereignty and security issues vis-a-vis Canadian-American relations, but they each adopt different scales and scholarly literatures to inform their contributions to current political, historiographical, and theoretical debates.
Securing Sovereignty: Canada, the U.S., and the Arctic, 1946-55 (Kikkert and Lackenbauer)

While Canada’s early postwar military-diplomatic actions related to the Arctic appear to be ad hoc, reactionary, and tentative, our hypothesis is that Canadian activities were appropriately suited to a complex situation. Officials at External Affairs acknowledged Canada’s limitations but managed to steer a prudent and practical course, laying the groundwork for future assertions of Canadian jurisdiction and sovereignty in the region. Gathering and analyzing further archival research will allow us to confirm whether “quiet diplomacy,” through established diplomatic and military channels, ultimately set bilateral Arctic relations on a mutually satisfactory course. Indeed, it appears that Canada secured greater American recognition of its Arctic sovereignty than previously thought through established political channels (Lackenbauer & Kikkert 2009, 2011, 2014). As such, this book will shed new light on the logic of securitizing moves in the early postwar period, build a conceptual model of sovereigntization to explain Canada’s particular concerns and corresponding strategy, and analyze which policy instruments Canadian officials adopted to balance security and sovereignty imperatives.

Securitization theory, first developed by the “Copenhagen School” in the 1990s, posits that a security issue is produced after a securitizing actor presents it as an existential threat and convinces the “audience” that this is the case. The “pioneers” of this approach, Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde (1998), identify three units of analysis: the referent object (the object of securitization); the security actor (actors who declare a referent object to be existentially threatened); and functional actors (actors who significantly influence decisions in the security sector). Audiences and context are also essential units of analysis to understand the practices and methods that produce security (Balzacq 2005, 2011). We will employ aspects of the Copenhagen model of securitization to help explain the creation of security threats and the sociological model of securitization to understand the construction of threats as pragmatic practice to attain political or policy goals. In moving beyond the poststructuralist model of the Copenhagen School, we draw upon the strengths of this critical linguistic approach without denying the benefits of applying more positivist research techniques to cases under study.

Canadian officials conceptualized the US as a threat to Canada’s Arctic sovereignty, but not as a security threat. Therefore, we will develop and test a parallel model of sovereigntization to analyze non-security threat construction and practices mobilized to protect Canadian terrestrial and maritime sovereignty. Our particular interest lies in exploring how securitizing and sovereigntizing moves influenced the development of policy tools or instruments related to defence, diplomatic engagement, and international law. In laying out criteria to assess the success or failure of these moves (labelled as “Canadianization” at the time), we are particularly attentive to the functional arguments they serve. When did the Canadian government turn to regulatory tools (processes of governmentality) and when did it turn to capacity tools (specific modalities for imposing external discipline) to attain desired policy outcomes? What resources was it willing to invest in these tools, to what ends, and for how long?

Careful attentiveness to the interplay between securitizing and sovereigntizing moves reveals interesting dynamics inadequately analyzed in existing historical scholarship on bilateral relations and the Cold War Arctic. By treating sovereignty and security as objective conditions, previous authors have differed in their assessments of whether Canada faced “real” security and sovereignty threats. This book is more interested in exploring the relationships and processes of interpretation and threat perception/construction that explained Canadian and American policy responses. Rather than arguing that Canada should have behaved differently, we are more interested in better understanding the logic behind particular courses of Canadian and American (in)action. To do so, we will undertake a deep reading of the extensive archival records in Ottawa and Washington to chart high-level political and diplomatic deliberations, as well as relations between military staffs and planners.
Modern Explorers: US Maritime Operations and the Canadian Arctic, 1945-60 (Lajeunesse and Lackenbauer)

Existing scholarship tends to examine bilateral relations from a Canadian perspective or (in the case of several recent M.A. theses, such as Evans 1995 and Herd 2005) from the perspective of high-level American politicians and senior strategists. This book shifts the focus to examine bilateral cooperation through an American operational lens. By acknowledging the US fixation on what it perceived as practical requirements to access the region, we will undertake the first in-depth look at US maritime operations in Canadian Arctic waters in the early Cold War. Between the end of the Second World War and the completion of the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line, the US Navy’s Military Sea Transportation Service and the US Coast Guard sent dozens of icebreakers and cargo ships to the waters of the Arctic Archipelago. (The Royal Canadian Navy lacked the heavy icebreakers or specialized landing craft needed to build and maintain postwar joint defence projects, making the American presence a practical necessity.) Accordingly, American vessels completed most of the early postwar charting and surveying in the region, transported materiel and personnel to establish radar and weather stations, and resupplied Canadian and American forces stationed in the Arctic Islands.

This book illuminates the practical experiences of icebreaker crews as well as the “lessons learned” that they generated while overcoming operational challenges as well as political ambiguity and sensitivity over sovereignty. Even with the benefit of “modern” technology, ships were frequently damaged during these voyages and captains begrudgingly accepted that they had to adapt or yield to environmental conditions (eg. Lackenbauer & Kikkert 2012). Accordingly, we will carefully examine how the nature of “exploration” and maritime activity in the Arctic Archipelago changed because of technology, improved capabilities, and experiential knowledge. Over time, the size and scope of Arctic convoys grew, requiring innovative planning, elaborate preparations, and complex joint (Canada-US) interdepartmental/interagency coordination. These “modern voyages” made an expanded security footprint in the Arctic possible and facilitated the establishment and sustainment of stations in parts of the Arctic that were hitherto inaccessible to non-Inuit. These operations culminated with the construction of the DEW Line, the largest construction project in the history of the North American Arctic (Morenus 1957; Heidt and Lackenbauer 2012; Farish and Lackenbauer 2015)

American Arctic operations must be situated within a delicate (and even volatile) political context of Canadian sovereignty sensitivities. Although the US acknowledged Canadian terrestrial sovereignty over the islands of the Arctic Archipelago during this era, the escalating tempo and scale of maritime activities in the waters between the islands raised questions about who had the right to control activities therein (Elliot-Meisel 1998, 2009; Lajeunesse 2007, 2012, 2013). American officials and crews discerned ways to balance Canadian efforts to micro-manage activities with the crews’ practical need to retain the necessary flexibility to operate effectively in the challenging Arctic maritime environment. We are interested in learning how American officials managed or sidestepped sensitive sovereignty issues, and our preliminary evidence suggests that creative diplomacy and accommodation overcame the inevitable friction caused by American interest and activities in sparsely populated or unpopulated parts of the Canadian Arctic.
The Joint Arctic Weather Stations: Science and Sovereignty in the High Arctic, 1946-1972 – Heidt and Lackenbauer

The third book undertakes the first systematic study of the Canada-US Joint Arctic Weather Stations (JAWS) program. It explores how diplomats, bureaucrats, and meteorological personnel from both countries collectively managed a truly bi-national project on the Canadian archipelago. By narrowing our focus to a particular program run jointly by both countries, we can explore how bilateral relationships played out on the ground. Our preliminary interviews and research challenge the program’s critics who claim that the Americans “unofficially” ran the stations and threatened Canadian sovereignty (eg. Grant 2010: 302). In addition to reinterpreting what diplomatic exchanges concerning the JAWS program reveal about Canada-US relations, this book builds upon recent scholarship revealing intersections between science and sovereignty (Powell 2008, Bocking 2007, Wråkberg 2002, Dodds 2011, Berkman and Walton 2009) and sheds light on the “changing political entanglement between science and policy in the polar regions” (Bravo and Sörlin 2002) during the Cold War. It also investigates the socio-cultural and political dimensions of scientific and sovereignty practices on a micro-scale.

Previous characterizations of the JAWS program have been drawn without systematically exploring life at the stations to understand how Canadian and American personnel managed interpersonal relations, national interests, scientific interests, and sovereignty concerns. Situating the JAWS experience in broader human contexts will necessitate examining life at the stations from multiple perspectives using station logs, archival collections, as well as oral history interviews already conducted with former JAWS employees. These sources will allow us to examine the scientific, gendered, leadership, and environmental dimensions of this program. In so doing, we will engage with relevant scholarly literature regarding the history and geography of Cold War science, including the ties between scientific practices and Cold War culture (Farish 2006, 2013; Heymann et al 2010), the environment (Doel 2003; Farish 2010), and geography – the literal terrain of science (Livingstone 2003).

Examining diplomatic, scientific, social, cultural, logistical, and environmental dimensions of this program from its inception in the 1940s to its full “Canadianization” in 1972 reveals several patterns and lessons. Our preliminary hypothesis, based upon a partial reading of the documentary records, suggests that Canadian officials sought and achieved a firm policy that assured their effective control while enjoying the advantages of American participation. Furthermore, American diplomats and station personnel were sensitive to Canadian concerns. Our research also belies the idea that JAWS was a military program under civilian guise (Grant 1988, Lajeunesse 2007, Bercuson 2011). The JAWS network was operated by civilian personnel employed by the US Weather Bureau and the Canadian Department of Transport, who forged unique understandings and working cultures that embodied bilateral cooperation on an interpersonal level.
Methodology

Each of these books will be grounded in mixed qualitative evidence. First, we will conduct a systematic survey of the applicable literature on the history of the north, polar psychology, legal systems, the environment, and critical geography. Next, we will consult published and unpublished memoirs by former stakeholders, oral interviews that we have already conducted, as well as interviews that have been preserved at other repositories.

We will also adopt a multi-archival approach. In order to complete our ambitious research program in a timely and efficient manner, we seek to create synergies by pooling our resources, saving time and money as well as reducing our carbon footprint. All of our monographs will draw upon evidence from archival collections at repositories across North America – with most of the key primary documents held at Library and Archives Canada (LAC) in Ottawa and at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) in Washington. In the first year of our grant, each member of the research team will visit these archives to examine the most pertinent files for their project and to identify other relevant collections for future consultation. In subsequent years, only one member of the research team will travel to NARA to conduct further research pursuant to all three projects, thus streamlining time and financial commitments. We will employ a similar arrangement for Ottawa, with two members of the research team travelling there in year two and one member in year three. A member of the research team will also travel north to consult the only existing copies of the station diaries at Resolute and Eureka, another to examine US Navy records held at the NARA regional facility in San Bruno, California, and another to conduct research in the files of the British Polar Committee and of the Foreign Office legal adviser on polar sovereignty at the UK National Archives in Kew. We will also adopt our collaborative approach when researching at regional and university archives including the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre/NWT Archives in Yellowknife, the Yukon Archives in Whitehorse, the Trent University Archives, the Arctic Institute of North America collection in Calgary, and Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, by sending one research team member to collect materials for everyone.

In short, our collaborative research program is conceived around individuals who have a deep knowledge of their respective projects, capitalizes on trust-relationships developed over the past half-decade, and pools resources and talents to offer time and monetary efficiencies that will ensure that we produce our respective books and associated articles in a timely manner.
Conclusions

After Prime Minister Stephen Harper came to office in early 2006, his refrain that Arctic sovereignty was a simple case of “use it or lose it” tapped into primordial Canadian anxieties about control over the region and became a dominant political message. Alarmist narratives, built upon ideas of Canadian negligence and alleged US challenges to Canada’s sovereignty, shape assumptions about what Canada should have done, and therefore must do, to demonstrate or defend its sovereignty and security (Lackenbauer 2009; Griffiths et al. 2011). Since 2009, however, a parallel government narrative has emerged, emphasizing the importance of international cooperation and characterizing the United States as Canada’s “premier partner” in the Arctic (Canada 2010).

This research program is designed to test our hypothesis that both countries sought to avoid internecine battles over sovereignty by devising effective strategies to facilitate operational cooperation without undermining their respective legal positions. Our research transcends various scales - from political and diplomatic offices in Washington and Ottawa, to the decks of US Coast Guard and Navy ships transiting Arctic waters, to the daily interactions of personnel at JAWS stations – to provide fresh insights into Canada-US relations and the processes of defining and managing sovereignty and security threats. We anticipate that our critical assessments of historical practices will help to frame and inform current decision-making, provoke dialogue and debate about Canada’s Northern strategies, and yield new insights into how bilateral legal disagreements can be managed on an “agree to disagree” basis (Griffiths 2003; Lackenbauer and Huebert 2014).
Our Research Team

Our research is explicitly designed as a team program, producing research synergies (savings in research time and direct costs), unique mentoring and publishing opportunities for postdoctoral fellows to produce co-authored books with an established scholar in the field, and training opportunities for graduate research assistants that will complement their academic training.

Historian P. Whitney Lackenbauer, the primary investigator, specializes in historical and contemporary Arctic sovereignty and security policies. He has participated in many “whole of government” and Canadian Armed Forces operations in the Arctic over the past decade, sits on the Arctic Security Working Group, and regularly runs courses and seminars for federal departments on Arctic policy. Lackenbauer is well versed in the relevant international relations, security and legal theory, as well as the historiography and contemporary political, geographical, socio-economic and cultural debates on government practices in and regarding the Canadian North. He will coordinate the overall program and act as the lead mentor for research assistants.

Lackenbauer has a proven track record in academic publishing and public policy outreach. To stimulate discussion and debate about Arctic security in a robust historical context, Lackenbauer’s main research efforts over the past decade have reconsidered intersections between sovereignty, security, and Northern policy on international, national, and local levels. His work frequently emphasizes how sovereignty and security projects, conceived from afar and implemented locally, have unintended consequences “on the ground” for Northern residents (particularly indigenous peoples).

Lackenbauer’s recent publications include A Historical and Legal Study of Sovereignty in the Canadian North, 1870-1942 (edited, based on original drafts by Gordon W. Smith, University of Calgary Press, 2014); Blockades or Breakthroughs? First Nations Confront the Canadian State, 1970-2007 (co-edited, McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2014); The Canadian Rangers: A Living History (UBC Press, 2013), short-listed for the 2014 Dafoe Prize; Canada and the Changing Arctic: Sovereignty, Security and Stewardship (co-authored WLU Press, 2011), Canada and Arctic Sovereignty and Security: Historical Perspectives (edited 2011), The Canadian Forces and Arctic Sovereignty: Debating Roles, Interests, and Requirements, 1968-1974 (co-edited 2010); and the Donner prize-winning Arctic Front: Defending Canada in the Far North (co-authored 2008). Lackenbauer was an inaugural Canadian International Council Fellow for 2008-09, completing a project titled Arctic Front, Arctic Homeland: Re-Evaluating Canada’s Past Record and Future Prospects in the Circumpolar North. He has appeared before parliamentary committees, has prepared policy reports and courses for various government departments, and has served as an advisor and consultant to federal and Aboriginal organizations.

Lackenbauer has received several SSHRC grants related to Arctic sovereignty and security issues over the past six years. His other recent grants and awards include co-lead of the ArcticNet project on the Emerging Arctic Security Environment (2011-15); a Fulbright Fellowship completed as a visiting professor at the School for Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, in Washington, DC in the fall of 2010; and co-chair of the Arctic Peoples and Security pillar of the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation/Munk School for Global Affairs Arctic Security project (2011-13). In addition to scholarly publications, he is a frequent contributor to media and policy discussions on Northern issues.
Historian Daniel Heidt is a postdoctoral fellow at the Frost Centre for Canadian Studies and Indigenous Studies at Trent University (co-supervisors: Stephen Bocking and Whitney Lackenbauer). His SSHRC funded program of work explores the spatial histories of isolation, masculinity, modernity, and science in the Canadian Arctic since 1945. As the coauthor of the Joint Arctic Weather Stations (JAWS) book, Heidt will be responsible for managing the collection of primary and secondary sources, integrating the oral history interviews that he has already conducted with former weather station personnel with written sources, and drafting half of the chapters. In addition, he will train several Research Assistants in archival research, including directing their activities at the national archives in Ottawa.

Heidt’s research interrogates the connections between sovereignty, security, and science in the Canadian Arctic. Over the past six years, he has developed an abiding interest in how security and sovereignty goals manifest “on the ground,” and has published on the resupply of the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line (with Lackenbauer) and diplomacy regarding the JAWS program. He has connected with a group of over one hundred former JAWS personnel through a listserv, leading to completed interviews with 29 individuals from this group (University of Waterloo Office of Research Ethics file #16564, 28 July 2010). His SSHRC postdoctoral research project builds upon this preliminary work by examining gender, leisure, polar psychology, modernity, and leadership to better understand the development of cultures at isolated stations and assess how these cultures influenced operational effectiveness. Along these lines, Heidt collaborated with Lackenbauer to edit Manitoban Andrew Taylor’s unpublished memoir of his participation in the British Antarctic operation Tabarin (forthcoming). More broadly, Heidt is interested in the history of science, including how scientific breakthroughs affect Canadian defence and foreign policy, and the significance of place to the development of scientific practice and culture.

Historian Adam Lajeunesse is a SSHRC postdoctoral fellow at St. Jerome’s University (supervisor: Whitney Lackenbauer). His research program examines the history of northern development, with a focus on hydrocarbon exploration from the 1960s to the mid-1980s. As co-author of the Arctic Voyages book, Lajeunesse will be responsible for archival research, contacting individuals for interviews, and writing half of the volume’s chapters. In addition, he will direct graduate researchers who will survey secondary source and newspaper material. This history of Arctic shipping dovetails very well into his SSHRC postdoctoral program – a large portion of which is devoted to studying Arctic tanker shipping in later decades.

Lajeunesse’s doctoral research focused on the evolution of Canada’s Arctic maritime sovereignty. His monograph Lock, Stock, and Icebergs: The Evolution of Canada’s Arctic Maritime Sovereignty, based on his dissertation, will be published by UBC Press in 2015, and he has published articles on the subject in International Journal, Canadian Military Review, and through the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies Occasional Paper series. A significant part of this work examines Canada’s diplomatic relationship with the United States and analyzes how the two nations have managed (or failed to manage) their competing positions on the nature of the Arctic waters. His doctoral work shed new light on how the two countries balanced the need for American shipping in the North with Canada’s sovereignty position. His postdoctoral work represents an evolution of many of these themes and focuses on resource development and Arctic
shipping in the 1970s and 1980s. In addition, Lajeunesse has produced some of the first detailed research on Cold War era submarine operations and joint defence cooperation (published in *Cold War History*). He is also in the process of publishing an article on Arctic shipping (with Lackenbauer) through the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute as well as articles on northern resource development and whole of government operations in the North (also with Lackenbauer). He has extensive experience working in all of the archives needed for this SSHRC project, including the US national archives and Library and Archives Canada.

Historian Peter Kikkert is currently finishing his Ph.D. at Western University and will take up a SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellowship at the Frost Centre for Canadian Studies and Indigenous Studies at Trent University (co-supervisors: Whitney Lackenbauer and Heather Nicol) in July 2015. His SSHRC-funded dissertation is a global history of sovereignty in the polar regions during the twentieth century, with a particular emphasis on Britain, the Commonwealth, and the United States. As coauthor of *Securing Sovereignty: Canada, the U.S., and the Arctic, 1945-56*, Kikkert will be responsible for conducting additional research at the national archives in Washington, Ottawa, and Kew, as well as for writing half of the book chapters.

Kikkert’s research explores the evolution of sovereignty and the legal principles for the acquisition of territory in an international, bi-polar context. In his Master’s thesis, Kikkert explored the intersections between sovereignty, security and the Canadian-American defence relationship in the early Cold War Arctic. Despite the fundamental differences in their national approaches to polar sovereignty, his subsequent work has identified the effectiveness of quiet diplomacy and pragmatic negotiations for securing implicit U.S. recognition of Canada’s terrestrial Arctic sovereignty. These research activities included collaborating with Lackenbauer to produce *The Canadian Forces and Arctic sovereignty, 1968-74*. Kikkert’s exploration of state sovereignty, polar policies, and the historical sociology of international law in the Arctic and Antarctic has also highlighted the need to situate national experiences in the polar regions within a broader, global context. Along these lines, Kikkert has recently completed an article with Lackenbauer concerning the impact that Indonesia had on Canada’s sovereignty strategy in the Arctic, as well as a book chapter exploring how international developments shaped the Canadian and American responses to the sector principle.
Student Training Strategies

To facilitate intellectual growth and professional training, undergraduate and graduate students will be exposed to advanced research techniques, methods and theories (from various disciplines) in a mutually-supportive team setting. By directly involving postdoctoral fellows in the training and management of research assistants (RAs), our project is designed to facilitate training for both graduate and postdoctoral members of our research team.

Although Lackenbauer will maintain primary responsibility for overseeing the graduate student RAs’ work and development, the research team’s postdoctoral members will develop supervisory and leadership skills by sharing responsibility for directing the RAs’ day-to-day activities. The postdoctoral members will also work with Lackenbauer to implement and manage a data sharing system that ensures all investigators have ready access to up-to-date research.

Undergraduate students will scan, OCR, transcribe, and format documents collected by researchers for dissemination on a website and/or through the Documents on Canadian Arctic Sovereignty and Security series.

Working on this project will also prepare graduate student RAs for the sophisticated research required for their theses or major research papers, as well as for their subsequent careers in academia, consulting, or the public service. Responsibilities and training opportunities will include:

- assisting the research team in setting research agendas and timelines
- preparing bibliographies and/or preliminary reviews of relevant international relations, political science, history, geography, and/or polar studies literatures
- identifying relevant archival holdings in North America, and submitting Access to Information (ATIP) requests to relevant government departments
- gathering relevant data from published primary sources, such as newspapers, parliamentary/congressional debates, committee meetings, and government policy documents
- managing data to ensure its availability to all of the research team, thus enhancing the students’ digital literacy and teamwork skills
- under the guidance of Lackenbauer and Heidt, conducting archival research at the Library and Archives Canada and National Defence Headquarters in Ottawa
- mentoring on how to prepare and presenting or co-presenting research findings at an academic conference or workshop
- mentoring on how to present/co-present or author/co-author portions of their research at conferences or in academic articles or book chapters

Accordingly, RAs will develop robust research and communication skills essential for academic and non-academic careers, including applied knowledge of advanced methodological and theoretical tools and interdisciplinary approaches, experience in supporting and/or directly contributing to the publication and dissemination of research, digital literacy, data management and analysis, project management, and workshop and conference presentations. All of these activities will take within a supportive team environment.
Knowledge Mobilization Plan

We anticipate that our Arctic research will continue to attract a diverse audience within and beyond the academic community. First and foremost, we will produce three monographs for university presses. These books will contribute to historical and policy debates by:

1. re-evaluating the existing literature about Arctic sovereignty and security through a systematic examination and appraisal of the archival record, publications, and interviews;

2. providing new theoretical frameworks (eg. the concept of *sovereigntization*); and

3. critically examining how a greater diversity of Canadian and American stakeholders imagined and constructed their respective Arctic interests and managed relations at political, diplomatic, and operational levels.

These books will be written to appeal to historians as well as other academic experts (eg. political scientists, geographers, international lawyers), policy-makers, and Arctic enthusiasts. We also hope that their narrative forms will make the material accessible and interesting to students.

The research team will also author or co-author scholarly articles for submission to peer-reviewed journals. We will also encourage research assistants to (co)author, present, and/or publish papers, articles, and/or book chapters based upon their research pursuant to this project. The researchers will also produce short summaries or briefings for government officials which we will submit to professional journals, and will present their findings regularly to professional meetings (such as the Arctic Security Working Group). We will also disseminate our research findings at Canadian and international conferences.

Pursuant to our research program, we will employ undergraduate co-op students to compile, scan, and transcribe important documents for publication in volumes for the *Documents on Canadian Arctic Sovereignty and Security (DCASS) Series* edited by Lackenbauer and Lajeunesse. These thematically organized, open-access e-books make unpublished primary materials on Arctic sovereignty and security topics more readily available to academics and policy experts.

We will also digitize selected documents and transcripts of oral interviews for dissemination on a multimedia website which will serve as a hub to share historical materials uncovered by our research team. Users will be able to browse documents, audio and video recordings, and photographs by manipulating GIS and chronological interfaces. We anticipate that this interactive website will broaden the audience for our findings and that it will make our research useful for pedagogical purposes. We are grateful that costs associated with this website will be covered by in-kind and direct support from the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies in Calgary, the Laurier Centre for Military Strategic and Disarmament Studies, as well as St. Jerome’s University.
Expected Outcomes

We expect the outcomes of this research program to benefit many sectors of Canadian society. By facilitating the flow of research between team members through a carefully integrated research program, we can accomplish our goals efficiently and economically (at a fraction of the cost to individually develop three books).

First, our books on Canadian-American relations in the Arctic will engage and (re)shape academic debates, both empirically and theoretically. In clarifying Canadian security and sovereignty policies and practices in historical context and across various scales, we will continue to develop a new, robust, evidence-based narrative of Cold War Arctic history. We hope that our studies also will help to inform broader international efforts to develop a comprehensive theory of securitization. By proposing a sovereignization framework, our research program will also suggest new ways to analyse Canadian Arctic sovereignty that should appeal to scholars across the social sciences, thus encouraging and enriching academic debate.

We anticipate that our research will also yield “lessons learned” that are applicable to current and future bilateral relations, thus informing and helping to improve public policies. Various federal departments, including Foreign Affairs Trade and Development, National Defence/Canadian Armed Forces, and Environment Canada, will have access to in-depth historical analyses of their past approaches to and involvement in the Canadian Arctic. So too will the US Department of State, armed services (particularly the US Navy), and the US National Weather Service. Our research team will strive to produce supplementary research outputs in formats that will appeal to civil servants who are accustomed to reading summaries or receiving briefings rather than reading academic tomes. Lackenbauer has extensive experience in this regard, and will mentor the other team members in this respect. He also will disseminate findings through the federal Arctic Security Working Group, in which he participates as an academic representative. In turn, we anticipate that feedback from government stakeholders will encourage us to ask new questions, build new networks, and propose tools and “best practices” that will inform responsible, effective public policies today and in the future.

Emerging scholars will benefit from mentoring associated with this project. Undergraduate and graduate student research assistants will develop advanced research, communication, and networking skills, and postdoctoral fellows will have an opportunity to hone their mentoring skills by helping to oversee students’ work and academic development alongside an established scholar.

In summary, our research program has both academic and policy relevance. Changes in the Arctic, which have elicited unprecedented political and media attention over the last decade, present both challenges and opportunities for Canada. The knowledge generated by our critical assessment of historical Canada-US security and sovereignty practices will contribute to decision-making and stimulate ongoing dialogue about Canada’s Northern strategies.
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