

POLICY BRIEF



AUGUST 17, 2020

A GBA+ Analysis of the Arctic and Northern Policy Framework – Safety, Security, and Defence Chapter

Nathalie Poirier
NAADSN Graduate Fellow

... gender mainstreaming constructs a new form of worker: the “gender expert” who is then given authority to analyse, monitor and suggest interventions based on “expert analysis” Thus, gender analysis becomes a “technology of rule,” constructing gender experts whose power ultimately goes unscrutinized in the context of the organization, thereby obscuring the ways in which gender systems are reproduced or fractured by gender mainstreaming itself. I call for a reorientation of gender mainstreaming, away from an approach that considers only the instrumental effects of policy and towards one that considers both instrumental and creative effects of policy ...

- Stephanie Paterson (2010), 397.

In her article “What’s the Problem with gender-based analysis? Gender mainstreaming policy and practice in Canada,” Stephanie Paterson proposes an approach to GBA+ that moves the practice from an *expert-bureaucratic* model to a *participatory-democratic* model. These models differ in their approaches. The *expert-bureaucratic* model relies on the expert to analyse policy offering up recommendations: integrationist. The *participatory-democratic* approach questions policy structures and collaborates with community groups as well as key

stakeholders to inform the process: agenda-setting. (Paterson, 2010, p. 397)

Acknowledging the historical destruction caused by Canadian public policy (such as the Indian Residential School), it is key and relevant for me to establish that I am a white female settler, a non-knower, and in the ongoing process of my own decolonization. From this standpoint and with the *participatory-democratic* lens, the following pages will put forth considerations of process when assessing gender and intersectionality in the ANPF

defense chapter project. It recognizes the need for a co-developed ¹ and inclusive approach that works *with* and learns *from* the Arctic and Northern Indigenous peoples, thus continuing to build trust and engagement in upcoming Canadian defence projects. As Mary Simon's summarizes in her report framing a proposed Arctic Leadership Model, "a new Arctic Policy Framework must address, not only principles of partnership and key policy focus areas, but also fundamental process questions as to 'how' the Arctic participates in priority-setting and decision-making in ways that differ from the past" (CIRNAC 2017). The following points are observations and considerations in accordance with Simon's report, *Principles for the Arctic and Northern Policy Framework*:

- Decisions about the Arctic and the North will be made in partnership with and with the participation of northerners, to reflect the rights, needs and perspectives of northerners.
And
- Policy and programming will reflect a commitment to diversity and equality, and to the employment of analytical tools such as Gender-Based Analysis Plus to assess potential impacts on diverse groups of people. (CIRNAC, 2019)

Approaches to policy development must include substantive consultation and collaboration with

Indigenous peoples whose lives are affected by policy actions and implementation. In the context of Inuit Nunangat (the Inuit homeland), these organizations include Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), the National Inuit Youth Council, Pauktuutit Inuit Women, Tungasuvvingat Inuit, and regional associations. This process is critical to mobilize the requisite support of rightsholders and to support and promote Indigenous resurgence. The consultative process should also embrace an approach, respecting diversity, that considers and acknowledges impacts on women, children, and minorities.

In January 2020, the Pauktuutit Inuit Women organization held a two-day national session with about fifty government participants, observers, and experts. The group reached a consensus on co-development guidelines, including recommendations that aligned with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (including provisions for "free, prior, informed consent," addressing and reaching shared objectives, clear decision making, and clear roles and responsibilities. ("Nipimit Nanisiniq – Finding Voice," n.d.)

Currently, the ANPF safety, security, and defence chapter does not outline a policy consultation process as such, which would contribute to a sense of collaboration and transparency. Possible criteria to build trust and dialogue amongst the different groups and organizations involved in the defence and security policymaking process include careful consideration of timelines (with due respect for

¹ In the context, and for the purpose of this document, what is understood as *co-development* needs to be addressed and formulated collaboratively. In her book *Life Beside Itself*, Lisa Stevenson (Assistant Professor of Anthropology at McGill University and the editor of *Critical Inuit Studies: An Anthropology of Contemporary Arctic Ethnography*),

discusses "working together" with Andrew Tagak the Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit coordinator: "... when you create a new policy, check it out, try it out, make sure it does not hurt anyone – then implement it. That's what we call integrating Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit into the new system." (Stevenson, 2014, p. 182)

cultural appropriateness and awareness, as well as the capacity limits of diverse organizations); ensuring that adequate resources and appropriate remuneration for knowledge sharing and participation are provided; establishing a clear agenda for ongoing dialogue; and identifying key indicators to measure success. These criteria are by no means exhaustive, and relevant stakeholders and partners should produce a more thorough set of considerations through a collaborative consultation process.

Furthermore, policy development should be sustainable and holistic, integrating social, cultural, economic, and environmental considerations. In respect to the principle on sustainable development, it is important for the policy to establish/mention *how* the Defence Team intends to ensure sustainability of projects, especially considering the significant cost and challenges of infrastructure development in Canada's North. Policies not only serve communities and individuals; they also create them. Anticipating how defence projects may impact communities, both short- and long-term, is key to sustainable relationship building. History serves as a guide in this respect. During the early Cold War, installations at places like Frobisher Bay (Iqaluit), Broughton Island (Qikiqtarjuaq), Hall Beach (Sanirajak), Cambridge Bay (Ikaluktutiak), and Tuktoyaktuk "attracted Inuit to congregate nearby for access to employment opportunities and medical services, creating sedentary communities over time." As Sarah Bonesteel describes, "defence project sites were initially expected to provide temporary employment for Inuit," but "cultural differences, such as concepts of work time and levels of training," limited and inhibited wage employment options (Bonesteel, 2008, p. 15).

The following offer a few observations based upon a deliberate reading of the ANPF safety, security and

defence chapter through a GBA+ lens. The blue text is excerpts from the policy; the black are comments, perceptions, and observations. The following paragraphs briefly address the language used in the policy giving the document a certain unilateral and dominant tone as well as cultural and intersectional considerations.

"While the Canadian Arctic has historically been — and continues to be — a region of stability and peace, growing competition and increased access brings safety and security challenges to which Canada must be ready to respond."

The use of "great peace and stability" is in the context of international relations and perhaps there would be added clarity if this were indicated. It is contested that Indigenous Peoples have experienced "great ... stability" and colonial violence might also invite questions about the notion that Indigenous peoples in the region have enjoyed "great peace."

"The remoteness of Arctic and Northern communities also poses a challenge with regard to critical infrastructure (CI) and emergency management (EM) considerations, which are likely to be exacerbated due to climate change. Melting ice could contribute to an increase in search and rescue requirements within the North (and its people). As such, monitoring capabilities of ice conditions and icebergs will need to be augmented to support the increased marine traffic through Northern waterways and to proactively limit EM response requests through cohesive mitigation and prevention efforts. CI requirements will increasingly need to consider a changing demographic and environment to ensure continued provision of essential services and capabilities. Specifically, robust CI is required in order to support

communications, EM and military capabilities, and safe transportation within the region”.

The policy addresses *what* will need to be done to ensure safety, but omitting *how* it will be done loses any sense of engagement with Arctic and Northern communities. Consequently, concern for infrastructure (CI) is imposed on these communities and environments. This paragraph (and others in this document) leave out the human component and give an impersonal, institutional tone to the policy framework.

Although the warming of the Arctic and the North offers economic opportunities, which would bring much needed socio-economic development, employment and infrastructure investments that are acutely lacking in the region, higher levels of activity could bring the potential for damage to unique ecosystems and may also increase the risks associated with increased movement of people and goods, the pursuit of interests by foreign state and non-state actors in Canada's Arctic and northern territory, and human-induced disasters. It is not difficult to imagine, for example, how a naturally-occurring or human-induced disaster in the Arctic Archipelago would place tremendous strain on the capacities of all levels of government, as well as on local communities, to support affected people and minimize the damage to affected wildlife, infrastructure, and ecosystems. –

This could be an opportune space for the Defence Team to underline the needs of women, youth, elders, and minority groups as particularly vulnerable to climate and environmental change, resource extraction, environmental and humanitarian disasters, and a sudden influx of people and goods into the region.

Similarly, Canada's Arctic and natural resources are attracting interest from foreign states and enterprises. Foreign investment, research, and science have the potential to improve the lives of Northerners. However, some of these investments and related economic activities could seek to advance interests that may be in opposition to those of Canada.

The use of Canada in this context is interesting: research has often served to justify and reinforce colonial structures, not Indigenous governance systems. The statement about “interests that may be in opposition to those of Canada” could intimate a lack of awareness about the distinct realities, needs, and interests of Arctic and Northern communities rather than those of Canadians as a whole.

Addressing these concerns from a decolonizing framework would invite critical questioning of our Western and foreign approaches to research, investment and science. For example, Paulette Regan cites Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s work to defines “parameters of decolonizing methodologies” that challenge non-indigenous scholars “to question the cultural, theoretical, and methodological traditions that define” Western academic work. Non-indigenous modes of knowledge production often continue “to oppress and colonize Native people, excluding or marginalizing their knowledge systems, world views, and pedagogy,” perpetuating exploitation and revictimization (Regan 2011, 33).

Recognizing that economic growth and investment in the Arctic supports good jobs, healthy people, and strong communities, ...

This vague statement does not specify which forms of economic growth and investment may serve Indigenous peoples’ interests, and which may not.

There are also security risks associated with these investments that could impact the well-being of Northerners. *Canada will continue to balance needed economic development while ensuring that security in the Arctic and the North is maintained.*

Juxtaposing Canada and *Northerners* lacks clarity; that is, who is understood to belong to each identifier. At first glance it would seem that Canada *is not* Northerners, which can be perceived as perpetuating the *peacemaker myth*.² It might be helpful to clarify the use of Canada (who does that represent, how do Indigenous Peoples want to be identified) as it used in juxtaposition to Northerners, leading the reader to understand that Canada (and Canadians) may or may not be synonymous with the Northerners. Language is important, and the contribution of Indigenous peoples is paramount in the Prime Minister's mandate letters to the Minister of National Defence in 2015 and 2019.

The long-term objectives of some of these states remain unclear, and their interests may not always align with our own.

Consistency of meaning would add a tremendous amount to the document. In this particular statement the use of the phrase "our own" does not address who, or which group, is encapsulated by this term.

These few observations suggest that a thorough and collaborative analysis would help to refine a robust, inclusive defence policy that demonstrates and effectively presents an awareness of the needs and interests of the Arctic and Northern communities in which the Defense team operates.

Other recommendations, which are found in the report by Pauktuutit Women of Canada on "Addressing Gendered Violence against Inuit Women," can also be applied and approached in the defence policy:

- **Culturally competent:** Ensuring that... [DND/CAF members] who are stationed in the Arctic and Northern regions receive cultural competency training on Inuit history and culture. The training should be community-specific, developed and led by Inuit, and include language training on the local Inuktitut dialect.
- **Inuit Advisory Committees:** Composed of elders, community leaders, and cultural facilitators, the primary purpose of these committees will be to ensure that ... practices and protocols are in line with Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit principles. In addition to placing the emphasis on Inuit methods of problem solving and conflict resolution, these committees will foster mutual understanding and respect between the community and the [Defense team]...
- **Trauma-informed:** Investments must be made to provide ... adequate training in trauma-informed approaches. This training must be made relevant to the history and

² The peacemaker myth, where Canadian society considers itself the heroes coming in to save and solve (a mythical quest) to solve the *Indian Problem*. (Regan, 2011, 2011, p. 34)

contemporary experiences of Inuit. With a firmer understanding of trauma and its indicators, ...[DND/CAF members] will be better positioned to de-escalate situations, build more positive relationships with the community, and assist in ensuring community wellness and safety.

- **Vicarious Trauma:**

To help manage the personal stress resulting from daily ...activities in Inuit communities and the effects of vicarious trauma on first responders, police officers should be encouraged to seek emotional support and guidance from community elders, counsellors, or natural helpers.

- **Duration of postings:**

...Where possible, posting contracts should be extended to sustain positive rapport between Inuit community members and regular service members, and enable trust and reciprocity to be built into community relations. (*Home*, n.d.)

- **Inuit Civilian Positions:**

In order to improve the ... Inuit must be employed ...in a number of capacities:

- Inuit interpreters and translators to ensure that community residents can interact with [CAF/DND members] in the appropriate local dialect.
- Cultural facilitators and/or natural healers to act as a liaison (Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada, n.d.)

The report of the Pauktuutit Women of Canada also reiterates the importance of follow through. “You can have all these recommendations, all these things that the community is saying, but there’s never any follow-up, follow through, based on the recommendations that people are saying over and over and over again,” it laments. The Defence Team must ensure that it listens to Arctic and Northern communities, that Northerners’ insights and priorities are reflected in policy and implementation plans, and that it delivers on promises.

References:

Bonesteel, S. (2008). *Canada’s relationship with Inuit a history of policy and program development*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC). (2017). *A new Shared Arctic Leadership Model* [Report]. <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1492708558500/1537886544718#sec1>

CIRNAC. (2019, June 14). *Canada’s Arctic and Northern Policy Framework* [Policy]. <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1560523306861/1560523330587>

Nipimit Nanisiniq – Finding Voice. (n.d.). *Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada*. Retrieved June 9, 2020, from <https://www.pauktuutit.ca/abuse-prevention/gender-based-violence/nipimit-nanisiniq-finding-voice/>

Paterson, S. (2010). What’s the problem with gender-based analysis? Gender mainstreaming policy and practice in Canada. *Canadian Public Administration*, 53(3), 395–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00134.x>

POLICY BRIEF



Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada. Retrieved June 9, 2020, from <https://www.pauktuutit.ca/>

Regan, P. (2011). *Unsettling the Settler Within—Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. UBC Press. <https://www.ubcpres.ca/unsettling-the-settler-within>

Stevenson, L. (2014). *Life Beside Itself: Imagining care in the Canadian Arctic*. University of California Press.