

NATO ASSOCIATION OF CANADA
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE POUR L'OTAN



SEVENTY YEARS OF SECURITY:
CANADIAN CONTRIBUTIONS, NEW
CHALLENGES, AND GLOBAL STABILITY



The NATO Association of Canada
Seventy Years of Security
© 2018

Senior Editors:

Dr. Joseph McQuade
Dr. James Poborsa

Editors:

Taylor Allen
Karim Abdelati

Design:

Taylor Allen

Contributing Authors:

Allen, Taylor
Atkinson, Ryan
Bewley, Dakota
Bhatia, Nabil
Caquimbo Valencia, Natalia
Corera, Marian
Dell, Justin
Di Leo, Michele
Haidar, Nasser
Hicks, Jacqueline
Lee, Changsung

Mussett, Benjamin
Narasimhan, Ananda
Natale, Sabrina
Panesar, Nilum
Qin, Nancy
Reiskind, Amaliah
Schaumer, Julia
Stollery, Brad
Varma, Ambika
Widdershoven, Cyril
Williamson, Lee

The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the contributing authors and do not necessarily represent those of the NATO Association of Canada

The NATO Association of Canada—Association Canadienne pour L’OTAN

Chairman of the Board: Hon. Hugh Segal, OC, OOnt

President: Robert Baines, CD, MA

The NATO Association of Canada is an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization dedicated to the idea that the transatlantic relationship between Canada, the United States, and the nations of Europe is of critical military, economic, and cultural importance to Canadians. The Association’s mandate is to promote a broader and deeper understanding of international peace and security issues relating to NATO.

60 Harbour Street, 4th Floor
Toronto, ON, Canada, M5J 1B7
Phone: (416) 979-1875
Fasimile: (416) 979-0825
Email: info@natoassociation.ca

A Note from the Chairman of the NATO Association of Canada

The Honourable Hugh Segal, OC,
Chairman of the NATO Association of Canada

Looking at and reflecting on the challenges NATO faces at 70, produces an interesting history. NATO's story reflects on seventy years of an alliance promoting peace, stability and protected democracy and freedom - not by attacking any enemy - but by making clear the idea of collective defence. Deterrence based on strong common values, the rapid capacity to deploy on land, in the air and on and under the sea is the kind of civilized posture that promotes stability, encourages diplomatic solutions and discourages adventurism.

The fall of the Berlin wall was not, as some at the time claimed, the end of history. It was, instead, a threshold in the liberation of large parts of Eastern Europe from Soviet influence and control. Any massive imbalance always produces revanchist tensions. To some extent, consolidation of economic and political control in Russia always, historically, involves the conjuring up of new external threats that are overblown to generate loyalty to the undemocratic regime in the Kremlin. Conversely, the success of the NATO alliance in standing firm across its entire territory and discouraging Russian adventurism, does not solve international threats. With the emergence of threats like climate change, environmental security, resource scarcity, economic security, biological threats, and the continued evolution of cyber security – NATO faces more challenges than ever.

Seventy Years of Security, has been assembled and edited by project managers Taylor Allen and, Karim Abdelati with the assistance of the organization's Editors in Chief, Dr. Joseph McQuade and Dr. James Poborsa, and is populated by the NATO Association's current and former interns, analysts, research fellows and contributors. This end product speaks volumes on the caliber of those selected for involvement – and their remarkable work and contributions to the association. Their involvement produces career-planning opportunities, experiences at home and abroad as well as contacts and networks, which benefit their interest in defence and strategic studies. Their constant presence and engagement reminds all of us that the NATO Association's primary purpose is education around the actual state and prospects for global security.

The future challenge for NATO remains robust and daunting. As a founding partner in NATO, Canada's engagement within a multinational defence posture has never mattered more.

Seventy Years of Security is an excellent, diverse and textured reflection on the challenges faced, and those that remain to be faced – and is a testament to the youth involved within the association.

I am delighted to express my warm encouragement and support for the effort that has gone into this publication.

Hon. Hugh D Segal , OC, OOnt
Chair
The NATO Association of Canada



The NATO Association of Canada FOUNDED 1966

CHAIR
Hon. Hugh Segal, OC

PRESIDENT
Robert Baines, CD, MA

HONORARY
SOLICITOR
Harry R. Burkman

SECRETARY
Andrew Mahut

TREASURER
Alex Macdonald

PUBLISHING
Seventy Years of Security

EDITOR IN CHIEF &
SENIOR RESEARCH
FELLOW
Dr. Joseph McQuade
Dr. James Poborsa

EDITORS
Taylor Allen
Karim Abdelati

DESIGN
Taylor Allen

Table of Contents

Section 1: Canadian Defence, Development, and Diplomacy

The Canadian Populace on the Canadian Forces & NATO.....7
Taylor Allen

What the Canada-Saudi Arabia Dispute Reveals About Canada’s Allies’.....9
Lee Williamson

Month 13 and a Reflection on the Economic Impact of Refugees in Canada11
Nilum Panesar

Sending Humanitarian Aid into Conflict Zones.....13
Sabrina Natale

The Yazidi Genocide: A Fight for Justice.....15
Jacqueline Hicks

The Case of “The Toronto 18”: Interview with Former Undercover Operative Mubin Shaikh.....17
Julia Schaumer

A Look at Anti-Radicalization Programs in Canada.....20
Benjamin Musset

Canada’s Cyber Security: A Discussion with Public Safety Canada.....22
Amaliah Reiskind

Section 2: Emerging Security

Understanding Terrorism.....29
Brad Stollery

The Cost of Climate Change?.....31
Marian Corera

Energy Conflicts Threaten The East Mediterranean.....33
Cyril Widdersboven

Yemen: A Forgotten Humanitarian Crisis.....35
Ambika Varma

The HIV/AIDS Pandemic: a Continued Threat to Global Health Security	38
<i>Nancy Qin</i>	
Unpacking Myanmar’s Ethno-Religious Conflict and the Plight of the Rohingya	40
<i>Nabil Bhatia</i>	
Sorting Fact From Fiction: Trolls, Bots, and the Erosion of Informed Debate	42
<i>Ryan Atkinson</i>	
<u>Section 3: NATO and the World</u>	
Should Canada and NATO allies build stronger ties with strategic partners in South Asia?	45
<i>Ananda Narasimhan</i>	
Interview with Ukrainian Consul General Andrii Veselovskyi on the Ukraine Crisis and Foreign Affairs	48
<i>Michele Di Leo</i>	
The Parallel State: Hezbollah And Its Replicas	51
<i>Nasser Haidar</i>	
NATO-Colombia Relations	53
<i>Natalia Valencia Caquimbo</i>	
China’s Debt-Trap Diplomacy in Africa	55
<i>Dakota Bewley</i>	
Evaluation of the Singapore Summit	57
<i>Changsung Lee</i>	
Woodrow Wilson and World War I, One Hundred Years On	59
<i>Justine Dell</i>	

The NATO Association of Canada’s *Seventy Years of Security* © 2018 is available online at NATOAssociation.ca for download and access to hyperlinked source material

Canadian Defence, Development and Diplomacy

The Canadian Populace on the Canadian Forces & NATO

Taylor Allen

Canadian national identity has often been associated in the popular imaginary with **peacekeeping and international stability**. Despite this popular perception, the Canadian government has consistently **decreased military spending**, initiated several **failed procurement plans** (the economic planning of purchasing military equipment/resources), and sports a **dated and relatively small military**.

In the past few years, two notable reporting polls have been conducted in order to gauge the Canadian public's knowledge, awareness, and interest in the government, military, and Canada's multilateral efforts.

In March of 2017, Canada's Angus Reid Research Institute conducted a **poll** to assess attitudes among the Canadian populace on various domestic and international issues. The study sampled 742 males and 773 females from different income brackets, education levels, and age groups from across the country – giving fair representation across the board. Among the 26 questions in the poll, two of them (questions 17 & 18) provide insight into the public's knowledge of Canada's defence apparatus, our relationship with the United States, and our involvement and commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Question 17 asked Canadians how they felt about U.S. President Donald Trump's call for NATO members to spend the NATO-recommended 2 per cent of GDP on their defence budget. The **results show** 52% of Canadian's answered NATO members should contribute the agreed-upon 2.0% GDP, while 48% said NATO members should be allowed to spend less.

Taylor Allen, Research Analyst and Current Program Editor for Canada's NATO

Originally Published on 24/09/2018

Question 18 asked the populace's opinion regarding Canada's 2017 defence spending which at the time was just under 1.0% – less than half of the contribution that Canada is responsible for under the terms of NATO. Curiously the **results show** a different story from the prior question, with 40% calling for an increase in defence spending while 60% either wanted to continue Canada's >1% or decrease military spending even further.

This year Earncliffe Strategy Group conducted a **reporting poll** on behalf of the Department of National Defence to gauge public awareness of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF). The **results** show that nearly three quarters (74%) of Canadians hadn't heard anything about the CAF in the past year. Additionally, **84% of Canadians** said they did not know about Canada's defence/military strategy (coined **Strong, Secure, Engaged**).

IPSOS group, a consulting and research organization conducted a **poll** on behalf of the NATO Association of Canada earlier this year that affirmed the prior mentioned reports – revealing that the majority of Canadians (**60%**) were unaware of NATO's mission.

Despite this lack of awareness among the Canadian public, both of these reports confirmed that the Canadian populace has had an increasingly positive outlook on the CAF's current status over the course of an **8 year trend**, despite its shrinking size, dated equipment, and low budget. Both the Angus Reid Research Institute and the Earncliffe Strategy Groups reports show either a disconnect between the government and the general public or contradictions between supporting the goal of reaching the 2.0% in defence spending recommended by NATO, yet simultaneously not supporting greater military spending.

So what does this mean for Canadian Citizens? It primarily shows how easy it is to support the military and the imagery of Canadian peacekeeping efforts when the Canadian population's

comprehension on the reality of the Canadian Forces is minimal. It means the public needs to act on their support for CAF and NATO peace enforcement initiatives by bringing budget and procurement issues to the political realm. Supporting the development of Canada's defence apparatus also directly correlates with Canada's defence industry, which – according to a **2018 report** – would also reap benefits to the Canadian economy.

What does this mean for the Canadian military and government?

In order to have **more productive talks** within the government and gain more widespread substantiated public support and civic action as opposed to having vaguely positive feelings, the public must be educated/made aware of Canada's limitations. A well-thought and sustained public relations campaign would be the best answer, though this is easier said than accomplished. In 2016, the Senate of Canada under Parliament tabled a **report** that directly addressed a series of issues and budgetary suggestions regarding the size and technological capacities of the Armed Forces, the Royal Canadian Navy, and the Royal Canadian Air force. Though recognized by the government, policy – particularly involving budget allocation – must have the support of the public in order to be successfully implemented. Many **procurement plans** have been drafted under the former Harper

administration and under the current Trudeau administration, yet they are consistently pushed aside or poorly communicated to Canadian constituents, which in turn leads to unfavourable support on economic plans from the populace and hesitation from the administration to continue down its path.

What does this mean for Canada and NATO?

NATO is a joint, multilateral organization that mutually benefits from efforts towards international stability and peace enforcement – it is founded on mutual reliance. Both **International leaders** and **domestic military officers** alike have vocally emphasized the need for Canada to step up its contributions. The Canadian forces are responsible and accountable for their effectiveness, which is only hindered by dated equipment, shrinking size, and reduced budget.

NATO and its related affiliate bodies like the NATO Association of Canada have implemented the **#WeAreNATO campaign** to serve as the organizations' public relations effort to educate member states and their constituents on what NATO is and does. While this is a step in the right direction, Canadian politicians need to bring this to the attention of the public in order to see more concrete change.

What the Canada-Saudi Arabia Dispute Reveals About Canada's Allies

Lee Williamson

On September 26, in the latest development in the ongoing diplomatic row between Canada and Saudi Arabia, the Saudi foreign minister, Adel Al-Juebir, asked that Canada stop treating his country “like a banana republic.” Al-Juebir repeated demands that the Government of Canada apologize for its August 2018 Tweets which called for the release of a jailed human rights activist.

This latest escalation comes amid optimism expressed earlier in the week that the foreign ministers of the two countries would meet on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly in hopes to diffuse tensions.

The ongoing dispute signifies deeper geopolitical trends that impact Canada and its security interests but for which Canada is merely a bit player. An analysis of these trends suggests that the row is far from being resolved. Furthermore, given the overwhelming silence of the international community on Saudi Arabian human rights issues more broadly, Canada's attempts to promote a human rights agenda in Saudi Arabia through diplomatic pressure seems to lack support even from close allies.

As many commentators have noted, the spat is further evidence of Canada's estrangement from the United States, which declined to condemn the jailing of the rights activists or come to Canada's defence in the crisis. The lack of cooperation between Canada and the United States reflects an increasingly precarious liberal international order, symbolized most notably in the west by the Trump administration's view of the world in transactional, realist terms. In less extraordinary times, Canada could have relied on a certain degree of diplomatic support from its closest allies, including the United States and the European Union, in its calls for human rights to be respected.

Lee Williamson, Current Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 11/10/2018

Saudi Arabia has noted the shift in the United States' view of the world and has embarked on a series of bold foreign policy moves, deepening its involvement in the civil war in Yemen and leading an embargo of Qatar, knowing that, so long as it remains a strategic partner of the United States, it has significant license to do as it pleases. The dispute in question reflects an emboldened Saudi Arabia led by a youthful reformist leader, Crown Prince Mohammad Bin Salman, who refuses to be lectured on internal human rights issues from a country which holds little sway in Washington and even less in the Middle East.

A similar diplomatic row erupted between Germany and Saudi Arabia in November 2017, when the foreign minister of Germany made comments that the Saudi government perceived as critical of Saudi foreign policy. This dispute led Riyadh to pull its ambassador and freeze out German companies. On September 25, the two sides reconciled at the UN General Assembly, with the current German foreign minister issuing an apology for “misunderstandings” in the relationship. The dispute and subsequent apology signal that even economically powerful states like Germany value their relationship with Saudi Arabia too much to risk taking an overtly strong stance against Saudi policies.

Will a similar rapprochement happen with Canada? Evidence suggests that it will be much more difficult to realize. The importance of the relationship between Canada and Saudi Arabia is limited. Bilateral trade between the two countries reached \$3.9 billion CAD in 2016 and thousands of Saudi medical students attend Canadian universities, but the relationship is not essential to either partner. Saudi Arabia wagered that the symbolic message of directing its fury at Canada outweighs the necessary downturn in relations with that country. Moreover, the Liberal government under Prime Minister Justin Trudeau faces an election in the coming year and is loath to appear overly conciliatory on such issues. There is little incentive for either side to exert itself in resolving the dispute.

The major implication for Canada, however, is what the incident has demonstrated regarding key relationships with its allies and, by extension, the cohesion of western NATO-allied countries. The silence of western countries and the apology by Germany in its separate dispute speak to a world in

which states conceive of their own interests in narrower, more realist terms. For progressive-minded liberal internationalists like Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, the silence speaks volume.

Month 13 and a Reflection on the Economic Impact of Refugees in Canada

Nilum Panesar

Canada made [headlines](#) when Justin Trudeau literally and figuratively opened his arms as Prime Minister to welcome refugees into the country. Under the federal government's [#WelcomeRefugees](#) initiative, over 40,000 Syrian refugees have relocated to Canada in the past year. The year 2016 saw the [largest number](#) of refugees to enter Canada since 1980.

The arrival of the Syrian refugees marked a pivotal point for Canada as a chance to demonstrate its reputation as a [caring and inclusive](#) nation. The world looked to Canada for exemplary refugee resettlement practices. In fact, the [United Nations](#) has openly praised Canada's refugee resettlement model and urged other parts of the world to adopt such a system. Now, for many refugees the day marking their first year in Canada has come and gone and the honeymoon phase is coming to an end.

Syrian refugees arriving in Canada are either privately sponsored by a family or community or they are given government support. The federal government of Canada provides 12 months of financial support for UN-sponsored Syrian refugees. [#WelcomeRefugees](#) is a [campaign](#) to involve individuals and businesses in the resettlement of Syrian refugees. Individuals can provide financial support or volunteer their services. Businesses can also provide money, time or jobs to support refugees who do not receive direct government support.

[Month 13](#) marks a significant time for Syrian refugees as a time for them to "[stand on their own](#)". Given refugees are provided 12 months of financial assistance from the federal government, month 13 is when both privately sponsored and government sponsored refugee families will no longer receive financial assistance. At that point, refugee families have the opportunity and obligation to continue their resettlement without financial assistance.

Nilum Panesar, Former Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 20/06/2017

Month 13 has come and gone for several sponsor families and the impact on the Syrian refugee families has varied.

Federal and provincial governments are [working with](#) and endorsing local agencies and other community tools such as [ESL classes and language interpreters](#) to assure the transition goes smoothly. Private sponsorships by Canadian families or communities donating their time and money would end as well – which for many, was an emotional and symbolic transition as well as financial. [Studies find](#) that privately sponsored families generally fare better economically than government sponsored families. The non-financial, psychosocial support the refugee families receive, including the access to the sponsor's network and advice is substantially valuable and helps them to acculturate into Canada faster. In fact, many privately sponsored refugee families [mention](#) the social support they receive from families is just as important as the financial – and that is what they miss the most after month 13.

While there are several case studies and personal stories of refugee families, statistics on their integration and relocation are in their infancy. It is expected that anywhere between [50 and 90 percent](#) of families will transition from government assistance to welfare – as critics of the proposed [12-month financial support plan](#) argue, a year is not enough for refugees to be comfortable on their feet in a new country with a new language, new culture, new political system and new way of life.

The global Syrian refugee crisis, which has mobilized parts of the world to act out of compassion, has also received heated backlash. Even though Canada is regarded as one of the [most welcoming](#) countries for refugees, one in four Canadians, according to an [Angus Reid poll](#), thinks Canada needs to have an immigration ban akin to Trump's travel ban. Several negative tropes persist around the inclusion and invitation of migrants into the country, and 41% of Canada's population thinks inviting 40,000 migrants is too many. While there are many reasons for this backlash (political, racial, economic) one of the main factors impeding support from Canadians was the fear of the

economic burden the relocation program would have on the Canadian economy.

In 2015, the federal government proposed a [\\$678 million](#) refugee budget towards the #WelcomeRefugees campaign to bring refugees in to Canada quickly. From 2015 – 2021, the federal Liberal party has set [\\$1.2 billion](#) to support the relocation and integration of Syrians into Canadian society. Many Canadians fear the already bloated social assistance program will not be able to handle the number of Syrian refugees arriving. However, a deeper look at the figures exposes the myth behind the fears. While \$678 million seems like a large figure, it is in fact only 0.2 percent of the annual federal budget. Even if all the refugees do in fact end up on welfare assistance, it will only increase the overall social assistance caseload [by 2.8 percent](#) given 1.27 million people already receive social assistance in Canada.

Furthermore, there is evidence from past refugee arrivals to support the claim that the refugees will in fact provide a huge economic boost for Canada. [Over 50,000](#) Vietnamese refugees arrived in Canada between 1979 and 1981. Now, many individuals and their offspring from this group are contributing extensively towards the Canada economy and society, including as doctors, lawyers

and teachers. Several people from this group are acting as sponsor families for Syrian refugees as well. The economic benefit to Canada from the Syrians will especially be helpful in “[have-not](#)” regions, such as Atlantic Canada who are counting on the economic stimulation created by young Syrian refugees. An analysis done by [VanCity credit union](#) finds that Syrian refugees in BC alone may generate over \$560 million in economic activity over the next 20 years.

Furthermore, according to Census 2016, Canada now has [more seniors](#) than children. Close to 50% of the Syrian refugees are under the age of 18. Canada will benefit from the extensive number of youth. In order to stimulate economic activity and ward off a stagnating economy, immigration remains a highly important factor. Immigration is a way to replace the retirees in the labour force, especially since it is not being replenished by youth born in Canada.

Canada has a chance to completely change its perception of the Syrian refugee crisis. As Month 13 looms for many Syrians who are trying their hand at integrating into Canada without financial assistance, it is a pivotal point in the country’s ability to see their presence as a blessing as opposed to a burden.

Sending Humanitarian Aid into Conflict Zones

Sabrina Natale

In 2016, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs ([OCHA](#)) reported that 13.5 million Syrians were in need of humanitarian assistance. Millions of innocent victims are fleeing what has become a region of immense political instability, destabilization, violence, war, and persecution. Immediate life-saving aid such as food, water, sanitation, and health care are desperately needed by [millions](#) of Syrians in various regions. Millions are also in need of shelter, household goods and education support. According to the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies ([IFRC](#)), Syria has been identified as one of the most dangerous areas for humanitarian aid response in the world today.

On Monday September 19, an airstrike on a United Nations aid convoy and on a Red Crescent warehouse in Aleppo left a [confirmed](#) 12 Red Crescent workers dead and many others seriously wounded. United Nations Humanitarian Chief, Stephen O'Brien, confirmed Syrian Arab Red Crescent (SARC) volunteers among those killed or seriously injured. The aid convoy was said to be delivering vital humanitarian aid such as food and medical supplies to 78,000 people in the town of Uram al-Kubra, west of [Aleppo](#) in northern Syria. As a result of the attack, the UN has been forced to temporarily suspend aid convoy deliveries to Syria in order to allow a review of security proceedings.

Humanitarian aid workers are exposed to countless security threats while working in some of the world's most dangerous and unstable areas. The Aid Worker Security Database ([AWSD](#)) identified in a 2016 [report](#) that kidnapping, fatalities and wounded casualties are the main threats targeting overseas aid workers. The very nature of providing humanitarian aid work involves placing oneself in areas of political instability, armed conflict zones or disaster relief areas. Many may assume working

conditions for aid workers to be safe, confined, isolated, bordered and protected within armed security, but often times this is not the case. Instead of avoiding what can be described as danger zones, aid workers and convoys seek them out and are often stationed extremely close to affected areas. Simply [traveling](#) to an affected area presents significant safety concerns as many attacks on aid workers occur while travelling to affected areas.

In February 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau spoke about Canada's new emerging role in [International](#) Development. Trudeau affirmed Canada's increased role in providing development assistance to some of the world's poorest and most fragile and vulnerable states. The Prime Minister believes this not only generates a stronger [international](#) community by working towards the prevention and management of threats affecting nations globally, but also reflects the culture and values of Canada towards assisting humanity in crisis situations. On Monday, September 19, 2016, Trudeau spoke at a United Nations Conference reaffirming Canada's commitment to providing humanitarian aid in response to the conflict in Syria. In what can be described as an extremely patriotic speech depicting Canada as a nation devoted to peacekeeping and humanitarian relief, the Prime Minister did not address concerns associated with the safety of overseas aid workers.

Responding to global conflicts and humanitarian crises is an integral part of NATO's security and [crisis](#) management intervention. In addition to military intervention, NATO's response to global conflicts are based on establishing peace, sustainability, deterrence, and conflict prevention. From a global perspective, providing humanitarian aid can assist in establishing the rule of law, holding individuals accountable for war crimes and injustices, and assist in deterring unjust regimes. A humanitarian crisis has inevitable repercussions such as increased asylum seekers, domestic security threats, and economic fluctuations, again, depending on the type of crisis taking place.

Sabrina Natale, Former Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 03/11/2016

It is important from an international perspective to ask how and in what ways a particular crisis or conflict affects the international community. How does the rise of an extremist group across Syria affect the international community? Threats affecting global security, health, environmental sustainability, mass destruction, terrorism and cyber warfare are not confined within a country's borders, but rather affect the international community as a whole. As a result, it is imperative that NATO, its member states and partner international organizations such as the United Nations and the European Union continue to establish global security networks and promote peace and global cooperation.

Although we must continue to send humanitarian aid to maintain Canada's global ties and its partnerships with international organizations, there are ways in which these missions can be made safer. By establishing clear security proceedings, alternative transportation methods and mission coordination involving emergency response

protocols, some risks can be mitigated. It is critical that aid workers be aware of and able to deal accordingly with unexpected circumstances that may cause delays in the distribution of humanitarian aid. The attacks on a humanitarian convoy, even after the imposition of a ceasefire, demonstrates the instability of working conditions for aid workers. A stronger, more effective body of legislation and procedures is required to protect overseas aid workers from the threats generated by global conflicts.

Canada should continue to send humanitarian aid in dangerous settings to promote international peace, security, deterrence and conflict prevention. It reflects the commitment Canada shares to providing assistance to those displaced by conflicts and circumstances beyond a citizens control, whether as a result of extremism, radicalization, or other causes. Having said that, aid workers should not become vulnerable targets while working overseas.

The Yazidi Genocide: A Fight for Justice

Jacqueline Hicks

In [August 2014](#), the Islamic State (ISIS) captured Mount Sinjar in northern Iraq and began a systematic slaughter of the Yazidi religious minority in Syria and Iraq. In [June 2016](#), the United Nations (UN) acknowledged that the systematic rounding up of the Yazidis in an effort to “erase their identity” meets the definition of genocide under the 1948 UN Convention on Genocide. Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister [Stéphane Dion](#) subsequently supported the UN’s stance on the issue.

The Yazidis are based mainly in northern Iraq, Syria, and now Germany. Estimates show there are somewhere between [70,000 and 500,000](#) Yazidis worldwide. The Yazidis have a [6,000-year-old](#) culture that draws on a mix of Mesopotamian traditions rather than one that follows a holy book. Jihadists consider the Yazidi people to be [“devil worshippers”](#) and regard them as “the worst sort of [infidels](#)” due to their syncretic religion. The relationship between Yazidis and Muslims has always been tense, as many Muslims despise Yazidis and many Yazidis do not feel safe around Muslims.

During August 2014, [ISIS fighters](#) killed more than 5,000 Yazidis, abducted over 3,600 women and sold them into sexual slavery, and drove over 500,000 from their ancestral lands. While there was some international response at the time, it has not been enough. With the help of [U.S. air strikes](#) that same month, many Yazidis were able to flee Iraq’s Nineveh Plain districts and find shelter in camps controlled by the Kurdish Regional Government in Iraq. While the immediate international response provided a moment of hope for many Yazidis, the action was brief and the U.S. pulled back after only a few months.

The evidence of genocide is [clear-cut](#). There are mass graves, eyewitnesses, as well as postings

online from ISIS filming its massacres. ISIS has also been very clear about its intentions towards the Yazidi people. An article in *Dabiq*, an ISIS newsletter, states that the “continual existence” of the Yazidi people is a matter Muslims should question as they will be asked about it on Judgment Day. Additionally, a [leaflet](#) explains how enslaving infidel women is in accordance with Islamic law, stating that it is permissible to beat, have intercourse with, as well as buy, sell, and gift female captives as they are “merely property”.

Since the evidence of genocide is overwhelming, many international groups, including the UN, have acknowledged that it is occurring. However, not enough has been done to help the Yazidi people and give them justice. It is estimated that about [4,800](#) women and children are still being held captive by ISIS, and about [85%](#) of the Yazidi population are currently global refugees. [Paulo Pinheiro](#), Chairman of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, said in a statement, “The crime of genocide must trigger much more assertive action at the political level, including at the Security Council.” Pinheiro also emphasized the obligation that the international community has under the 1948 Genocide Convention to take action.

There are two particular individuals who are determined to bring ISIS to court and provide justice for the Yazidi people. Nadia Murad was 21-years-old when ISIS fighters arrived in [Kocho](#), a Yazidi village in Iraq where she lived. The ISIS fighters brought everyone to the village school and separated the men from women and children. The men and older women were murdered while the young women and children were forced on buses and taken to Mosul. Many of the younger boys would be forced to convert to Islam, while the women and girls were sold as slaves. Murad was sold to a jihadist who raped and punished her daily. Eventually, she was able to escape and found sanctuary in Germany. Stories like Murad’s are common among Yazidis, although many have a less fortunate ending. Murad has become a [symbol](#) of survival for the Yazidi people as she is willing to

Jacqueline Hicks, Former Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 01/03/2017

testify publicly and repeatedly about her harrowing experience as a slave of ISIS.

Amal Clooney, an international and human rights lawyer, has taken on Nadia Murad as a client and they are determined to bring ISIS leaders to [stand trial](#) before the International Criminal Court (ICC) or a hybrid court backed by the UN and Iraqi government, as long as it meets international standards of justice. When speaking about why it is so important that the Yazidi people obtain international justice, [Clooney](#) claims it is “important you don’t just turn the page without people being held to account”. Right now Clooney is focused on gathering as much evidence as possible for the trial. She is putting forth a proposal for the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) for an “[ISIS Commission](#)”. This commission would involve sending a team to investigate crimes committed against all Iraqis, including Sunnis, Shias, Christians, and Yazidis. The investigators would also gather evidence and identify ISIS suspects who can be served with financial sanctions.

Murad and Clooney are not the first to spearhead the effort to bring the case of genocide to the ICC. Two [Yazidi groups](#), the Free Yazidi Foundation and Yazda, submitted a report to ICC prosecutor Fatou Bensouda detailing the atrocities committed by ISIS since August 2014. Bensouda acknowledges the crimes that ISIS is committing against the Yazidi in Syria and Iraq, but calls on the international community to act as the ICC has no jurisdiction in Syria and Iraq, since they are not ICC members. However, the report argues that the ICC has jurisdiction over the [5,000-7,500](#) foreign fighters who have joined ISIS from ICC member states. As [Amal Clooney](#) asserts, “If the ICC can’t prosecute the world’s most evil terror group in the world, what is it there for?” This is a feeling of frustration echoed by many. In April 2015,

a [report](#) from the ICC stated that the jurisdictional basis for opening a preliminary examination was “too narrow” at that time. Still, Clooney and Murad vow not to give up. They are determined to gather as much evidence as possible through testimonials and investigations so that the pressure to prosecute will become “[overwhelming](#)” for the ICC.

The Yazidi genocide highlights fundamental problems with international law that need to be fixed. As of now, there are very few deterrents to stop terror groups such as ISIS from committing crimes such as genocide, since they know any judicial actions made against them will likely be halted by geo-political roadblocks and slow action from international bodies. In the meantime, though, the international community can take action. Thousands of Yazidi refugees need help with access to hospitals, schools, and jobs, as well as psychological support for the thousands of women who have suffered trauma and sexual violence. In [October 2016](#), Canada’s Immigration Minister John McCallum stated that the federal government would take urgent action to bring Yazidi refugees to Canada. Further to that McCallum said that his department would send a group on an [expedition in Iraq](#) to investigate the situation, gather facts, and determine a course of action regarding the genocide.

[Robert Guest](#), foreign editor for *the Economist* who travelled to Iraq to meet with Yazidis in refugee camps, stated that the Yazidis he met during his trip had three basic wishes. They want to return home, they want the world to acknowledge what happened to them as genocide, and they want justice. The fulfillment of the Yazidis’ wishes lies in the hands of the international community, which needs to rally together to push ISIS out of Yazidi villages and gather enough evidence so that the ICC will have no choice but to act.

The Case of “The Toronto 18”: Interview with Former Undercover Operative Mubin Shaikh

Julia Schaumer

In part two of a two-part interview series, Julia Schaumer interviews former undercover operative Mubin Shaikh about his involvement in foiling prospective terrorist attacks by “The Toronto 18”.

Julia: Could you tell me a little bit about who “the Toronto 18” were, how this case came to the attention of the authorities and how you were brought into the picture?

Mubin: “The Toronto 18” is the case of 18 aspiring violent extremists who were arrested in connection with a terrorist plot in Canada in 2006. I was already working undercover for CSIS since I returned back from Syria, and I saw in the newspaper the first Canadian had been charged on terrorism charges. His name was Momin Khawaja and he used to sit beside me in the Quran school that I described in the beginning. So, I see a reference to CSIS, and I call them up, not knowing that, if I’m reading about a guy being sentenced, that means that the police were investigating him. I didn’t know any of that, so I called CSIS and said, “Hey, I know this guy, it must be a mistake”, and they said, “No it’s not a mistake, but we’re going to send somebody to come and talk to you.” Which they did, and he basically recruited me as a walk-in to work for the service. So, then I worked two years for the service.

By the end of 2005, I can say that I worked several investigations related to the mandate of CSIS. Meaning of course *jihadists* or otherwise Islamist threats. So, at the end of 2005... I was told, “Listen there are some guys, here’s what they look like”, I was given their pictures, and “We just want you to tell us what they’re about.” So, it was very highly compartmentalized; I was not ever given advance information about what the service may have known about this target group (target of investigation). It’s funny because the targets were going to be at a particular event that was happening. It was at a banquet hall. It was regarding the

Julia Schaumer, Research Analyst and Current Program Editor for the Women in Security program
Originally Published on 02/10/2018

individuals who had been arrested on the security certificates. And I had in fact been invited to the event separately; separate from CSIS tasking me to go to that event. Yeah, that worked wonderfully in court because the defence was like, “Well you would not have gone if the authorities didn’t send you” and I was like, “Well actually, yeah, I would have.”

Long story short, I went in, sat down, I waited, a guy came, his face was covered, he gave me greetings, he removed his mask and it was Zakaria Amara; target number two. So, I thought to myself, “Oh that’s interesting. He came to me, I didn’t even have to go to him.” And then he said, “Oh my other buddies are coming, so I’m just waiting for them.” And I said maybe it’s the rest of the guys that I saw. And sure enough, it’s the rest of the guys that I saw. Not all of them, but most of them. And then they came over and I took that as an opportunity that when Zakaria stood up, I also stood up. And then we moved to a larger table and instead of me being this stranger, I pointed to one of them was like, “Hey, don’t I know you from Medina Mosque from Saturday nights?”... and in fact he had seen me there from back in the day. So that actually turned out to be true and that was a way for me to cement or at least suggest to the leader that, “Hey, this guy is one of us.” So, that’s really how the infiltration began. And then at the end of the event, we went outside, and they recruited me to their group. They asked me if I wanted to help train the participants that they had invited to a training camp that they were holding up in the woods. So of course I agreed and it was after that, I then traversed over to the RCMP as a police agent. And it is from this point that the police investigation begins, which lasts for six months, and then the arrests took place in 2006. And then I would spend four years in court as a witness.

Julia: Was there ever a point where you felt like you were at risk of being compromised?

Mubin: Oh yes, of course. I can give you a great example: This is December 4th...I get a phone call from Zakaria Amara, “Hey I need to talk to you, come and meet me at the Tim Hortons.” So I go there and he says, “Look I want to go shopping for guns, can we do that?” and I said, “Yeah we can do that”, and he said, “Good that was a test. Some people said you might be a spy, so I had to know for sure.” So, did I feel like I could’ve been? Yeah.

Julia: What was the best piece of advice or guidance that you were given from CSIS or the RCMP while under cover?

Mubin: [laughing] I chuckle... Advice? They give that? There was no advice. The only guidance was “tell the truth. Don’t ever misrepresent information”. That’s it. But there was no advice in terms of what you can say, what you can’t say, what you should or shouldn’t do.

Julia: That’s surprising to me.

Mubin: Isn’t it? It’s insane [laughs].

Julia: What were some of the plans of “The Toronto 18” that were discussed or that you found out about later?

Mubin: I mean, I would still say a lot of it was aspirational. Which doesn’t make it any less dangerous or any less criminal. And those ideas were at the general aspirational level to facilitate or directly commit violent acts of extremism in city centres. And it could be done in a number of ways. We did discuss specific things. For example, taking my van, loading it up with explosives and taking it down to Ottawa and detonating it. The whole Parliament Hill thing came up because there was one snippet that was entered as evidence in court in an audio intercept, meaning a recording device left in a van, where there was discussion about how one of the young offenders in the group would be beneficial to chop the heads of the politicians off because he was so good with the axe chopping wood. This was the whole storming the parliament, killing the parliamentarians, forcing the eviction of Canadian forces from Afghanistan, having diversion IEDs go off in Ottawa to have first-responders rush to that scene while we would be attacking the parliament building. That was the

major “plot” that kind of was discussed that I was directly party to. Others that I would learn about later would be the stock exchange, or what Zakaria Amara and those guys were doing, Hitting the CSIS building, the Darlington power plant in Pickering.

Julia: What kinds of projects are you involved with now?

Mubin: Well, it’s interesting. A year after the case was over, CSIS reached back out to me just to say “hey” and I didn’t do anymore work for them, I mean I can’t. But I styled myself as an independent expert because while I was in court, I also obtained a Master’s degree in Policing Intelligence and Counter Terrorism. Basically, I wanted to make sense of what the hell I got myself involved in. You know, an altruistic guy going into this thing not realizing what kind of storm was going to come from this. So, having been put through that entire legal spectrum of prosecuting terrorism, a very unique experience. You know, the PTSD that I developed from it. So since then, at the end of 2010, I gave my first talk at the CASIS. I gave my first talk on the Toronto 18 and a lot of people were interested in that. A lot of people saw that, “Wait this guy actually knows what he’s talking about, he’s gone through it himself, he was operational as well, he’s got some academic basis now.” Since then, I’ve been contracted by, overwhelmingly, the US government. So, State Department, stuff in training a new class of diplomats or foreign service members, the US DOD has been very good to me. So, I’ve done a number of things for them from the influence activity side: role playing, instructing special operations forces etc. I’ve just been doing contract work really, with overwhelmingly the US.

Julia: At a policy level, do you think Canada is doing enough to nip things in the bud in terms of stunting radicalization? For that matter, what are your thoughts regarding countries such as France and Belgium where this has been a problem?

Mubin: Really since 2014, attacks blasted up in 2015, 2016 they were even higher, and I think it was in 2017 they started to drop a bit and in 2018 it was just pathetic. Having seen all of those things that happened, talking to intelligence officials and government people and everyone across the board,

I realized that in fact, Canada was doing the best out of everybody. There are a number of reasons for this: primarily that it was not a government-driven objective. Any kind of counselling was being done organically at the grass-roots level. Anyone that we talked to today who has studied the top-down government-driven approaches, the vast majority of them conclude the same thing that I saw. That if you want to have an effective program, it's got to be organic and it's got to be grass-roots driven. I would add to that that the proof that we are doing a very good job is in the incredibly low number of people that joined ISIS... I regularly remind people that there are over a million Muslims in Canada. How many have been picked up on terrorism charges? Maximum 25? You're dealing with fractions of percentages... If you look at the US, George W. University, they published I think it was also 27 or 30 people. Let's say 50, divided by

3.5 million Muslim people. Oh, 0.0000142%... By the numbers alone, it's negligible. And one could make the argument that one incredibly low numbers and two, the reason for that is because most Muslim organizations teach Muslims not to blow shit up. I would say that this is where a lot of the prevention happens; in the mosques. It's completely opposite of when people think that radicalization happens in the mosque, which is ludicrous. It's actually the opposite. The prevention happens in the mosque. And so when we now talk about deradicalization programs in that formal, official sense, what are we talking about? I mean if you really look at things, originally deradicalization programs began with white supremacists and it's now being implanted and applied to the *jihadists*. And now people are acting like it's some new thing. That is where some countries are struggling...

A Look at Anti-Radicalization Programs in Canada

Benjamin Musset

Canada has been left relatively unscathed by terrorism. However, that doesn't mean the country is immune to these types of threats. Though Canada has not suffered attacks like those recently witnessed in Britain or France, there have been several [smaller incidents](#) over the past few years.

Most recently, in late [September](#) a Somali-born man attacked an Edmonton police officer and four pedestrians before being apprehended. A black and white ISIS flag was later found in the attacker's van. Other potentially devastating terrorist plots have been [narrowly thwarted](#). And scores of Canadians who once [left](#) to join terrorist organizations overseas have now since returned.

Meanwhile, the ongoing rise of far-right extremism has broadened the scope of Canada's terrorism threat. In fact, the country's most lethal terrorist event in recent years was not committed by a violent Islamist but rather a white nationalist who [opened fire](#) during evening prayer at a Quebec City mosque. A 2015 [study](#) on right-wing radicalism in Canada found over 100 different extremist groups operating across the country at that time. With the continued global ascent of far-right politics, the number of such groups has likely proliferated over the past two years.

In efforts to combat the country's domestic terror threats, anti-radicalization programs have become increasingly popular. Through the use of methods like community outreach and counselling, counter-radicalization attempts to prevent an individual's embrace of extremist ideology before the person engages in or supports acts of terrorism. Deradicalization uses similar methods, with a particular emphasis on personal counselling, to rehabilitate those who have already succumb to radicalism.

Earlier this year, the federal government [announced](#) the creation of the Canada Centre for Community Engagement and Prevention of Violence. Under the oversight of Public Safety Canada, the Canada Centre works to

prevent the spread of radicalization across the country by supporting local outreach initiatives and funding research into the topic. Last year's federal budget [allocated](#) \$35 million to anti-radicalization over the next five years as well as an additional \$10 million each year thereafter.

The Centre is committed to combating all forms of extremism, a decision that has been commended by experts in the field. "Making it one type of terrorism specific, for example, al-Qaeda or ISIS-inspired terrorism, is a recipe for creating fear, suspicion and perpetuating the notion of suspect communities within a population," [said](#) Jeremy Littlewood, a terrorism expert from Carleton University.

In addition to government-run programs, anti-radicalization has been endorsed widely by civil society groups, particularly within the Canadian Muslim community. Last year the [Council of Canadian Imams](#) announced that the organization would begin funding its own ["deradicalization clinics"](#) in Toronto this fall.

Daniel Koehler, the founder and director of the [German Institute on Radicalization and Deradicalization Studies](#) (GIRDS), says that a distinction must be made between deradicalization and disengagement. [According to Koehler](#), the latter refers to "simple behavioral change," where the person in question may no longer necessarily engage in illicit activity but still supports the cause. As former CSIS strategic analyst Phil Gurski [notes](#), a person who may be disengaged "can of course opt to 're-engage' at a future point."

Koehler encourages deradicalization efforts to go further, beyond mere disengagement. "You have to renounce the ideological goals of that violence as well, to reach a recognition and acceptance of the victims' suffering, and the injustice that was produced by that specific violence," he argues.

Having worked to rehabilitate neo-Nazis as well as religious extremists, Koehler says genuine deradicalization efforts must identify what drove

the person toward extremism in the first place. The origins of one's violent fanaticism can stem from a diverse array of places, he says, from the frustration of finding work to despair over the plight of one's own community. A sense of disillusionment in some form appears to be a common motivator. Aside from personal counselling, Koehler says that other methods commonly used in deradicalization programs include vocational training and "creative art therapy."

Syed Soharwardy, founder of [Muslims Against Terrorism](#) and the [Islamic Supreme Council of Canada](#), is particularly focused on counter-radicalization. According to Soharwardy, young Muslims in Canada remain vulnerable to [recruitment](#) by radical groups like ISIS whether it be online or through direct overtures from members in their community. Based in Calgary, the imam regularly meets with Muslim youth to help dispel the religious legitimacy of these groups and ensure young people know how to respond if they are approached. "If they approach," Soharwardy recently told some of his young mentees, "you should be smart enough to know that ISIS is very big criminals in the eyes of Islam."

While counter-radicalization efforts, like Imam Soharwardy's work with Muslim youth, are generally recognized as constructive, deradicalization programs have been viewed with a degree of skepticism. Much of this comes down to the fact that their effectiveness is exceedingly difficult — some say ["impossible"](#) — to measure. Generally, the only quantifiable way to assess a program's success is by looking at the rate of recidivism among its graduates. But, as Marisa L. Porges, a Fellow from the Council on Foreign Relations, has [noted](#), recidivism can be hard to determine in the first place as it "reflect[s] only what is known to intelligence services, which is limited." Moreover, Gurski argues that an individual's genuine beliefs and intentions cannot even be ascertained beyond a shadow of a doubt. "We can observe and document changes in behaviour since these are overt," he says. "Then again, any changes of this nature are signs of disengagement and not necessarily ones of deradicalization."

Benjamin Musset, Research Analyst and Former Program Editor for Canada's NATO Program, *Originally Published on 24/10/2017*

Ultimately, Gurski, now the president of [Borealis Threat and Risk Consulting](#), believes that graduates of deradicalization programs should generally still be viewed with suspicion by intelligence and security forces. "The working assumption must be 'once a terrorist always a terrorist' unless there is a tremendous amount of evidence to the contrary."

Koehler, who in addition to his activity in Germany [has also worked](#) with radicalized individuals in the US, concedes that deradicalization programs do not guarantee success, and that some more hardened individuals may not be responsive to them. "Most of the ideal candidates have thought about changing, thought about leaving, but do not know how to do it, or are afraid of the consequences," [says](#) Koehler.

However, despite its weaknesses, deradicalization has proven successful in certain cases. Some previously radicalized individuals have gone on to be integral intelligence sources for police. In the mid-2000s, Canadian [Mubin Shaikh](#), who had once recruited individuals to extremism before rejecting it himself, went undercover as a CSIS informant eventually [helping to unravel](#) the "Toronto 18" terrorist plot. Moreover, those who are successfully rehabilitated are also often the best resources to counter extremism among youth, as pointed out by both Koehler and Porges.

Though Koehler acknowledges the importance of security and intelligence efforts in counterterrorism strategy, he says that these measures don't address overall problem. That is to say, the security apparatus doesn't help to diminish the radical ideology that fuels terrorism itself. In fact, Koehler suggests that securitization [inadvertently legitimizes](#) extremism in the eyes of its adherents. Anti-radicalization efforts, on the other hand, directly work to invalidate the ideology.

Koehler [puts it](#) this way: "It's a game, and by arresting and [using] repressive action, we prove them right. We have to do it, I'm not saying we should abstain from that; we have to punish people who commit crimes and do illegal things. But if you just raise pressure in the container without providing a valve to release steam and provide a way out of it, it's not good."

Canada's Cyber Security: A Discussion with Public Safety Canada

Amaliah Reiskind

1. First off, would you be able to tell us a little about the Canadian Cyber Incident Response Centre (CCIRC) within Public Safety? What is its mandate? Where does it sit in the federal government cyber security structure?

CCIRC works within Public Safety Canada and serves as the single point of contact for owners and operators of critical infrastructure to report cyber incidents and seek assistance. We work in partnership with provinces, territories, municipalities, and private sector organizations to protect their critical cyber systems. As Canada's national computer security incident response team, we are also responsible to coordinate the national response to any serious cyber security incident.

Among CCIRC's core activities, we provide incident response assistance to our partners free of charge. We also provide advice and support to prepare for and mitigate against cyber events by issuing a range of guidance documents, [security bulletins](#), and technical reports related to cyber security issues. This helps our partners better understand cyber risks and make informed decisions. Owners and operators of cyber systems work with CCIRC on a voluntary basis, to improve the security on their cyber systems through information sharing on cyber threats and mitigation strategies.

2. The Minister of Public Safety released a new [National Cyber Security Strategy](#) in June 2018. Could you explain to us what Canada's vision is for cyber security for the years to come?

The Government of Canada launched its first Cyber Security Strategy in 2010. Due to the fast pace at which the digital environment is changing, the Canadian government initiated a review of its

Amaliah Reiskind, Research Analyst and Former Program Editor for Cyber Security and Information Warfare
Originally Published on 22/08/2018

cyber strategy. In 2016, a broad consultation undertaken across Canada helped identify gaps and opportunities, as well as new ideas to work together to keep Canadians safe. While it is important to be aware of cyber threats, Canada's cyber security policy was not driven out of fear or defensiveness. The new Strategy rather aims to capitalize on the advantages of new technologies and the digital economy while managing its risks.

As cyber threats become more frequent and severe, they have the potential to undermine the resiliency of our critical networks and infrastructure and bring significant harm to our national security and economic prosperity. The Strategy identifies the leadership role of the Government of Canada and conveys the importance of strengthening collaboration with our stakeholders and partners. The Government of Canada and partners will look to the Strategy to provide direction for the decision-making challenges of the future.

With this in mind, the Strategy's core goals are reflected in the Budget 2018's substantial investments in cyber security, which totals more than \$500 million over five years. This is the largest single investment in cyber security made by the Canadian government, which clearly demonstrates Canada's commitment to safety and security in the digital age. With these enhanced capabilities and in collaboration with its partners, the new national cyber security Strategy will better protect Canadians from cybercrime, respond to evolving threats, and help defend government and private sector's critical systems.

3. Outlined in the National Cyber Security Strategy is the creation of the [Canadian Centre for Cyber Security](#), to begin initial operations in fall 2018. CCIRC will be one of the federal branches consolidated into it, along with functions from Shared Services Canada and the Communications Security Establishment (CSE). How will a unified centre help strengthen Canada's cyber security practices?

The creation of the Canadian Centre for Cyber Security addresses many of the coordination gaps raised during the consultation. As you previously mentioned, the Cyber Centre will bring together the cyber security operational experience and technical expertise of CCIRC, CSE, and the Security Operations Centre of Shared Services Canada into a single, unified source of expert advice, guidance and services. Once it becomes operational in the fall 2018, the Cyber Centre will be the first Government of Canada integrated source of expert advice, guidance, services and support on cyber security operations for governments as well as critical infrastructure owners and operators. The Cyber Centre will also be a trusted source of general cyber security information for Canadians and the private sector.

The Cyber Centre will inform, communicate, and educate all Canadians about cyber security issues by providing a clear and trusted voice on issues that affect their daily lives. The Centre will reduce cyber security risks to Canadians by providing expert advice, guidance, services and support. It will also monitor the cyber security environment and use that understanding to identify, address, and share knowledge about systemic threats, risks and vulnerabilities. Ultimately, the Centre will provide quicker, more effective information flow between the Government and private sector partners resulting in stronger cyber protection, defence, and security for the Government, the private sector, and all Canadians.

The decision to house the new Cyber Centre within CSE was made in part because CSE already has the necessary legal authorities in place, with its review and privacy protection mechanisms, to support the Centre. Overall, the Cyber Centre will strengthen Canada's cyber ecosystem and support a resilient cyber community.

4. Another area discussed in the new Cyber Security Strategy is the importance of collaboration with private industry. What has the government been doing to further establish these ties?

The Strategy highlights cyber security as one of the most serious economic and national security concerns for Canada. Although digital technologies and the Internet are integral to innovation and economic growth, Canadian small and medium-size businesses may not always realize the risks present in their cyber environment. Failure to protect adequately their IT systems can lead to adverse economic consequences including data breaches and theft of valuable intellectual property. Adopting good cyber security practices are critical to maintain Canada's economic competitiveness, stability and long-term prosperity. However, the government cannot do this alone; defending our national interests against cyber threats is a shared responsibility.

Over the years, CCIRC has relied on its extensive partnerships with owners and operators of critical infrastructure across Canada to identify cyber issues and to enable the information sharing that is critical to preventing, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from cyber incidents. Among the approaches used to facilitate information sharing, CCIRC hosts sector based community calls to provide a regular exchange of information on cyber threats and trends experienced by specific sectors. We also participate in conferences that give us an opportunity to directly engage with critical infrastructure sectors and inform them about vulnerabilities specifically affecting their sector of activity. The health of the cyber ecosystem in Canada is heavily reliant on the collaboration and information exchange that occurs between all the relevant stakeholders responsible for critical cyber systems underpinning Canada's national security, public safety, economic prosperity and innovation.

The new Cyber Centre will continue to build on the collaboration that was previously established by CCIRC and other federal agencies with owners and operators of critical infrastructure across Canada. The Centre will be an outward-facing organization and will welcome collaborative partnerships and projects with the Canadian cyber security sector. It will be open to regular engagement with industry, governments, academia, and the media. It will also advance new partnerships and dialogue with other jurisdictions, the business community, and international partners. These partnerships will help

us defend our Canadian interests against cyber threats in a mutually beneficial manner.

5. As mentioned, an integral part to Canada's cyber security is the safekeeping of its critical infrastructure. What has Public Safety been doing to build resiliency? What have been some of the main challenges in doing so?

Public Safety has been working particularly closely in recent years with critical infrastructure sectors to strengthen their cyber resilience. As outlined in the [National Strategy for Critical Infrastructure](#), Public Safety is continuously working to enhance critical infrastructure resilience and better protect Canada and Canadians by raising awareness of threats and vulnerabilities, and by working with industry partners to prepare for all types of disruptions, including cyber-based incidents. The challenges associated with safeguarding critical infrastructure from cyber threats vary by organization, but can include incomplete adoption of top cyber hygiene practices, variable alignment with standards, varied knowledge and experience of staff, and in some cases resource constraints to improve staff training or upgrade equipment.

The Critical Infrastructure and Strategic Coordination Directorate within Public Safety has developed a range of programs designed to strengthen the cyber resilience of critical infrastructure. First, Public Safety conducts cyber security assessments under the [Regional Resilience Assessment Program](#) (RRAP). These assessments help owners and operators of critical infrastructure identify and address cyber vulnerabilities, from both an organizational and technical perspective, through the delivery of on-site interviews and network testing. Public Safety also organizes Industrial Control Systems (ICS) Security Symposiums to provide a forum for critical infrastructure sectors to build partnerships and share information on the latest cyber security trends and mitigation measures. These events include technical workshops designed to provide ICS operators with hands-on opportunities to learn and practice mitigation and defence techniques. In addition, Public Safety works with critical infrastructure owners and operators to develop and deliver cyber security exercises to test cyber security practices and incident response capabilities. These

exercises aim to foster enhanced cooperation and information sharing among public-private sector partners and help improve the overall cyber security posture of Canada's critical infrastructure.

6. Canada and the U.S. share some of their critical infrastructure, are there agreements in place for shared cooperation on their cyber security? How has this cooperation changed with the new American government?

This is a really good question. [The Canada-U.S. Cybersecurity Action Plan](#) enhances the already strong bilateral cyber security cooperation that exists between our countries to better protect shared critical infrastructure. The Canadian government works closely with the U.S. to protect critical cyber systems to respond to and recover from any cyber disruptions, and to make cyberspace safer for all our citizens. This means working together, not just at the border, but also beyond the border to enhance our security and accelerate the legitimate flow of people, goods and services.

The Cybersecurity Action Plan's specific goals include enhancing collaboration on cyber incident management between each country's cyber security operations centres; improving information sharing and engagement with the private sector; and the ongoing collaboration between Canada and the U.S. on the promotion of cyber security awareness to the public.

Both Canada and the U.S. recognize the importance to work together to enhance the protection and resilience of vital cross-border critical infrastructure. When a new government is elected in Canada or the U.S., the transition happens seamlessly as the coordination and collaboration mechanisms in place to prevent and respond to cyber attacks are well-established in the standard operating procedures between Canadian and U.S. cyber security operations centres. There are several important efforts between Canada and the U.S. to deepen our already strong bilateral cyber security cooperation.

7. It has been found there is a low awareness of cyber security threats in Canada's maritime transportation industry. What has Public Safety

been doing to help the industry bolster itself against emerging cyber threats?

The Maritime Cyber Risk Project is an interdepartmental initiative created to provide concrete solutions to protect Canada's maritime transportation sector from emerging cyber threats. Speaking with Canadian port authorities it was noticed that the maritime industry is still paying a lot of attention to its physical security; but this is insufficient nowadays and cyber security concerns can no longer be ignored. The marine industry is heavily dependent on technologies and commercial ICS devices for its navigation and communication systems. By 2030, new technologies are expected to significantly change the shipping industry's operations and the supply chain will soon become completely automated. These rapid technological changes may put the industry at risk, as they may introduce vulnerabilities that can get hacked. Currently, 90% of the world trade is carried by sea, making the maritime shipping industry a prime target for cybercriminal activities, especially for fraud attempts.

The Maritime Cyber Risk Project is a whole-of-government effort that has contributed to build a community of experts on cyber security issues in the maritime transportation sector that has involved 10 agencies and departments: Public Safety Canada, Transport Canada, Fisheries and Ocean Canada, the Canadian Coast Guard, the Department of National Defence, Innovation, Science and Economic Development, the Communications Security Establishment, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and Defence Research and Development Canada. Last year, the working group outlined concrete recommendations to address gaps identified in maritime policy or operational issues related to cyber security that were briefed to the Interdepartmental Marine Security Working Group, a forum dedicated to identifying and coordinating federal initiatives to enhance the Government of Canada's maritime security program.

Overall, the marine industry has been active in recent years to promote good cyber security practices. As you may remember, last year in June,

one of the world's biggest container shipping lines was hit by the NotPetya malware that spread across several port terminals. This incident was estimated to have cost between \$200-300 million to the company. Following the NotPetya cyber incident, the joint industry group *Be Cyber Aware at Sea* released a second edition of their [Guidelines on Cyber Security Onboard Ships](#) that aligns with the International Maritime Organization's guidelines on cyber risk management. In addition, in 2016 Transport Canada identified best practices in [Understanding Cyber Risk: Best Practices for Canada's Maritime Sector](#) to support maritime stakeholders' efforts to secure their cyber systems. The NotPetya cyber incident highlighted to the industry how important it is to invest in cyber security and how failing to do so will only cost more in the end.

8. How has the cyber threat landscape in Canada changed in recent years? Have you found there's been a shift in which industries are targeted and what methods are being used?

One of the big trends that has changed in recent years is that criminal activities have moved online. With the emergence of virtual currencies and the increasing sophistication of encryption technologies, cyber criminals can avoid having their transactions reported, and we see new types of frauds appear, like ransomware and crypto mining. Also, the threats are becoming more sophisticated; their impacts are larger and cost more money to recover. A good example of this is that recent threats will now use multiple vectors to lure and infect their victims, using various techniques like spear phishing emails, doppelganger domains or watering holes, to avoid detection. As well, many of the vulnerabilities that are currently being exploited are common vulnerabilities and exposures (CVE) for which patches are available, but that remained unpatched. Despite these alarming trends, there has been an increase in cyber security awareness and more industries are willing to put the time and money into protecting their networks and intellectual property.

9. What is Canada's involvement regarding cyber security on the world stage? What actions is Canada taking to build cooperation with other countries?

The strongest strategic alliance within which Canada actively engages is the Five Eyes (FVEY) community. The FVEY is a partnership between Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States that facilitates intelligence cooperation and information sharing. Engagement and coordination between Five Eyes countries has been pivotal in ensuring cyber security resilience within our respective countries. In fact, the FVEY strategic dialogue has made significant progress on cyber security issues, particularly with respect to information sharing on the threat environment, coordinated cyber incident response, and international policy coordination.

Canada has made efforts to advance like-minded interests, particularly the promotion of an open, secure and resilient Internet. To this end, Canada has actively participated in cyber security discussions at international fora, including the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts (UN GGE). In addition, Canada's Anti-Crime and Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Programs (ACCBP and CTCBP) help support global efforts to combat cybercrime and threats to cyber security. Since 2007, the ACCBP and CTCBP have contributed \$15.6M to cyber security capacity building, primarily in the Americas and Southeast Asia.

The new Strategy includes foundational elements that are consistent with our FVEY partners, including strengthening cyber security of government systems, tackling cybercrime and increasing public awareness and engagement among other things. As part of Canada's new way forward on cyber, the federal government will take a leadership role to advance cyber security in Canada and will, in coordination with allies, work to shape the international cyber security environment in order to promote Canada's values on the world stage.

10. What are the main changes brought forward by the new [national security legislation \(Bill C-59\)](#) and how will this impact Canada's Cyber Security Strategy?

With constantly evolving global technological and threat landscapes, governments around the world

are re-thinking their national approaches and strategies to protect their citizens. Under the proposed new national security legislation (known as Bill C-59), which is still before Parliament, the Government of Canada would be allowed to use CSE's unique online capabilities to further protect Canadians and its national interests from cyber threats. This could include, for example, taking action to deter cyber threats targeting critical Canadian networks or to defend against foreign actors looking to interfere with Canada's democratic process.

It is important to note that none of these proposed activities could be directed at anyone in Canada or at Canadians anywhere. The CSE activities proposed in Bill C-59, including foreign cyber operations, would also be subject to review by the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency (NSIRA) and the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians.

11. In closing, what forms of cyber security threats do you see emerging in the future? What proactive steps could/should Canada take to protect itself?

As new technologies emerge and present new opportunities to improve the lives of Canadians, these same technologies also have a down side as they may have vulnerabilities that could get exploited by actors with malicious intentions. We are seeing innovations that will significantly change our way of lives with autonomous vehicles, smart cities, automated supply chains, smart home devices, artificial intelligence and quantum computing. Nowadays everything is connected to the Internet for better or for worse. Back in 2016, the Mirai botnet caused one of the most disruptive distributed denial of service (DDoS) attacks and brought down an Internet service provider by enrolling a large number of poorly misconfigured Internet exposed devices (e.g. routers, DVR, CCTV). What could be the impacts of a massive DDoS attack if it was used to disrupt the election process? Other similar concerns can be raised with quantum computing. If the technology falls into the wrong hands, it will make all previous encryption obsolete, and State secrets will no longer be protected.

Yet, despite the unforeseen challenges that these new technologies will bring, the National Cyber Security Strategy was designed to take into account the innovative and adaptive aspects of the cyber ecosystem. By committing to position Canada as a global leader in cyber security, the federal government clearly outlined in its Strategy

its intent to support advanced research, foster digital innovation, and further develop cyber skills and knowledge domestically. Moreover, initiatives like the creation of the new Canadian Centre for Cyber Security will lead to better coordination of efforts to protect and defend Canada from cyber threats.

Emerging Security

Understanding Terrorism

Brad Stollery

Since 9/11, the Western public's baseline expectation of a 'normal' terror-attack frequency has gradually shifted upward. These days, a period of several months without an attack in Europe or North America seems like a lengthy respite.

Major attacks have been fewer and further between thanks in large part to the work of intelligence agencies. Brian Michael Jenkins, a terrorism specialist at the RAND Corporation, [writes](#) that investigators in the US and the UK have thwarted most terror plots before they could be carried out. Nonetheless, the globalized free-flow of people and ideas that benefits humanity also makes terrorism a fixture of the modern zeitgeist—grievances are imported and exported just as easily. Terrorism isn't going away anytime soon.

In spite of analysts' best efforts, spontaneous attacks remain difficult to disrupt, especially if perpetrated by small groups or 'lone wolves' who have committed no crimes until the moment they strike. More terror attacks are almost certain to occur in Europe and North America eventually, including by white supremacists and [neo-fascists](#). Public preparation for these traumas should include an effort to understand the logic of terrorism because, as French national security expert François Heisbourg [warned](#) after the 2015 Bataclan atrocity in Paris:

Fear leads to anger...

Fear is the operative element of terrorism. Lacking the conventional means to wage war against a much stronger opponent, terrorists weaponize fear by randomly targeting civilians. Doing so makes anyone a potential victim, even though very few are ever harmed, statistically speaking. Despite causing a larger loss of life than any other terror attack since then, 9/11 didn't even come close to posing an

existential threat to the United States. Still, the panic it caused, and the political and military overreactions it provoked, have been far reaching. The events of that day led to the creation of an extensive surveillance apparatus, an extrajudicial targeted assassination program, and terrible human rights abuses in prisons such as Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay. These phenomena have fundamentally altered the political culture in Western democracies, showing that a poor reaction to fear is indeed more destructive to our society than any terror attack has been.

Terrorism is [defined](#) according to three main pillars:

1. Calculated, but indiscriminate, threat or use of violence designed to induce widespread fear
2. Intended to coerce governments or societies
3. Committed in the pursuit of political goals

This sort of strategy is usually employed in asymmetric conflicts where one side is heavily outgunned by its adversary, which is why terrorism is often called the "weapon of the weak." It's more accurate to think of terrorism as the weapon of the politically weak, however, because history is filled with [examples](#) of militarily-capable states using terror tactics to intimidate a disobedient public or influence an enemy state's population during wartime. An authoritarian dictator who uses violence to repress domestic civil dissent is as much a terrorist as Usama bin Laden.

Terrorists of all stripes essentially take public peace-of-mind hostage, demanding that the government or community pay a ransom in the form of certain political concessions. Demands vary according to circumstances. For instance, among other desires, one of al-Qaeda's central motivations for perpetrating 9/11 was to force the US government to withdraw its troops from Islam's holy land, Saudi Arabia. Alternatively, [Dylann Roof](#) murdered nine black church-goers in 2015 in an attempt to start a 'race war.' Both parties committed acts of terror.

Human, all too human

Readying ourselves and tempering our reaction is an important step, but no analysis of terrorism

Brad Stollery, Former Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 16/03/2017

would be complete without contemplating a terrorist's motives. Recognizing the strategic logic of terrorism in a conflict is straightforward, yet that hardly explains why someone might feel justified in taking innocent human life. Seeing the world through the eyes of a terrorist is [difficult](#), but not impossible.

In a previous [article](#) I briefly explored Islam's relationship with violence. Religious influence clearly has some use in explaining how, in the right situation, one could feel morally justified in committing horrible deeds. Salafi jihadist ideology in particular offers some explanation, though [suicidal terrorists](#) are not always religious, let alone necessarily Muslim. Perhaps the most crucial part of countering violent extremism ([CVE](#)) is to understand the radicalization process. In Dylann Roof's [manifesto](#), we get a glimpse of his path to becoming a terrorist. The [interrogation recording](#) of Alexandre Bissonette sheds light on the delusional mindset that led him to shoot several people praying in a Québec City mosque in 2017. Both men imagined terrifying threats that called for some valiant act of heroism, so far as they were concerned.

The steps in this journey are common among varieties of terrorists, but are also shared by gang members, and even by many soldiers in uniform. After all, no one ever sees themselves as the bad guy. Anyone who kills another human being needs to feel morally justified in doing so—if necessary, they'll jump through mental hoops to convince themselves that murder is permissible given the circumstances.

Maajid Nawaz, himself a former radical, [outlines](#) the radicalization process as usually involving:

1. A sense of grievance, real or perceived
2. An identity crisis that emerges from that sense of grievance
3. A sense of belonging, often provided by a charismatic recruiter
4. An ideological narrative that provides the mission or the cause

The desire for personal meaning is a central motivation for embarking on such a journey, and often involves seeking recognition for contributing to what one perceives as a greater cause. Just as several other mass murderers have viewed themselves as victims making a noble sacrifice, Dylann Roof clearly saw himself as a martyr. Speaking about the human need for belonging, economist Mark Harrison points out that “You can get [social solidarity] in many different ways...[including] by joining together to commit acts of violence. Sometimes that's [soccer] hooliganism, sometimes it's terrorism.”

The Pakistani publishing company CFX Comics has produced a [graphic novel](#) series that tells the story of the radicalization process, in order to educate and discourage young people from falling victim to it. As the comic book illustrates, every terrorist is a victim in his own way, because he has to feel sufficiently aggrieved to pursue retributive justice. There are evil deeds, but there are no evil people.

Some people hold toxic beliefs that are simply unshakable, and they must be stopped. At the same time they must also be understood on a human level if we intend to defeat the phenomenon of terrorism while attempting to salvage the person inside the terrorist. In the long run, that's the only way to win.

The Cost of Climate Change?

Marian Corera

Global temperatures are increasing, and the threat of climate change is a widely discussed issue. Rising temperatures lead to rising ocean temperatures, ocean acidification, exaggerated natural disasters, loss of bio diversity and a countless number of other negative impacts. While the warning signs are already lit, governments are still lagging in their efforts to minimize the impact of climate change. As we ponder the economic downfall in cutting our greenhouse emissions, have we considered the cost of continuing to ignore climate change?

The Case for Hurricanes

The economic damage humans endure during hurricane season is undoubtedly hefty, and it continues to grow. While it is difficult to untangle the exact extent of the human impact in worsening the magnitude of hurricanes, the increase in hurricane activity is linked to rising sea surface temperatures. The rise of sea surface temperatures is expected to [contribute](#) to increased wind speeds, as well as the recurrence of intense storms, according to the Centre for Climate and Energy Solutions.

In the past year, the North Atlantic region was no stranger to the economic destruction caused by intense hurricanes. North Atlantic [hurricanes](#) are known to have increased in frequency, intensity and duration since the 1980s. The United States alone weathered \$306.2 billion dollars worth of [damages](#) due to adverse climate events in 2017. The total [cost](#) of climate events in the US since 1980 is approximately a whopping \$1.5 trillion.

Hurricane Maria devastated the Puerto Rican economy in 2017, destroying roads, infrastructure, homes and assets across the island. The combined economic [impacts](#) of both hurricanes Maria and Irma for Puerto Rico was an estimated \$40 billion. Cyclone Pam wreaked havoc in the nation of

Vanuatu in 2015, destroying livelihoods and displacing many. Adverse climate events have an especially negative impact on the tourism industry of these island nations, whose economies rely heavily on tourist revenues.

Climate refugees

Climate refugees is a term seldom used, yet it remains strikingly relevant today. Hurricane season periodically displaces people within the United States and along the Atlantic coast. 18 million people were [displaced](#) due to weather related incidents in 2017, with floods, storms and cyclones causing the most damage. Risk models suggest that on average roughly 2 million people a year will be [displaced](#) due to cyclones. The reality is that natural disasters, exacerbated by climate change, is contributing to the creation of waves of refugees, temporary and otherwise. Many return to landscapes of chaos, in what was previously their homes, workplaces and livelihoods. As such, climate refugees are more likely to experience poverty, lack access to clean water and energy, and experience an overall drawback in economic activity.

Of all new internal [displacements](#) in 2017, 39 percent was caused by armed conflicts, while the larger portion of new internal displacements (61 percent) was from natural disasters. This puts into scale the sheer magnitude of climate refugees over the past year. Increasing our ability to deal with adverse climate events, as well as reducing the human effect in creating adverse climate events, is thus in need of more focus. Climate change is clearly happening, and taking action to prevent an array of negative externalities, such as exaggerated natural disasters, should not be postponed.

As climates fluctuate, countries will in the future experience extreme climate events such as droughts, hurricanes, floods and other natural disasters. In addition to the creation of climate refugees, climate change will thus cause competition over scarce and vital resources. Cape Town came strikingly close to experiencing a water crisis in 2018. Governments that will not be able to

Marian Corera, Research Analyst and Current Program Editor for the Security, Trade, and the Economy program
Originally Published on 26/09/2018

successfully overcome these challenges will find both an economic and humanitarian crisis on their hands.

The Paris Agreement

In a time when many seem to question the importance of both the domestic and international strides nations have taken to combat climate change, note that climate change is not without its consequences. The impacts of climate change are felt around the globe. [The Paris Agreement](#) makes headway towards fighting climate change. Article 2(a) of the Agreement aims to limit the rise of average global temperature to less than 2 degrees celsius above pre-industrial levels. That is to try to keep global temperature from rising over 2 degrees celsius from what it was prior to the industrial revolution.

While further efforts will undoubtedly be required to reverse the effects of human activity on our environment, the Paris Agreement is a start. The Agreement rests upon nationally determined contributions. In essence, each country develops its own strategy on how to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, rather than having a binding norm for all. Drawing upon the limitations of the Kyoto Protocol, the Paris Agreement encourages voluntary action plans from governments. For example, the French government committed to a [climate plan](#) in 2017, which includes developing clean mobility, removing greenhouse gas emitting

vehicles from the market by 2040 and generating carbon free electricity. The Paris agreement provides a framework for leaders to understand and discuss the global need to limit greenhouse gases and encourages national action plans.

Of course, not all leaders share this view. Washington [retreated](#) from the Agreement, as it would be disadvantageous to American workers while benefitting other countries. President Trump has always been vocal in his support towards the coal industry. Combatting climate change, undoubtedly requires a shift towards renewable energy sources, a switch the Trump administration hesitates over the loss of jobs it would create. It should be noted, however, that while the transition would entail job cuts in certain industries such as coal, it also entails growth in others such as renewable energy. In fact, [studies](#) have shown that in the long term the effects of deteriorating environmental conditions would outweigh the cost of remaining in the Paris Agreement. As temperatures are allowed to soar unchecked, the cost of offsetting its negative consequences too soar along.

Climate change is a global problem and the effects of climate change do not discriminate by country or region. Undermining international efforts towards combatting climate change for short term economic gains, thus, does not make sense for our long term economic security.

Energy Conflicts Threaten The Eastern Mediterranean

Cyril Widdershoven

The continuing news about the Syrian Civil War tends to obscure [the emergence](#) of the East Mediterranean basin as a potentially significant energy-producing region, where military clashes in coming months cannot be ruled out. Recent energy-related [success stories](#) in the region include Egypt's offshore gas discoveries and the continuing growth of Israel's offshore gas projects, as well as promising developments offshore from Cyprus and possibly also Lebanon.

The Eastern Mediterranean is the only NATO region where uncertainties about both security and energy combine to threaten the stability of strategic relations. Turkey's recent moves to project military power have increased the uncertainty over security of energy supply, causing concern amongst its neighbours such as fellow NATO member Greece, but also Israel and Egypt.

Rich in energy resources, the Eastern Mediterranean waters are now being explored and developed after decades during which strategic confrontations rendered their exploitation politically impossible. Yet the continuing Syrian disaster creates possible fall-out for countries in the region, including Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey, as well as for the divided island of Cyprus.

In 1974 the northern third of Cyprus was occupied by Turkish forces, who remain there. This occurred during an invasion that followed the coup against Archbishop Makarios by ethnic Greeks seeking to unite the island politically with the Greek mainland. Many Turks from the Anatolian peninsula have immigrated to northern Cyprus since then.

On August 28 [news emerged](#) that the Turkish armed forces are considering construction of a sovereign naval base in the Turkish part of Cyprus and that the Turkish navy has submitted such a proposal to the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

for the base. Such a base would facilitate military activities in (Greek) Cypriot offshore areas, where American and European oil and gas majors are now planning exploration activities.

Tension from the ongoing confrontation between Cyprus and Turkey is made worse by off-and-on low-intensity clashes between Turkish and Greek armed forces. The Greeks report harassment of Greek fishermen by Turkish vessels on a regular basis in the eastern Aegean Sea.

Greece is concerned by the [announced Turkish plans](#) to drill for gas deposits in the East Mediterranean, including in Cyprus's exclusive economic zone (EEZ). Most of the energy reserves that Turkey wishes to claim are in disputed areas, such as near Greek islands or Cyprus, or in the maritime zones of others.

State-controlled Turkish media have recently stepped up their efforts in support of Ankara's claims on several offshore areas. Most sensitive is the maritime region to the south of Cyprus. Earlier this year, Turkish warships blocked exploratory vessels of the Italian company Eni. These vessels had sought to conduct drilling in waters that Turkey asserts belong to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which no state other than Turkey recognizes.

Turkish officials [have reiterated](#) that Ankara has [no plans to back away](#) from its energy plans in the East Mediterranean, including maritime areas under Cyprus's jurisdiction according to the UN Convention on the Law of Sea, to which Turkey is however not a party.

The drilling vessel *Fatih*, docked in the southern Turkish city of Antalya, will [most likely head](#) east this autumn between the Karpas peninsula in northern Cyprus and the Gulf of Iskenderun. Turkey's seismic vessel *Barbaros Hayrettin Pasa* is [already surveying](#) this region.

Cyril Widdershoven, Current Special Contributor, Energy Security Program

Originally Published on 11/09/2018

Other Eastern Mediterranean countries such as Israel and Egypt are unsympathetic to Turkish claims but hopeful to avoid military force, the use of which they do not, however, renounce for themselves. Ankara [has warned](#) several European governments not to support the hydrocarbon exploration activities being conducted by Cyprus in the East Mediterranean.

In October the American energy major ExxonMobil plans to begin drilling for gas in Block 10 of Cyprus's EEZ. The French major Total also is set to start drilling in February 2019. Previous French operations have already been constrained or blocked out-right by Turkish naval threats to their vessels approaching Cypriot waters.

Strong economic growth over the last number of years has supported Ankara's overall strategy. However, increasing unemployment and social unrest accompanied by decreased purchasing power could force unconventional measures, not excluding military adventures to distract the public. The ongoing continual worsening of Turkey's economic situation threatens the country's social fabric and possibly even its role within NATO.

Turkey's recent emergence as an investment destination for sovereign wealth funds and institutional investors created a boom in infrastructure and real estate projects. The latter, however, are financed by external debt, which now threatens the country's economic fabric.

At the same time, Ankara needs to reassess its options of energy supply security as Tehran is removed from circulation. American sanctions on Iran will diminish Turkey's capacity to receive oil and gas from Iran, although Iran's oil [has in the past](#) been rebranded as Iraqi and sold worldwide anyway. Erdogan's strong support for Hamas, Hezbollah, the Muslim Brotherhood, Syria and Iran likely exclude LNG import options from Israel and Egypt.

Turkey is facing a domestic financial and economic crisis with its currency plunging at the same time as its ongoing military operations in Syria head for a confrontation around Idlib. It is not to be excluded that the fall-out leads to an opportunistic military move in offshore waters. That would in turn threaten direct confrontation with other NATO allies, regional powers such as Egypt and Israel, or even Russia.

Yemen: A Forgotten Humanitarian Crisis

Ambika Varma

Yemen is currently facing one of the world's most gruelling humanitarian crises. The situation is dire and the need for a long-term political solution has reached a point past desperation. [17 million](#) people are without access to secure food and 7 million are on the brink of famine. Over [3 million people](#) have been displaced and more than 40,000 people have been killed or injured, most of them civilians. Severe outbreaks of cholera are ongoing and exacerbated by a lack of water sanitation and medication. In June 2017, the Food and Agriculture Organization's Director General Jose Graziano da Silva briefed the United Nations Security Council and stated, "...what is happening in Yemen is the largest humanitarian crisis today."

As of July 2017, a total of [862,858](#) cases of cholera have been reported, resulting in 2,177 deaths, most being children. Nearly 5,000 cases are reported per day. Ongoing conflict, destroyed water and health infrastructure, and malnutrition have caused the people to become more vulnerable. As if this were not bad enough, the [Saudi Arabian](#) blockage of airports, sea routes, and highways has blocked humanitarian aid from entering Yemen. Only [45% of hospitals](#) in Yemen are currently functional, and even prior to the Saudi-led blockade, only 30% of required medicines were reaching these hospitals. According to the [International Red Cross](#), cholera cases in Yemen could reach 1 million by the end of the year.

Like most other wars in the Middle East, the crisis in Yemen is a complicated one. To begin to understand it, we must examine the underpinnings of the Yemeni Civil War. In 1962, when the King of Yemen, Ahmad bin Yahya Hamidaddin, died, conflicting ideologies and foreign powers sparked a civil war and this resulted in the Kingdom being divided in two: North Yemen and South Yemen. The conflict persisted for years until the two

separated countries were finally united as the Republic of Yemen in [1990](#), led by President Ali Abdullah Saleh, previously the leader of North Yemen.

The [Houthis](#), officially called Ansar Allah, are a Zaidi Shi'a-led movement that started in what was called North Yemen in 1992. The movement commenced to promote a Shi'a revival against the Sunni majority. As tensions rose between North and South Yemen, the Houthis exacerbated the issue, by seeking to overthrow the [government](#) and a civil war erupted in 1993, concluding with Saleh's government victorious.

During the next ten years, the Houthi rebel group became increasingly radical. Their [slogan](#), "God is great; Death to America; Death to Israel; God curse the Jews; Victory to Islam," incited rage and condemnation. They regrouped in religious centres and founded an armed group called 'Believing Youth.' They also staged violent anti-American protests and accused former President Saleh of pandering to the President of the United States at the expense of the Yemeni people. In 2003, Yemen placed a \$55,000 [bounty](#) on Hussain Badr al-Din al-Houthi, the founder of the Houthi movement. [A year later](#), the government managed to capture and kill him in Sana'a. This sparked a war between Saleh's government and the Houthi rebels. The result, bouts of violence at the hands of both the Houthis and the government, caught civilians in the midst. Over the years, civilian [casualties](#) reached several thousand, while even more people were displaced.

In [2011](#), during the heat of the Arab Spring, the Yemeni Revolution took place. The fight against underemployment, corruption, and violence escalated to calls for Saleh's resignation. The fight against the Houthi rebels was placed on a temporary hold as the government went through upheaval. After months and several defections of military and government personnel, Saleh finally resigned. For prosecutorial immunity, he signed over his power to Vice-President, Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi.

Ambika Varma, Research Analyst and
Former Program Editor for the Women in
Security
Originally Published on 14/12/2017

The next few years, the Houthi rebels focused on growing their base of operations, with funding from [Iran](#). They continued to terrorize the population in Yemen by committing acts of [terrorism](#), mainly in the northern regions of Kushar and Mutsaba. The conflict took a new turn, when the Houthis, fuelled with anger over new oil subsidies, [seized](#) Yemen's capital, Sana'a. By early 2015, with the help of former President Saleh, once an active opponent of the Houthis, the group secured Hadi's resignation and dissolved the parliament. After resigning, Hadi fled to neighbouring Saudi Arabia, where he found asylum. The conflict grew more complex with a myriad of external parties becoming interested in the internal conflict. Iran was [accused](#) of seeking to create a Shi'a stronghold in Yemen, through the Houthis, which incited Saudi Arabian involvement.

For the most part, the international community has remained critical of the Houthi rebels. This led to the formation of an international coalition led by Saudi Arabia and supported by President Hadi. The coalition [includes](#) the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, Jordan, and Sudan, while the United States and the United Kingdom have been providing key intelligence and logistical support to the coalition. The United States and the United Kingdom have also [increased](#) weapon sales to members within the coalition. Other countries, such as Eritrea and Somalia, have lent their airspace and naval space to [help](#) the coalition conduct their operations. The consequence was the start of the Yemeni Civil War, which [officially](#) began on March 25th, 2015, when Saudi Arabia launched airstrikes against the Houthi rebels.

These airstrikes have effectively worsened the conflict. Yemen's situation was bad enough under the territorial disputes led by the Houthis, as well as forces from al-Qaeda of the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) but it is now a [Level 3 emergency](#), as declared by the United Nations (UN). This is the highest level of emergency stages in the UN.

Many of the airstrikes conducted by the Saudi-led coalition have been in serious [violation](#) of international laws. Civilians, their homes, and buildings should not be targeted; medical facilities should not be targeted; and strikes launched from

civilian areas are unlawful. These laws are, of course, frequently ignored in times of conflict. But the Saudi-led coalition is heavily backed by many of the G7 countries that are also part of NATO and hold permanent seats on the United Nations Security Council. The countries that are hailed as enforcers of democracy within the international community at large are perpetrating one of the worst humanitarian crises of today.

On [December 4th, 2017](#), former President and ally of the Houthis, Saleh, was killed by Houthi rebels. Two days earlier, he had announced that he would put an end to his alliance with the Houthi rebels. This sparked outrage and he was murdered. The situation, desperate enough, turned even more deadly overnight. Medical teams, NGOs, and humanitarian suppliers all came under fire, literally.

According to the [International Committee of the Red Cross](#), at least 125 people were killed and 238 were injured during the fighting. Jamie McGoldrick, the Humanitarian Coordinator for Yemen, called for a humanitarian pause: "I call on all parties to the conflict to urgently enable a humanitarian pause on Tuesday, December 5, between 10 AM and 4 PM to allow civilians to leave their homes and seek assistance and protection." The pause did not come to fruition and the fighting still continues.

Recent reports are now saying that the Saudi-led coalition is targeting food supplies. [Data](#) on coalition airstrikes have recorded 356 air raids targeting farms, 174 targeting market places, and 61 air raids targeting food storage sites between March 2015 and September 2017. [Damian Green](#), First Secretary of State of the UK, has said that the UK government will not stop weapon sales to Saudi Arabia because "our defence industry is an extremely important creator of jobs and prosperity." He said also said that Britain is "the fourth largest humanitarian donor to Yemen." But what does that matter when the weapons manufactured are creating a need for massive humanitarian aid in the first place?

The chlorine tablets that might save cholera-infected children are forbidden from entering because of the Saudi-led coalition, which is supported by the United States and the United

Kingdom, in complete and utter disregard for international law. The Saudi airstrikes that are hitting the Arab region's poorest country are further devastating the region and its people. Canada and France are two other countries that are currently engaged in lucrative arms deals with Saudi Arabia. Though Canada's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chrystia Freeland, "...calls on all parties to the conflict in Yemen to abide by their obligations under international humanitarian law to avoid civilian casualties..." it is not enough. When it comes to selling weapons to Saudi Arabia, former Liberal cabinet minister, Irwin Cotler, says, "I don't think we should be [undertaking] arms sales with a country that is engaged in major human-rights violations." Unfortunately, even with the ongoing debate, there does not seem to be an end in sight to the weapon contracts in place and this makes Canada amongst the countries complicit in the deaths of thousands of Yemeni civilians.

While the Saudis continue to commit their war crimes, the Houthi rebels have not been any better

– they have been recruiting child soldiers. The UN reported a fivefold increase of children recruited into the army in just one year. This has dire consequences for future stability in the region, especially with the proliferation of IS, AQAP, and other extremist groups. As unfortunate as this is, it does not excuse coalition airstrikes or blockades designed to starve the population.

Unfortunately, Western complicity is not a new concept. As we continue to fight proxy wars, whether in Afghanistan or in Iraq, the situation in the Middle East continues to deteriorate for the civilians that have no choice but to remain in the country. In order to hold our governments accountable, we must be aware of the situations that surround us and be cognizant of what wars our own governments are perpetuating. The war in Yemen is not anticipated to end any time soon, but the governing bodies responsible for creating the largest humanitarian crisis of today can certainly put an end to the horrific humanitarian conditions underway.

The HIV/AIDS Pandemic: a Continued Threat to Global Health Security

Nancy Qin

The [2015 Gap Report by UNAIDS](#) began with a section full of promise, titled: “Beginning of the end of the AIDS epidemic.” The data presented by the Gap Report is likewise rosy and encouraging. The rate of new HIV infections has dropped by half in more than 20 nations in the last three years. Acquired immune deficiency syndrome, or AIDS, was the leading cause of death for individuals living with HIV. The Gap Report mentioned that the number of deaths related to AIDS have decreased by more than a third since 2005. In addition, the Report also noted the continued reduction in new cases of HIV-infections, in both adults and children. No doubt, these numbers are an extraordinary accomplishment, one which saw the outpouring of collective effort from countless medical professionals, research personnel, diplomatic and logistic staff on a transnational scale.

Despite the milestone achievement in the combat against HIV/AIDS, the pandemic continues to be a threat to collective health security. The link between HIV/AIDS and global security has been documented as early as 2000, illustrated by the [UN Security Council Resolution 1308](#). Resolution 1308 recognized HIV/AIDS can destabilize collective security by posing as a threat to military personnel during peacekeeping missions, and is especially problematic during forced displacement, and in other humanitarian crises. Additionally, the UN has recognized the ability of HIV/AIDS to undermine the social stability of an affected nation. The high death toll of working adults leads to orphaned children and is also devastating to economic development, and can result in as much as a [2% decrease in GDP](#).

The destabilizing effect of HIV/AIDS to security during humanitarian crises and large-scale conflicts was further recognized by the [UN Security Council](#)

[Resolution 1983](#) in 2011. Similar to Resolution 1308, Resolution 1983 stressed the potential socio-economic damage of HIV/AIDS in heavily-affected nations. Resolution 1983 also noted in particular the devastation brought about by HIV/AIDS to women and children.

In addition to the socio-economic devastation and complications during large-scale conflict caused by HIV/AIDS, the pandemic also severely destabilizes health security in other ways. Many of these challenges have been described in the 2015 Gap Report. As many as 35 million people have been infected by HIV as of 2013. Access to the life-saving therapy of combination antiretrovirals by persons living with HIV continue to be a significant challenge; more than 50% of the people living with HIV do not have access to combination antiretroviral therapy, or cART. As is noted by a [2015 Lancet article](#), inaccessibility to healthcare is a substantial challenge to individual health security, which collectively forms global health security. The high number of individuals without adequate means to treatment poses a significant threat to global health security.

One population which may continue to be of concern over long term are the children who have been affected by HIV. While the use of combination antiretroviral therapy has had tremendous success in preventing the transmission of HIV from expectant mothers to their children, infants who have been exposed to antiretroviral therapy during pregnancy have been found to have higher chances of adverse birth outcomes. A [recent study](#) published in *Clinical & Experimental Immunology* highlights the differences of well-being observed in children prenatally exposed to antiretroviral therapy and HIV infection compared to those who have not. The study found increased infant mortality, by as much as twofold, in children exposed to HIV and antiretroviral therapy during pregnancy. In addition, prenatally exposed infants were more susceptible to infections. Additionally, as the widespread use of antiretroviral therapy is a relatively recent event, its long-term effect on

Nancy Qin, Research Analyst and Former Program Editor for NATO’s Arc of Crisis

Originally Published on 15/09/2017

children who have been exposed to it during pregnancy is currently unknown. As the effort to make antiretroviral therapy more readily available to persons living with HIV, especially expectant mothers, so becomes the importance of increased support for their children.

The United Nations have long recognized HIV/AIDS as a threat to global security, and have

made a commendable effort with impressive results in the fight to curtail the HIV/AIDS pandemic. However, much work is needed in order to consistently lower new number of HIV infections, improve the accessibility to adequate treatment, and to provide medical support for children who have been prenatally affected by HIV and its therapies.

Unpacking Myanmar's Ethno-Religious Conflict and the Plight of the Rohingya

Nabil Bhatia

Over a dozen Nobel laureates penned an open [letter](#) to the *United Nations Security Council* on December 29, 2016, highlighting the role of fellow Nobel laureate, Aung San Suu Kyi, in the plight of Myanmar's Rohingya Muslims. In the letter, the esteemed group, which included Nobel Peace Prize winners Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Malala Yousafzai, urged the Security Council and Secretary-General António Guterres to treat the Myanmar crisis as a foremost priority, comparing it to previous conflicts in Rwanda, Darfur, Bosnia, and Kosovo. Despite the ethnic cleansing campaign against the Rohingya and the subsequent refugee crisis, the situation in Myanmar has gone unnoticed by many, primarily due to a lack of international media reportage and a string of [laws](#) banning criticism of the military in the media. No matter how novel it may seem to many in the international community, ethno-religious tension in Myanmar is not new; to analyze recent developments, it is necessary to analyze the history of this tension in the country.

Rohingya Muslims are a distinct ethnic group with their own linguistic and cultural identity. The group, which makes up the majority of Myanmar's minority Muslim population, lives primarily in Rakhine State, located in western Myanmar. Unlike Arakanese Muslims in Rakhine State, who speak a language similar to Burmese and claim that their ancestors have lived in Myanmar for centuries, there is much [debate](#) as to whether the majority of Rohingya are native to Rakhine or settled there during the period of British colonial rule (1824-1948) after fleeing their native Bangladesh. According to the official stance of the government, the Rohingya are [illegal migrants](#) from Bangladesh. As a result, Aung San Suu Kyi refuses to refer to the group as 'Rohingya' and has lobbied governments around the world to do the same, opting instead for [terms](#) such as 'Muslim

community in Rakhine State'. Previous Myanmar administrations referred to the group as 'Bengalis', a label that implies the group's foreignness.

As a result of this ethno-religious tension, the Rohingya have been treated as second-class citizens for decades. During the Japanese occupation of Myanmar (formerly Burma) in the [Second World War](#), Rakhine State (formerly Arakan) became the site of armed offensives between Allied and Japanese forces. The majority of Muslims in Rakhine supported the British, while the State's non-Muslim population supported the Japanese, leading to attacks between the two religious groups, and eventually, segregation. With the onset of a single-party, military-led socialist state in [1962](#), hundreds of thousands of South Asians were [expelled](#) from the country, political organization and activity by Muslims was banned, and newly adopted policies denied citizenship status to most Muslims in Rakhine. In the following decades, many Rohingya fled to Bangladesh, while others sought [asylum](#) in Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia. In military-led ethnic cleansing campaigns in [1978](#) and 1991 respectively, over 450,000 Rohingya were forced out of Myanmar. With the passing of the [Burma Citizenship Law](#) in 1982, the Rohingya were [excluded](#) from citizenship due to their non-indigenous status and their inability to prove their lineage in the country before 1948.

More recently, in 2009, a [letter](#) from the Myanmar Consul-General in Hong Kong revealed the scope of the animosity held by the government towards the Rohingya. In the letter, the Consul-General claimed that "Rohingya are neither 'Myanmar People' nor Myanmar's ethnic group" and that when compared to people of Myanmar whose complexion is "fair and soft, [and] good looking", Rohingya are simply "dark brown" and should thus be considered foreigners.

Tensions finally reached their boiling point in 2012 as violence broke out between local Buddhists and the Rohingya, killing over 200 Rohingya and

Nabil Bhatia, Former Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 09/01/2017

displacing over 140,000, who were forcefully relocated into refugee camps. While the government claims that camps were set up to protect the Rohingya from attacks, conditions in the [camps](#) are notoriously squalid, and residents are faced with malnutrition, waterborne diseases, mass deaths, and are susceptible to tuberculosis, HIV, and malaria. The situation has been worsened due to the eviction of aid groups such as Doctors Without Borders, who not only provided aid to the Rohingya, but also collected information and statistics which revealed the scope of human suffering. As a result, the extent of human rights violations in Myanmar's refugee camps today is not fully known.

2015 and 2016 saw an increase in religious intolerance and the rise of [Buddhist nationalist](#) groups, both of which signal that this decades-long conflict seems to be escalating at an alarming rate. Buddhist nationalist groups were influential in the government's decision to pass four laws pertaining

to religious conversion, marriage, healthcare, and monogamy which, according to Amnesty International, "were passed despite containing provisions that violate human rights, including by discriminating on religious and gender grounds". With the decision to revoke Temporary Registration Cards (TRCs), many Rohingya were stripped of statehood, identity documentation, and the ability to vote.

With continued [military](#) and [police](#) abuses of the Rohingya this past year and the Bangladeshi government's [denial](#) of asylum to Rohingya refugees, many Rohingya are faced with the decision to either remain in Myanmar and face persecution, or make the perilous journey to neighbouring countries where they may very well also be denied asylum. With Nobel Peace Prize Winner Aung San Suu Kyi remaining silent on the Rohingya crisis, pressure by the international community and civil society institutions are the Rohingya's only hope for survival.

Sorting Fact From Fiction: Trolls, Bots, and the Erosion of Informed Debate

Ryan Atkinson

You read an article and agree with the author's argument. Scrolling down you read the comments and connect with one that presents various logical holes in the article. Ideas you had not previously considered change your perspective. Did a human influence your thinking? The quickening pace of advancing technology is making the noticeable difference between humans and Internet bots more indiscernible and will continue to do so to greater and greater degrees as technology continues to progress.

[The Internet Research Agency \(IRA\)](#) is a Russian company located in St. Petersburg that has engaged in political influence operations propagating perspectives online to influence international opinions. [Examples of targeted influence operations](#) include the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election, U.K. Brexit Referendum, and 2017 French Presidential Election.

A [former IRA employee](#) described working for the organization like being a character in George Orwell's *1984*, "a place where you have to write that white is black and black is white [...] in some kind of factory that turned lying, telling untruths, into an industrial assembly line." He worked in the "commenting department" failing to transfer to the "Facebook department" because they required "you to know English perfectly" in order to "show that you can represent yourself as an American."

[Employees were given lists of topics](#) where three employees would work together on a single news item, coordinating their posts to give the illusion of discussion or debate and "to make it look like we were not trolls but real people. One of the three trolls would write something negative about the news, the other two would respond, 'You are wrong,' and post links and such. And the negative one would eventually act convinced." [Documents](#)

Ryan Atkinson, Research Analyst and
Current Program Editor for the Cyber Security
and Information Warfare program
Originally Published on 02/10/2018

[describe that the IRA](#) expected employees to manage 10 Twitter accounts that obtained at least 2,000 followers and tweeted at least 50 times a day.

[Twitter has reported](#) over 50,000 accounts linked to Russia were used to tweet automated material about the 2016 U.S. election. Initial reports claimed that 677,775 Americans interacted with these accounts, but this [figure has been increased to 1.4 million](#) people unsuspectingly interacting with accounts associated with Russian proxies. [Twitter announced](#) it had identified 3,813 accounts associated with the IRA that had posted 175,993 tweets during the U.S. Presidential Election campaign.

Individuals posing as Americans or citizens of other targeted states influenced public opinion by working to sculpt an individual's viewpoint in line with Kremlin perspectives towards specific events. Networks of automated Internet bots, short for software robots running tasks online, operated with a similar objective – influencing, shaping, and changing opinions in line with the Kremlin. Social bots are a subcategory of Internet bots and include accounts controlled by software using algorithms to generate content and communicate with human accounts.

Not all bots are malicious, and [some serve useful purposes](#) spreading news, coordinating volunteer activities, and assisting volunteers to [edit Wikipedia pages](#), for example. The [malicious use of bots](#) has increased in recent years to "manufacture fake grassroots political support [...] promote terrorist propaganda and recruitment [...] manipulate the stock market [...] and disseminate rumours of conspiracy theories." Noticeably, it is already becoming difficult to tell the difference between human and bot activity online and the distinction between the two will only become more indiscernible with further technological advancements, such as the application of artificial intelligence and [deep learning](#) to automated online communications.

“Political bots” are a further subcategory of social bots used to influence political discussion using algorithms on social media. Samuel C. Woolley and Philip N. Howard of Oxford University’s Internet Institute argue they are “written to learn from and mimic real people so as to manipulate public opinion across a diverse range of social media and device networks.” Woolley and Howard use the term “computational propaganda” to describe the “use of algorithms, automation, and human curation to purposefully distribute misleading information over social media networks.” Alessandro Bessi and Emilio Ferrara use specific indicators to differentiate between humans and bots, with some online activity including the presence of default account settings, lacking geographical metadata, retweeting more than generating content, and having “less followers and more followees.”

There are also clear distinctions between humans and bot networks based on the specific posting schedules with “repetitive and nonsensical” content “published at non-human speeds,” specifically “to amplify divisive content produced by human-curated accounts, state-controlled media (e.g. RT), or other proxies, and to attack specific individuals or groups.” Discerning such distinctions will become more difficult as bots are developed to include more advanced technologies, especially as artificial intelligence and machine learning enable bot activity to “adapt to new contexts, suggest relevant original content, interact more sensibly with humans in proscribed contexts, and predict human emotional responses to that content.”

Samuel C. Woolley and Douglas R. Guilbeault of the Oxford Internet Institute have found that bots were able to achieve “positions of high centrality within the retweet network, as evidence of their capacity to control the flow of information during the election.” Such central positions were reached through “retweeting others and being retweeted” thereby reaching “positions of measurable influence during the 2016 U.S. election.” People were retweeting posts made by bots enabling the influence of “meaningful political discussion over Twitter, where pro-Trump bots garnered the most attention and influence among human users.”

One major feature of the problem is that it has been shown to work to manipulate “public opinion, choke off debate, and muddy political issues” specifically targeting “sensitive political movements when public opinion is polarized.” For political campaigns the use of political bots “have become an acceptable tool of campaigners,” according to Woolley and Guilbeault.

Dr. Howard adds that “the political consultants who work [on U.S. campaigns] go off to London and Ottawa and Canberra, and they ply their trade there.” According to Howard, it is through experimentation in past campaigns such as in Ukraine in 2014 and the U.K. and U.S. in 2016, that innovations occur and “carry over into other democracies. Very soon we’ll see the same kind of techniques in the next Canadian election. We’ve already seen them in other democracies.”

Studying political influence operations requires understanding how applied technologies are evolving and rapidly changing how publics can be manipulated to the end of foreign interests. The use of AI will intensify this in addition to the implementation of so-called “deep fakes” which use “facial mapping and artificial intelligence to produce videos that appear so genuine it’s hard to spot the phonies.” A computer is given a lot of images and audio of a person and through an algorithm is able to learn “how to mimic the person’s facial expressions, mannerisms, voice and inflections. If you have enough video and audio of someone, you can combine a fake video of the person with a fake audio and get them to say anything you want.”

Future research must aim to understand modern political influence operations basing policy developments both on what technologies were applied and how advancing technologies will be incorporated into future operations. In order to combat future operations, in which discerning fact from fiction may become nearly impossible, governments and information-providers must strengthen press freedoms, independent fact checking, and anti-disinformation institutions within civil society. Fighting propaganda with counter propaganda must be avoided as it only intensifies the informational security dilemma.

NATO and the World

Should Canada and NATO allies build stronger ties with strategic partners in South Asia?

Ananda Narasimhan

The Asia-Pacific region is growing in economic, political and strategic importance. While much of the focus has been on the Western Pacific, stronger ties with the Indian military could offer a mutually beneficial strategic partnership to the global and regional security objectives of Canada and NATO allies.

Since the end of the Second World War, Pacific-oriented, Western countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States have all exerted their influence and values in the Pacific region. The [Asia-Pacific](#) region, sometimes referred to as Indo-Pacific, includes East Asia and the Western powers of the Pacific. The region continues to increase in importance from an economic, political and security perspective, and is also home to some of the [most dangerous, but important waters](#) for commercial navigation. For instance, the Malacca strait between Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore and the South China Sea is an important naval trade route for transporting commercial goods, with over 120,000 vessels a year and an estimated [15.2 million barrels](#) of oil shipped to the region, and further towards the Americas. Vessels transporting oil are a target for many pirates, who have often succeeded in capturing and reselling the oil for their own profit. This fundamental trade route is at constant risk, posing security risks to NATO's western region, including the US and Canada, and potentially costing millions of dollars in lost revenue.

In addition, the increasing military expansion in this region poses a particular concern for NATO allies. China in particular has been flexing its muscles with their newly launched [aircraft-carriers](#) their first purchased from Russia and using their designs in producing their own original. Intimidating regional neighbours by creating artificial island airbases to control the South China Sea, and with plans to

extract the oil and control regional shipping routes. The US have several small [naval bases](#) in the Philippines, Vietnam, Australia, and a larger force based near the border of North Korea, however they have limited capacity in the South China Sea due to the proximity of a large Chinese naval base on Hainan Island. Any US activity near the Malacca Strait could arguably be seen as a provocation against China.

One of the potential ways to protect trade routes would be through developing a strategic naval partnership with an allied nation that has a strong military presence in the region, and that has the naval capabilities to tackle pirates operating near the Malacca Strait, as well as safeguarding the South China Sea.

One such example is the Republic of India, which could potentially support NATO in promoting peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region. Some of the fastest and largest growing economies are in the region, which is also home to over two thirds of the world's population. While there are several other strategically important countries in the region, India remains unique for several reasons. In addition to having a strong [military history](#), India has a strong military connection to the United Kingdom, as Indian soldiers were involved in dozens of global conflicts during the British Raj, including the Opium, Boer, and both World Wars. India is also one of the largest contributors to current United Nations peacekeeping operations. Being the largest democracy in the world, India also shares the values of NATO and its allies.

NATO has a range of military and diplomatic missions carried out by member states, and [interacts](#) regularly with non-member states, through partnerships, which include the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Mediterranean Dialogue, and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative. Building stronger partnerships and collaboration with strategically important states, such as India, could potentially support maintaining security and trade in the region.

Ananda Narasimhan, Research Analyst and Former Program Editor for the Canadian Armed Forces
Originally Published on 02/06/2017

India's navy currently stands as the [5th largest navy in the world](#), and has been receiving [growing attention](#) from many states and private military organizations to support India's plans to further develop its naval capabilities. [Israel](#), for example, signed a multi-million-dollar deal for increasing naval-defence partnership, realizing that their Eastern flank can be protected further with India's naval cooperation in exchange for military technological advancement. This has proved to be a beneficial [diplomatic relationship](#) between these two countries. A potential aspect of bringing India to the role of contributing to NATO's objectives could be further joint military exercises to build upon already ongoing [tri-lateral exercises](#) between Japan, the US, and India. This provides a stepping-stone and unique opportunity for a mutually beneficial naval-defence relationship, leading to a possible extension of the NATO branch in South Asia.

The Canadian Royal Navy had a limited presence in Southeast Asia and South Asia, with a handful of exercises in the Pacific. Canada and the US both share the goal of promoting stability within the region, with the [Asia-Pacific Defence Policy](#), however Canada's limited naval activities can consequentially make the US doubt the confidence of their ally in guarding NATO's western border. Canada's naval expansion can join their Commonwealth allies in the region, specifically India. As a result, Canada, in collaborative exercises with the Indian navy, can prove to the US that Canada is keeping up with their contribution in guarding the Asia-Pacific. In addition, Indo-Canadian diplomatic and military relations would beneficially increase.

A strategic path to ensuring security in the Asia-Pacific region and to reach the economic, political, and security goals of Canada and its NATO allies in this region could be made through strengthening ties with the Indian military. This could be a mutually beneficial partnership as India is expanding its military capabilities.

Many countries in the Asia-Pacific region have been progressively and sometimes aggressively increasing their respective military capacity. Two of the region's military powers have long remained

China and India. China alone has an [estimated](#) 2.3 million active personnel, and with military funds almost twice in size compared to India's 1.3 million active military personnel and budget. The one major difference between these two powers is that India is the [largest importer of military goods](#). This is a challenge for maintaining its military infrastructure and equipment. The [massive modernization programme](#) to improve every aspect of the Indian military offers an opportunity for new partnerships and collaborations to be forged. India has recently [purchased](#) 22 apache attack and 15 chinook helicopters from Boeing for 3 billion dollars, allowing joint training between the US and Indian military, and increasing diplomatic as well as military cooperation between the two countries.

Other NATO members could build further military partnerships with India. For instance, NATO members can create a joint partnership programme to further modernize the Indian armed forces. Instead of India signing multiple billion dollar deals, a single multi-dynamic beneficial contract with NATO members could support 2% NATO states' national defence budgets or alternatively NATO's own fund. More importantly, NATO could have a lead strategic partner in the Asia-Pacific, which could buffer security threats in the region, and in doing so, could form a unique partnership to help maintain security within the region.

[Current debates](#) on the Indian military modernization programme and whether a mutual Indian-NATO partnership could be realized highlights that this type of partnership can be mutually beneficial, since for India this implies an increase in its military resources, training and infrastructure. Although India has billions to spend, the risk of overlapping their military budget and mismanagement can have dire consequences for the acquisition of new weapons and other military equipment. There is pressure on the government for India to start investing on its own military industrial complex, rather than relying on foreign militaries and organizations like NATO. With private military companies already offering to [help start up](#) parts of a new Indian defence industry, India could take advantage of these opportunities, which would be more beneficial to Indian national security in the long-term. However,

instead of establishing a partnership with NATO, India could look at a country and use them for advice in developing the individual soldier, with a small arms project. [Canada's National Defence Industrial Association](#) has created and implemented such assignments for expanding their own military abilities. India could benefit by looking at examples from Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) development and modernization process, and adapt successful initiatives to their own military requirements. Yet the CAF are arguably successful due to the fact that they are a smaller military than India's, and designing a plan for the Indian military would be on a much larger scale. Another criticism made in these articles is the emphasis that India should not focus primarily on defence spending, but focus rather on development. Many of these are noted in the [Sustainable Development Goals](#) (SDGs) that require more immediate attention, such as building infrastructure, [universal health coverage](#), and [promoting education](#) for all.

While many western countries have for long tried to gain influence in the region, establishing

an [Asian NATO](#) could perhaps further legitimize this influence. A framework could include multiple countries with shared concerns for economic prosperity and security in the region, led by key states like India, and supported by NATO's policy, diplomatic and military guidelines. While potentially reducing the economic, political and military influence of China, the establishment of an Asian NATO may however be perceived as further meddling by Western powers in the region, but merits consideration.

There is a [definite interest](#) in India to fortify its military infrastructure, equipment, and capacity. Given the strategic importance of the Asia-Pacific region, finding like-minded allies that support democratic values and are already a strong military nation provides an opportunity for NATO and its allies to build stronger ties with India to support its objectives in the region. This also allows for a mutually beneficial partnership that may support India's military objectives.

**Interview with Ukrainian Consul General,
Andrii Veselovskyi on the Ukraine Crisis and Foreign Affairs**
Michele Di Leo

Andrii Veselovskyi is currently serving as the Consul General of Ukraine in Toronto. Prior to this, he held senior positions in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, including as Ambassador to Egypt, Kenya, and Sudan. An expert in European affairs, he was Ukraine's Deputy Foreign Minister from 2005 to 2008, during which he played an integral part in expanding Ukrainian relations with the European Union, before eventually becoming Ukraine's permanent representative to the European Union from 2008 to 2010. He graduated from Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv in 1974; in addition to his native Ukrainian, he is fluent in French and English.

Michele Di Leo had a chance to sit down with Amb. Veselovskyi to discuss the reasons behind his decision to become a diplomat, and why he believes that Russian aggression in Eastern Ukraine has ramifications for Canada's security and global stability.

Could you begin by discussing your personal and educational background, and how that influenced your decision to join the Foreign Service?

AV: I was born in Lviv, then my parents moved to Kiev. Both of my parents were interested in literature, history, and intellectual questions, but they were both agriculturalists by profession. They brought part of this interest to me and that is why I was exposed to different things which promoted an interest in diplomacy.

I learned French in school and it eventually got to a proficient level. I can remember this occasion when I was in a youth camp and there were some foreigners there who only spoke French. I was the only person in the camp who could translate. I felt so supportive and useful that I decided that I would go into diplomacy. It was the Soviet Union so it was

very difficult to skip from languages to diplomacy. I managed but it was not easy.

You eventually became the Ukrainian Ambassador to Egypt, Kenya, and Sudan. What were the most important policy issues that you dealt with?

AV: Ukrainian interests in Egypt were quite deep. Many Egyptians studied in the technical and military institutions in Ukraine in the Soviet Union. I have also met thousands of Ukrainian women who married Egyptians that studied in Ukraine, and then went to live in Egypt. Some Ukrainian economic products are also beloved by Egyptians, including wheat, sugar, and steel. This gave Ukraine a special place in Egypt and I was posted here from 2001-2006. I managed to bring these relations to a new level not because of my specific capacity, but because there was a window of opportunity. Ukraine at this time was becoming more productive as other competitors were weaker. I remember that the turnover of trade between Egypt and Ukraine during my tenure jumped from \$300 million to \$1 billion. I tried to be helpful in these questions while young Ukrainian companies were forming.

As for Kenya and Sudan, I was the first Ukrainian Ambassador to these countries so it was an opening up of relations. Ukrainian energy companies started to look around to find new ways of securing gas and oil for Ukraine because of the increasing problems with Russian Federation. From that time on, particularly from 2001-2002, Russia started to make Ukraine more dependent on energy. Ukrainian companies looked at countries like UAE, Kenya and Sudan. Unfortunately, the internal situation in Sudan as well as technical questions were not positive enough so we didn't get there. Still relations were enlarged and we opened up trade in different areas with both these countries.

When you became the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, what were the important geopolitical matters that you had to

Michele Di Leo, Research Analyst and
Former Program Editor for Expanding
Community
Originally Published on 27/02/2017

confront? I assume that you were also dealing with Russia more at this time.

AV: From the very beginning, it was never a pleasant moment to deal with Russia. It was in 1993 that Russia claimed Crimea and Sebastopol. At that time, Russia was weak and not as arrogant as it now. But with the support of the UN, we managed to stop this. The second time they did it in was 2001-2002. They wanted to grab an island which was Ukrainian, so the President of Ukraine at that time came to this place and he demonstrated that the Russians would have to move him too. I remember discussing with the Deputy Prime Minister for Russia. He said, "The more you deal with Russia, the less you trust it." The policy for the Russian elite did not change since 1991. They did not understand that there is no more Soviet Union. There is no more dictator and subjects. There are equal sovereign states. They did not understand that so we are seeing the results today.

My sphere of responsibility as Deputy Foreign Minister was Europe. This included dealing with relations between Ukraine and EU, the area around Ukraine, so the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, former Soviet Union republics, and Eastern Europe. As I call it, ultimate security matters. It was a very challenging time for me because it is a different level of responsibility and I was dealing with both the EU and NATO. It was also a possibility to understand the strategic challenges for Ukraine.

With all the experience and knowledge that you have of Europe, are you worried about the future of the EU? What's your take on current political events?

AV: Because I was involved with the EU, I know there were other situations when the EU almost broke up. In 1999, and later, when they tried to work out a constitution. Brexit is another challenge, but the idea that European nations cannot individually withstand international competition is so deeply anchored in their minds. I don't think the EU would break up, but it's definitely undergoing some changes. The European Economy is also much stronger if it is united, rather than if it has to compete amongst itself, and with other countries.

This economic reason is a cause for cohesion, whatever form that may be.

In regard to Brexit, we can also think about how the youth voted over 70% in favour of remaining in the EU.

AV: Yes, and the "Remain" side won in the biggest cities as well. It's too early to call.

We're seeing that America, despite President Trump's comments, remains firmly committed to the Transatlantic relationship. Has this been more reassuring?

AV: President Trump was issuing strange statements before becoming President and he is issuing different statements now. I think his assessments of NATO were made on the basis of general knowledge, but once he got into the office and was given classified information, he started to see the situation differently.

The second point has to do with institutions. All potential possibilities for any human being in the world exist within a net of relations and rules. So it is not just General Mattis' words which reassure me, it is the presence of strong institutions in America including the Department of Defence. Other institutions also add their say and that forms the basis for policy. Trump goes along with the policy and rules which have been worked out within all American institutions and administrations.

There have been reports of an escalation in fighting in the Donbass region. How is Ukraine managing the conflict at this time?

AV: Unfortunately, it's because of so many other things happening around the world that Ukraine is a small place in the grand scheme of things. But it is dealing with a very important principle: national sovereignty is to be intact and protected by international law. Also, nobody can grab territory unilaterally, which Russia did. They recognized their annexation of Crimea, while they do not recognize their presence in the eastern part of Ukraine. We have prisoners who have been documented as Russian officers, and evidence of the use of Russian armaments produced only in Russian. We have testimony, footage from drones,

intelligence, etc. This is the first point, they violated international law.

The second point is also very important. Ukraine signed the Budapest Memorandum upon which it gave up its weapons of mass destruction. For that, it was supposed to get reassurance from the U.S, Britain, France, China and Russian Federation that they would respect its territorial integrity. It's a strong signal that nobody is immune because international law is not respected. It is an incentive for Russia, Iran, Pakistan, North Korea and whoever else. What would you think about a world with 20-4 nuclear powers threatening each other?

Canada prides itself on being one of Ukraine's strongest allies. What words would you offer to our government concerning Ukraine?

AV: I am glad that, independently of whichever Canadian government, they maintained the same line. As for Minister Freeland, her commitment to international law is well-known. From an international relations point-of-view, Canada's position was necessary and firm. What the Canadian government did two years ago was very important in supporting Ukrainian military forces. They have sent 200 specialists who have trained Ukrainian forces with NATO equipment, regulations and capabilities. This help is very

important and should be continued. That is why the decision of the government is necessary.

My advice would be to take quick decisions in order to ensure that the forms of support can come and continue this work. The knowledge of Canadian trainers is unique and very supportive for us.

As the Consul General of Ukraine in Toronto, what would be your message to all Canadians in terms of how they can assist Ukraine?

AV: For a long period, Canada was a shining castle on the hill. A peaceful country with many natural resources, an excellent environment and good human relations. Suddenly, the world started to come closer and closer to Canada. It came closer in the military sphere and in cyber war, and it came closer unfortunately in things like terrorism as demonstrated by the incident in Quebec. The dangers of a different world are coming closer to Canada. In that sense, Canadians are becoming more involved in the world. Please look at the example of Ukraine as a danger not only for Ukraine, but for Canada as well. As soon as the basic rules of international law are violated without punishment, they will be violated again. My hope is that Canadians will continue to understand the importance of participating in world affairs even stronger.

The Parallel State: Hezbollah And Its Replicas

Nasser Haidar

There are almost no examples in modern history of a militia organization that can amount to the level of strategic success that Hezbollah has been, and especially to Iran. What people, states and organizations think of Hezbollah polarizes popular opinion, though its reach has become undeniable. On May 6, 2018, Hezbollah and its Lebanese political allies performed remarkably well in the Lebanese parliamentary elections, becoming the single biggest parliamentary grouping.

Origins

Hezbollah as an organization was formed in 1982 as a fighting force in southern Lebanon against the Israeli occupation. The occupation from the border all the way up to Beirut was entrenched and many different groups fighting against it were also fighting one another in the 15-year Lebanese civil war.

Hezbollah was a [policy tool](#) of Iran. As a Shiite majority country, Iran has always projected its identity as a protector of Shiites around the Middle East, and especially to those who have been marginalized, repressed or whose interests have been ignored entirely by the state that cannot claim to represent them. Lebanese Shiites made up roughly a quarter of the population, but were significantly politically and economically underrepresented.

The Lebanese State

Hezbollah's position, power, and influence have always varied in Lebanon, but whether it should exist or not has hardly been a question asked within the country's tiny borders. Not only is it a militia, but it is also a political party that has significant political power in Lebanon. By pushing the Israeli army back from Lebanese territory on more than one occasion, Hezbollah legitimized itself not just

within the Shiite population, but also to a wider segment of a population that viewed it as the "[resistance](#)" against any and all foreign intervention, especially that of Israel.

Its image as a legitimate Lebanese entity was damaged when it was [accused](#) of orchestrating the assassination of the beloved former prime minister Rafiq Hariri, but it quickly regained it in the summer of 2006 when it [defended against](#) another war with Israel, the Middle East's most formidable military.

To its critics, Hezbollah is [an Iranian proxy](#) doing Iran's bidding, which could never be independent of its patron, and would not always have Lebanon's best interests in mind, thus undermining the Lebanese state. These concerns are legitimate, as it threatens to create [a parallel state](#) within Lebanon, one being voted in, and the other reporting to Tehran.

In 2013, the critics' fears were realized when Hezbollah [intervened](#) in the Syrian Civil War to protect its ally Bashar Al-Assad from being deposed. Lebanon's official state policy regarding the war was that of neutrality, due to the delicate sectarian balance that could threaten to plunge the country into civil war. Despite Hezbollah's [legitimacy being dented](#), its venture into Syria was shockingly successful, turning it into a regional player and transforming Hezbollah from a militia, into an army.

On top of that, Hezbollah and its allies [won nearly all of the seats](#) they ran for in the Lebanese parliamentary elections of this year, the first in 9 years. This makes them the largest political entity in parliament and significantly larger than its last representation in parliament. Although Lebanon's political make-up is too complex to consider Hezbollah to be the decision maker in the country, it will now still be much more difficult to blur the line between the militia and the state.

International Concern

Nasser Haidar, Research Analyst and Former Program Editor for Emerging Security

Originally Published on 24/07/2018

The confusion regarding Hezbollah's status can mostly be explained by looking at foreign nations' relations with it. The United States, Saudi Arabia & its allies, and Israel have designated it [as a terrorist organization](#). The European Union, on the other hand, makes [an important distinction](#) between Hezbollah's armed wing and its political wing, referring to the former as a terrorist organization, but not the latter.

At a time when the Middle East is experiencing serious upheaval, the security, governance, and legitimacy vacuums in the region become easy to permeate, and the creation of similar groups is increasingly possible. This [phenomenon](#) that can already be seen in Libya, Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Somalia.

Kuwait, Morocco, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, and multiple European and South American countries have had their issues with the group over the decades, but [its ties](#) to the Houthi rebels in Yemen have been the most pronounced yet. The Houthi's [resemblance](#) to Hezbollah is of major concern to Iran's enemies, as

it proves that Hezbollah is not just an outlier, but rather a model that could be successfully replicated.

The Popular Mobilization Forces (PMF) in Iraq is already an example of this. [The PMF](#), numbering up to 150,000 people, has been successful in fighting off Daesh, but remains allied to Iranian Shiite clerics, especially Ayatollah Khamenei, and has thus sparked [sectarian tensions](#) across the country. The Iraqi parliament [legitimized](#) their presence as a paramilitary force through legislation, but their allegiances do not belong to the government. Such a scenario is the exact realization that was feared in Lebanon – that a parallel state would emerge.

As long as central governments in the region continue to be slow to address all of their citizenry's economic, political, and social needs, the vacuum will continue to grow, and regional and international powers will continue to take advantage of their grievances to establish a foothold of influence similar to Iran's in Lebanon, Yemen, and Iraq. While the nation-state erodes, a return to sectarian tribalism is only a matter of time.

NATO-Colombian Relations

Natalia Valencia Caquimbo

In May 2018, President Juan Manuel Santos made the announcement that Colombia would be joining NATO as a “[global partner](#),” joining the ranks of eight other countries in this position: Afghanistan, Australia, Iraq, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mongolia, New Zealand and Pakistan. While Colombia does not fit the geographical criteria for membership into the alliance, the [inclusion](#) of certain countries in NATO’s activities, operations and conferences traces back to the 1990s. This was seen as a step towards maintaining dialogue and developing more flexible partnership policies with non-membership countries, given that the emergence of transnational threats such as cyber-attacks, terrorism and drug trafficking require cooperation from a wide range of countries.

Within the context of decades of political violence, drug trafficking and a leftist insurgency, and in light of the signing of the 2016 peace accord between the Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), Latin America’s oldest guerrilla group, the government has worked to rebuild the country’s image and improve relations with strategic partners at the international level; thereby moving the country towards a more prominent role in the international community with its inclusion in NATO and the OECD. Becoming NATO’s [first](#) global partner in Latin America has brought much criticism from neighbouring countries such as Ecuador, Venezuela, Bolivia and Brazil—criticism which points to the ambivalence that exists in the continent in regards to military ties with Western states and the role of NATO and in particular the United States, as its most prominent member, in security relations with Latin America.

While Colombia first expressed interest in joining NATO back in 2006 under President Alvaro Uribe and was rejected, as the country did not fulfill the

geographical criteria, it later signed an [agreement](#) on the Security of Information on 25 June 2013 that would allow it to pursue further cooperation and consultation in areas of common interest. This agreement was mainly based on sharing intelligence and military experiences in the areas of drug trafficking and terrorism; making it the [first](#) security-oriented accord between NATO and a Latin American country. Prior to this agreement, relations between NATO and Latin America had been [limited](#) to the participation of Argentina and Chile in the Stabilization Force in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in addition to Argentina’s participation in the Kosovo Force peacekeeping mission.

The historical trajectory of US relations in Latin America during the Cold War, and to a lesser extent that of its European counterparts, has meant that any type of security or military agreement with a Latin American country is a source of friction in the region, particularly among countries such as Ecuador, Venezuela, and Bolivia that consider themselves ‘anti-imperialist.’ Nonetheless, it can be said that the presence of NATO in the continent is not entirely new; this is because the US has strategically intervened in the country under the policy of the ‘war on drugs.’ Over the last two decades, US foreign policy towards Colombia has focused on the fight against drug trafficking and terrorism, most visibly through [Plan Colombia](#), a security aid package that aimed to strengthen the country’s security institutions, particularly its military. This form of US intervention has left a controversial legacy in the country and in a broader context, a climate of distrust towards American involvement in Latin America.

As a ‘post-conflict’ country, there is fear that a NATO-Colombia partnership would be a setback to consolidating peace by involving the country in military operations abroad. However, as a global partner, Colombia is not bounded by [Article 5](#) of NATO’s treaty that binds its members by the principle of ‘collective defence.’ As a global partner, the emphasis is on [cooperation](#) “in areas of mutual interest, including emerging security challenges” but there is also the possibility of contributing

Natalia Valencia Caquimbo, Former Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 25/07/2018

“militarily or in some way”—which is a cause of serious concern among member countries of the regional alliance [UNASUR](#) which Colombia is a member. Given that UNASUR is a model of regional integration and cooperation, in this context, Colombia’s participation in an extra-continental military alliance poses a threat to regional [integration](#), and, furthermore, can be seen as a threat to peace and stability with the possible introduction of arsenals in the region. Moreover, Colombia is the US’ strongest ally in the region, and given the bilateral agreements in areas of economic and commercial interest, under the guise of cooperation, geopolitical affairs may influence the direction of future initiatives in the region. Hence, the organization’s shift towards Latin America, with Colombia as the entry point, is viewed by many neighbouring countries with caution.

For Colombia, joining NATO is an important first step for improving its image abroad, even then, as the first country in Latin America to join this privileged position, it is important not to ignore other non-hemispheric actors in the region such as China and their growing strategic involvement in the region. Given its historically strong ties to Washington and the strategic geographical position that allows it to have access to both the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, Colombia was the ideal choice for NATO’s expansion into the continent. What remains to be seen is whether other countries in the region can overcome their distrust of NATO and thus follow Colombia’s footsteps—or continue to show their opposition to any semblance of Western intervention in the continent despite changing realities in the region, and in the world.

China's Debt-Trap Diplomacy in Africa

Dakota Bewley

The classical understanding of colonialism generally references the type undertaken by European powers in the fifteenth century, such as Great Britain and France, or the Japanese empire during the early 20th century. Practices of colonialists include invasions, the alienation of indigenous populations, and forceful subjugation of locals. With the introduction of international diplomacy and law, organizations such as the UN [condemns](#) such practices in the modern-era. It would therefore appear that these practices have since been abolished however, according to the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), a new, more subtle method of stripping away national sovereignty has become more prominent. Such an approach is not achieved through brute force, but rather political, economic and diplomatic [influence](#).

Under China's One Belt One Road initiative, China as a rising power, has the potential to undermine the United States' position as a [global superpower](#). This initiative is best explained as a twenty-first century version of the maritime silk road, in which China plans to spend an ambitious [US\\$1 trillion](#) on infrastructure and energy projects across Asia, Africa, and parts of Europe. The modus operandi of China in developing countries is to achieve state capture by providing loans to governments that are sure to default. In 2009, China replaced both the U.S. and the E.U. as [Sub-Saharan Africa's largest trading partner](#), and trade between [China and Sub-Saharan Africa](#) increased exponentially over the past quarter-century, roughly from US\$1 billion in 1980 to US\$166 billion in 2011. Between 2000 and 2014 Chinese institutions loaned more than [US\\$84 billion](#) to Sub-Saharan African countries, in which one of the top recipients, Angola, was also China's largest oil importer outside the Middle East.

It should be noted that simply engaging in trade is not a predatory practice. In fact various countries

such as the United States, tend to exert some degree of [soft power](#), the ability to attract and co-opt, rather than by coercion (hard power), over trading partners, including Canada. Canada's trade with the United States accounts for a whopping [20%](#) of Canada's GDP. It is the manner in which China goes about its trade practices, however, that reflects malfeasance. China's loan contracts do not come without stringent strings attached, as Chinese institutions claims they [do](#). Much of the lending contracts are [collateralized](#) by Africa's natural resources, infrastructure, or securing military bases in the region. In 2017, debt-ridden Sri Lanka ceded majority ownership of the [Hambantota port](#) to China. In early 2018, China took over control of a Dubai-based [Doraleh Container Terminal](#). Currently, [Port de Djibouti S.A.](#), a particularly key strategic port for American and European allies in Djibouti, is also vulnerable to capture by Chinese institutions. These are just a few examples of how the Chinese One Belt One Road initiative plays out in practice. That is, by enticing foreign countries with a supposedly win-win situation, when in reality they are unlikely to pay back. China is then well-situated to pressure countries to give up control of their assets, territory and influence to reconcile their debt obligations.

It should be noted that there is already an existing international framework to stimulate world trade and economic progress in developing countries. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is a multilateral agency that consists of thirty-six member countries, including the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States that has put in place various mechanisms to oversee this initiative. China is not a part of the OECD and thereby is not subjected to the [OECD Creditor Reporting System](#). The problems with this are two-fold. First this allows China to provide potentially predatory lending practices to vulnerable states, such as those in Africa, under the guise of economic development. Secondly, this prevents the rest of the international community from seeing official Chinese data of loans, economic plans, and infrastructure projects funded by China.

Dakota Bewley, Current Junior Research Fellow

Originally Published on 04/10/2018

Not only have economies in transition, such as those in Africa, been subjected to Chinese financial influence, North American countries have also been affected. Throughout the 2016 American presidential election, politicians such as [Marco Rubio](#) and [President Trump](#) made efforts to highlight the growing national security threat of a rising Beijing. The United States has also emphasized that Washington will prevent Chinese-

based companies, such as mobile tech giant [Huawei](#), from gaining a foothold in the country, citing [national security risks](#). In May 2018, the Trudeau government blocked the Chinese takeover of Canadian construction company Aecon, also citing [national security risks](#) of our own, in an attempt to prevent Chinese institutions from monopolizing assets in Western countries.

Evaluation of the Singapore Summit

Changsung Lee

It has been over two weeks since the Singapore summit ended. Overall, the assessment of the Singapore Summit is negative. In particular, the US media and experts who disbelieve North Korea suggest that it amounted to North Korea's victory and America's defeat. But is it true that the Singapore talks were really a failed meeting?

The criticism stems from the fact that the United States failed to achieve the inclusion of the phrase "complete, verifiable, irreversible denuclearization (CVID)" in the joint statement, which also lacked the specificity of a formal agreement. The United States, of course, can be seen as having failed in the Singapore talks in that it failed to achieve its goal of CVID. However, what we have concluded is that we have overlooked the historical relationship between the United States and North Korea.

First, the US and North Korea have been in a mutually hostile relationship for more than half a century. How can specific agreements be reached at the first meeting between hostile nations? Mutual trust is essential for concrete agreement, but the United States and North Korea threatened to attack one another only half a year ago. It is impossible for them to make a concrete agreement when such a relationship exists.

Second, we need to focus on the meaning of CVID. CVID has a very important meaning as a principle of denuclearization regarding North Korea, which has never been accepted in the past. Given that negotiations are a process of give and take, a corresponding price is required to allow North Korea to accept CVID. In return, North Korea asked the US for regime security guarantees. In other words, the North Korean regime security guarantees must also be included in order to enter CVID into the Joint Statement. The question remains as to whether the United States is ready to accept it.

Changsung Lee, Visiting Scholar and senior South Korean government policy advisor

Originally Published on 06/07/2018

Third, it is generally common to make comprehensive agreements at a summit, and to make detailed and concrete agreements at follow-up talks. The summit with North Korea is no different. There cannot be a concrete consensus after the first meeting under a hostile relationship. The agreement on the first summit between the two Koreas in 2000, the June 15 Joint Declaration was also a comprehensive agreement of five terms (White Paper on Korean Unification 2001).

Considering that this is the first meeting between the US and North Korea, which is a hostile relationship built on mutual distrust, and even though it failed to stipulate the CVID, it is possible to evaluate that there was a meaningful achievement in the denuclearization of North Korea, and the creation of a new US-North Korea relationship.

If so, can the Singapore conference, which has achieved such a modest level of success, be able to achieve concrete results concerning North Korea's denuclearization?

Subsequent negotiations will be much more difficult than the Singapore Summit because there are many difficulties in the North Korean nuclear negotiations. As an example, we can refer to the joint statement of the six-party talks in 2005 that had been abandoned, as it was unable to overcome difficulties in the implementation process. Specifically, the US and North Korea did not reach a consensus on the verification protocol.

Therefore, in future negotiations on the North Korean nuclear issue, narrowing the gap between the two sides on specific issues such as denuclearization procedures (reporting, verification and disarmament) and timelines, methods of securing the North Korean regime, and procedures and methods for normalizing US-North Korea relations is imperative.

However, if we look closely at the Singapore Summit, we can expect both sides to be able to overcome this crisis.

First, the Singapore agreement is more binding and more likely to be implemented than any other US-North Korea agreement. Until now, there has been no case where either of the participants at a summit signed a document on direct denuclearization and normalization of bilateral relations. In particular, since the talks are promises made to the entire world, both of them will face intense international criticism if they do not follow through with their promises. In addition, both leaders are aiming to achieve concrete results in the wake of the talks. President Trump has a desire to make North Korea's denuclearization a political achievement ahead of the upcoming mid-term elections in November, and since [Kim Jong-un is promoting this Summit to North Koreans as his diplomatic achievement](#), he should take measures to improve the quality of life of North Koreans as a concrete achievement.

Second, it is Kim Jong Un's attitude toward denuclearization that is promising. He first implemented important denuclearization measures before the talks without any prior consideration from the United States, and verified the follow-up measures verbally. In other words, [he destroyed the nuclear test tunnels at Punggye-ri](#) and promised to shut down the ballistic missile engine test site. It is difficult to find cases in which measures are taken to benefit the opponent without any compensation. Therefore, Kim Jong Un's attitude toward denuclearization seems to have given credibility to the other party. However, [according to recent reports from the North Korean research institutes](#), North Korea continues to enhance its nuclear programs. Therefore, it is necessary to stay vigilant.

Third, the US and North Korea, in these hostile relations, have a solid mediator who supports negotiations. President of the Republic of Korea, Moon Jae In, played a very important role in the

process of the Singapore Summit. He delivered Kim Jong Un's position to Trump regarding the US-North Korea summit, and [after the original announcement of Trump's cancellation of the summit](#), he confirmed Kim Jong Un's intention through the inter-Korean summit.

Historically, the mediator's role in coordinating conflicts between hostile countries is very important, and Moon Jae-In, who is trusted by Trump and Kim Jong-Un, is uniquely qualified to play that role.

In addition, the atmosphere of reconciliation among the three countries has been hard to find in the past. In the past, a vicious cycle in which other bilateral relations deteriorated when one of the bilateral relations improved was repeated. For example, the relationship between South Korean President Roh Moo-Hyun and US President Bush was not good in the past, but North Korean leader Kim Jong-Il and President Roh Moo-Hyun maintained good relations. On the other hand, President Lee Myung-Bak, the successor of President Roh Moo-Hyun, maintained a very close relationship with President Bush, while the relationship between North and South Korea was at its worst. Because the US-North Korean relations and inter-Korean relations are closely related, these positive relations between the three parties will help to advance the US-North Korea negotiations.

The upcoming US-North Korea talks will present a series of difficulties. However, they can overcome these difficulties based on the good performance that has been made in Singapore. Moreover, US-North Korea talks will be able to proceed smoothly if Trump reduces the confusion and distrust of public opinion by refraining from spontaneous tweets and media interviews.

Woodrow Wilson and World War I, One Hundred Years On

Justin Dell

“It would be the irony of fate if my Administration had to deal chiefly with foreign affairs.” [These words](#), uttered by Woodrow Wilson to a friend just days before he became the 28th President of the United States in 1913, would prove more ironic than he could have possibly imagined. Foreign affairs would come to *define* his presidency, not to mention his name. His eight-year administration (1913-1921) coincided with World War I and the most critical years of its diplomatic aftermath. It was a period that ushered in the greatest sea-change in global affairs since Napoleon. One epoch of world history marked by European colonial empires, great power rivalry, and exclusive economic trade zones, ended with a cataclysmic bang in the trenches of the Western Front; a new era, characterized by the ascendancy of [ideals of collective security and free trade](#), dawned, largely due to Wilson’s soaring public call for a new world order governed by these principles. They did not make their full impact on the world stage until after World War II had convinced the war-weary world that they were wise and necessary. They became incarnate in organizations like the United Nations, NATO, and the World Trade Organization. More importantly, they became part of the zeitgeist of a rules-based international order, a world based on law, not might.

By way of contrast, if there is one word that summarizes the international status this system replaced, it would be “anarchy”. Anarchy in the discourse of international relations does not have the same connotation that it has in the popular imagination – melee chaos. Rather, it signifies a status between states in which power and self-interest are the chief dynamics governing relations between them. For the “[realist](#)” school of international relations, anarchy is the natural and immutable way of the world. This concept is easy to understand if smaller social units are understood as microcosms of the world as a whole. For

example, relations between individuals *within* a small town are not typically anarchical, precisely because civil government maintains order. Law, not might, determines the relations between them. Despite their unequal levels of strength or access to resources, individuals in an ordered society receive fair and equal treatment based on the stipulations of the law. However, no higher source of political authority existed above individual states prior to World War I. Thus, the international order functioned like a local town would if it had no constable – there would be anarchy in the sense that access to resources and security could only be found through the use of domineering force against fellows or alliances between individuals against others. Thus, in the anarchic world order that Wilson sought to replace, the most powerful countries of the world dominated the weak, and competed with one another for domination of each other’s resources in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion. Security, if it ever existed, was only tenuously achieved through the building up of national military capacities and by the balance of power existing between rival states. The unsustainability of this system was illustrated by its meltdown in World War I.

Wilson identified the diseased nature of this anarchic global arena with the precision of a pathologist. Secret security arrangements between great powers had created the atmosphere of suspicion and instability that primed the world for conflict in 1914. Wilson’s idea for a League of Nations, an organization in which national grievances could be put on the table and conflicts resolved transparently before a world forum, was integral to diffusing conflicts before they became conflagrations. Moreover, he realized that only free trade and countries’ reliance on comparative advantage would obviate states’ temptations to use military force to dominate resources for economic exploitation.

The tragedy of Wilsonian ideals is that the political classes did not take them seriously enough after World War I. Many European leaders wanted to [return to anarchy and secret dealing](#). Americans chose to isolate themselves. The free trade policies

Justin Dell, Research Analyst and Current
Program Editor for NATO Operations

Originally Published on 09/11/2018

advocated by Wilson ran afoul colonial powers that wished to preserve their exclusive economic zones. When the Great Depression struck in the 1930s, countries retreated behind walls of economic protectionism. This likely [made the Depression worse](#), creating fertile ground for fascism, which in turn led to World War II.

It took this second, tragically avoidable conflict for people to truly understand that anarchy would never make for lasting peace. Wilson, it was realized, had been onto something. The creation of the United Nations as the successor to the League, embodied this collective security arrangement, coupled with the universalization of liberal and democratic values in the form of the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#). This became the moral authority above and beyond the 'might makes right' ethos of anarchic international relations realism. Even states that flout the UN's values feel compelled to [acknowledge their legitimacy](#), even if it is done in a perfunctory spirit. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which became the World Trade Organization, has worked assiduously to lower all trade barriers, excluding on agriculture. [Gone were exclusive colonial economic zones](#). The expansion of free market capitalism has since resulted in the [greatest alleviation of poverty in world history](#).

A century has now passed since World War I ended and Wilson occupied the White House, and there is a strange feeling of déjà vu in the air. Just as Wilson was president at a time of historic change, when the world stood at a fork in the road, the world of today appears to be standing at the edge of another great transition, albeit a transition back to a previous condition. Just as someone who climbs over the crest of a hill begins to descend the opposite slope, back to their original elevation, there are [indications](#) that the world is heading back to the pre- rather than the post-World War I order, marked by a resurgence of [great power rivalry](#), a [diplomacy of suspicion](#), and [protectionism](#).

Anarchy, in other words.

The most recent [National Security Strategy](#) put forward by the White House makes the indisputable observation that the forces of autocracy are on the rise, especially in Russia and China. Its tone recalls the angst of the Western democracies that feared Germany's growing power in the lead-up to World War I and then, a generation later, fascism's gains in Europe. The Trump Administration's willingness to recognize this threat is commendable. However, in advocating what it euphemistically calls "principled realism," belittling transnational security arrangements, narrowing its vision of the purpose of the U.S. military to merely being one of defending American national interests, and in advocating economic protectionism, it risks repeating the mistakes made by the Western powers in the preludes to the two World Wars.

The centennial of the 1918 Armistice that ended World War I should give the people of the world, and the people of democratic societies in particular, reason for pause. It should be an occasion for them to ask the question: what kind of a world do we wish to live in? It would be an unmitigated tragedy for the international system, ordered along liberal and democratic principles promoted by Wilson, an order that has resulted in unrivalled economic growth, the expansion of civil liberties, and overall human flourishing, to be supplanted by the archaic system of anarchy it replaced. This should be of particular concern to Canadians. Canada has much to boast about, but it is not a "great power" in the traditional sense of the word. As a country of only 37 million people, with no nuclear weapons, but tantalizing resources, Canada depends on the integrity of the rules-based international order, solidarity with other like-minded democratic states in the NATO alliance, and cooperation with organizations of collective security like the United Nations, for its continued security, independence, and way of life.

The mission of NATO Association of Canada is to promote peace, prosperity, and security through knowledge and understanding of the importance of NATO.

The NAOC has strong ties with the Government of Canada including Global Affairs Canada and the Department of National Defence. We are constantly working to create and maintain relationships with international organizations such as the World Bank Group, the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, NATO Headquarters, the International Criminal Court, and other prominent international NGOs and think tanks

As a leading member of the Atlantic Treaty Association (ATA), the NATO Association of Canada strives to educate and engage Canadians about NATO and NATO's goal of peace, prosperity and security. NATO Association of Canada ensures that we have an informed citizenry able to contribute to discussions about Canada's role on the world stage.

The NATO Association of Canada

Seventy Years of Security

© 2018

NATO ASSOCIATION OF CANADA
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE POUR L'OTAN

