



# Global Security Studies Review

VOL. I, No. 3

AUGUST 2013

A publication of the Center for Security Studies at  
Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service

<http://gssr.georgetown.edu>

## Global Security Studies Review

Published by the Center for Security Studies  
at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service

Brandon Aitchison *Editor-in-Chief*  
Rick Dembinski *Associate Editor for Military & Defense*  
Ryan Doherty *Associate Editor for the Middle East*  
Austin Imperato *Associate Editor for Asia*  
Tomas Kristlik *Associate Editor for Latin America*  
Whit Miller *Associate Editor for Africa*  
Claire Schneider *Associate Editor*  
John Warden *Associate Editor for U.S. National Security*  
Raj Pattani *Assistant Digital Editor*

Access Global Security Studies Review online at <http://gssr.georgetown.edu>.  
Connect on Facebook at <http://www.facebook.com/GeorgetownUniversityGSSR>.  
Contact the Editor-in-Chief at [GSSR.info@gmail.com](mailto:GSSR.info@gmail.com).

*Global Security Studies Review* (GSSR), the official academic review of Georgetown University's Center for Security Studies, welcomes full-length article submissions, op-eds, and book and article reviews for publication. All submissions should feature insightful and original analysis, and should appeal to both specialists and general-interest readers.

Op-ed submissions should typically not exceed 1,000 words in length. Op-eds should be timely and may address any issue regarding foreign affairs or national security.

Article submissions should typically not exceed 6,000 words in length. Articles may address any issue relevant to foreign policy or national security. All articles selected for publication will be edited and peer-reviewed, and subsequently approved for publication by the author(s).

Book and article reviews should range from 1,000 – 2,000 words in length.

All submissions should be sent to [GSSR.submissions@gmail.com](mailto:GSSR.submissions@gmail.com). Please refer to our website for additional submission guidelines.

GSSR uses an anonymous editing and peer-review process; only the Editor-in-Chief will know the author's name until publication.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in GSSR do not necessarily represent those of the editors or staff of GSSR, the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, or Georgetown University. The editorial board of GSSR and our affiliated peer reviewers strive to verify the accuracy of all factual information contained in GSSR. However, the staffs of GSSR, the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, and Georgetown University make no warranties or representations regarding the completeness or accuracy of information contained in GSSR, and assume no legal liability or responsibility for the content of any work contained therein.

## Table of Contents

Review of George F. Kennan: An American Life	5
<hr/>	
<i>Martin J. Cool reviews George F. Kennan: An American Life, a biography by John Lewis Gaddis. The book combines captivating storytelling with new insight into the life of one of America's preeminent foreign policy thinkers of the twentieth century. Highlighting the disconnect between Kennan's original ideas on the policy of containment and his displeasure with later statesmen's attempts at their application, Gaddis eloquently presents a coherent and enthralling narrative of one of the giants of the Cold War era.</i>	
U.S. Counterterrorism Policy and Hezbollah's Resiliency	9
<hr/>	
<i>Nathan Brown analyzes the United States' efforts to combat the Lebanese terrorist group Hezbollah, which has become perhaps the most capable and firmly established terrorist group operating today. Despite the United States' interest in defeating Hezbollah, it has yet to clarify what end-state it is seeking for the organization.</i>	
Beyond Oil: The New Energy Geopolitics of the Middle East	21
<hr/>	
<i>Andrea Clabough examines the advent of unconventional drilling, which has shaken the foundations of the global energy environment. These changes are being felt most profoundly in the Middle East, where a new group of energy suppliers is emerging while traditional energy giants are being challenged for the first time in decades.</i>	
Securing Canadian Sovereignty in the Arctic	26
<hr/>	
<i>Raj Pattani assesses the ability of the Canadian government to protect its claims in the Arctic. This article discusses the emerging benefits of holding Arctic territory, describes risks associated with increased Arctic activity, provides an overview of the international context in which Arctic disputes are evolving, and reviews current initiatives undertaken by the Canadian government to secure Canada's north.</i>	
Dirty Politics: Ethnic Cleansing and U.S. Policy in Myanmar	35
<hr/>	
<i>Sloane Speakman explores allegations of ethnic cleansing in Myanmar. Despite recent government reforms, scores of the nation's religious and ethnic minorities have been killed or displaced across the nation. The widespread human rights violations are divergent from the positive steps toward democracy.</i>	

## Review of George F. Kennan: An American Life

By Martin J. Cool

Of all the wise decisions George Frost Kennan made in his life, surely one of the best was choosing John Lewis Gaddis as his biographer. After reading the lengthy but eminently readable *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012), one is struck by the general absence of sensible decision-making by a man with incredible foresight in international affairs. Gaddis seamlessly weaves together Kennan's life of inconsistencies and philosophical vacillations, producing a coherent biography of a figure misunderstood both by his contemporaries and by his modern-day admirers.

Kennan, born in Milwaukee and raised by sisters who would serve as anchors throughout his life, is best known for his "Long Telegram," which he sent as a diplomat in Moscow in 1946, and an article he published in *Foreign Affairs* a year later under the pseudonym of "Mr. X", which publicized the ideas of the secret telegram. Both writings contributed to laying the foundation for American policy towards its Soviet Union rival for much of the Cold War: the Soviet Union. Kennan's ideas on the implacable nature of the Soviet regime and the policy of "containment" designed to block its expansionist nature became accepted wisdom for the cold warriors of his generation, as well as many of those who followed. Kennan, however, soon fell out of favor with many of the leading policymakers of the day, in large part due to his frustration with what he perceived as a misinterpretation of his ideas and the resulting policy manifestations.

It is this dynamic — one of successive presidents, secretaries of state, and other foreign policy thinkers misapplying Kennan's thoughts on containment — which acts as a protagonist for much of the action throughout Kennan's life as presented by Gaddis. To Kennan's chagrin, no one was able to adequately apply his diplomatic philosophy. As a result, as Gaddis writes at the conclusion of the chapter on "Mr. X", after 1947, Kennan "could never regard the doctrine with which he was credited as his own."

Gaddis, however, makes it clear that the fault lies more with the egoistic Kennan and his perception of the policies enacted than with his containment disciples. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, and later President Reagan, were all more sympathetic in utilizing Kennan's ideas when making policy than was President Kennedy, Gaddis writes. But, whereas the former flattered Kennan little, the latter personally and persistently praised Kennan for his contributions. Kennan's desire for recognition, which is evident in his speeches and writings, is a consistent theme throughout the book. Yet by viewing his own ideas through the prism of the personalities at the White House, Kennan eventually became blind to the part he played in the formation of American foreign policy.

In bringing the personality of the author of the “X” article in from the cold, Gaddis has completed a monumental achievement, which required more patience than Gaddis may have expected. Not unlike the drawn-out Cold War conflict, the completion of the book, some thirty years in the making, was delayed by Kennan's unexpected longevity. “Poor John Gaddis has seen his undertaking being put off for years while he waits for me to make way for it,” Gaddis quotes Kennan saying in 2003, two years before he died at the age of one hundred and one. With unrestricted access to his papers, diaries, and dream journals, which together represented 330 boxes worth of materials, one presumes additional time was not something a Kennan biographer would begrudge.

Gaddis was able to draw on a wealth of information in part because of Kennan's talent as a writer. Kennan's literary skills are especially evident in his many correspondences, diary entries, and published works. Evoking the beauty of the Russian countryside or the persistent yet mesmerizing monotony of a long train ride, Kennan makes evident why he periodically wondered whether he should have been a novelist rather than a diplomat. “I could take more pride in one page of decent writing than in being an Ambassador,” Gaddis quotes Kennan writing, years before he would become Ambassador to the Soviet Union for an abbreviated period of time in the early 1950s.

Yet it was his combination of linguistic skill, writing talent, and enviable timing that enabled Kennan's success at the State Department. Commenting on the fortuitous timing of the “long telegram,” Gaddis writes that Kennan later recalled that, “six months earlier this message would probably have been received . . . with raised eyebrows . . . six months later, it would probably have sounded redundant.” After the “long telegram,” he was given the opportunity to help shape American policy closer to home. While teaching at the recently created National War College, Kennan explored themes just coming into vogue, such as how the U.S. might project world leadership after World War II. What Kennan called “measures short of war”—ideas that might be recognizable to the international relations student of today who has studied Joseph Nye's concept of “soft power”—included such concepts as using actions with “psychological effects”, increased economic ties with like-minded nations, and participation in international organizations like the United Nations. All of these policy tools were integral to Kennan's containment strategy. As the years passed, they would grow in importance, even as policy-makers in Washington used them less and less, Kennan believed, risking nuclear war with their bellicose actions towards the communist world.

*... the risk of nuclear conflict was a principal reason for Kennan's increased support for a less confrontational stance.*

As Gaddis tells it, the risk of nuclear conflict was a principal reason for Kennan's increased support for a less confrontational stance. Indeed, it was principally

this aversion to conflict that caused Kennan to turn his back on the “application of counter-force at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points,” words he used in the Mr. X article. Eventually, Kennan reached a point where he seemed eager to concede to Soviet leaders in order to reduce the risk of nuclear conflagration. Although branded a founder of the Realist school of international relations theory, only the earlier Kennan philosophy can be said to align tangentially with its precepts. As Gaddis explains, Kennan’s *American Diplomacy: 1900-1950*, a collection of lectures which in written form firmly established Kennan within the realist school of thought, is a realist conception of the world written by someone that had never read Thucydides. “It was yet another example of Kennan’s strange tendency,” Gaddis says, “to be remembered more for what he said in haste than for what he took the time to ponder.”

Gaddis presents a wonderful tableau of the historian at work, guiding the reader’s attention ever so slightly so that we are left with the impressions of an artisan plying away at his trade. Gaddis’s subject offers a malleable object with which to craft, especially during Kennan’s belated but ultimately successful attempts at writing history himself. “He had a historian’s consciousness of the past,” Gaddis writes, “which gave him a visionary’s perspective on the future.” Sometimes including quotations of questions he asked Kennan directly and the answers he received, Gaddis takes the time to distill for the reader the obligations of a biographer, writing that they must “place their subjects within the period in which they lived.” At times, he includes direct quotations of the questions he asked Kennan and his verbatim responses. He also adroitly addresses many of the quirks of writing about someone else’s life. Like a Renaissance painter etching his likeness into the corner of a painting, Gaddis’s imprints are evident throughout the book. “All diaries entangle fiction with truth,” Gaddis writes, “so there’s little point in seeking to sort out here which was which.”

Gaddis is at his most compelling when interweaving Kennan’s professional pursuits with his family life, especially his weekends at his farm in Pennsylvania and the strains of his frequent international travel. However, whether it’s because Kennan’s diary writing became sparse during the time he was most influential in D.C. policy circles, or perhaps for some other reason, such accounts are sparse during Kennan’s monumental decisions, like when crafting the Marshall Plan. This is a noticeable flaw in the book. Gaddis also makes it clear that he will only allude to potential indiscretion in Kennan’s marriage, never making a decisive statement one way or the other, but dutifully presents the evidence for the reader to decide.

In the end, the book itself reads like an entanglement of fiction and truth due in large part to the combination of Kennan’s advanced literary skills and to Gaddis’s conception of plot. In understanding the hard reality of domestic political maneuvering, Kennan was a complete novice, never adjusting to the nuances of how to make his recommendations palatable to the policy-making community, no matter how well they were crafted. He expected instead that the “mere statement on a single

occasion of a sound analysis” should be accepted without question. Writing in his memoirs, Kennan acknowledged this “mysterious” policy-making process so prevalent in democracies. But it was his own self-centeredness, Gaddis writes, that prevented him from recognizing it sooner. Whether or not it was selfishness that caused Kennan to choose a historian with the inimitable skills of Gaddis as his biographer is unclear. In any case, we should be as thankful for that choice, as we are for the clarity and foresight with which Kennan was able to delineate the policy that would guide a nation for more than fifty years in its struggle against communism. ■

---

*Mr. Cool is a student in Georgetown University's Security Studies Program. He is an active-duty officer in the United State Air Force and a graduate of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University's Global Security and Intelligence Studies undergraduate program.*

# U.S. Counterterrorism Policy and Hezbollah's Resiliency

By Nathan Brown

Since its founding in 1982, Hezbollah has become perhaps the most capable and firmly established terrorist group operating today. Despite the United States' interest in defeating Hezbollah, it has yet to clarify what end-state it is seeking for the organization. At present, Syria's civil war and international sanctions over Iran's ongoing nuclear program have presented significant opportunities for the United States to truly undercut Hezbollah's base of support. This analysis considers past and present U.S. counterterrorism policy pertaining to Hezbollah and provides recommendations for moving forward.

Of all the terrorist organizations operating today, Hezbollah may be the most capable and firmly established. In addition to its terrorism capabilities, Hezbollah is a political entity with a formidable guerilla force; a media conglomerate; a network of hospitals, schools, and other social services; and an international crime syndicate involved in money laundering, extortion, and smuggling operations. In an oft-repeated quote, former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage said, "Hezbollah may be the A-team of terrorists and maybe al Qaeda is actually the B-team."<sup>1</sup> Armitage went on to add, "They're on the list and their time will come." His statement somewhat ambiguously indicates that Hezbollah has never been the object of a U.S.-led counterterrorism campaign designed to truly defeat it.

The United States' interest in defeating Hezbollah stems from its record of scoring significant strikes against U.S. targets in Lebanon in the 1980s and assisting in terrorist attacks against other U.S. targets abroad over the past thirty years. Yet, therein lays the difficulty: what does defeating Hezbollah mean? If defeat means rendering Hezbollah nonexistent in any form, then it is unlikely that the United States can ever succeed. However, if defeat means effectively deterring Hezbollah from engaging in terrorist activities, then perhaps the objective is achievable. Currently, the United States has yet to clarify what end-state it is seeking regarding Hezbollah. The following analysis will discuss U.S. counterterrorism goals pertaining to Hezbollah, which have remained fairly consistent over the years; ranging from "active defense"<sup>2</sup> in the 1980s to — in the current wording of the National Strategy for Counterterrorism

---

<sup>1</sup> Rebecca Leung, "Hezbollah: 'A-Team of Terrorists,'" *CBS News*, [http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-18560\\_162-550000.html](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-18560_162-550000.html) (accessed 28 April 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Naseer H. Aruri and John J. Carroll, "U.S. Policy and Terrorism," *American - Arab Affairs*, Vol. 14, 59, 30 September 1985.

<http://search.proquest.com.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/docview/219491821/13D7E8BD9696EBF2847/18?accountid=11091> (accessed 28 April 2013).

of 2011 — understanding its intentions and capabilities, while also disrupting its terrorist operations.<sup>3</sup>

A solid understanding of Hezbollah's formation and rise to power is essential for a thorough analysis of past U.S. counterterrorism actions against it. Only through understanding the fundamental sources of Hezbollah's strength and popularity can its vulnerabilities be fully identified and exploited. In the interest of breaking down its thirty-year history into manageable segments, this analysis will examine key periods in Hezbollah's history of over three decades, while also describing U.S. and Israeli counterterrorism actions taken during that time. Finally, this analysis will take into account the lessons learned from past actions and make recommendations for moving forward, which include increasing diplomatic and law enforcement pressure on Hezbollah's financial network, isolating it further from its foreign sponsors, and improving the capability of the Lebanese Armed Forces to be a viable alternative to Hezbollah as the backbone Lebanon's national security.

## Past Actions

Analyzing U.S. counterterrorism strategy against Hezbollah using only open source information is a challenging task. That said, certain trends can nonetheless be observed. This analysis must also consider Israel. In addition to being a key U.S. ally in the region, Israel faces a significantly greater threat from Hezbollah and has taken the lead in kinetic actions directed against the organization. Over the years, the United States and Israel have cooperated in a number of ways against Hezbollah, spanning the military, diplomatic, and political spectrums. Despite this history of strong coordination, it is doubtful that there has ever been a truly bilateral U.S.-Israeli counterterrorism strategy designed to defeat Hezbollah.<sup>4</sup>

Shortly after its founding in 1982, Hezbollah emerged as a lethal enemy to both Israel and the United States. The prominent 1983 embassy and Marine barracks bombings in Beirut, followed by a number of high profile kidnappings and hijackings led to significant actions taken against the organization. These actions must be understood in light of wider geopolitical events taking place, as well as sometimes competing U.S. and Israeli interests. It would be detrimental to view just the terrorist attacks and consequent counterterrorism reactions as evidence of a failed strategy. Rather, U.S. actions pertaining to Hezbollah can best be understood as a small part of a much wider Middle East policy.

---

<sup>3</sup> United States, *National Strategy for Counterterrorism*, June 2011, [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/counterterrorism\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/counterterrorism_strategy.pdf) (accessed 23 February 2013).

<sup>4</sup> It is "doubtful" because no mention of a joint agreement to that effect could be found in open sources; there has been intelligence sharing and joint research and development efforts but not a bilateral strategy for defeating Hezbollah.

The United States became involved with Hezbollah as a ripple effect of Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982. Israel's objective was to defeat the PLO and secure its northern border from terrorist attacks indefinitely.<sup>5</sup> The first half of that objective proved more achievable than the second. As with recent U.S. military efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, the military operation was initially successful in defeating the PLO. But Israel failed to devise a solid exit strategy and it counterproductively expanded upon its objective, one that was initially limited in scope. The United States entered Lebanon as part of an international force in 1982 to help end the conflict. In April 1983, sixty-three people died in a bombing at the U.S. embassy in Beirut followed by 241 Marines killed by a bombing at their Beirut barracks that fall.<sup>6</sup> Additional attacks were carried out against Israeli and French targets during the same time period. Daniel Byman, a Brookings Institute scholar on terrorism in the Middle East, points out that most of these attacks were carried out before Western and Israeli intelligence officials even understood that a new terrorist threat existed; consequently, reprisal attacks were frequently directed at the wrong targets.<sup>7</sup>

U.S. and Israeli counterterrorism efforts against Hezbollah in the 1980s can be analyzed on the tactical, operational, and strategic levels. Tactically, Hezbollah proved very effective. Neither the United States nor Israel was prepared for Hezbollah's use of suicide bombings. For example, the U.S. Marine on post at the Beirut barracks was under orders to keep his weapon unloaded in order to be consistent with the nonaggressive nature of the U.S. mission in Lebanon.<sup>8</sup> Thus, he was unable to prevent the explosive-laden truck from ramming through the barrack's gate. Suicide bombings coincided well with Hezbollah's veneration of martyrdom and sacrifice, and the tactic quickly proved to be highly effective and lethal.

Although the U.S. Intelligence Community certainly took note of Hezbollah after the series of bombings and kidnappings, resulting covert operations seem to have been limited in scope. The Reagan administration redefined its counterterrorism strategy in 1984 as "active defense," with the goal of aggressively thwarting attacks before they occurred.<sup>9</sup> After the U.S. embassy and barracks bombings there is some evidence that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) began targeting Hezbollah leadership, likely in concert with Israeli intelligence. For example, media reports cite links between the CIA and the 1985 bombing of Hezbollah leader Sheik Fadlallah's home that missed Fadlallah but killed Jihad Mughniyah, the brother of the leader of Islamic Jihad.<sup>10</sup> While these reports are unconfirmed, they indicate the existence of CIA-led operations against Hezbollah leadership during the 1980s. However, these

---

<sup>5</sup> Daniel Byman, *A High Price* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 210.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>8</sup> Tom Diaz and Barbara Newman, *Lightning Out of Lebanon* (New York: Presidio Press, 2005), p. 59.

<sup>9</sup> Aruri, "U.S. Policy and Terrorism."

<sup>10</sup> Byman, 218.

operations appear to have been narrowly focused, and not part of a broad, concerted effort to dismantle or defeat Hezbollah.

On a strategic level, the United States and Israel seemed more concerned with regional geopolitical issues in the early 1980s than with scuttling an emerging terrorist group. Thus, they inadvertently conceded two significant strategic victories to Hezbollah. First, the United States opted to withdraw its military forces from Lebanon shortly after the 1983 barracks bombing. The death toll there exceeded U.S. casualty tolerance, particularly in the absence of clear national interests in Lebanon at the time. While the withdrawal may have been a wise move in terms of limiting American involvement in a complex and bloody civil war, it was a strategic victory for Hezbollah. It is doubtful that even with the benefit of hindsight, the United States would have chosen to remain militarily committed in Lebanon in the 1980s; however, it is clear that the withdrawal demonstrated to Hezbollah that terrorism against the West can produce results. Moreover, there is some evidence that suggests that the U.S. withdrawals from Beirut in 1984 and from Somalia in 1994 inspired Osama Bin Laden to use terrorism as a means of driving the United States out of Muslim lands.<sup>11</sup>

The second strategic victory for Hezbollah in the 1980s came at the hands of the Israelis. Israel's invasion successfully routed the PLO. The Israelis were initially welcomed by the Shi'ites of southern Lebanon due to the animosity between the Shi'ites and the oppressive PLO.<sup>12</sup> However, the longer Israel remained in Lebanon, the more the populace turned against it. Adding to this were several high-profile incidents that resulted in Shi'ite civilians being wounded and killed, further turning popular attitudes against Israel. In 1985, Israel established a security zone in southern Lebanon with a persistent Israeli Defense Force (IDF) presence.<sup>13</sup> Israel's liberation of Shi'ite lands consequently became an occupation that played directly into the strategy and image of Hezbollah as a resistance organization.<sup>14</sup> Israel became its primary enemy and the underlying reason for Hezbollah's existence as a resistance movement.

Many attribute Israel's error to its lack of a clear strategy, particularly an endgame, before invading Lebanon in 1982. In *A High Price*, Dr. Byman writes, "Israel ended up trying to find a military solution without a political arrangement."<sup>15</sup> Part of the problem was that Israel's presence in southern Lebanon undermined the authority and sovereignty of the already weak Lebanese government, whose cooperation Israel badly needed. At the same time, Hezbollah was rising with strong Syrian and Iranian support, based on the public message that it was the true defender of the Shi'ites and that the Lebanese government was corrupt and inept. This message clearly resonated

---

<sup>11</sup> Diaz, 69.

<sup>12</sup> Byman, 211.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 220.

<sup>14</sup> Dominique Avon and Anais-Trissa Khatchadourian, *Hezbollah: A History of the "Party of God"* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), p. 119.

<sup>15</sup> Byman 219.

among the Shi'ites, as Hezbollah's ranks swelled throughout the 1980s.<sup>16</sup> Consequently, at the end of the decade, Hezbollah was waging a growing insurgency, managing an effective social services network, and expanding into the realm of international terrorism. Israel, on the other hand, was mired in an untenable political situation. In sum, during the 1980s, U.S. and Israeli counterterrorism efforts may have resulted in a few tactical and operational victories in the form of detainments and targeted killings, but on the strategic level Hezbollah was clearly on the rise by the end of the decade.

During the 1990s, the United States began to take a slightly more integrated approach to counterterrorism, though there were several persistent problems that inhibited efforts against Hezbollah. One of the main improvements in the counterterrorism fight was the introduction of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act in 1996, which enabled new avenues of attack against Hezbollah's global operations. At the same time that Hezbollah entered politics in 1992, it continued expanding its global fundraising network. The United States appears to have become aware of this growing problem in U.S. cities in the early 1990s, as federal investigations into Hezbollah activities were gradually launched. However, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 limited investigators and intelligence teams in their ability to confront the group because the act prevented effective sharing of intelligence during criminal investigations.<sup>17</sup> As a result of these legal barriers, one FBI official said at the time, "We were just keeping a lot of records on Hezbollah. We weren't going after them aggressively."<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Hezbollah was able to effectively exploit federal laws regarding fundraising activities and disguise financial support as charity.

The Antiterrorism Act made it illegal to support officially designated foreign terrorist organizations. Once Hezbollah was added to the list in 1997, new tools became available for attacking its global fundraising network. Prior to enactment of the legislation, federal law enforcement officials focused on obtaining convictions or deportations of Hezbollah operatives and supporters for smaller offenses, and by some accounts this was fairly successful. More than fifty Hezbollah members were charged with criminal violations or deported in 1995 and 1996 alone.<sup>19</sup> After 1996, law enforcement officials were given greater freedom in pursuing actual terrorism charges against Hezbollah members in the United States. However, there were still significant obstacles to using intelligence in criminal courts to secure convictions. The Antiterrorism Act did not solve the institutional and legal information sharing barriers between intelligence and law enforcement agencies.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. 225.

<sup>17</sup> Diaz, 149.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 146.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. 194.

By the end of the 1990s, Israel's counterterrorism strategy against Hezbollah met even greater challenges. Militarily, Israel could continue to engage in a tit-for-tat campaign against Hezbollah, but by 2000 it could not maintain political support for its military presence in southern Lebanon. Thus, it opted to withdraw from Lebanon in 2000 with the exception of two small areas, Shebaa Farms and Kfarshouba Hills.<sup>21</sup> As with the U.S. withdrawal in 1983, though on a much greater scale, this withdrawal conceded a significant strategic victory to Hezbollah. In the eyes of the Arab world, Israel had clearly backed down. Hezbollah's credibility and popularity were boosted while Israel's Lebanese partners were abandoned.<sup>22</sup>

Over the first twenty years of Hezbollah's existence, most of the counterterrorism activity directed against the organization appears to have consisted of monitoring its international growth while also targeting its senior leadership. Despite, and perhaps because of, the killings of key Hezbollah leaders, the organization continued to expand and grow in popularity. Moreover, whenever Israeli pressure on Hezbollah intensified, its state supporters — Iran and Syria — were willing to continue escalating the level of aid they gave to Hezbollah. Most importantly, Israel's attempts to destroy popular support for Hezbollah through a system of collective punishment of the Lebanese populace were counterproductive. When Israel responded to guerilla attacks with artillery barrages on nearby Lebanese villages that may or may not have had fighters present, the populace turned against the Israelis and increased its support for Hezbollah.<sup>23</sup> Thus, Israel's counterinsurgency strategy failed and also undermined its counterterrorism strategy for combating Hezbollah. In 2000, Hezbollah emerged with a better fighting force, strong foreign backing, and more popular support.

The events of 9/11 served to significantly increase U.S. and international attention on terrorism. Most of that focus was on al Qaeda, but several things changed in the approach to Hezbollah as well. Internationally, state-support for terrorism became a much riskier endeavor, as governments caught sponsoring terrorism risked drawing U.S. ire. It is unknown to what extent this may have limited Iran's willingness to sanction Hezbollah attacks outside of Israel. Certainly, Iran and Syria continued funneling weapons to Hezbollah and other Palestinian groups.

*... [Post-9/11], state-support  
for terrorism became a much  
riskier endeavor...*

In targeting Hezbollah's finances, the U.S. Treasury Department made some progress after 9/11. There were disruptions of cells in the United States followed by the dismantling of some of Hezbollah's operations abroad, particularly in South America and Africa. The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control

---

<sup>21</sup> Avon, 69.

<sup>22</sup> Byman, 240.

<sup>23</sup> Avon, 51.

(OFAC) reported efforts to disrupt Hezbollah finance networks in South America in 2004, 2006, and 2008, as well as another network in Africa in 2009.<sup>24</sup> These announcements displayed growing intent by the United States to expand its counterterrorism efforts against Hezbollah. Hezbollah's operations in these areas had existed for many years, but it seems that the increased international focus on countering terrorism worldwide may have resulted in some of these arrests and asset seizures.

Israeli strategy vis-à-vis Hezbollah continued to seek military solutions to the problem. Israel resorted to military action in 2006, initially with strong international support. The 2006 Second Lebanon War began after Hezbollah kidnapped two Israeli soldiers and then ambushed the Israeli unit sent to rescue them. In response, Israel launched an air campaign followed by ground operations that resulted in significant Lebanese civilian casualties and collateral damage, and dealt a temporary blow to Hezbollah in the form of a popular backlash against Hezbollah's involvement in sparking the conflict. In the process, Israel sustained 121 combat deaths and, once again, suffered international condemnation for the destruction of Lebanese villages and buildings in Beirut and elsewhere in Lebanon.<sup>25</sup> The 2006 war was another example of Israel applying a military solution to a target that is effectively integrated within the Lebanese populace—making heavy collateral damage a certainty. Hezbollah benefitted from the prestige of dealing Israel a number of casualties and surviving the short-lived war, while Israel suffered another political blow. In the end, the 2006 war was a net gain for Hezbollah.

Since 2006, the U.S. counterterrorism strategy against Hezbollah has continued to loosely follow previous lines of action. The United States has persisted in targeting Hezbollah's finances abroad, while also sharing intelligence with Israel. One breakthrough occurred when U.S. forces in Iraq recovered information that eventually led to the death of one of Hezbollah's most notorious operators, Imad Mughniyah, in Damascus in 2008.<sup>26</sup> Outside of these isolated victories, it appears that Hezbollah continues to remain firmly enmeshed in Lebanese society. Its popularity is still high among Lebanese Shi'ites. Surveys conducted in 2003 and 2011 indicate Hezbollah is strongly supported by more devout Shi'ites regardless of income, education, or age.<sup>27</sup> Despite this, the U.S. counterterrorism strategy against Hezbollah appears to have

---

<sup>24</sup> U.S. Department of the Treasury, "Hizballah" Press Releases, <http://www.treasury.gov/press-center> (accessed 28 April 2013).

<sup>25</sup> Byman, 260.

<sup>26</sup> Andrew Wander, "Israeli Daily Fleshes Out Anatomy of Mughniyah Assassination," *The Daily Star Lebanon*, <http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Politics/Feb/09/Israeli-daily-fleshes-out-anatomy-of-Mughniyah-assassination.ashx#axzz2SMZNSjAs> (accessed 4 May 2013).

<sup>27</sup> Simon Haddad, "What Leads Some Lebanese Shiis to Support Hizballah?" *Comparative Strategy*, 32:71–87, 19 February 2013, <http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/doi/abs/10.1080/01495933.2013.754166> (accessed 28 April 2013).

changed little. The National Strategy for Counterterrorism of 2011 mentioned Hezbollah twice, but failed to clarify the desired end-state for confronting the organization. Instead, the paragraph on Hezbollah closely resembled the Reagan administration's defensive policy of the mid-1980s.

Perhaps the best developments in the counterterrorism campaign against Hezbollah have occurred in the geopolitical realm. Syria's civil war and international sanctions over Iran's ongoing nuclear program have weakened Hezbollah's two key patrons. Hezbollah is certainly concerned about these developments. There are indications that it, or Iran, has attempted to secure new transit routes for Iranian weapons and equipment flights over Iraq.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, Hezbollah has committed to backing the Assad regime, indicating that it views the fate of the Assad regime as an important, if not vital, interest. On April 30, 2013, Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah stated, "Syria has true friends in the region and the world that won't permit Syria to fall in the hands of America, Israel, and [extremist] groups."<sup>29</sup> Shortly thereafter, his statement was backed up by the deployment of hundreds of Hezbollah fighters to Syrian cities in defense of the regime. Clearly, Hezbollah grasps the importance of the geopolitical shifts taking place in the region. Both of these unresolved issues present significant opportunities for the United States and Israel to truly undercut Hezbollah's base of support.

## Recommendations

Hezbollah's center of gravity is its support from the Lebanese populace. That support provides it with recruits, a defensive shield from Israeli strikes, and political clout. The critical requirements for securing its popular support are the recognition of Hezbollah as a more competent and legitimate protector of Shi'ite interests than the Lebanese government, as well as the social service networks that play a critical role in the daily lives of the populace. A key enabler for Hezbollah's services and military strength is its funding stream. Without funds, Hezbollah will be unable to pay its fighters or continue to provide the services that engender popular support among the Shi'ite Lebanese, and it will likely begin to unravel. These funds are derived from a number of sources, but perhaps most prominently from Iran. While the exact extent of Iran's support for Hezbollah is unclear, it does seem evident that Hezbollah is dependent on Iran's support to maintain its various programs. Syria and Iran are both mired in their own problems; thus, those funding streams have become a key vulnerability for Hezbollah.

---

<sup>28</sup> Anthony H. Cordesman, Michael Gibbs, Bryan Gold, and Alexander Wilner, "US-Iranian Competition: The Gulf Military Balance – II," *CSIS*, Tenth Edition, p. 37, [http://csis.org/files/publication/120222\\_Iran\\_Gulf\\_Mil\\_Bal\\_II\\_WMD.pdf](http://csis.org/files/publication/120222_Iran_Gulf_Mil_Bal_II_WMD.pdf) (accessed 1 May 2013).

<sup>29</sup> Sam Dagher, "Hezbollah Chief Pledges to Aid Assad Regime," *The Wall Street Journal*, 1 May 2013, final edition.

One recommendation is to ensure that any strategies devised for intervention in Syria or negotiations with Iran take into account their relationships with Hezbollah. The United States should establish the goal of securing Hezbollah's isolation. As Hezbollah loses confidence in its regional patrons, it is likely that it will seek to make up for the lost revenue through further expansion of its criminal network. Hezbollah's popularity and reputation as a less corrupt alternative to the Lebanese government may suffer as a result. The United States should seek to exacerbate this trend. The goal should be to force Hezbollah to give up its terrorist activity and fully integrate into the legitimate Lebanese government. If Hezbollah refuses to become fully legitimate, as will likely be the case, then isolating Hezbollah from its foreign patrons will force it further into criminal activity which can be exploited by U.S. information operations and law enforcement efforts in order to corrupt its image as a resistance movement and further disrupt its funding network.

The United States should also try harder to win the perception war. This is a difficult task since, unlike Hezbollah's popular Al-Manar channel, the United States and Israel cannot control the media. However, they can choose what to feed it. The United States should encourage a greater spotlight on Hezbollah's criminal activities. Senior officials should get involved in press releases regarding actions taken against Hezbollah's criminal network. Public affairs offices should release mug shots after key arrests along with documentation of Hezbollah's smuggling and narcotics trafficking activities. Moreover, multiple reports have indicated Hezbollah often uses extortion among Lebanese communities abroad in order to secure financial contributions.<sup>30</sup> Basically, Hezbollah operatives threaten to punish expatriate families' relatives in Lebanon if certain fees are not paid. These activities should be well documented and released to the press for maximum effect. Hezbollah should be seen as a global criminal organization that is actively buying votes in Lebanon for the purpose of its own survival and power rather than the good of the country.

To complement this, the United States should increase pressure on Hezbollah's fundraising network abroad. Continuing to blacklist banks and individuals found to be supporting Hezbollah will have some effect; however, the United States should use its political weight to pressure the European Union to officially recognize Hezbollah's political wing as a terrorist organization. After the 2012 Bulgaria bombing, the European Union eventually designated Hezbollah's military wing as a terrorist organization in July 2013.<sup>31</sup> This was a step in the right direction; however, it is likely that Hezbollah will retain the ability to continue fundraising in Europe thanks to the overlap of its military and political leadership. Despite the significant diplomatic

---

<sup>30</sup> U.S. Department of the Treasury, "Treasury Designates Islamic Extremist, Two Companies Supporting Hizballah in Tri-Border Area," *Office of Public Affairs*, <http://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/js1720.aspx> (accessed 28 April 2013).

<sup>31</sup> The Associated Press, "EU Declares Hezbollah's Military Wing Terror Group," *National Public Radio* <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=204415777> (accessed 13 August 2013).

hurdles associated with labeling Hezbollah's political wing as a terrorist organization due to its strong representation in the Lebanese government, this is a necessary step that would assist in providing further mechanisms for isolating and delegitimizing Hezbollah. If Hezbollah's political wing is eventually blacklisted, its removal from the list should be conditioned on the organization laying down its arms.

Regarding Israeli policy toward Hezbollah, Israel should refrain from another major ground invasion of Lebanon. Past operations have clearly shown that military action is inherently limited in what it can accomplish in Lebanon. It also tends to foster popular support for Hezbollah among Lebanese Shi'ites. Instead, Israel should focus on improving its defensive capabilities. Israel should continue bolstering its missile-defense systems—its Iron Dome network has already shown itself to be very useful against Hamas. Stronger missile defense gives the tactical benefit of neutralizing one of Hezbollah's key means of force projection, and provides the political benefit of assuring Israelis that they are not entirely at the mercy of random rocket attacks. This reduces Hezbollah's intended terror effect. Congress and the U.S. Defense Department should throw their full weight behind these missile-defense programs in order to continue expanding their coverage and capabilities.<sup>32</sup> It is worth noting that Iron Dome only succeeded after U.S. financial backing was provided in 2009.<sup>33</sup>

The United States should continue to attempt to empower the Lebanese government and its military. Currently, the Lebanese government's Special Investigation Commission (SIC) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs are well aware of Hezbollah's illicit financial activities, yet they are unwilling to prosecute Hezbollah members or freeze their assets.<sup>34</sup> Ostensibly, this is because the government does not recognize Hezbollah as a terrorist organization; however, it is most likely out of fear of retribution. This weakness should not prevent the SIC from at least building cases against Hezbollah members such that if Lebanon's internal balance of power shifts, it will be able to utilize the already developed cases.

Finally, Hezbollah's strength as a terrorist organization is directly tied to its strength as a guerilla fighting force. There are no silver bullets in regards to combating this problem. As Israel has learned, direct confrontation with Hezbollah is a difficult affair, and time and again military operations have proven to bolster Hezbollah rather than weaken it. Instead, the United States should pursue a different strategy to weaken Hezbollah, namely by building up the capacity of the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF).

---

<sup>32</sup> *H.R. 2717*, which calls for increased U.S. support for Israeli missile defense programs, was introduced on 17 July 2013, but there has been no action on it to date other than its referral to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. U.S. Library of Congress, *H.R.2717 - United States-Israel Missile Defense Cooperation Act of 2013*, <http://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th/house-bill/2717/committees> (accessed 19 August 2013).

<sup>33</sup> Adam Entous and Charles Levinson, "Israel's Iron Dome Defense Battled to Get Off Ground," *The Wall Street Journal*, 26 November 2012, final edition.

<sup>34</sup> U.S. Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2011: Lebanon*, <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/2011/195544.htm> (accessed 28 April 2013).

A large part of Hezbollah's popularity and perceived legitimacy is wrapped up in its claim to be the only Lebanese force truly capable of resisting Israel. The U.S. military has cooperated with the Lebanese Special Operations Forces (LSOF) since 1997, often through foreign internal defense missions. However, unlike the LAF, the LSOF are not stationed in southern Lebanon alongside Hezbollah. To solve this problem, some U.S. special operations commanders have recently proposed creating training teams drawn from the LSOF in order to build up the fighting capacity of the LAF in southern Lebanon.<sup>35</sup> They have also emphasized that this action must be accompanied by Lebanese information operations intended to bolster the reputation of the LAF as their capabilities increase.

Legally, there is already a clear mandate for building up the LAF for the purpose of disarming Hezbollah; all that is lacking is the strength and political will to do so. Following the 2006 war, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701 stated that all weapons in Lebanon were to be limited to the Lebanese government.<sup>36</sup> At present, the LAF is in no position to attempt to disarm Hezbollah. In all likelihood, building up the LAF to compete with Hezbollah will be a long process. However, given the current regional events that are threatening Hezbollah's external base of support, it makes sense to expedite the process now. Strengthening the LAF will raise the costs Hezbollah would be forced to incur in the event of an internal conflict with the Lebanese government. As of late 2011, there were only four U.S. special operations units involved in training the LSOF.<sup>37</sup> Increasing the number of U.S. trainers would demonstrate U.S. commitment to strengthening the Lebanese government and push Hezbollah into a more precarious internal position, even while it strains to support the Assad regime in Syria. Metrics for success in this endeavor should include the number of southern Lebanon-based LAF units trained in counterterrorism operations, surveys of Lebanese public opinion regarding the LAF's capabilities, and surveys gauging public support for Hezbollah retaining its arms.

## Conclusion

In its thirty-year history, Hezbollah has repeatedly defied efforts to weaken or destroy it. Its center of gravity rests in its strong support from the Shi'ite Lebanese. This support enables it to live and work among the people, which transforms attacks against Hezbollah into attacks against the Lebanese people. This defense has worked during the course of its existence, foiling repeated Israeli military attempts to destroy it. Moreover, Hezbollah's ties to the populace and strong sense of community built

---

<sup>35</sup> Michael Foote, "Operationalizing Strategic Policy in Lebanon," *John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School*, <http://www.soc.mil/swcs/SWmag/archive/SW2502/SW2502OperationalizingStrategicPolicyInLebanon.html> (accessed 2 May 2013).

<sup>36</sup> United Nations, <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8808.doc.html> (accessed 3 May 2013).

<sup>37</sup> Foote, "Operationalizing Strategic Policy in Lebanon."

around Shi'ism provide it with a ready pool of potential recruits who are often indoctrinated at a young age. This youth indoctrination process will also help Hezbollah overcome potential generational obstacles as its current leaders hand off the cause to the next generation. Hezbollah's popularity seems to stem from several factors, but perhaps most importantly, its social services have filled a much needed role abdicated by the government. These services require significant external sources of funding, and that has become Hezbollah's critical vulnerability.

Past Israeli counterterrorism strategy appears to have focused on eliminating key Hezbollah leaders and deterring Hezbollah attacks through aggressive reprisals for any transgressions along the volatile Israel-Lebanon border. The United States largely seems to have let Israel take the lead against Hezbollah. It has provided Israel with international political backing, significant military aid, and intelligence sharing, in addition to carrying out limited attempts to disrupt Hezbollah's international finance network. Moving forward, the U.S. Treasury Department should increase targeting of Hezbollah's financial network while stepping up the public affairs portion of those efforts to delegitimize Hezbollah's image. At the same time, the U.S. State Department should use the momentum from Hezbollah's recent attacks in Bulgaria and elsewhere to increase pressure on the European Union to officially label Hezbollah's political wing a terrorist organization, rather than only Hezbollah's military wing. Doing so would further enhance the international efforts against Hezbollah's financial network by limiting its ability to use political fundraising mechanisms to channel funds to its militant operations. Furthermore, as the diplomatic community deals with Syria and Iran, Hezbollah should also be considered in any planning and negotiations with the ultimate goal being to isolate the group as much as possible from its foreign sponsors.

Finally, the U.S. should increase efforts to strengthen the LAF. Building up the LAF's capabilities and bolstering its image within the Lebanese populace through coordinated information operations would raise the costs to Hezbollah of sparking a conflict with the Lebanese government while also undermining Hezbollah's claim to be the only force in Lebanon capable of resisting Israel. The United States should clarify the goals set forth in the National Strategy for Counterterrorism of 2011, particularly by specifying a desired end-state for combating Hezbollah. This would assist in fostering interagency cooperation and would go a long way toward finally defeating an old enemy of the United States. ■

---

*Mr. Brown is an MA candidate in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University focusing on terrorism and sub-state violence. Prior to attending Georgetown, he served four years as a ground intelligence officer in the United States Marine Corps.*

# **Beyond Oil: The New Energy Geopolitics of the Middle East**

By Andrea Clabough

In recent years, the advent of unconventional drilling has shaken the foundations of the global energy environment. These changes are being felt most profoundly in the Middle East, where a new group of energy suppliers is emerging while traditional energy giants are being challenged for the first time in decades. All of these developments imply major changes for energy security in the Middle East and for the global community more broadly.

For decades, energy development in the Middle East has equated to one word: oil. Middle East oil production has fueled the region's most influential actors and periodically threatened the energy security of the global community at large, most dramatically in the 1970s when the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) cartel restricted the global oil supply resulting in high prices and gas shortages. Indeed, seemingly boundless reserves of fossil fuel resources were among the few consistent factors defining an often-turbulent region.

Today, however, the consistency of the Middle East energy dynamic is rapidly evolving as the old guard of oil and natural gas developers may be losing their historic advantages in fuel development while a new group of potential energy developers are taking advantage of recent technological advances that have unlocked previously inaccessible reserves of fossil fuels. These potentially dramatic changes will have major repercussions for the entire region. Indeed, they are already radically changing the global energy security environment.

## **Hydraulic Fracturing and the Shale Revolution**

Ironically, these developments in the Middle East can be traced back to a key moment of innovation in the United States: the commercial application of hydraulic fracturing in the late 2000s. As recently as 2008, the U.S. faced a daunting energy challenge: oil and natural gas were both expensive and heavily imported while renewables technologies were in their infancies. Hydraulic fracturing — the process of extracting natural gas from small pockets of shale rock through horizontal drilling methods — changed everything. The abundance of natural gas scattered throughout North America, previously uneconomical and difficult to extract, became easily harvested, resulting in increased exploration and production throughout the continent. In addition to the sudden glut of natural gas, hydraulic fracturing gave way to the commercial production of shale oil — that is, oil trapped within shale rock formations with similar geological traits as those containing natural gas.

Today, facilities such as that in Sabine Pass, Louisiana originally designed to import natural gas from North Africa are being rebranded as lucrative export facilities. In addition to the imminent expansion of the U.S. natural gas export market, the U.S.

Energy Information Administration (EIA) has predicted that the United States will soon join the world's leading oil producers, generating as many as 9.7 million barrels of oil per day by 2020 - a nearly 100 percent increase from 2011 levels.<sup>1</sup> North Dakota, for example, contains both the Bakken Shale and Three Forks Formations; while estimates on the recoverable oil reserves in these areas have varied, the most recent US Geological Survey of this region has estimated recoverable resources at 7.4 billion barrels of oil.<sup>2</sup> If these estimates prove legitimate, it is nearly certain that these lucrative reserves will be developed.

### The Old Guard: New Suppliers, New Markets

In 2010, five of the top 10 oil-producing countries in the world were located in the Middle East: Saudi Arabia (the second largest global producer behind Russia), Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). This group accounted for more than a quarter of global oil production. Because oil and natural gas are usually produced together, Saudi Arabia and Iran were also among the leading gas producers, in addition to Qatar and Algeria. Each of these economies continues to depend on energy development to varying degrees; in some cases such as Algeria, fossil fuels are a profitable industry, while they are the economic and political lifeblood of oil-welfare states like Saudi Arabia.

As of 2013, however, the rapid growth of U.S. oil production, as well as the potential for production in new regions, including Southeast Asia, will introduce a new brand of oil suppliers to the global market. These changes will not occur immediately, and the U.S. may never export large quantities of oil, preferring to instead supply its own demand with support from friendly, and equally well-resourced, neighbors. Nevertheless, the decline of U.S. oil demand will shift energy markets east to major developing economies in Asia. Indeed, the newest EIA Short-Term Energy Outlook predicts that China will surpass the United States as the leading consumer of oil by October 2013.<sup>3</sup> While there will remain a strong international oil demand, led by soaring Chinese consumption, the influx of suppliers could have major effects on Middle East oil producers accustomed to captive markets and easily manipulated supplies. The key issue is not so much *demand* for oil and fossil fuels more generally, but rather *control* of the global marketplace. Whereas in the past organizations like OPEC could finely tune the oil supply to maximize profits and influence, the old oligarchic system is rapidly transforming into a multipolar one.

---

<sup>1</sup> The US Energy Information Administration, "U.S. crude oil production could reach 10 million barrels per day by 2040," 14 June 2013. <http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=11691>.

<sup>2</sup> Patrick Rucker and Valerie Volcovici, "US doubles oil reserve estimates at Bakken, Three Forks shale," 30 April 2013. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/30/usa-energy-bakken-idUSL2N0DH26020130430>.

<sup>3</sup> United States, Energy Information Administration, Short-Term Energy Outlook, 6 August 2013. [http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/steo/pdf/steo\\_full.pdf](http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/steo/pdf/steo_full.pdf).

Thus far, Middle East leaders have been sanguine about this issue, preferring to show cool responses to otherwise disturbing EIA and International Energy Agency (IEA) reports that demonstrate an evolving dynamic that threatens to destabilize the international price of oil. Although discussion of the shale revolution dominated a recent OPEC conference in June 2013, the organization's Secretary General noted, "OPEC will be around after shale oil finishes."<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Saudi Arabia's oil minister has compared the shale revolution to other oil discoveries that ultimately produced far higher expectations than actual results.<sup>5</sup> This optimism, however, may mask a deep internal thought process within the old guard, particularly the Gulf states, about how to deal with the energy supply changes that are rapidly becoming a reality. As IEA Executive Director Maria Van der Hoeven observed, "North America has set off a supply shock that is sending ripples throughout the world."<sup>6</sup>

### **From the Gulf to the Mediterranean**

The sudden emergence of the U.S. as an energy superpower has fundamentally affected the global energy market and, by extension, a host of associated international security issues. For the Middle East, however, an equally important facet of the ongoing energy revolution is the export of unconventional drilling technologies to potential new energy developers.

The proliferation of unconventional drilling technology has led a new group of potential fossil fuel producers in the Levant to reexamine their fossil fuel reserves. Leading this group is Israel. With offshore reserves concentrated in a handful of major shale plays, Israel is estimated to have access to more than 250 billion barrels of shale oil in its Shfela Basin,<sup>7</sup> oil accessible through imported U.S. horizontal drilling technology. In addition, Israel possesses several trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves in the Tamar, Leviathan, and Karish fields.<sup>8</sup> In the face of this sudden abundance of energy, Israeli officials have declared that 60 percent of its resources will be used domestically, although international exports (currently headed to Jordan) have already

---

<sup>4</sup> Florian Neuhof, "OPEC report concedes threat from U.S. shale boom," *The National*, 11 July 2013. <http://www.thenational.ae/business/industry-insights/energy/opec-report-concedes-threat-from-us-shale-boom#ixzz2ZJkkf77b>.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> International Energy Agency, "Supply shock from North American oil rippling through global markets," 14 May 2013. <http://www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/pressreleases/2013/may/name,38080,en.html>.

<sup>7</sup> Ken Silverstein, "Israel's Natural Gas Finds Win the World's Notice," *Forbes*, 11 April 2013. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2013/04/11/israels-natural-gas-finds-win-the-worlds-notice/>.

<sup>8</sup> Reuters, "Israel's Karish field has estimated 1.8 tcf of natural gas," 14 July 2013. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/07/14/israel-karish-idUSL6N0FK02F20130714>.

been approved in the Israeli Knesset.<sup>9</sup> The abundance of Israeli natural gas could also have profound effects on sometimes tenuous relationship with its neighbor, Egypt. For years, Israel has been a major importer of Egyptian natural gas; Israel is now set to become a potential competitor supplier. With Turkey and Israel already contemplating a pipeline to supply Europe (undercutting both Egyptian and Russian producers) with Israeli gas, it is clear that Israel intends to move quickly in developing this strategic asset.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, optimistic forecasts for Israeli energy exports may evolve further as shale reserves are fully explored and estimates are potentially downgraded.

The Mediterranean shale plays —geographic regions suitable for shale development — are not confined to Israel’s coastal waters; indeed those claims by Israel are already disputed by the Palestinian Authority (PA), Lebanon, and even Cyprus and Turkey.<sup>11</sup> The Levant Basin in question covers a large swatch of the Mediterranean, inconveniently spanning multiple countries’ territorial waters. Given the tremendous uncertainty in the Levant region surrounding the ongoing Syrian conflict, these countries have not overly exerted their territorial claims to the oil and gas beneath their shared waters. In the long-term, however, Levant states may find the allure of lucrative energy development tempting enough to risk tensions with Israel in order to secure all or part of resources technically within their territorial claims. It is plausible that the PA, Lebanon, and Cyprus may all try to assert their maritime territorial claims against those of Israel. Still, they are likely to face difficulty without concerted international support from key actors such as the EU and the U.S., which typically avoid antagonizing Israel and have little interest in the dispute so long as the fossil fuels are developed and sold.

Assuming that one or multiple countries are able to develop these resources without a dispute akin to the South China Sea problem, where does this lead? In Israel’s case, new and pervasive energy security could ameliorate broader security concerns as Israel gains a commodity to trade amongst its immediate neighbors (most of whom are energy-poor) and a potential area of cooperation for mutual economic gains. The potential to become a net energy exporter after decades of heavy imports would be a tremendous advantage for Israel. In addition to securing its own energy independence, and no longer relying on the unstable Egyptian energy export market (another victim of that country’s present instability), Israel could potentially strengthen its ties to Europe by reducing its dependence on Russian supplies and the mercurial

---

<sup>9</sup> Avi Bar-Eli and Moti Bassok, “Israeli cabinet votes yea on natural gas export,” *Haaretz Business*, 23 June 2013. <http://www.haaretz.com/business/.premium-1.531561>.

<sup>10</sup> Steven Scheer, “Israeli gas group in talks on pipelines to Turkey, Jordan, Egypt,” *Reuters*, 6 August 2013. [www.reuters.com/article/2013/08/06/delek-natgas-exports-idUSL6N0G72F920130806](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/08/06/delek-natgas-exports-idUSL6N0G72F920130806).

<sup>11</sup> John C.K. Daly, “Israel eyes gas reserves in contested waters,” *The Christian Science Monitor*, 25 September 2012. <http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2012/0925/Israel-eyes-gas-reserves-in-contested-waters>.

tendencies of Russia's state-owned fuel development company, Gazprom. However, with the U.S. and Australia on the verge of supplying large amounts of natural gas to the international community—and Qatar already doing so—it is unlikely that any of these Mediterranean states could hope to compete in a global natural gas export market. The necessary infrastructure to do so would be capital intensive and take years to develop.

Rather, as the Knesset's 40 percent cap on natural gas exports demonstrates, the potential benefits may be best applied to domestic energy demand. In Lebanon's case, with a potentially robust economy held back by uncertain energy supplies, the development of natural gas could provide an economic turning point for that country. The PA, facing entrenched poverty and few valuable native industries, would benefit tremendously from a secure energy infrastructure and the potential profits associated with energy development, particularly if these goals could be achieved through some sort of trade or development partnership with Israel. In sum, developing Mediterranean energy resources could have significant advantages for all interested parties if presently high expectations for extraction come to fruition. However, in a region fraught with entrenched political, economic, and cultural tensions, sharing even a very large "pie" of fossil fuel resources will almost certainly be easier said than done.

*... in a region fraught with entrenched political, economic, and cultural tensions, sharing even a very large "pie" of fossil fuel resources will almost certainly be easier said than done.*

## Conclusion: The New Energy Equation

A handful of monumental technological advances have spurred developments that are changing the old regime of Middle Eastern energy politics. While the long-standing energy giants of the region are facing a new set of suppliers and potential control challenges, a new group of formerly import-dependent states are eyeing vast, untapped fossil fuel resources just off their coastal waters. Certainly, energy development of any type is a long process replete with mistakes, revisions, and technological and regulatory hurdles. The broader political and economic effects of this development will not likely be felt for years to come. Nevertheless, the international community would be wise to anticipate them now, and take steps to ensure that the new energy landscape of the Middle East is as constructive, not destructive, as possible. ■

---

*Ms. Clabough is a recent graduate of the Security Studies program at the Georgetown School of Foreign Service. She holds Bachelors degrees in Political Science and History from Vanderbilt University and is from Knoxville, Tennessee.*

# Securing Canadian Sovereignty in the Arctic

By Raj Pattani

This article evaluates the ability of the Canadian government to protect its Arctic claims. The article discusses the benefits of holding Arctic territory, the risks associated with increased Arctic activity, the international context that shapes Arctic disputes, and existing Canadian government initiatives to secure the north. The article concludes with policy prescriptions that would strengthen Canada's Arctic claims. These recommendations include: supporting Arctic management and environmental stewardship; encouraging locally-driven, organic growth in northern aboriginal communities; developing capabilities to better provide global and national public goods; and, finally, enhancing Canada's ability to detect, identify and track vessels operating in Arctic waters.

This article will evaluate Canadian claims to Arctic territory and Ottawa's ability to protect those claims. The article proceeds in five parts. First, it will describe the material and strategic benefits of holding Arctic territory. Second, it will discuss certain risks associated with increased activity in the Arctic. Third, the article will present the international context in which competing claims to the Arctic have developed. Fourth, it will describe recent initiatives undertaken by the Canadian government to better secure its territorial claims in the north. Finally, the article will offer some policy prescriptions that can be pursued by the Canadian government in order for it to meet its strategic aims in this region.

## Emerging Benefits of Holding the North

In legal terms, the Arctic is an ill-defined region. Academics have specified boundaries for the Arctic using lines of constant temperature along the earth's surface and even transition points from one type of soil to another.<sup>1</sup> As a general guideline, one can consider the Arctic to be the region north of the 60<sup>th</sup> parallel.<sup>2</sup> At present, eight states have territorial claims in the Arctic: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway,

---

<sup>1</sup> Diethard Mager, "Climate Change, Conflicts, and Cooperation in the Arctic: Easier Access to Hydrocarbons and Mineral Resources?" *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law* 24 (2009): pp. 348-349. For a map showing how different definitions demarcate Arctic territory, see: "What is the Arctic?" *National Snow and Ice Data Center*, 8 August 2013, <http://nsidc.org/cryosphere/arctic-meteorology/arctic.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Maxime Bernier, *Canada's Arctic Sovereignty: Report of the Standing Committee on National Defence* (Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2010), p. 16, <http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/hoc/Committee/403/NDDN/Reports/RP4486644/nddnrp03/nddnrp03-e.pdf>. In this context, the 60<sup>th</sup> parallel refers to the latitude 60 degrees north.

Russia, Sweden, and the United States.<sup>3</sup> As the global climate appears to warm, the material and strategic benefits of holding northern territory are becoming increasingly apparent, and the competition for Arctic control between these eight states and other stakeholders will intensify.

Material benefits of holding Arctic territory include access and rights to oil, gas, minerals, and fish.<sup>4</sup> According to an estimate by the United States Geological Survey, the region north of the 60<sup>th</sup> parallel might hold 13 percent of the world's undiscovered oil and, prior to the discovery of shale gas, 30 percent of the world's undiscovered natural gas.<sup>5</sup> Other estimates have suggested that the Arctic might hold one quarter of the world's undiscovered energy reserves and as much as half of the world's undiscovered hydrocarbons.<sup>6</sup> While exact estimates of natural resource potential in this underexplored region are impossible to determine, it is clear that the Arctic will play an increasingly important role for states seeking new sources of economic growth and a stable supply of energy.

Perhaps more important, however, is the strategic benefit that control of the Arctic would confer to states in the region. In summer 2007, one estimate suggested Arctic ice coverage had fallen to one half the level that existed in 1957.<sup>7</sup> As a result of this melt, new sea lines of communication are becoming available for commercial and military traffic. The Northwest Passage, which connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans using internal waterways cutting through the northern Canadian archipelago, can shorten a journey from Europe to Asia by 4,350 miles (7,000 kilometers). Prior to this ice melt, ships were forced to use the Panama Canal to make the trip.<sup>8</sup> Depending on the size of ships using this route and the type of cargo they carry, shipping companies could save 20 percent in operational costs by navigating the Northwest Passage instead of the Panama Canal; a trip from Europe to Asia that once cost \$17.5 million could drop to \$14 million.<sup>9</sup> A state with control of shipping routes in the

---

<sup>3</sup> "Outsiders in the Arctic: The roar of ice cracking," *The Economist*, 2 February 2013, <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21571127-will-asian-countries-consolidate-or-disrupt-arctic-stability-roar-ice-cracking>.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew Carnaghan and Allison Goody, *Canadian Arctic Sovereignty* (Ottawa: Parliamentary Information and Research Service, 2006), p. 6, <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/prb0561-e.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Brian Case, "Sovereignty issues loom as Arctic sea ice melts," *CBC*, 12 September 2012, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2012/09/12/f-franklin-who-owns-the-arctic.html>. As *The Economist* suggests in "Outsiders in the Arctic," this 30 percent estimate is not necessarily accurate following the shale gas boom, although it is nonetheless indicative of the energy resources that may lie beneath Arctic ice.

<sup>6</sup> Carnaghan, *Canadian Arctic Sovereignty*, 6.

<sup>7</sup> Scott G. Borgerson, "Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming," *Foreign Affairs* 87 No. 2 (2008): p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> Andrea Charron, "The Northwest Passage in Context," *Canadian Military Journal* (Winter 2005 – 2006): p. 41.

<sup>9</sup> Borgerson, "Arctic Meltdown," 69-70.

Arctic would stand to benefit from increased economic activity and the ability to extract transit fees. In addition, such an Arctic power could achieve strategic importance in international relations that currently belongs to states in the vicinity of the Suez Canal, Panama Canal, Strait of Hormuz, and Strait of Malacca.

In order to realize the economic potential of shipping in the Arctic, plans are already in place to connect Russia's Murmansk with Canada's Hudson Bay Port, which would then link European and Asian ships to North American railways. An ambitious private sector has begun to invest billions of dollars in tankers and ships that could navigate the Arctic without the support of icebreakers.<sup>10</sup> The commercial potential of the Arctic seems almost limitless, with one report suggesting that the next decade alone could see investment in the region exceeding \$100 billion.<sup>11</sup> As the north becomes a more viable region for commercial and military operations, new risks will emerge for Arctic states.

### **Risks of Increased Activity in the North**

In the Cold War, one could characterize dangers in the Arctic as arising from great power conflict. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, some have suggested the region is now governed by cooperative relationships.<sup>12</sup> Despite a lessening in the military competition between states after the Cold War, increased activity in the Arctic poses great environmental risks that need to be explored further.

A main concern involves the environmental integrity of the Arctic region, with a specific fear that the transit of oil-carrying vessels and the extraction of oil will increase the likelihood of a major spill in this remote part of the world. One recent report explains that the environmental consequences of an oil spill in the Arctic would be worse than spills that have occurred in warmer climates. In the north, the biodegradation of spilled oil would likely be slower and existing mechanical recovery methods would be difficult or near impossible to implement. In-situ oil burning could help remove oil, but the environmental impact of chemicals used in this method is not known and could have lasting effects. In addition, in areas with high wind and poor visibility, neither mechanical recovery nor in-situ burning could serve as viable solutions for oil spill management.<sup>13</sup>

*... existing mechanical recovery methods would be difficult or near impossible to implement [in an Arctic oil spill contingency].*

<sup>10</sup> Borgerson, "Arctic Meltdown," 70-71.

<sup>11</sup> Charles Emmerson and Glada Lahn, *Arctic Opening: Opportunity and Risk in the High North* (London: Chatham House-Lloyd's, 2012), p. 6.

<sup>12</sup> Andrew Hart, Bruce Jones, and David Steven, *Chill Out: Why Cooperation is Balancing Conflict Among Major Powers in the New Arctic* (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2012), p.1, pp. 14-15.

<sup>13</sup> Emmerson, *Arctic Opening*, 6, 39.

These gaps in engineering capabilities are significant enough to give pause to those considering the development of the Arctic. Equally concerning are the institutional gaps in oil spill management capacity. A former United States Coast Guard official stated that the United States is not prepared to respond to a major oil spill in the Arctic.<sup>14</sup> A recent report highlighted similar deficiencies in Canada: the Canadian Coast Guard has not performed Arctic oil spill management exercises in more than a decade and has not vetted oil firms to ensure they have adequate spill management capabilities.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, company liability for oil spills in Canada is limited to \$40 million, even following the \$40 billion oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico.<sup>16</sup>

These technical and institutional concerns are particularly worrying when one considers recent developments in Arctic oil extraction. The U.S. Government previously granted permission to Royal Dutch Shell to conduct oil operations in the Arctic. Despite an investment of \$4.5 billion in its Arctic projects, Shell's two ships used in the north were damaged in accidents. Shell's northern operations have involved oil containment equipment failures, groundings, and environmental and safety violations that regulators are currently investigating. In light of these setbacks, Shell announced in 2013 that it would suspend its Arctic operations.<sup>17</sup> While this could be taken as a sign that the Arctic regulatory regime is working, the Shell example also shows that even early, limited steps to develop Arctic oil infrastructure development have been premature. Until the technical and institutional deficiencies that plague Arctic operations are dealt with, economic expansion will continue to bring serious risks to the Arctic environment. These risks do not affect a single country in isolation; they are international in character and have evolved in an international context.

## International Context

A 2010 report by the Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on National Defence spelled out the current state of affairs in the Arctic bleakly: the international community and Arctic states, it said, "currently lack ... a set of multi-lateral norms and regulations governing the Arctic region."<sup>18</sup> At the same time, the report explained that the number of states with Arctic interests is growing; while in the past the Arctic was the realm of states with territorial claims north of the 60<sup>th</sup> parallel, today it is emerging

---

<sup>14</sup> Ronald O'Rourke, *Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues for Congress* (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2013), p. 29, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41153.pdf>.

<sup>15</sup> Louie Porta and Nigel Bankes, *Becoming Arctic Ready: Policy Recommendations for Reforming Canada's Approach to Licensing and Regulating Offshore Oil and Gas in the Arctic* (Washington, DC: Pew Environmental Group, 2011), p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> "Canada unprepared for Arctic oil spill, group says," *CBC*, 9 September 2011, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/story/2011/09/09/environment-canada-arctic-oil.html>.

<sup>17</sup> John M. Broder, "With 2 Ships Damaged, Shell Suspends Arctic Drilling," *The New York Times*, 27 February 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/28/business/energy-environment/shell-suspends-arctic-drilling-for-2013.html?ref=arcticregions>.

<sup>18</sup> Bernier, *Canada's Arctic Sovereignty*, 5.

as an area of strategic importance to China, South Korea, and the European Union.<sup>19</sup> Singapore, India, Italy, and Japan can also be added to the list of concerned states, as demonstrated by their applications to join the Arctic Council, a multilateral institution that has to-date included only the eight states with territorial claims in the Arctic.<sup>20</sup>

Recent developments with China illustrate the internationalization of the Arctic portfolio. In April 2012, China and Iceland signed accords on energy and Arctic issues. Near the one-year anniversary of these accords, on 15 April 2013, China and Iceland signed a free trade agreement.<sup>21</sup> The following day, the Icelandic President called for increased Chinese and Asian involvement in Arctic issues.<sup>22</sup> While a thorough assessment of China's apparent rise and its implications for Arctic issues would be outside of the scope of this article, it is worth noting that this seems to be an instance of a middle power seeking to align itself with an emerging great power in order to advance an otherwise vulnerable strategic position on the Arctic portfolio. While the internationalization of Arctic issues is inevitable because of the nature of benefits and risks associated with the opening of once-frozen seas, the absence of solutions on points of conflict between states is likely to hasten the involvement of non-Arctic states.

Points of tension in the Arctic persist today, including cooperation on the establishment of rules regarding the transit of oil; issues regarding environmental stewardship; a dispute between Canada and Denmark about which country has sovereignty over the 1.3-square kilometer Hans Island; a dispute between Canada and Denmark over territorial claims in the Lincoln Sea; a dispute between Canada and the United States regarding claims in the Beaufort Sea; and a disagreement between Canada and much of the rest of the world regarding the status of the Northwest Passage.<sup>23</sup>

For Canada, the status of the Northwest Passage is among the most important, particularly because of its implications on the transit of oil in the Canadian Arctic, where spills would be difficult to manage. The Northwest Passage is recognized as Canadian territory, but there is continued disagreement over whether the Canadian

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. 3.

<sup>20</sup> "Outsiders in the Arctic," *The Economist*.

<sup>21</sup> "Iceland and China sign free-trade deal aimed at Arctic riches," *The Globe and Mail*, 15 April 2013, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/international-business/iceland-and-china-sign-free-trade-deal-aimed-at-arctic-riches/article11222626/>.

<sup>22</sup> Suzanne Goldenberg, "China should have a say in future of Arctic – Iceland president," *The Guardian*, 16 April 2013, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/apr/16/china-future-arctic-iceland>.

<sup>23</sup> Borgerson, "Arctic Meltdown," 72; and, "Statement on Canada's Arctic Foreign Policy: Exercising Sovereignty and Promoting Canada's Northern Strategy Abroad," *Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada*, Modified 29 January 2013, [http://www.international.gc.ca/polar-polaire/canada\\_arctic\\_foreign\\_policy\\_booklet-](http://www.international.gc.ca/polar-polaire/canada_arctic_foreign_policy_booklet-la_politique_etrangere_du_canada_pour_arctique_livret.aspx?lang=eng)

[la\\_politique\\_etrangere\\_du\\_canada\\_pour\\_arctique\\_livret.aspx?lang=eng](http://www.international.gc.ca/polar-polaire/canada_arctic_foreign_policy_booklet-la_politique_etrangere_du_canada_pour_arctique_livret.aspx?lang=eng). Note the Norway-Russia dispute cited in the 2008 *Foreign Affairs* article has since been resolved.

government has the right to regulate transit in the passage or if the passage is considered an international strait through which other states could send ships without receiving prior permission. The United States, usually a Canadian ally and partner, has adopted the stance that the Northwest Passage is an international strait. While there may be some security benefits for the United States in having Canada control who can navigate the Northwest Passage, supporting Canadian claims regarding control over these internal waters would risk delegitimizing other American claims for freedom of navigation abroad.<sup>24</sup>

Despite the apparent stalemate on a number of Arctic issues, there is some reason for optimism. The Arctic Council, for example, has provided Arctic states with an opportunity to cooperate on low-risk initiatives; in 2010, member states signed an agreement to cooperate on search-and-rescue operations.<sup>25</sup> Canada and the United States have agreed to cooperate in mapping exercises and icebreaking operations, and Canada now exchanges scientific data with Russia.<sup>26</sup> In 2011, Russia and Norway signed a breakthrough agreement to resolve their dispute over claims in the Barents Sea.<sup>27</sup> Some have suggested that Canada and Denmark should expedite the resolution of their dispute over Hans Island in order to create further “positive momentum” in the Arctic portfolio. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) provides Arctic states with a structure that can be used to facilitate such diplomatic agreements.<sup>28</sup> The prospects for international cooperation, then, are not necessarily dim.

## Canadian Government Initiatives to Secure Arctic Sovereignty

The Canadian Government remains committed to pursuing diplomacy to resolve its territorial disputes in a way that is consistent with international law. It has established this diplomatic track as its “first priority” and is actively pursuing recognition of its continental shelf claims under UNCLOS. Consistent with this approach, Canada is working with Arctic partners, through the Arctic Council, to build consensus over Arctic management issues.<sup>29</sup> The Canadian government effectively employed diplomacy to obtain support for Article 234 of UNCLOS,<sup>30</sup> which gives Arctic states

---

<sup>24</sup> Charron, “The Northwest Passage in Context,” 42, 45; and, Carnaghan and Goody, *Canadian Arctic Sovereignty*, 5.

<sup>25</sup> “Outsiders in the Arctic,” *The Economist*.

<sup>26</sup> Case, “Sovereignty issues loom as Arctic sea ice melts.”

<sup>27</sup> “Russia and Norway agree deal over oil-rich Barents Sea,” *BBC*, 7 June 2011, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-13686049>.

<sup>28</sup> Case, “Sovereignty issues loom as Arctic sea ice melts.”

<sup>29</sup> “Statement on Canada’s Arctic Foreign Policy: Exercising Sovereignty and Promoting Canada’s Northern Strategy Abroad,” *Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada*; and, “Canada’s Program,” *Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada*, Modified 15 August 2012, <http://www.international.gc.ca/continental/program-canada-programme.aspx>.

<sup>30</sup> Charron, “The Northwest Passage in Context,” 45-46.

the ability to apply regulations intended to protect the environment, provided that regulations are based on the “best available scientific evidence” and account for the need for efficient transit.<sup>31</sup>

More controversial are the Canadian government’s initiatives in the Arctic to maintain the three requirements of sovereignty: “jurisdictional control, territorial integrity, and non-interference by outside states.” This requires the ability to lawfully exercise control of what happens under the sea, at the surface and in the airspace controlled by a state.<sup>32</sup> Most of the Arctic capabilities sought by the Canadian government over the past decade are intended to enable it to retain control over the Northwest Passage, where an increase in unregulated international traffic would threaten Canada’s claim that these are internal waters that should be subject to Canadian regulations.<sup>33</sup>

In 2007, the Canadian government announced that it would build the northern Nanisivik Naval Facility in order to store fuel for Canadian Forces ships and establish offices and accommodations for Canadian Forces personnel.<sup>34</sup> The facility will complement the existing Canadian Forces Northern Area facilities in Yellowknife, Northern Warning System facilities operated under NORAD, and five existing icebreakers that operate in the north.<sup>35</sup> In 2012, however, the Canadian government announced that, while the Nanisivik Naval Facility would still come into service in 2016, it will now store only half the originally specified amount of oil and will no longer be required to accommodate Canadian Forces staff. These reductions were intended to reduce the cost of the facility, since it was trending to become over budget due to apparently unforeseen expenses associated with working in the Arctic.<sup>36</sup>

More recently, the Canadian government’s plan to procure Arctic patrol ships has come under criticism, with one think tank report predicting the \$7.4 billion program would become a “blunder.”<sup>37</sup> The report argues that the planned ships have

---

<sup>31</sup> “Part XII: Protection and Preservation of the Marine Environment,” *United Nations*, Modified 2001, [https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unclos/part12.htm](https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/part12.htm).

<sup>32</sup> Carnaghan and Goody, *Canadian Arctic Sovereignty*, 1-2.

<sup>33</sup> Carnaghan and Goody, *Canadian Arctic Sovereignty*, 5. Note this document does not suggest Canadian Arctic procurement has been geared towards maintaining control over the Northwest Passage. This citation is included here because it explained that unchecked use of the Northwest Passage by other states would establish a history of international use and reliance on this transit route that could then undermine Canadian claims that the Northwest Passage is an internal waterway that has historically been subject to Canadian control.

<sup>34</sup> “DND backtracks on Arctic naval facility,” *CBC*, 22 March 2012, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/story/2012/03/22/north-nanisivik-plans-change.html>.

<sup>35</sup> Carnaghan and Goody, *Canadian Arctic Sovereignty*, 9.

<sup>36</sup> “Arctic naval facility downgrade due to high cost, says DND,” *CBC*, 27 March 2012, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/story/2012/03/27/north-nanisivik-high-cost.html>.

<sup>37</sup> “Arctic patrol ship plan headed for ‘disaster,’ says report,” *CBC*, 11 April 2013, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/story/2013/04/11/north-arctic-patrol-ship-plan-disaster.html>;

limited range, would be too slow for an open-ocean patrol mission, and would only be able to operate in the Arctic during summer and early fall. The program came under further criticism when it was revealed that these ships with summer ice-breaking capability would be designed at a cost of \$288 million, where a similar Norwegian ship was designed and built for less than half that amount in 2002. At present, it is unclear whether Canada will be able to procure a meaningful number of patrol ships under the existing program, since the cost to build the ships has not yet been calculated.<sup>38</sup> For Canada to successfully secure its interests in the Arctic, it should adopt policy changes.

## Policy Prescriptions for the Canadian Government

The Canadian government should continue its efforts to resolve its territorial disputes following a diplomatic track. At the same time, Canada should seek to increase its Arctic “presence”<sup>39</sup> and develop new Arctic capabilities towards that end.

The Canadian government should invest in research and development facilities that can help fill the knowledge gap that exists with regard to Arctic management. It should, for example, establish and staff northern research facilities that can develop and explore new oil spill management technologies that would be effective in cold climates. The investments in research and development here would also provide Canada with a new area for cooperation with Arctic states that are amenable to Canadian claims regarding the integrity of its internal waterways.

At the same time, the Canadian government should work with aboriginal populations in northern Canada to invest in infrastructure that would support these populations in their economic development, with a focus on investing in facilities and equipment sought by the local communities, rather than on infrastructure that would primarily be intended to bring non-aboriginal development to the region. It should especially seek to facilitate organic growth in aboriginal communities in the north-most areas of Canada. The intent here is to make sure development is of the kind that aboriginal communities could support and welcome, since Canada’s Arctic claims are bolstered by the presence of vibrant aboriginal communities in the north.<sup>40</sup>

The Canadian government should also invest in military capabilities that could help it establish command of the commons in the north, similar to the United States’

---

see also, Michael Byers and Stewart Webb, *Titanic Blunder: Arctic/Offshore Patrol Ships on Course for Disaster* (Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2013), 12-24.

<sup>38</sup> Terry Milewsky, “Shipbuilding contract holds \$250M mystery,” *CBC*, 2 May 2013, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/story/2013/05/02/pol-milewsky-shipbuilding-design-mystery.html>.

<sup>39</sup> Bernier, *Canada’s Arctic Sovereignty*, 5-6.

<sup>40</sup> *Statement on Canada’s Arctic Foreign Policy* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, 2010), 10-11. The Canadian Government wishes to explore energy and mining opportunities in the north. While this would bring economic development to the region, it is not clear that this development is in the interest of aboriginal communities in the north. Further consultation with aboriginal communities is required to ensure development is locally driven.

effort to provide public goods by securing sea lines of communication and responding to natural disasters. The Canadian government should invest in search-and-rescue capabilities, oil spill management capabilities, ice-breaking ships that can support international commerce, and maritime charting operations that could make navigation in Canadian waters safer.

Finally, the Canadian government should invest in equipment that would enable it to detect, identify and track foreign vessels operating below or on the surface of northern waters, and it should maintain investments in radar systems that already detect intrusions of Canadian airspace. The enforcement of Canadian control over its Arctic territory will not be possible without this kind of detection equipment; by enhancing these capabilities, the Canadian government can file protests in the event of foreign intrusions and have a surveillance and reconnaissance network that would support future interdiction operations, should the need arise.

The Arctic is the next frontier for energy exploration and economic development. Canada will need to strike a balance between its need to promote international cooperation and economic growth while also protecting its security interests, especially those centered on protecting the fragile ecosystem north of the 60<sup>th</sup> parallel. The Canadian government should invest in research and development to support Arctic management, encourage locally-driven growth in established northern communities, develop northern capabilities that can allow Canada to better provide public goods, and enhance the Canadian authorities' ability to detect, identify and track foreign vessels operating below or at the surface of Arctic waters. By following these policy prescriptions, the Canadian government will be able to increase its presence in the Arctic, enhance its ability to command the emerging commons of this region and maintain sovereignty in the north. ■

---

*Mr. Pattani is a graduate student in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.*

# Dirty Politics: Ethnic Cleansing and U.S. Policy in Myanmar

By Sloane Speakman

Since 2010, Myanmar has initiated reforms that have substantially opened the long-isolated country. Yet, Myanmar's leaders are also simultaneously sponsoring – or at least ignoring – widespread ethnic cleansing against the country's ethnic and religious minorities. Scores of the nation's religious and ethnic minorities have been killed or displaced across the nation. The widespread human rights violations are divergent from the positive steps toward democracy. While many of the reforms should be applauded, the United States must balance its desire for a Southeast Asian democracy with respect for the values that make democracy work.

Since its 2010 transition to a nominally civilian government, Myanmar has made significant progress toward real, democratic reform.<sup>1</sup> The government has initiated a series of political and economic reforms leading to a substantial opening of the long-isolated country, including releasing hundreds of political prisoners, reaching preliminary peace agreements with ten of the eleven major armed ethnic groups, and gradually reducing restrictions on freedoms of the press, association and civil society.

Yet while Myanmar's leaders appear to be moving toward a functioning democracy, there have also been reports that the government and security forces have “actively encouraged – or at least turned a blind eye” – as a widespread ethnic cleansing campaign against the country's ethnic and religious minorities takes place.<sup>2</sup> Scores of the nation's 800,000 Rohingya Muslims, as well as ethnic groups in the border regions, have been killed or forced from their homes in coordinated attacks across the nation. The destruction is so widespread that the damage has been captured by satellite imagery showing 27 disparate zones of destruction with nearly 5,000 structures destroyed and 348 acres of Muslim-owned residential property burned.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the name Myanmar in this article instead of Burma, per recent White House policy change. In 1989, the ruling military government changed the country's British name of Burma to their ancient name of Myanmar, a move that was strongly opposed by pro-democracy forces within the country since they considered the government to be illegitimate and thus lacking the power to do so. Myanmar is also the recognized name at the United Nations. While the United States originally referred to the nation as Burma, President Obama began introducing the use of Myanmar in May 2013. (For more information, see: Ben Schreckinger and Tin Aung Kyaw. “A nation-state by any other name: Burma or Myanmar?” *Global Post*. 2 July 2013. <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/groundtruth-myanmar/nation-state-any-other-name-burma-or-myanmar>.)

<sup>2</sup> Jerome Taylor and Oliver Wright, “Burma's Rohingya Muslims: Aung San Suu Kyi's blind spot,” *The Independent*, 20 August 2012. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/burma-rohingya-muslims-aung-san-suu-kyis-blind-spot-8061619.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Human Rights Watch, “Burma: End ‘Ethnic Cleansing’ Against Rohingya Muslims,” 22 April 2013. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/04/22/burma-end-ethnic-cleansing-rohingya-muslims>.

The widespread and significant human rights violations occurring within Myanmar contrast starkly with the positive steps the country has made toward democracy. These human rights violations are also clearly in conflict with the United States' commitment to human rights. Myanmar's progress in divergent directions and the United States' complicated relationship with the budding democracy illustrate the conflict between the United States' steadfast commitment to promoting democracy around the globe and its belief in human rights. This article will discuss the egregious human rights violations taking place in Myanmar. It will then analyze the extent to which the Myanmar government is supporting – or at least ignoring – the violence that many are calling a coordinated ethnic cleansing campaign. The analysis will conclude with a discussion about the key U.S. interests at play and potential policy options.

### **From Reform to Violence**

The peaceful, democratic transition that has taken place in Myanmar has been incredible in many ways. In 2010, the military dictatorship that governed Myanmar since 1962 announced it would hold parliamentary elections and begin a transition to civilian control. This offered the Myanmar people a real chance at democracy for the first time in nearly fifty years. The United States was quick to act on the opportunity, awarding Aung San Suu Kyi – a national hero and democratic champion who had been under house arrest for nearly two decades – the Congressional Medal of Freedom. On 20 May 2013, after President Obama became the first sitting U.S. president to visit the country, President Thein Sein became the first Myanmar leader in fifty years to be received by the President of the United States in Washington, DC.<sup>4</sup>

The 2010 election was far from flawless, but the government has initiated a series of political and economic reforms that have significantly opened the long-isolated country. Some of the reforms include releasing hundreds of political prisoners, reaching preliminary peace agreements with ten of the eleven major armed ethnic groups, and gradually reducing restrictions on freedoms of the press, association and civil society. While the military's ruling Union Solidarity and Development Party swept more than 75 percent of the seats, today, other parties are beginning to build and strengthen their institutions in preparation for the next round of elections in 2015, including Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy.<sup>5</sup>

The story of democratic success in Myanmar seems almost too good to be true. Not long after the transition began, widespread ethnic violence began to emerge, including attacks against the minority Rohingya Muslim population in Rakhine State. Violence against the nation's 800,000 Rohingyas ignited in June 2012 after allegations that a Buddhist woman was raped by a group of Muslims, leading to the lynching of

---

<sup>4</sup> Megan Slack, "President Obama Meets with President Thein Sein of Myanmar," 20 May 2013. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/05/20/president-obama-meets-president-thein-sein-myanmar>.

<sup>5</sup> Humanitarian Information Unit, Department of State, "Burma 2010 Election Results," 26 March 2012. [https://hiu.state.gov/Products/Burma\\_Elections2010and2012\\_2012Mar22\\_HIU\\_U553.pdf](https://hiu.state.gov/Products/Burma_Elections2010and2012_2012Mar22_HIU_U553.pdf).

ten young Muslim men.<sup>6</sup> Since then, scores of Rohingyas have been killed and an estimated 68,000 are living in appalling conditions after being forced from their homes.<sup>7</sup> There have also been “strong suggestions that Myanmar’s security forces actively encouraged – or at least turned a blind eye – as Rohingyas were burned out of their homes.”<sup>8</sup>

Muslims have always faced persecution and suffered from “outsider” status in Myanmar. The scale of the recent attacks and riots, however, are unprecedented in recent memory. Attacks on Muslim schools, mosques and businesses have been reported in many regions, and a state of emergency has been declared in various cities. In the central town of Meiktila, more than 40 Muslims have been killed, and Human Rights Watch estimates as many as 828 buildings destroyed and 8,000 people displaced.<sup>9</sup> In the nation’s largest city and former capital, Yangon, a mosque was burned to the ground, killing thirteen children. Since the increased violence broke out last year, Human Rights Watch estimates that tens of thousands of people have been displaced, as well as denied access to humanitarian aid.<sup>10</sup> They remain unable to return home. Several hundred have died at sea trying to escape.<sup>11</sup> Human Rights Watch has so far uncovered four mass graves dating as far back as June 2012.<sup>12</sup>

In addition to the religious-based violence against Muslims in the country, Myanmar is also experiencing a resurgence in ethnic-based violence with the various separatist movements reigniting their campaigns. The military attacked separatist bases in the predominately Christian Kachin State, ending a seventeen-year truce. Additionally, separatist efforts are being waged in the states of Karen, Karenni and Shan, all of which claim the government never lived up to its promise of autonomy and creation of a federal structure and argue for a new, federal constitution. The hopes of achieving this ideal state ended with the military assassination of General Aung San, Aung San Suu Kyi’s father, after independence and the installation of a military dictatorship. In these conflicts, both sides share a history of human rights abuses, especially in the border regions. Reports of retaliatory killings and rapes by the army against civilians are widespread, as well as reports of attacks on refugee camps and

---

<sup>6</sup> Alex Bookbinder, “969: The strange numerological basis for Burma’s religious violence,” *The Atlantic*, 9 April 2013. <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/04/969-the-strange-numerological-basis-for-burmas-religious-violence/274816/>.

<sup>7</sup> Currently, exact death toll estimates are unavailable due to the ongoing nature of the conflict. Reliable estimates from organizations, such as the Human Rights Watch, indicate that scores have been killed.

<sup>8</sup> Taylor, “Burma’s Rohingya Muslims: Aung San Suu Kyi’s blind spot”.

<sup>9</sup> Human Rights Watch, “Burma: End ‘Ethnic Cleansing’ Against Rohingya Muslims,” 22 April 2013. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/04/22/burma-end-ethnic-cleansing-rohingya-Muslims>.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

forcible relocations. Meanwhile, separatist groups have been accused of employing child soldiers.<sup>13</sup>

One of the struggles in addressing Myanmar's ethnic tensions is that there are an estimated 135-200+ ethnic groups and 108 ethno-linguistic groups living in the country, making Myanmar one of the world's most diverse countries.<sup>14</sup> As such, Myanmar's religious and ethnic identities can be very fluid, and there is extensive overlap among groups.

The widespread human rights violations occurring against the Rohingya Muslims as well as other ethnic-based violence occurring throughout the country conflicts with the positive steps Myanmar has made toward democracy. The United States must balance a desire for democracy with a respect for human rights – and this means cautious support for a government that condones violence on a potentially genocidal scale.

### Evidence of State Sponsorship

At the core of the United States' relationship with, and policies toward, Myanmar is the question of whether the violence is state-sponsored. While this factor may be irrelevant in terms of formulating a humanitarian response, the specifics of exactly who is fomenting violence is critical when it comes to future relations with this budding democracy. Is the violence across Myanmar a state-sponsored, or at least state-ignored, attempt to eliminate the Rohingya Muslims and other minority groups? If the answer is yes, there is a word for that, and it comes with serious consequences: genocide.

Though 89% of the country is Buddhist and only 4% is Muslim, Muslims have been repeatedly targeted since the military government began its reign.<sup>15</sup> According to the United Nations, the Rohingyas are one of the most persecuted minorities in the world.<sup>16</sup> The Rohingyas are considered illegal immigrants from Bangladesh, referred to as "Bengali," "so-called Rohingya" or "the pejorative, *kalar*."<sup>17</sup> Without citizenship, the Rohingyas are not only denied basic services by the government, such as education and healthcare, but are forced to ask permission to leave their village, marry and, recently, to abide by a two-child policy. One victim, U Shwe Mawng, told a reporter, "We never

---

<sup>13</sup> Jayshree Bajoria, "Understanding Myanmar," Council on Foreign Relations, 21 June 2013. <http://www.cfr.org/human-rights/understanding-myanmar/p14385>.

<sup>14</sup> Oxford Burma Alliance, <http://www.oxfordburmaalliance.org/ethnic-groups.html>, (Accessed 13 July 2013)

<sup>15</sup> CIA World Factbook, 13 August 2013. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/bm.html>.

<sup>16</sup> BBC, "Q&A: Communal Violence in Myanmar," 22 April 2013. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-18395788>.

<sup>17</sup> Human Rights Watch. "All You Can Do is Pray: Crimes Against Humanity and Ethnic Cleansing of Rohingya Muslims in Burma's Arakan State," April 2013. <http://www.hrw.org/node/114882>

had this kind of violence during the military dictatorship. I don't think Myanmar is ready for democracy."<sup>18</sup>

The group primarily associated with these attacks is known as "969," a Buddhist nationalist movement that claims to be supported by elements of the military. Their name comes from the cosmological opposite for 786, a number associated with the Islamic phrase "In the name of Allah, the Compassionate and Merciful," whose numbers add up to 21 – which they argue means that Muslims want to take over Myanmar in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. 969 believes it is responding to "foreign influence" within Myanmar by attacking the Muslims in the country. Though claiming to be a nonviolent movement, its leader, Ashin Wirathu, proudly claims to be the "Burmese bin Laden" and publishes hate-filled speeches and sermons that mirror language used by Nazi Germany. Wirathu was jailed in 2003 on charges of inciting religious violence, but was released as part of a larger amnesty deal during the democratic transition. Wirathu promulgates the belief that governments of foreign Muslim countries send Myanmar Muslims funds in order to control the economy, with the ultimate goal of taking over. While some Muslims have done well financially in Myanmar, the "notion that they are economically dominant is 'laughable.'"<sup>19</sup> Still, Wirathu consistently promotes boycotts of Muslim businesses, arguing that their profits "will be used against you and your families...who will force conversions. Once they become overly populous, they will overwhelm us and take over our country and make it an evil Islamic nation."<sup>20</sup> In their recent 1 July 2013 issue, *TIME* magazine published Wirathu on their cover with the title, "The Face of Burmese Terror."<sup>21</sup>

The government of Myanmar has repeatedly denied having any ties to the attacks, as well as dismissing any allegations that it is permitting them to continue. Yet, they have failed to match these words with actions, doing very little directly to bring an end to the violence. Basic arguments about a lack of capacity are insufficient; some of the most brutal attacks have occurred for days on end on the doorstep of some of the nation's largest military and police installations, including the attacks in Meiktila, home to country's largest air force base. Muslims in several areas have been forced to set up neighborhood watches because they do not trust the police. This type of vigilant protection often leads to more violence, but many feel the government and police forces are not adequately protecting them. Neighborhood watch volunteers have

---

<sup>18</sup> Daniel Otis, "Burma's 'hidden genocide': A rare visit to Rohingya refugee camps," *The Star*, 18 May 2013.

[http://www.thestar.com/news/world/2013/05/18/Burma\\_cyclone\\_and\\_monsoon\\_could\\_unleash\\_a\\_flood\\_of\\_hate\\_between\\_buddhists\\_and\\_muslims.html](http://www.thestar.com/news/world/2013/05/18/Burma_cyclone_and_monsoon_could_unleash_a_flood_of_hate_between_buddhists_and_muslims.html).

<sup>19</sup> Bookbinder, "969: The strange numerological basis for Burma's religious violence".

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> Daniel Shearf, "Burma Objects to Time Criticism," *Voice of Asia*, 24 June 2013.

<http://www.voanews.com/content/Burma-objects-to-time-magazine-criticism/1687888.html>.

claimed to catch and turn in some of the culprits, only to watch the police release them hours later.

The relationships and protections many 969 leaders have with government and military officials further the case against the Myanmar government. After TIME Magazine's "Face of Buddhist Terror" cover, President Sein defended Wirathu, and the magazine was prohibited from being sold in Myanmar.<sup>22</sup> Despite the fact that Wirathu has called Muslims "a scourge threatening Myanmar's Buddhist character," President Sein insisted on his website that "the monk's order was striving for peace and prosperity." Naturally, Wirathu blamed the TIME cover on Muslims extremists.<sup>23</sup> While hundreds of Muslims have been jailed for inciting violence, very few Buddhists have been prosecuted and authorities have not acted against Wirathu for hate speech.<sup>24</sup>

Even Aung San Suu Kyi has been largely absent on the issue. As the most powerful and respected figure in the nation, Suu Kyi's statements on the matter would have significant consequence. Yet she consistently avoids directly answering questions regarding the Rohingyas citizenship, even after receiving her Nobel Peace Prize in 2012, which she was awarded while under house arrest in 1991. Though she recently spoke out against the new two-child policy that was adopted for Rohingyas on 7 June, she followed by saying, "I do not want to aggravate the situation by saying that one community is wrong or the other community is wrong."<sup>25</sup> Such statements indicate that her political ambitions of being elected president and her desire to avoid alienating many of her Buddhist supporters are clouding her judgment.

A 153-page Human Rights Watch report entitled "All You Can Do is Pray" places blame for the violence solidly on the Myanmar government.<sup>26</sup> It states, "[Myanmar] authorities...have committed crimes against humanity in a campaign of ethnic cleansing against Rohingya Muslims...since June 2012."<sup>27</sup> The report details the role of national, state and local authorities "in the forcible displacement of more than 125,000 Rohingya and other Muslims and the ongoing humanitarian crisis."<sup>28</sup> State security forces have not only stood by idly in allowing attacks to happen, but have been active in supporting groups and "destroy[ing] mosques, conduct[ing] violent mass arrests and block[ing] aid to displaced Muslims."<sup>29</sup> Many times, particularly during the

---

<sup>22</sup> Shibani Mahtani, "Myanmar Bans TIME Magazine Issue Over 'Buddhist Terror' Cover," Wall Street Journal, 26 June 2013. <http://blogs.wsj.com/searealtime/2013/06/26/myanmar-bans-time-magazine-over-buddhist-terror-cover/>.

<sup>23</sup> BBC, "Burmese leader defends 'anti-Muslim' monk Ashin Wirathu," 24 June 2013. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-23027492>.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Taylor, "Burma's Rohingya Muslims: Aung San Suu Kyi's blind spot".

<sup>26</sup> Human Rights Watch, "All You Can Do is Pray: Crimes Against Humanity and Ethnic Cleansing of Rohingya Muslims in Burma's Arakan State".

<sup>27</sup> Human Rights Watch. "Burma: End 'Ethnic Cleansing' Against Rohingya Muslims."

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

attacks that took place in October of last year, the attacks were publicized beforehand, yet security was not increased in the areas of expected attacks. In one instance, on 23 October 2012, mobs allegedly attacked Muslims in a coordinated effort in nine towns, razing entire villages and killing residents “while security forces stood aside or assisted the assailants.”<sup>30</sup> On the single deadliest day, in which 70 people were allegedly killed in a daylong massacre in Yan Thei village, security forces were said to have assisted in the incident by disarming the Rohingyas while the Buddhist groups carried machetes, guns and Molotov cocktails. Though advance warning was given, little additional security was deployed and 28 children were reportedly hacked to death.<sup>31</sup>

If accurately reported, the attacks have an undeniable level of coordination and planning, and it is becoming increasingly clear that the government has been aware of what is happening. Pamphlets are distributed, public statements are made, even the phrase “ethnic cleansing” is used in “full view of local, state and national authorities.”<sup>32</sup> Moreover, no action to punish those responsible or to assist the Rohingyas in recovering has been taken. In a move consistent with state-sponsored ethnic cleansing, some officials have deliberately attempted to “send a message” to the Rohingyas: According to the Human Rights Watch report, “On June 13, a government truck dumped 18 naked and half-clothed bodies near a Rohingya displaced persons camp...Some of the victims had been ‘hogtied’ with string or plastic strips before being executed.”<sup>33</sup> While President Sein hosts diplomatic visits with international leaders – including the President of the United States – he has also obstructed the delivery of humanitarian aid to those who need it, reminiscent of the government’s failure to allow international assistance following Cyclone Nargis in 2008.<sup>34</sup> The Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency “was blocked from building 5,000 permanent homes for the Rohingyas” and at least 14 Muslim humanitarian workers have been arrested. One such worker was accused of having a letter of support from al-Qaeda.<sup>35</sup> While President Sein established a twenty-seven member investigative commission to “reveal the truth behind the unrest,” it has not reported any findings to the public since its establishment in August 2012, though it promised to produce its findings within a month.<sup>36</sup>

In the end, the acts of murder, deportation, forcible transfer and persecution against the Rohingyas qualify as crimes against humanity, defined by the United

---

<sup>30</sup> Human Rights Watch. “All You Can Do Is Pray,” p. 5.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. 10.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, 12.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, 15.

<sup>34</sup> Human Rights Watch. “Burma: End ‘Ethnic Cleansing’ Against Rohingya Muslims.”

<sup>35</sup> Otis, “Burma’s ‘hidden genocide’: A rare visit to Rohingya refugee camps,”

<sup>36</sup> David Mepham, “Burma: the EU has been too quick to lift sanctions,” *The Guardian*, 23 April 2013.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/apr/23/burma-eu-too-quick-lift-sanctions>. For information on the commission, see: “Myanmar to investigate Rakhine clashes.”

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-19303869>.

Nations as “crimes committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack by a government or organization on a civilian population.”<sup>37</sup> Ethnic cleansing is defined as “a purposeful policy by an ethnic or religious group to remove by violence and terror-inspiring means the civilian population of another ethnic or religious group from certain geographic areas.”<sup>38</sup> The Human Rights Watch report concludes by arguing that Myanmar’s supporters, including the United States, “need to wake up and realize the seriousness of the Rohingya’s plight and demand that the government urgently stop abuses, promote the safe return of displaced Muslims and ensure accountability to end the deadly cycle of violence.”<sup>39</sup> Genocide Watch has placed Myanmar at an updated level of “Stage 7,” meaning it is a “current genocidal massacre,” citing the ongoing attacks against minorities, including the Rohingya Muslims, Kachin Christians, and minorities in Karen, Shan and Kachin States.<sup>40</sup> Claims such as genocide or ethnic cleansing are not made lightly. Human Rights Watch writes, “Our findings confirm the extensive state involvement and planning in the killings and destruction of property, as well as the forced displacement of populations.”<sup>41</sup>

## Policy Recommendations

While Myanmar represents significant opportunity to promote democracy in a strategic region, the United States must not ignore the abuses on the ground in pursuing its interests. It is critical to move forward in a way that appropriately pressures those in power in Myanmar to bring an end to the violence and reignite their democratic progress. It will be essential for the United States to work closely with the Association for South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and other regional powers in order to accomplish this.

Despite the recent confirmation of Samantha Power as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and the creation of the Atrocities Prevention Board nearly a year ago, the United States’ policy in Myanmar is not living up to its promise to “make the deterrence of genocide and mass atrocities ‘a core national interest and core moral responsibility.’”<sup>42</sup> While any threat of outside involvement in bringing the conflict to an end is premature, the United States should be more vocal in demanding objective investigations. If crimes are found, the United States should insist on honest attempts to bring the perpetrators to justice. Likewise, the United States must recognize the gap

---

<sup>37</sup> Human Rights Watch, “All You Can Do Is Pray.” Definition according to the Commission of Experts Established Pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 780. <http://www.hrw.org/node/114882>. (Accessed 12 July 2013)

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid*, 11.

<sup>39</sup> Human Rights Watch. “Burma: End ‘Ethnic Cleansing’ Against Rohingya Muslims”.

<sup>40</sup> Genocide Watch. “Myanmar/Burma.” <http://www.genocidewatch.org/myanmar.html>.

<sup>41</sup> Mephram, “Burma: the EU has been too quick to lift sanctions”.

<sup>42</sup> John Norris, “APB for the APB.” *Foreign Policy*. 16 July 2013.

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/07/16/apb\\_for\\_the\\_apb\\_syria\\_atrocities\\_prevention\\_board\\_samantha\\_power?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/07/16/apb_for_the_apb_syria_atrocities_prevention_board_samantha_power?page=full).

between the government's words and its actions. Myanmar leaders' interest in winning favor with the United States offers leverage on this point. Attempting to both build relationships and influence their behavior is a delicate balance that will require skillful diplomatic measures. Though it is worth the time and resources to invest in Myanmar's success as a democracy, the United States cannot continue to ignore reports of widespread and coordinated violence. The United States has the opportunity to become a long-term strategic partner with this Southeast Asian nation, working hand-in-hand with it as Myanmar becomes a stable democracy. It is worth the United States' time and resources to invest in Myanmar's success.

There are many key strategic interests that make Myanmar an attractive partner in the region. Myanmar offers a potentially critical counterweight to China in the region. While its emergence on the world stage is relatively recent, Myanmar is strategically located at the crossroads of South and East Asia. Myanmar's strategic location offers direct access to the Indian Ocean, a primary interest for China, a nation trying to maintain competition in the region against India's growth. Additionally, Myanmar is rich with natural resources, including petroleum, natural gas, coal, timber, copper, hydropower and gems. Economic growth in Southeast Asia has reinforced the desire for regional security.<sup>43</sup> There is the possibility of significant spillover effects from the ethnic and religious violence in Myanmar, which has created huge refugee flows in a fragile region that is ill-equipped to handle large-scale humanitarian crises. Spillover may be even more likely than one would think – 969's Wirathu's has made several claims that, "once they are done with the Muslims in Burma, they will move onto Muslim targets elsewhere."<sup>44</sup>

Regional concerns about Myanmar's stability could also impact U.S. interests, particularly since it lies within the zone of competition between India and China. Myanmar is set to chair ASEAN next year, leading the way toward ASEAN's goal of economic integration by 2015. Regional concerns about stability and integration abound. China, which views regional stability as tied to stability in Myanmar, would benefit greatly from the access and opportunity that Myanmar's 1,200-mile coast offers. Likewise, India is in search of a constant and reliable energy supply, which Myanmar possesses. India's "Look East" policy also calls on the world's largest democracy to look for greater influence under China's nose and expand relations in Southeast Asia.

Lastly, Myanmar should be a global concern because of the significant amount of opium produced and consumed there. Sitting within the "Golden Triangle" — the lawless border region between Myanmar, Thailand and Laos that feeds into China's permeable southwest borders — Myanmar produces 25 percent of the world's opium,

---

<sup>43</sup> Stephen B. Groff, Speech at Economic Growth in Southeast Asia: Integration, Sustainability, Capacity Development. 28 June 2013. <http://www.adb.org/news/speeches/economic-growth-southeast-asia-integration-sustainability-capacity-development>.

<sup>44</sup> Bookbinder, "969: The strange numerological basis for Burma's religious violence".

making it the second largest global producer after Afghanistan.<sup>45</sup> Gary Lewis of the United Nations Office of Drug and Crime (UNODC) reports that there “is no question that there is a strong connection between the conflicts in the country and the most immediate sources of revenue to purchase weapons,” noting that areas of highest cultivation intensity is correlated to the areas of ongoing conflict.<sup>46</sup> Long-term peace and security in the region depends on an effort to address the poppy problem.

Most importantly, Myanmar offers the United States an opportunity to demonstrate the sincerity of its commitment to its values. The United States should not cut off all relations with Myanmar, but instead work with its leaders to address the conflict. The following are several policy recommendations for moving forward in a way that balances the U.S.’s desire for a strong, independent and democratic partner with pragmatism and respect for minority and human rights.

First, pragmatic engagement with the leadership in Myanmar must be maintained. U.S. diplomatic efforts should be focused on pressing President Sein’s government to handle governance issues beyond the capital and encourage it to work alongside its peripheral populations. The United States should encourage the creation of a governing system based on graduated federalism and provide assistance to border ethnic regions that will require local-level assistance. Political leaders in Myanmar face a significant challenge. Despite the liberal-leaning positions of some leaders and their desire to please the international community, the anti-Muslims sentiment is quite popular throughout the country’s Buddhist majority.<sup>47</sup> The government often dismisses policies like the recent two-child law for Rohingyas in Rakhine State as “local” initiatives and promises that they “will look into it.”<sup>48</sup> They continue to make national security arguments about the Rohingyas, claiming they are facing threats from “illegal immigration.” In reality, Myanmar is a diverse, multi-ethnic state that can only survive as a democracy if it offers equal rights to all citizens. Above all, U.S. diplomatic efforts must emphasize the protection of vulnerable minority rights as the cornerstone of a functioning democracy.

Second, the current sanctions regime against Myanmar, one of the most prominent elements of U.S. policy toward the country, must be addressed in a way that

---

<sup>45</sup> United Nations Office of Drug and Crime, “South-East Asia Opium Survey 2012: Lao PDR, Myanmar,” [http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/sea/SouthEastAsia\\_Report\\_2012\\_low.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/sea/SouthEastAsia_Report_2012_low.pdf).

<sup>46</sup> Andrew R.C. Marshall, “Special Report: Myanmar gives official blessing to anti-Muslim monks,” Reuters, 27 June 2013. <http://mobile.reuters.com/article/idUSBRE89U08K20121031?irpc=932>.

<sup>47</sup> Max Fisher, “I am proud to be called a radical Buddhist’: More Burmese embracing anti-Muslim violence,” Washington Post, 21 June 2013.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/06/21/i-am-proud-to-be-called-a-radical-buddhist-more-burmese-buddhists-embracing-anti-muslim-violence/>.

<sup>48</sup> Min Zin, “National Security is no excuse for bad behavior (in Burma),” Foreign Policy, 07 June 2013. [http://transitions.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/06/07/national\\_security\\_is\\_no\\_excuse\\_for\\_bad\\_behavior\\_in\\_Myanmar](http://transitions.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/06/07/national_security_is_no_excuse_for_bad_behavior_in_Myanmar).

allows for economic growth, but maintains U.S. leverage. Both upholding and relieving sanctions come with tradeoffs. In April 2013, the European Union prematurely lifted all economic sanctions on Myanmar except the arms embargo, with British Foreign Secretary William Hague congratulating the Myanmar government for its “remarkable changes.”<sup>49</sup> *Guardian* reporter David Mephram said that European leaders have been “seduced by a romantic narrative of swift democratic transformation.”<sup>50</sup> Simply put, the EU has been too quick to reward positive achievements and has surrendered its leverage in pressing the Myanmar government for accountability. While the desire to court Myanmar and solidify economic partnerships is understandable, it is unlikely that the wholesale lifting of these sanctions will encourage better behavior or accountability and may even allow crimes to be committed at an irreversible level.

Sanctions relief should be gradual and in direct response to positive economic and political reforms. The United States must maintain an action-for-action approach, rather than “action-for-hope for the best” approach, in order to retain its leverage in pushing President Sein and others to continue positive reforms.<sup>51</sup> Tom Andrews, president of United to End Genocide, made it clear in his testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that alleviating these symptoms could be “a matter of life and death for tens of thousands” of Myanmar citizens.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, to solidify long-term positive relations, sanctions relief should be viewed with a certain level of permanence. Washington should work with civil society and ethnic leaders to develop binding standards for U.S. companies doing business in Myanmar before lifting sanctions.

Lastly, while sanctions should not be universally lifted, the Myanmar economy needs stimulation, and U.S. development initiatives should reinforce President Sein’s governance efforts in order to reach the most troubled areas. Licit economy options to counter the significant opium trade should be introduced. Current UNODC projects include substituting paddy, rice, maize, beans, tea and other crops for poppy, as well as alternative development initiatives, such as building roads and other agricultural infrastructure projects.<sup>53</sup> It is critical that USAID and other agencies work with local-level governments to encourage sustainable development devoid of political corruption.

---

<sup>49</sup> Mephram, “Burma: the EU has been too quick to lift sanctions”.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Walter Lohman, “Burma: Lift Sanctions Now, Ask Questions Later,” Real Clear Politics, 21 May 2013. [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/05/21/Burma\\_policy\\_lift\\_sanctions\\_ask\\_questions\\_later\\_118477.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/05/21/Burma_policy_lift_sanctions_ask_questions_later_118477.html).

<sup>52</sup> Joshua Lipes, “NGOs Warn Against Lifting of Sanctions,” Radio Free Asia, 25 April 2013. <http://www.rfa.org/english/news/myanmar/sanctions-04252012155110.html>.

<sup>53</sup> UNODC, “Sustaining Opium Reduction in Southeast Asia: Sharing Experiences on Alternative Development and Beyond.” Presented at the Regional Seminar: Global Partnership on Alternative Development (GLOI44), 15-17 December 2008 in Chiang Mai, Thailand. p. 95. (Accessed 20 August 2013). See also: UNODC. “Opium Poppy Cultivation in South East Asia: Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand.” December 2008. (Accessed 20 August 2013). See pp. 45-89. <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crop-monitoring/index.html>.

Democracy in Myanmar is extremely delicate. The social, political, religious and ethnic tensions are complex with multiple, overlapping layers that make addressing them extremely difficult. In the end, one of the most important things is to recognize that *everyone's* hands are dirty in Myanmar. Moving forward, tradeoffs will need to be made between justice and reconciliation.

## Conclusion

Myanmar's evolution in divergent directions and the United States' complicated relationship with the budding democracy illustrate the conflict between the United States' steadfast commitment to promoting democracy around the globe and its belief in human rights for all, including minorities. The transition to a nominally civilian, democratic government has seen many reforms and improvements that should be applauded and encouraged. However, the government's role in the large-scale violence and ethnic cleansing of religious and ethnic minorities is unacceptable. Tradeoffs are always difficult to make; the situation in Myanmar has revealed the ways in which democracy for all does not always mean justice for all when it comes to civil conflicts. There is a delicate balance between being fair and achieving justice for every wrongdoing and working to start clean and establish a functioning state structure that does not institutionalize the current state of affairs. The United States must balance its desire for a strong democracy in China's backyard with a respect for the values that make democracy work. ■

*... the United States' complicated relationship with this budding democracy illustrates the conflict between the United States' steadfast commitment to promoting democracy around the globe and its belief in human rights for all ...*

---

*Ms. Speakman is a second-year M.A. candidate in Security Studies in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service. Currently studying in Amman, Jordan, she focuses on the effects of civil conflicts on neighboring countries.*