



vol 5

THE STRATEGIC OUTLOOK FOR CANADA LES PERSPECTIVES STRATÉGIQUES DU CANADA



**Institut de la Conférence des associations
de la défense**

L'Institut de la Conférence des associations de la défense est un organisme caritatif et non partisan qui a pour mandat de promouvoir un débat public éclairé sur les enjeux notre sécurité et de la défense nationale.

Institut de la Conférence des associations
de la défense
151 rue Slater, bureau 412A
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1P 5H3

613 236 9903
www.cda-cdai.ca
cda@cda-cdai.ca

Tous les logos et les marques de commerce utilisés sont la propriété de leurs détenteurs respectifs.

L'utilisation qui en est faite dans cette publication l'est en vertu des dispositions de la loi canadienne applicable sur l'utilisation équitable non commerciale et nominative.

Conference of Defence Associations Institute

The Conference of Defence Associations Institute is a charitable and non-partisan organisation whose mandate is to promote informed public debate on national security and defence issues.

Conference of Defence Associations Institute
151 Slater Street, suite 412A
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5H3

613 236 9903
www.cda-cdai.ca
cda@cda-cdai.ca

All logos and trademarks used are the property of their respective holders.

Use in this publication is under non-commercial and normative fair use provisions of applicable Canadian law.

vimy paper / cahier vimy no 5

THE STRATEGIC OUTLOOK FOR CANADA



LES PERSPECTIVES STRATÉGIQUES DU CANADA

Conference of Defence Associations Institute
Institut de la Conférence des associations de la défense
© 2012

Paul Chapin and George Petrolekas

"The Strategic Outlook for Canada" *Vimy Paper*; vol 5: February 2012.

« Les perspectives stratégiques du Canada » *Cahier Vimy*; vol 5: février 2012.

ISBN 978-0-9865362-1-2 (print)

ISBN 978-0-9865362-2-9 (electronic)

Cataloguing data available from Library and Archives Canada.

vimy paper / cahier vimy no 5:

THE STRATEGIC OUTLOOK FOR CANADA

LES PERSPECTIVES STRATÉGIQUES DU CANADA

Authors:

Mr. Paul Chapin*

*Director of Research, CDA Institute.
Former Vice President Pearson Peacekeeping
Centre, Former Director General International
Security, Department of Foreign Affairs*

Mr. George Petrolekas

*International telecommunications
executive and soldier.
Former advisor to two Chiefs of Defence Staff, and
Liaison Officer to several NATO commanders*

Advisory Committee:

Dr. David Bercuson*

Dr. Douglas Bland*

Col (Ret'd) Brett Boudreau*

Dr. Ian Brodie*

Col (Ret'd) Mike Capstick

Dr. Howard G. Coombs

Dr. John Scott Cowan*

Mr. Thomas d'Aquino*

ex Amb Ferry de Kerckhove*

LGen (Ret'd) Richard Evraire*

Dr. Jack Granatstein

Gen (Ret'd) Ray Henault*

Mr. Paul Hillier

ex Amb Claude Laverdure*

Mr. Arnav Manchanda

Col (Ret'd) Brian MacDonald*

LGen (Ret'd) George Macdonald*

Gen (Ret'd) Paul Manson*

BGen (Ret'd) Don Macnamara*

Ms. Meghan Spilka O'Keefe

Col (Ret'd) Alain Pellerin

Mr. David Perry

The Honourable Hugh Segal*

**Member of the Board of Directors of the CDA Institute*



PRÉFACE

Le *Cahier Vimy 2012* est fondamentalement différent de ses prédécesseurs de par l'ampleur du sujet qui y est abordé. Alors qu'il partage avec ces derniers le processus sous-jacent, qui consiste à réunir des experts pour donner au lecteur une synthèse quelque peu galvanisante de « sensibilisation situationnelle », ceux-là étaient, volontairement, concentrés sur un faisceau plus étroit. Avec la volatilité politique et économique substantielle à l'étranger, et la nature changeante des décisions que nous devons prendre, il a été décidé, cette année, d'appliquer l'approche « groupe d'experts » à un aperçu stratégique, d'où est issu le présent *Cahier Vimy : Les perspectives stratégiques du Canada*. Il revêt également un nouveau format.

La structure du *Cahier Vimy 2012* s'est imposée d'elle-même. Il s'ouvre par une revue des développements récents dans le monde de la sécurité internationale, suit avec une analyse des perspectives pour 2012, et se termine par quelques conclusions concernant les intérêts du Canada qui sont en jeu et ce qu'on devrait en faire. Très bientôt des communications additionnelles examineront de façon plus approfondie les participations majeures récentes, comme en Afghanistan et en Libye, l'aspect pangouvernemental, la transformation alliée et le cyberspace. Tout ça, dans le contexte de rigueur économique qui sévit dans l'ensemble du monde développé, d'où les morceaux sur l'approvisionnement et les budgets.

Le *Cahier Vimy 2012 : Les perspectives stratégiques du Canada* est écrit par Paul Chapin et George Petrolekas. Tous les deux ont joué des rôles pivots dans la rédaction et la production de l'étude de l'Institut de la CAD sur l'OTAN publiée en 2010, intitulée *La défense collective au 21e siècle : un point de vue canadien*. Ce nouveau document été produit avec l'aide d'un comité consultatif de l'Institut composé d'officiers militaires à la retraite, de diplomates, d'universitaires, de cadres d'entreprises et de dirigeants politiques.

Les vignettes biographiques des auteurs de ces études à venir reflètent le mélange de talents auxquels l'Institut est en mesure de faire appel. Ce sont tous des érudits qui n'ont plus à faire leurs preuves ; il s'agit d'une variété de collaborateurs venant des milieux militaires, diplomatiques, académiques et des affaires. Quelques-uns sont membres du conseil d'administration de l'Institut de la CAD, ce qui souligne la belle ressource de recherche que représente notre conseil d'une quarantaine de personnes. Mais un certain nombre de nos auteurs est constitué de jeunes chercheurs dans la fleur de l'âge et du métier, qui travaillent comme analystes pour l'Institut de la CAD, dont certains ont été aidés dans leur développement antérieur dans l'étude de la défense et de la sécurité par le programme du Forum sur la sécurité et la défense (FSD), financé par le MDN (maintenant en voie de suppression progressive), et/ou par l'Institut de la CAD lui-même.

L'Institut espère que le présent cahier stimulera et informera la discussion entourant la formulation des stratégies et des politiques. Il s'inscrit dans la continuité de la mission de l'Institut, qui est de réunir des praticiens reconnus de la sécurité et de la défense dans le but d'être pour les Canadiens et Canadiennes une voix indépendante et renseignée sur des questions qui ont de l'importance pour le Canada et les Canadiens et Canadiennes. Nous vous saurions gré de nous communiquer vos commentaires.

John Scott Cowan
Président, Institut de la Conférence des associations de la défense

Alain Pellerin, colonel (ret.)
Directeur exécutif, Institut de la Conférence des associations de la défense

février 2012



PREFACE

Vimy Paper 2012 is fundamentally different from its predecessors in the breadth of its topic. While it shares with those earlier works the underlying process of gathering together experts to provide the reader a somewhat galvanizing “situational awareness” synthesis, those works were more narrowly focused, by design. With substantial political and economic volatility abroad, and the changing nature of the decisions we must take, it was decided this year to apply the “group of experts” approach to a strategic overview, and hence this *Vimy Paper: The Strategic Outlook for Canada*. It is also appearing in a new format.

The structure of *Vimy Paper 2012* fell into place naturally. It leads with a review of recent developments in the international security environment, follows with an analysis of the outlook for 2012, and finishes with some conclusions about the Canadian interests at stake and what to do about them. Very shortly, there will be additional papers providing a deeper look at recent major involvements, such as Afghanistan and Libya, whole of government, allied transformation, and cyberspace. All this in the context of economic stringency throughout the developed world — hence pieces on procurement and on budgets.

Vimy Paper 2012: The Strategic Outlook for Canada is written by Paul Chapin and George Petrolekas, both of whom played pivotal roles in the writing and production of the CDA Institute’s 2010 NATO study *Collective Defence in the 21st Century: A Canadian Perspective*. It was produced with the help of an advisory committee of the Institute consisting of retired military officers, diplomats, academics, business executives and political leaders.

The thumbnail biographies of the authors of the forthcoming studies reflect the mix of talents on which the Institute is able to draw. All are proven scholars with a variety of military, diplomatic, academic and business backgrounds. A few are members of the Board of the Institute, underscoring what a fine research resource our nearly 40-person board is. A number, however, are up and coming young scholars working as analysts for the Institute, some of whom were assisted in their earlier development in the study of defence and security by the DND-funded Security and Defence Forum (SDF) program now being phased out, and/or by the CDA Institute itself.

The Institute hopes that the current paper stimulates and informs discussion on strategy and policy formulation. It is part of the Institute’s continuing mission to assemble acknowledged security and defence practitioners to provide Canadians with an independent and informed voice on issues which matter to Canada and Canadians. We welcome your feedback.

Dr. John Scott Cowan
President, Conference of Defence Associations Institute

Alain Pellerin, Colonel (Ret’d)
Executive Director, Conference of Defence Associations Institute

February 2012



SOMMAIRE

L'année 2011 a fait la preuve que l'on pouvait mobiliser une action collective pour débarrasser le monde de dictateurs et protéger la population civile. Mais ce faisant, se sont également révélés les défis omniprésents des engagements collectifs dans le contexte actuel des systèmes et structures internationaux. Les événements qui se sont produits au cours de l'année ont souligné plus que jamais la nécessité impérative du leadership américain; ils ont démontré à l'envi combien le monde est interconnecté au plan économique alors que la crise financière a déterminé les décisions en matière de sécurité et de défense.

Les Américains en ont assez de la guerre et sont profondément déçus du peu de résultats après tant d'efforts; en outre ils se sentent exploités par des alliés ingrats. Les discussions s'intensifient sur la façon de définir l'intérêt national et sur la mesure dans laquelle la sécurité des États-Unis exige la perte de vies et des dépenses considérables dans des endroits lointains. La montée en puissance d'une forme d'isolationnisme, alliée à la fragilité de l'économie vont obérer la liberté de manœuvre de l'administration américaine si, en 2012, elle souhaitait dépêcher dans un endroit quelconque des forces expéditionnaires importantes à moins que la sécurité du pays ne soit profondément menacée ou qu'une crise humanitaire ne soit catastrophique.

En Syrie, on voit une intervention internationale émerger comme une probabilité. Pour être le plus efficace, la résistance doit fusionner et tenir le terrain afin que le monde extérieur puisse l'aider à se défendre, comme ce fut le cas en Libye. Une certaine autorisation de légitimation est préférable, mais de plus en plus improbable. Étant donné l'étendue des meurtres sanctionnés par l'État, les nations individuelles vont devoir, sur la seule base de la morale, offrir des forces armées et déterminer le degré et la nature de l'intervention.

Le scénario le plus dangereux touche à l'Iran où les ayatollahs semblent sur le sentier d'un conflit possible. À moins que les sanctions ne réussissent ou que la théocratie révolutionnaire iranienne ne s'effondre, un conflit risque d'être inévitable. L'Iran a pris une très sérieuse option en faveur de l'arme nucléaire, le pays possède en outre une technologie de lancement de missiles avancée et il pourrait être à même de détonner une bombe atomique rudimentaire dans un proche avenir. Israël, estimant faire face à une menace existentielle, ne permettra pas à l'Iran d'y parvenir et sera prêt à agir seul.

Un autre scénario susceptible de provoquer un conflit en 2012 serait la renonciation par l'Égypte du traité de non-agression avec Israël, accompagnée d'une remilitarisation du Sinaï. L'Égypte a déjà rompu l'entente avec Israël qui prévoyait l'interdiction du passage des combattants et des armes du Hamas dans la bande de Gaza par le sud. Les Islamistes contrôlent deux tiers des sièges au parlement égyptien et certains d'entre eux ont évoqué la dénonciation du traité.

Enfin, en Corée du Nord le pays est dirigé par un « génie militaire » qui n'a pas encore fait ses preuves, on peut toujours s'attendre à une action d'éclat de la RDPC juste pour provoquer une guerre générale. On se doit d'espérer que les Chinois ne relâchent pas leur contrôle sur les Coréens du Nord. Mais tout est ambigu dès qu'il s'agit de la Chine. Le renforcement majeur des forces chinoises est en train de bouleverser l'ordre géopolitique de la région, ce qui a provoqué un réalignement américain vers l'Asie-Pacifique.

En raison de l'interconnexion de l'économie mondiale, le Canada n'est pas à l'abri des crises économiques ailleurs, surtout si un ralentissement de l'économie mondiale venait à provoquer des problèmes politiques et de sécurité. Les intérêts du Canada sont en jeu et il est grand temps que soit élaborée une stratégie d'ensemble qui prenne en compte l'évolution de la situation partout dans le monde et qui inspire nos décisions en matière de politique de sécurité et de défense.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The year 2011 demonstrated that collective action can be mobilized to rid the world of despots and protect the innocent, but it also revealed on-going challenges of collective engagement within present international systems and structures. Events offered graphic evidence of the continued need for US leadership, and showed how much the world is economically interconnected as the debt crisis drove decisions on security and defence.

Americans are war-weary, disappointed with what has been achieved at great expense, and feeling exploited by ungrateful allies. Debate is intensifying over how national interests should be defined and the degree to which the security of Americans requires expenditure of lives and treasure in faraway places. The rising mood of disengagement coupled with a fragile economy will make it very difficult for the Administration to send large forces anywhere in 2012 unless security interests are openly threatened or humanitarian need is overwhelming.

In Syria, an international intervention is emerging as a probability. To be most effective, the resistance must coalesce and hold ground which the outside world can help defend, as happened in Libya. Some legitimizing authorization is preferable but increasingly unlikely. Given the extent of state-sanctioned murder, individual nations, on a moral basis alone, will need to offer forces and determine the degree and nature of the intervention.

The most dangerous scenario involves Iran where the ayatollahs have set a course for hostilities. Unless sanctions succeed or the revolutionary theocracy in Tehran collapses, conflict is likely unavoidable. Iran is well along the road to developing a nuclear weapon, has advanced delivery technology, and in the near future may be able to detonate a rudimentary nuclear device. Israel, perceiving an existential threat, will not let the Iranians succeed, even if it has to act alone.

Another scenario with the potential for conflict in 2012 would be Egypt renouncing its 1979 non-aggression treaty with Israel and remilitarizing the Sinai. It has already breached an agreement with Israel to prevent Hamas fighters and weapons entering the Gaza Strip from the south. Islamists control two-thirds of the seats in the Egyptian parliament and some have called for action to undo the treaty.

Finally, with an untried “military genius” now at the helm, there is the possibility that a DPRK stunt designed merely to provoke precipitates a full-scale war. One hopes the Chinese do not lose their grip on the North Koreans. Ambiguity surrounds much of what the Chinese are up to. Their build-up of forces is transforming the geopolitics of the region and has contributed to an American “pivot” towards Asia-Pacific.

Because the global economy is so interconnected, Canada is not immune to economic crises elsewhere, especially if economic failure leads to political and security problems. Canada’s interests are at stake and it is time for an overall strategy to take account of developments across the globe and inform our decisions on security and defence policy.



AVANT-PROPOS

Les perspectives stratégiques du Canada jette un regard plutôt limité sur une toile de fond très vaste, mais la volatilité politique et économique substantielle qui règne sur le monde et la nature changeante des décisions qu'il faut prendre nous ont imposé un sens d'urgence lors de la confection de ce rapport préliminaire.

Le mot « stratégique » lui-même est un mot avec lequel les Canadiens se sentent mal à l'aise et qu'ils utilisent souvent mal à propos. Le Canada a rarement eu à s'impliquer dans la préparation d'une stratégie d'envergure (définie par Colin Gray comme « l'emploi à dessein de tous les instruments du pouvoir mis à la disposition d'une communauté de sécurité »). Historiquement, le Canada s'est impliqué dans des stratégies d'envergure en très large part par procuration, en laissant à d'autres le soin de prendre les devants, pour démontrer ensuite notre statut de souveraineté en décidant de nous joindre ou pas à des initiatives lancées par d'autres, et, ce faisant, en retenant un degré de contrôle sur la forme et l'étendue de notre participation, avec les contraintes que comporte cette attitude. Dans les vingt premières années qui ont suivi la fin de la Guerre froide, le Canada n'avait pas encore atteint un consensus, même modeste, sur une vision cohérente de ses intérêts d'alors, et encore moins sur une grande stratégie vouée à la promotion de ceux-ci. En fait, ce n'est que très récemment qu'il est devenu un peu à la mode de reconnaître que le Canada a des intérêts. La mythologie répandue précédente était que, n'étant pas une ancienne puissance coloniale, nous n'avions pas d'intérêts, et que notre rôle dans le monde était exclusivement de promouvoir les « valeurs canadiennes », lesquelles étaient, d'une certaine façon, préférables aux valeurs d'autres démocraties libérales. Ce point de vue plein de suffisance voulant que le Canada fût un phare important, altruiste, unique de compréhension civilisée – et adoré de tous – faisait chaud au cœur de beaucoup de Canadiens, et il n'était que légèrement plus tortueux que le point de vue opposé, celui d'une très vieille réalité devenue un mythe. Cet autre extrême, c'était le point de vue colonial pessimiste, pseudo-réaliste, que nous étions un pion semi-autonome qui devait servilement suivre à tous égards l'exemple de la grande puissance ou des grandes puissances auxquelles nous étions alliés. Ces mythes allaient à l'encontre d'un discours sérieux sur les sphères où se trouvaient nos véritables intérêts. Mais ce n'est plus le cas.

À ce qu'il semble, il y a du changement dans l'air. Le gouvernement majoritaire actuel parle facilement de nos « intérêts ». En même temps, beaucoup d'auteurs orientés sur l'histoire ont réanalysé nos actions des six dernières décennies et constitué un dossier éloquent disant que, même quand nous assumions des tâches apparemment altruistes, nous faisons aussi habituellement la promotion de nos intérêts. Bien sûr, certains experts en politique étrangère ont prétendu, à juste titre, que les deux idées concurrentes de l'implication du Canada dans le monde peuvent ne pas être aussi dichotomiques qu'il peut paraître, en ce qu'il y a une multitude de situations dans lesquelles la projection internationale des valeurs démocratiques libérales a beaucoup été dans notre intérêt. Un de nos espoirs, dans le présent volume, est que celui-ci va contribuer à une maturation de la façon dont nous nous voyons nous-mêmes sur la scène mondiale, et que les mythologies conflictuelles à œillères du passé ne vont pas continuer à tenir le haut du pavé dans la même mesure que précédemment.

En tentant de comprendre les enjeux qui entourent la défense et la sécurité aujourd'hui, on doit composer avec diverses nouvelles réalités de la vie. De plus en plus, un certain nombre d'enjeux clés ne restent pas confinés à une région. Plus que jamais auparavant la mondialisation dans le commerce et la finance a rattaché les unes aux autres les réalités économiques qui traversent l'ensemble du monde développé. Certaines des menaces physiques sont également difficiles à contenir géographiquement ou à attribuer à des États-nations particuliers, des jihad militants, parfois exprimés comme terrorisme, aux effets de vagues en provenance d'États faillis ou défaillants, comme en donnent l'exemple la piraterie émanant de l'Afrique de l'Est et s'étendant à travers l'océan Indien. Et, quel que soit le point de vue adopté, le changement climatique, et l'échelle des contributions anthropogéniques à sa rapidité de propagation, ne connaissent non plus aucune frontière, tout comme l'ensemble des questions connexes touchant à l'énergie.



FOREWORD

The Strategic Outlook for Canada is a rather compressed look at a very broad canvass, but worldwide and substantial political and economic volatility, and the changing nature of the required decisions gave us a sense of urgency in fashioning this preliminary report.

The very word “strategic” is an uncomfortable one for Canadians, and oft misused. Rarely has Canada had real involvement in developing grand strategy (defined by Colin Gray as the “purposeful employment of all instruments of power available to a security community”). Historically, Canada has done grand strategy largely by proxy, letting others lead and then demonstrating our sovereign status by deciding whether or not to join initiatives launched by others, and, when doing so, by retaining a degree of control over the form and extent of our participation, and the attendant constraints. In the first twenty years after the end of the Cold War, Canada had not yet reached even a modest consensus on a cohesive vision of its contemporary interests, let alone a grand strategy to further them. Indeed, it is only very recently that it has become somewhat fashionable to acknowledge that Canada has interests. The previous pervasive mythology was that, not being a former colonial power, Canada had no interests, and its role in the world was exclusively to promote “Canadian Values”, which were somehow to be preferred over the values of the other liberal democracies. This self-aggrandizing view that Canada was an important, selfless, unique beacon of civilized understanding, and beloved by all, made many Canadians feel good, and it was only slightly more loopy than the competing view, a very old reality that had become a myth. That other extreme was the pessimist/pseudo-realist colonial view that Canada was a semi-autonomous bit player that had to slavishly follow in every respect the lead of the great power or powers with which it was allied. These myths militated against serious discourse about where our real interests lie. But no more!

Change, it seems, is in the wind. The present majority government speaks easily of our “interests.” At the same time, many historically oriented writers have re-analyzed our actions of the past six decades and made a telling case that even when we took on apparently selfless tasks, we were also usually furthering our interests. Indeed, some foreign policy experts have argued, to good effect, that the two competing ideas of Canada’s involvement in the world may not be all that much of a dichotomy, in that there have been a multitude of situations in which the international projection of liberal democratic values has been very much in our interest. One of our hopes for this paper is that it will contribute to the maturing of the way we view ourselves on the world stage, and that the competing blinkered mythologies of the past won’t continue to hold sway to the same extent.

In trying to make sense of the issues surrounding defence and security today, one must accommodate various new facts of life. Increasingly, a number of the key issues don’t stay confined regionally. Globalization in trade and finance has tied together the economic realities across the entire developed world as never before. Some physical threats are also not easily confined geographically or attributed to specific nation states either, from militant jihad, sometimes expressed as terrorism, to the ripple effects from failed and failing states, as exemplified by piracy concerns extending from East Africa across the Indian Ocean. And regardless of one’s take on climate change and the scale of anthropogenic contributions to its rate, it also has no borders, and neither do all the attendant energy issues.

To a greater extent than ever before, political decisions on issues of defence and security also rest on an underpinning of complicated and uncertain science, whether that science is economics, climate science, nuclear engineering, aeronautics, biological sciences, medicine or information technology. But science and politics are uncomfortable travelling companions, and always have been.

Distortions of science by the political process are inevitable, even in the most open and democratic systems, because they are inherently different processes and reach conclusions or decisions by entirely different methodologies. Ideally, in science, there is a process of continuous refinement, building on past established data and facts, with experimentation, confirmation, open verification and civil discourse. In politics, with all the best will in the world, the competition for media attention and popular support produces tactical exaggeration, incomplete discourse, huge oversimplification, transient effects, short



Dans une plus large mesure que jamais auparavant, les décisions politiques sur les questions de défense et de sécurité reposent également sur un fond de science compliquée et incertaine, que cette science soit l'économie, la climatologie, le génie nucléaire, l'aéronautique, les sciences biologiques, la médecine ou la technologie de l'information. Mais la science et la politique font de mauvais compagnons de voyage, et l'ont toujours été.

Les distorsions de la science par le processus politique sont inévitables, même dans les systèmes les plus ouverts et les plus démocratiques, parce qu'il s'agit de processus différents en soi, qui arrivent à des conclusions ou des décisions par des méthodologies entièrement différentes. Idéalement, en science, il y a un processus de raffinement continu, qui s'appuie sur les données et les faits passés établis, avec expérimentation, confirmation, vérification ouverte et discours civil. En politique, avec toute la meilleure volonté du monde, la concurrence pour l'attention des médias et l'appui populaire produit une exagération tactique, un discours fragmentaire, une sursimplification à outrance, des effets transitoires, une mémoire courte, un partisanerie intense et une convergence seulement quand c'est absolument nécessaire, et, même alors, pas toujours. En surimposition à tout ça on trouve les complications du secret, parfois nécessaire, particulièrement là où il s'agit de questions de défense nationale, de sécurité ou même du bien-être général de l'État, et parfois tout simplement voulu par le gouvernement pour éviter la complexité et l'embarras dans l'arène politique. Il n'est donc pas surprenant que beaucoup d'avocats et relativement peu de scientifiques se retrouvent au parlement, et que la sphère politique puisse involontairement faire violence à la science à des fins politiques.

Et ça, c'est le meilleur de l'histoire. Ce qui est encore pire, c'est que l'histoire déborde d'exemples de régimes répressifs qui ont fait de la mauvaise science la servante de leurs fins idéologiques. Même au cours du siècle dernier, la science nazie a épouvanté l'humanité, pendant que Staline mobilisait le potentiel du travail frauduleux de Trofim Lysenko pour créer une fable nocive qui allait à contre-courant de la génétique moderne.

Il arrive que le public se fasse bourrer de mauvaise science pour une bonne raison, comme pendant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, quand le lien, biochimiquement plausible mais faux, entre la consommation de carottes et l'amélioration de la vision nocturne fut largement disséminé par les autorités du Royaume-Uni comme ruse de sécurité pour expliquer facilement le succès des chasseurs de nuit britanniques, alors secrètement équipés de radar aéroporté, contre les bombardiers allemands. Combien d'entre nous ont été élevés à se faire dire : « Mange tes carottes ; c'est bon pour la vue » ?

Et même les « bons » gouvernements peuvent avoir leur scientifiques préférés et leur science préférée. Dans les Godkin Lectures, à Harvard, en 1960, le physicien et auteur C.P. Snow a raconté le détail de la querelle du temps de guerre, en Grande-Bretagne, entre des conseillers scientifiques clés Sir Henry Tizard et Frederick Lindemann (Lord Cherwell). Publié un an plus tard sous le titre « Science and Government », son discours est persuasif et révèle à quel point même les gouvernements démocratiques manipulent inévitablement mal les connaissances et les opinions scientifiques sur les questions de défense ou de sécurité, spécialement quand il y a une nécessité de secret. Et 60 ans plus tard, l'échec des services de renseignements américains sur la question des armes de destruction massive en Iraq souligne comment, dans un environnement nécessairement secret, l'évidence et l'opinion collaborent de façon si étroite qu'on a de la difficulté à les démêler.

Clairement, une bonne partie du difficile arrimage entre la science et le gouvernement tient au besoin occasionnel, et au désir pas mal plus fréquent, de secret de la part du gouvernement. Les délais et le manque de candeur de la Chine dans l'affaire du SRAS, et des temporisations et de litotes semblables pendant des accidents nucléaires utilisées par l'Union soviétique au moment de Chernobyl, et, à un moindre degré, mais pas au degré zéro, par le Japon sur Fukushima Daiichi étaient sans doute voulus, en premier lieu, par ces gouvernements pour les protéger de l'embarras et, peut-être, pour être mélioratifs en vue de prévenir la panique, même si, objectivement, ces façons de faire ont causé du tort en retardant les réactions appropriées à grande échelle.

Mais l'incapacité de la plupart des gouvernements d'assumer la science ne tient pas seulement au retard et à la sous-réaction ; les sur-réactions politiques, bien que moins fréquentes, se produisent



memory, intense partisanship, and convergence only when absolutely necessary, and not always even then. Overlaid on all that are the complications of secrecy, sometimes needed, especially where issues of national defence, security or even general well-being of the state are concerned, and sometimes merely desired by government to avert complexity and embarrassment in the political arena. So it is unsurprising that plenty of lawyers and relatively few scientists end up in parliament, and that the political sphere may unintentionally abuse science for political purposes.

And that's the best of it. Worse yet, history is replete with examples of repressive regimes making bad science serve ideological purposes. Even within the past century, Nazi science appalled humanity, while Stalin harnessed the fraudulent work of Trofim Lysenko to create a noxious fable running counter to modern genetics.

Sometimes the public is fed bad science for a good reason, as during the Second World War, when the biochemically plausible but untrue link between consuming carrots and improving night vision was widely circulated by UK authorities as a security ruse to explain away the success of British night fighters, by then secretly equipped with airborne radar, against German bombers. How many of us were brought up being told, "Eat your carrots, it's good for your vision"?

And even "good" governments can have their favourite scientists and their preferred science. In the Godkin Lectures at Harvard in 1960, physicist and writer C. P. Snow detailed the wartime feud in Britain between key science advisors Sir Henry Tizard and Frederick Lindemann (Lord Cherwell). Published as "Science and Government" a year later, his discourse is persuasive about how badly even democratic governments inevitably handle scientific knowledge and opinion on questions of defence or security, especially when secrecy is required. And 60 years on, the US intelligence failures over weapons of mass destruction in Iraq underscore how, in a necessarily secret environment, evidence and opinion link arms so tightly that they are hard to disentangle.

Clearly a good part of the uneasy fit between science and government hinges upon the occasional need for, and the rather more frequent desire for, secrecy by government. China's delays and lack of candour over SARS, and similar temporizing and understatement during nuclear accidents by the Soviet Union at the time of Chernobyl, and to a lesser but non-zero extent by Japan over Fukushima Daiichi were doubtless intended in the first instance by those governments to protect them from embarrassment and perhaps to be ameliorative by preventing panic, but objectively did harm by delaying the appropriate full-scale responses.

But the inability of most governments to cope with science is not only about delay and under-reaction; political overreactions, while less frequent, do occur as well, especially with anything which sounds scary, whether it is or not. For example, in the nuclear energy field, a venting of a trivial amount of a relatively short lived and weak beta-emitter like tritium is often spun and then reacted to as if it were a near-meltdown.

Canada has no immunity from the science and government conundrum. In the early 1960's the Liberal decision to accept four separate American nuclear weapons systems for use by the RCAF and the Canadian Army under dual key arrangements with the US was justified by quite out-of-date science and strategic thinking that largely had just gone out of fashion in the US at the moment we came on board, but the decision suited us politically for a brief period.

Today Canada faces a broad range of near-term questions that bear hugely on defence and security, and a goodly number are underpinned by the sort of scientific complexities that tend to befuddle governments. Some examples are:

1. What additional WMD proliferation risks are posed by Iran's nuclear ambitions? How close is Iran to a weapon? Is Iranian rhetoric about wiping out Israel to be believed, or, perhaps more cogently, can one justify discounting it? Will Iranian devices find their way into the hands of non-state extreme Islamist groups in the same way other Iranian weapons do, and over what time scale? And what about possible transfer to other actors of devices made by Pakistan or North Korea? What are current risks from dirty



également, particulièrement avec tout ce qui a l'air effrayant, à juste titre ou à tort. Par exemple, dans le domaine de l'énergie nucléaire, l'évacuation d'une quantité triviale d'un émetteur bêta, relativement faible et de courte durée de vie, comme le tritium, est souvent manipulée comme s'il s'agissait d'une quasi-fusion de réacteur, avec la réaction conséquente.

Le Canada n'échappe pas à l'énigme de la science et du gouvernement. Au début des années 1960, la décision des libéraux d'accepter quatre systèmes séparés d'armes nucléaires américaines pour utilisation par l'ARC et l'Armée canadienne en vertu du système de double clé avec les É.-U. a été justifiée par une science et une pensée stratégique passablement désuètes qui venaient tout juste de largement passer de mode aux É.-U. au moment où nous sommes montés à bord, mais la décision a fait politiquement notre affaire pendant une brève période.

Aujourd'hui, le Canada fait face à une vaste gamme de questions à court terme qui portent lourdement sur la défense et la sécurité, et un bon nombre sont soutenues par la sorte de complexités scientifiques qui ont tendance à embrouiller les gouvernements. En voici quelques exemples :

1. Quels risques additionnels d'ADM sont posés par les ambitions nucléaires de l'Iran ? À quelle distance dans le temps l'Iran est-il d'une arme ? Doit-on croire à la rhétorique de l'Iran concernant l'anéantissement d'Israël, ou, peut-être plus pertinemment, peut-on justifier la décision de ne pas faire crédit à cette menace ? Les engins iraniens vont-ils se retrouver dans les mains de groupes islamistes extrémistes non étatiques de la même façon que d'autres armes iraniennes, et sur quelle échelle temporelle ? Et qu'en est-il du transfert possible à d'autres acteurs d'engins fabriqués par le Pakistan ou la Corée du Nord ? Quels sont les risques présents provenant de bombes sales, d'armes chimiques et biologiques, et comment ces technologies évoluent-elles ?

2. Comment controns-nous les menaces cybernétiques ? Quels changements juridiques sont nécessaires pour des mesures actives, par opposition aux mesures seulement passives ? Quelle recherche est critique pour garder une avance sur ces menaces ?

3. Dans quelle mesure les points de vues extrêmes des débuts sur le changement climatique ont-ils convergé vers un terrain d'entente ? Quels sont les meilleurs estimateurs des échelles temporelles pour traiter des enjeux de souveraineté dans un Arctique plus ouvert ? Dans quelle mesure et avec quelle rapidité les questions de changement climatique produiront-elles des migrations humaines plus étendues que celles qu'on voit maintenant, et comment nos attitudes en matière de défense et de sécurité seront-elles affectées par ces instabilités ?

4. Quelles pandémies nous guettent à l'horizon ? De quelles préparatifs, tant dans le domaine scientifique que celui des politiques et des lois, avons-nous besoin pour être raisonnablement préparés aux risques de pandémies en général ?

5. Pouvons-nous prédire les modèles économiques à venir ? Combien de coupures budgétaires sont nécessaires, et pour combien de temps ? La science sinistre est-elle capable de rester à la hauteur des esprits inventifs de ceux qui donnent aux investissements des formes d'emballage étranges ?

6. Avons-nous une taxonomie correcte des menaces ? Y a-t-il des menaces substantielles que nous n'avons pas prévues ? Sommes-nous en train de commettre l'erreur habituelle de faire des extrapolations à partir seulement du passé le plus récent, et d'assumer que les menaces se ressembleront ? Par ailleurs, avons-nous rigoureusement tiré du passé récent toutes les bonnes leçons que nous pouvons ?

Il est presque possible de répondre maintenant à beaucoup de ces questions, mais plusieurs d'entre elles vont nécessiter des années de recherche additionnelle pour trouver une réponse adéquate et, peut-être encore des années après, pour pénétrer pleinement notre conscience politique. Parfois ce travail retombe sur ceux qui ne s'y attendent pas. Par exemple, l'approvisionnement de défense joute tous les jours ces problèmes à base scientifique, avec toutes les incertitudes attenantes qui y sont contenues. Il en a toujours été ainsi quand on s'apprête à acheter une chose qui n'existe pas encore, mais l'intensification technologique d'aujourd'hui accroît encore la difficulté du processus.



bombs, chemical and biological weapons, and how are these technologies evolving?

2. How do we counter cyber threats? What legal changes are needed for active, as opposed to merely passive measures? What research is critical to keep ahead of those threats?

3. To what extent have the early extreme opposing views on rates of climate change converged on a middle ground? What are the best estimators of time scales for dealing with sovereignty issues in a more open arctic? To what extent and how quickly will climate change issues produce human migrations more extensive than those being seen now, and how will our defence and security postures be affected by these instabilities?

4. What pandemics are on the horizon? What preparations, both scientifically and in the policy and legal domain, do we need to be reasonably prepared for pandemic risks in general?

5. Can we predict future economic patterns? How much budget cutting is needed, and for how long? Can the dismal science keep up with the inventive minds of those who package investments in weird forms?

6. Do we have a correct threat taxonomy? Are there substantial threats we have not foreseen? Are we making the usual mistake of extrapolating from only the most recent past, and assuming threats will be similar? On the other hand, have we extracted all the good lessons we can from the recent past?

Some questions are nearly answerable now, but most will need years of work to be answered adequately, and possibly years more to fully penetrate our political consciousness. Sometimes that work falls upon those who do not expect it. For example, defence procurement abuts against these science-based problems every day, with all of the attendant uncertainties inherent therein. It was always thus, when setting out to buy a thing which does not yet exist, but technological intensification now just makes it harder.

Still and all, in the end, government must and will decide both the level and the emphasis of its support for Canadian capabilities in defence and security. And it will need to do so with an imperfect grasp of what is also imperfect science and imperfect prediction. But certain underlying verities ought to encourage government to stretch itself, even in times of economic constraint, to keep those capabilities robust.

It is an immutable truth that the first purpose of government is the defence and security of the state and of its people. Fail in that, and no other duty of the state retains meaning. So this is one insurance premium it is unwise to skimp on.

But government will be sorely tempted to do just that. Canada and Canadians have performed admirably in recent conflicts abroad, and we have been fortunate as well in avoiding or countering certain threats at home. In expeditionary operations the Canadian Forces have been seen to be amongst the most effective, and have been hugely praised by our allies. Domestic operations have also gone well, with smooth cooperation between the CF and a wide range of first responders or other agencies tasked with various security and risk mitigation roles. It would not then be surprising if, within government, there developed a certain tendency to rest upon our laurels. It is only natural.

But even in the face of our successes, those who achieved them in the field invariably observe that we have, to a degree, been fortunate in our opponents. Those in the know have pointed out that, when we have faced human opponents, however determined, courageous or ruthless, those opponents have been inconsistently expert, poorly trained, poorly equipped and poorly supplied. A wise Canada will understand that it cannot rely forever on the incompetence or poverty of its opponents.

Dr. John Scott Cowan
President, Conference of Defence Associations Institute



Toutefois, au bout du compte, le gouvernement doit et va décider à la fois du niveau et de l'intensité de son appui pour les capacités canadiennes en matière de défense et de sécurité. Et il devra le faire avec une appréhension imparfaite de ce qui est aussi une science imparfaite et une prédiction imparfaite. Mais certaines vérités sous-jacentes devraient encourager le gouvernement à faire un effort de plus, même en des temps de contraintes économiques, pour garder à ces capacités leur robustesse.

C'est une vérité immuable que le but premier du gouvernement est la défense et la sécurité de l'État et de son peuple. S'il y manque, aucun autre devoir de l'État ne continue à avoir un sens. C'est donc une prime d'assurance sur laquelle il est peu sage de lésiner.

Mais le gouvernement sera douloureusement tenté de faire justement ça. Le Canada, les Canadiens et Canadiennes se sont conduits admirablement bien dans les récents conflits à l'étranger, et nous avons aussi eu la bonne fortune d'éviter ou de contrer certaines menaces ici même sur notre sol. Dans les opérations expéditionnaires les Forces canadiennes ont été vues comme parmi les plus efficaces, et elles ont été grandement louangées par nos alliés. Les opérations intérieures se sont aussi bien déroulées, avec une coopération sans heurt entre les FC et une large gamme de premiers intervenants ou autres organismes chargés de divers rôles de sécurité et d'atténuation des risques. L'on ne devrait pas être surpris si, au sein du gouvernement, on a développé une certaine tendance à s'asseoir sur ses lauriers. Ce n'est que naturel.

Mais même à la face de nos réussites, ceux qui en sont les responsables sur le terrain notent invariablement que nous avons, jusqu'à un certain degré, été fortunés dans nos adversaires. Ceux qui savent ont montré que, quand nous avons affronté des adversaires humains, quels qu'aient été leur détermination, leur courage ou leur impitoyabilité, ceux-ci ont été experts de façon incohérente, mal entraînés, mal équipés et mal approvisionnés. Un Canada sage va comprendre qu'il ne peut pas éternellement s'en remettre à l'incompétence ou à la pauvreté de ses adversaires.

John Scott Cowan

Président, Institut de la Conférence des associations de la défense



NOTABLE EVENTS IN 2011

JANUARY

14 - Confronted with a popular movement which unleashes unrest across the Arab world, Tunisia's president Ben Ali flees the country after 23 years in power. The UN reports some 300 were killed in the unrest.

21 - Three people die and hundreds lose power after a winter storm strikes the Maritime Provinces.

24 - Quebec goes through a cold snap and Hydro-Québec registers a record consumption of electricity reaching 38,200 megawatts at 7:30 A.M.

FEBRUARY

11 - In Egypt, with massive crowds filling the central Tahrir Square in Cairo, leader Hosni Mubarak becomes the next Arab leader to step down handing over power to the military. Nearly 850 civilians are killed in the revolt. Mubarak, who had been in power since 1981, went on trial in August.

14 - The latest country to join what was dubbed the Arab Spring, Bahrain, is struck with protests calling for political reforms. Saudi Arabia sends troops and the protests are crushed by mid-March. Around 30 people die in the repression.

15-16 - A rebellion erupts in Benghazi, Libya's second-biggest city, against the 42-year-old regime of Muammar Gaddafi. The opposition creates the National Transitional Council, which is recognized by the UN and over 60 countries.

19 - An explosion ruptures the Trans-Canada Pipeline in Beardmore, Ontario, forcing the evacuation of the community.

22 - In New Zealand's city of Christchurch, a devastating 6.3 temblor kills just over 200 people.

24 - Minister of Foreign Affairs Lawrence Cannon announces arrangements for Canadians in Libya to leave the country. The government orders a CC-177 Globemaster strategic airlifter based at Spangdahlem, Germany, to divert to Rome to stand by for a non-combatant evacuation operation (NEO).

26 - Irish Prime Minister Brian Cowen becomes the first political victim of the financial crisis rattling the Eurozone after his ruling Fianna Fail party was crushed by voters angry over the economy and an EU/IMF bailout. He was followed out of office in March by Portuguese premier José Sócrates.

27 - Prime Minister Stephen Harper announces that Canada will impose sanctions on Libya additional to those authorized by the UN, including asset freezes and a ban on financial transactions with the Libyan government.

MARCH

2 - HMCS Charlottetown (FFH 339) with a crew of 240 leaves Halifax for Libya to lend humanitarian assistance.

11 - A massive earthquake and tsunami devastate northeastern Japan, leaving 25,000 people dead or missing and unleashing a nuclear crisis at the Fukushima plant, the worst since the 1986 Chernobyl disaster.



MARCH (continued)

15 - Syria becomes the next Arab country to face popular protests, which were put down heavily by the security forces. More than 5,000 people died in the following months of unrest according to the UN. The regime of President Bashar al-Assad faced international pressure over the repression and Syria is later suspended from the Arab League.

15 - An *Operation Attention* theatre activation team is deployed to Kabul to prepare the next stage of Canada's military engagement in Afghanistan.

19 - The Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Chief of the Defence Staff attend a meeting in Paris with leaders from France, Britain, the Arab League and the UN to discuss the Libyan crisis.

19 - A coalition joint task force including Canada, led by US Africa Command under *Operation Odyssey Dawn* launches air operations to enforce a no-fly zone over Libya to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas pursuant to UNSCR 1973.

25 - The conservative government in Canada is defeated on a non-confidence vote by the opposition and a general election was called.

27 - NATO assumes responsibility for air and sea operations against Libya under *Operation Unified Protector*. Command authority is vested in LGen Charles Bouchard of Canada at 0600 hrs GMT on 31 March.

APRIL

11 - The fourth president of the Ivory Coast Laurent Gbagbo is arrested by troops loyal to the fifth president Alassane Ouattara after a disputed election and a brief civil war. In November Gbagbo was transferred to the International Criminal Court in the Hague.

MAY

2 - The 41st federal election is held with the Conservative Party winning a majority government. For the first time, the NDP becomes the official opposition and the Green Party elects its first member to the House.

2 - Al-Qaeda chief Osama bin Laden, responsible for the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States, is shot dead by US commandos in Pakistan after a 10-year manhunt.

5 - The Canadian Forces arrive to aid with the flooding in Quebec caused by the Richelieu River overflowing its banks.

9 - The Canadian Forces deploy to aid with flooding in Manitoba.

14 - IMF chief Dominique Strauss-Kahn, a high-profile figure in French politics and global economics, resigns after being accused of sexual misconduct in New York. The charges are later dismissed, but his presidential ambitions are ruined.

15-16 - Wildfires destroy a large section of Slave Lake, Alberta forcing 7,000 residents to evacuate with assistance of the Canadian Forces.

17 - Demonstrations against government austerity measures begin in Spain. They spread to other countries with tens of thousands demonstrating around the world on October 15.

26 - Serbia finally finds and arrests Ratko Mladic, Europe's most wanted man responsible *inter alia* for the Srebrenica massacre in 1995. He is later transferred to the Hague for trial.



JUNE

15 - In mid-June, the government commences its Deficit Reduction Action Plan (DRAP) aimed at cutting most government department base budgets by 5%. The target is raised to 10% in the fall.

22 - US President Barack Obama announces that 33,000 US troops will be brought home from Afghanistan by mid-2012. A week earlier, NATO had begun the process of transferring security responsibilities to Afghan troops.

JULY

9 - South Sudan proclaims independence after a January referendum in which almost 99% voted in favour of secession. The new country becomes the UN's 193rd member state.

21 - The US space shuttle *Atlantis* cruises home for a final time closing a 30-year chapter in American space exploration.

21 - Eurozone leaders agree on a second bailout for Greece worth 159 billion euros (\$215 billion) in a bid to prevent that country from going bankrupt and the contagion spreading throughout the EU currency zone.

22 - 77 people are killed in a massive twin bombing and shooting spree in Norway. The culprit, Anders Behring Breivik, is later judged insane.

25 - The leader of the Official Opposition, Jack Layton, takes a medical leave of absence and an interim leader of the New Democratic Party is appointed.

26 - Prime Minister Harper announces that Canada is imposing sanctions on Iran under the Special Economic Measures Act (SEMA), in addition to existing sanctions passed under the United Nations Act. The new sanctions are imposed because Iran has violated its international obligations by ignoring successive UN Security Council resolutions to cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and suspend its enrichment-related activities.

30 - Canada's combat mission in Kandahar is officially ended.

AUGUST

2 - After a weeks-long battle, the US Congress agrees on a massive austerity plan and raises the US debt ceiling. On August 6, however, Standard and Poor's cuts the US credit rating from its top-flight triple-A for the first time in history.

4 - The police shooting of a 29-year-old black man in Tottenham, in north London, provokes rioting in the capital and elsewhere. Across England, five people are killed and hundreds of shops looted, with some set alight.

4-26 - Canada Command, the military command responsible for all routine and contingency operations in Canada and continental North America, conducts *Operation Nanook* in the far north. The exercise is a joint (Navy, Army, Air Force and Special Forces), integrated (working with whole-of-government partners) and combined (multi-national) operation, which simulates a response to a major air disaster and a maritime rescue event in the Northwest Passage.

13 - The federal government extends trade, travel and assets sanctions against Syria, in response to the oppression of anti-government protests.

16 - The government announces that Maritime Command, Land Force Command and Air Command are to be renamed the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army, and the Royal Canadian Air Force, respectively.



AUGUST (continued)

20 - First Air Flight 6560 crashes near Resolute Bay killing 12 people and injuring three others. The Canadian Forces provide first response and save three.

22 - Jack Layton dies of cancer. A state funeral is held for him August 27.

23 - An earthquake, originating in the state Virginia, is felt in a wide area of Canada from Sudbury to Fredericton. There are no injuries or damage in Canada.

25 - A leaked report, commissioned by DND and conducted by LGen Andrew Leslie, suggests internal efficiencies and savings can be achieved by cutting full time reserve positions, contractors and civilian staff, and merging command HQs.

SEPTEMBER

20 - Afghanistan's former president, Burhanuddin Rabbani, who has been tasked with finding a peace deal with the Taliban, is assassinated

23 - Palestinian leader Mahmud Abbas unsuccessfully asks the United Nations to admit the state of Palestine. On October 31, however, Palestinians win entry to UNESCO, prompting the US to cut the organisation's funding.

OCTOBER

7 - The Nobel Peace Prize is awarded to Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Liberian "peace warrior" Leymah Gbowee, and Yemen's Arab Spring activist Tawakkul Karman.

17 - Following reports of an Iranian-coordinated plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States, Canada imposes further sanctions against Iran, adding to the list of persons named in Schedule 1 of the SEMA Regulations the names of the five members of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps suspected of orchestrating the plot.

20 - Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi is found and killed after forces from the country's new rulers seize his hometown of Sirte after a seven-month-long campaign. On October 23, the new rulers declare that Libya has been liberated.

21 - President Barack Obama announces that 39,000 US forces will be withdrawn from Iraq by the end of the 2011 - after a nearly nine-year campaign and 4,400 casualties.

23 - A 7.2 magnitude earthquake in eastern Turkey kills more than 600 people.

23 - In Tunisia, the reportedly moderate Islamists of the Ennahda party win 89 of the 217 seats in the country's new constituent assembly.

27 - EU leaders reach a ground-breaking deal to save the bloc's single currency, which includes a new rescue of Greece, a trillion-euro bailout fund, and a deal squeezing banks to share the burden of the two-year debt crisis.

31 - The world's population is estimated to pass the seven billion mark this week.

31 - *Operation Mobile*, the Canadian Forces contribution to the NATO force in Libya, stands down.



NOVEMBER

6 - Greek Socialist Prime Minister George Papandreou agrees to stand down amid a crippling debt crisis. He is succeeded by Lucas Papademos, the former vice-president of the European Central Bank.

8 - The IAEA reports “serious concerns” about Iran’s nuclear activities. It says it has “credible” information Tehran may have worked on developing atomic weapons, prompting the West to reinforce sanctions against the Islamic republic.

12 - In Italy, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi becomes the latest leader to lose his job over the euro-zone financial crisis, resigning amid Italy’s 1.9 trillion-euro debt burden. He is replaced by technocrat Mario Monti, who vows to balance the Italian budget by 2013.

19 - A week of clashes begins in Egypt between police and demonstrators opposed to the military regime. The clashes leave 42 dead.

21 - Canada joins the US and Britain in imposing new sanctions on Iran. The sanctions prohibit financial transactions with Iran, expand the list of prohibited goods to include all goods used in the petrochemical, oil and gas industry in Iran, amend the list of prohibited goods to include additional items that could be used in Iran’s nuclear program, and add new individuals and entities to the list of designated persons found in Schedule 1 of the SEMA regulations.

23 - After months of deadly clashes in Yemen, President Ali Abdullah Saleh signs a deal to hand over his powers after 33 years in office.

26 - The US space agency’s rover, *Curiosity*, blasts off on a nearly nine-month journey to Mars where it will search for signs that life once existed on the Red Planet.

28 - Downtown Bangkok is successfully defended from inundation during Thailand’s worst floods in decades. The toll includes at least 666 killed and damage to millions of homes and livelihoods.

29 - The British embassy in Tehran is attacked by protesters angry at fresh sanctions against Tehran’s nuclear programme. Britain expels Iranian diplomats and shuts its embassy in response.

DECEMBER

5 - France and Germany call for a rewrite of the EU treaty to set uniform tough budget standards across the eurozone, as S&P threatens sweeping ratings downgrades if Europeans fail to act to end the euro-zone debt crisis.

14 - Islamists trounce their liberal rivals in the opening phase of Egypt’s first election since the fall of Mubarak, with one in four voters choosing hardline Salafists.

16 - Canada amends and updates the list of persons whose assets are subject to freezing under the Freezing Assets of Corrupt Foreign Officials (Tunisia and Egypt) Regulations.

23 - Canada imposes further sanctions against Syria under SEMA in response to the Syrian government’s ongoing and escalating repression of civilians. The new measures further expand Canada’s targeted sanctions against the Syrian regime and those who provide it support.



THE YEAR IN REVIEW

*Often do the spirits of great events stride on before the events,
And in today already walks tomorrow.*

Samuel Taylor Coleridge

The year 2011 marked the anniversaries of the two events which have most shaped the international security environment of our times: the end of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the terrorist attacks of 2001. Events which will rank forever as transformative moments in world history.

Lessons of the times

The year demonstrated that collective action can be mobilized in ridding the world of despots and protecting the innocent (Libya), but it also revealed the difficulties and limits of collective engagement (Syria and Iran) within the present systems and structures that govern the international order. North Korea embarked on a third generation of Kim family misrule, providing a graphic illustration of how rock-hard some problems really are.

The year saw the end of a long-standing engagement in Iraq and the beginning of the end of the Afghanistan commitment, demonstrating the challenges inherent in expeditionary operations. Events offered graphic evidence of the continued need for US leadership and raised questions about how Western democracies fulfil their responsibilities for international peace and security. The year clearly showed how the world is economically interconnected, as European debt crises and an American-led recession drove decisions on security and defence structures in many nations.

Unexpectedly, allies found themselves immersed in a conflict in North Africa resulting from the political dust-storm which had blown across the region and toppled several long-entrenched dictators. When the worst of them made the mistake of publicly threatening vengeance against his people, international intervention to protect those people became unavoidable – though the UN Security Council stipulated the population could only be protected from the skies and from offshore. It was a stipulation most nations agreed with, wary of any action that could lead to deeper and longer term engagement. But if the higher-end estimates of tens of thousands killed is anywhere near true, the Libyan campaign could hardly have been what the framers of the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect had in mind. Further east, the dictator of Syria continued to murder thousands with impunity.

Dramatic as developments were in Libya and Syria, they will be of little strategic consequence compared to what might happen in Egypt and Iran. Egypt has the largest Arab population in the world (82 million), sits astride the vital Suez Canal, and largely determines whether there will be war or peace in the Middle East. Having been run by military strongmen since 1952, it entered a period of political promise in 2011. A military governing council was taking the most tentative steps towards democracy, but in the background loomed the prospect of radical Islamist elements seeking to assume power – and undo the 1979 non-aggression treaty with Israel. In Iran, a defiant government took the region several steps closer to hostilities as more evidence emerged of the progress Tehran has made in developing a nuclear weapon.

At home, Canadians elected a majority Conservative government for the first time since 1988. One factor was an economy strong enough to help them ride out the worst of the global financial crisis. The Harper government declared its intention to pursue an interests-based international security policy, but was forthright that cuts to planned defence spending were unavoidable if the public accounts were to be brought back into balance in the near term. To that end, in addition to the Strategic Operating Review it had already launched, the government instituted a Deficit Reduction Action Plan (DRAP) in June of 2011 aimed at cutting 5% from most government departments. However, the sluggish growth of the economy and gloomier longer-term forecasts forced Ottawa in the fall to raise the target of its expenditure cuts to 10%. Cumulatively, we foresee that defence cuts will be in the order of 15%, and there will be additional effects from cuts to security-related departments such as CSIS, the RCMP, the Canadian Coast Guard and the Canada Border Services Agency.



HIGHLIGHTS OF 2011:

- The Soviet Union was confined to history 20 years ago, but Vladimir Putin's announcement in 2011 that he would run again for the presidency along with a parliamentary election rife with ballot fraud demonstrated how precarious is democracy's hold on Russia. Combined with an uncompromising foreign policy illustrated by its recalcitrance on Syria and tepid response to the emerging Iranian crisis, and with fast growing military expenditures, Russia is back as a problem.
- Ten years after 9/11, jihadists continued to wage their "low intensity" war but with diminishing returns. With no recent successful jihadi operations in North America, Europe or Asia, the "war on terrorism" was mostly being waged in the Middle East, parts of Africa and South Asia. Osama Bin Laden, Anwar al-Awlaki, Fazul Abdullah Mohammed and others terrorist notables were hunted down and killed, and much of Al Qaeda's support network hobbled.
- In Afghanistan, progress remained slow but steady, periodically interrupted by insurgent attacks against soft targets and illustrations of how feckless one's allies can be. Pakistan's double-dealing was confirmed through several leaked US reports and publicly by America's top soldier. Encouragingly, NATO's new focus on training Afghans to assume responsibility for their own security by 2014 produced some hopeful results, but an assured positive ending is far from being a foregone conclusion.
- The United States finally departed Iraq in 2011, a generation after coalition forces first deployed to the region in *Operation Desert Storm*. The first Gulf War expelled Iraq from Kuwait but left Saddam Hussein in power in Baghdad; the second removed him and disbanded his despotic regime. But the country has been in political turmoil and apprehended civil war ever since. The United States had been drawing down its combat forces for some time, and the Administration's decision to bring them all home was unexpected if popular. It became inevitable, however, when Iraq refused to accord the protections usual in a Status of Forces agreement to the relatively small contingent the US planned to leave in place. What happens next is an open question. There still exist deep ethno-religious splits within Iraq.
- In 2011, a colloquially named Arab "spring" spread across North Africa to the Middle East and the Gulf, bringing down long-entrenched dictators. But the freedom and justice espoused by the demonstrators will take time to secure, with no guarantee as to the nature of the governments they will find themselves under.
- In March, the Security Council authorized UN member states to take "all necessary measures" to protect civilians under attack in Libya, but not to set foot in the country. After some hesitancy, NATO devised an air campaign and naval blockade which brought down the Gaddafi regime. To many observers, the NATO intervention went beyond the implied limits of the action the Security Council had authorized and is now raising expectations for a second intervention in Syria. The Libyan campaign offered a further demonstration of the high professionalism of the Canadian Forces. But NATO's *Operation Unified Protector* took seven months at the cost of thousands of civilian lives.
- The revolutionary theocracy in Tehran appeared to have crossed the Rubicon in 2011. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) declared that Iran was developing a nuclear explosive device, may have plans to mount it on a medium-range missile, and continued to defy demands that it fulfill its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). UN-authorized sanctions were imposed and covert operations undertaken against Iranian nuclear installations and personnel, but Tehran was not deterred. It blustered and threatened to attack NATO bases in Turkey and to close the Strait of Hormuz, renewing worries about the rationality of the regime.
- In 2011, North Korea lamented the passing of its second Stalinist leader and prepared for a third, while Pyongyang's enablers in Beijing let another opportunity pass to defuse the ticking time bomb on their border. This raised a question as to how much influence Beijing actually has on North Korea whose citizens continue to suffer from chronic food shortages and other privations.
- In Washington, a president who had enjoyed high approval ratings at home and abroad found himself facing a tough re-election race in 2012. His foreign policy successes — including finding and disposing of Osama Bin Laden — contrasted with the difficulties experienced in his "reset" with Russia, his "engagement" with Iran, his "new beginning" with the Arab world, and an inability to advance the Mideast peace process, all underpinned by political gridlock, an underperforming economy, and severe fiscal constraints which will require reductions in US defence spending — though not likely at the expense of Washington's important strategic "pivot" to the Asia-Pacific region.
- In Europe, EU leaders had to work hard in 2011 to hammer out a second package of measures designed to prevent the collapse of Eurozone member economies. The package required European banks to accept a 50% write-off of Greek debt owed to private creditors and achieve 9% capitalization, while increasing the European Financial Stability Fund (EFSF) to about €1 trillion. In aid of restoring confidence, EU leaders discussed the idea of creating a common fiscal union across the Eurozone with strict and enforceable rules embedded in treaty. The UK's rejection of the package heightened rifts within Europe. Almost overlooked was that the austerity measures introduced after late 2009 have had the effect of accelerating the decline of most European defence budgets.



THE OUTLOOK FOR 2012 AND BEYOND

We cannot know the future, but we can know some things about 2012 with reasonable certainty. We can also speculate with some reliability on how trends evident today are likely to play out tomorrow. The economic and fiscal issues which preoccupied governments for much of 2011 can be expected to command at least as much policy attention in 2012. But as governments grapple with the effects of the hugely consequential decisions they have taken and the constraints these have imposed on their actions, their attention will inevitably be drawn to global events demanding their engagement.

Developments in the United States will have the greatest impact on Canada: political winds blow north, economies are interdependent, external threats are often shared. But it is in developments across the oceans where the risks to the safety and security of Canadians lie.

The United States

This is an important election year in the United States. With an incumbent president running for re-election and control of Congress likely in question, decisions in 2012 on foreign and defence policy and on deficit reduction will be more than usually influenced by domestic partisan calculations (and maybe in future years as well).

Americans are war-weary, disappointed with what has been achieved at great expense, and feeling exploited by ungrateful allies. Debate is intensifying over how national interests should be defined and the degree to which the security of Americans requires expenditure of lives and treasure in faraway places. There is a rising mood of disengagement which will translate into actual disengagement in selected areas no longer deemed to be in the national interest.

There will be no going back to Iraq whatever happens and 2012 will feature continued drawdown of US forces and involvement in Afghanistan. The Administration will find it very difficult to send forces anywhere in 2012 unless the security interests of the United States or those of its closest friends and allies are openly threatened or humanitarian needs are overwhelming. With the economy improving but remaining fragile, the United States would be hard pressed to finance or gain public support for any new foreign policy or defence initiative not directly in support of the supreme interests of the country.

In the event Washington cannot avoid sending forces into harm's way in 2012, there is every indication the Pentagon would want any engagement to be short and sharp, with objectives which are as narrow and clearly defined as possible, and with little or no chance of stretching into a lengthy and complex intervention of the type which characterized the Iraq and Afghanistan campaigns. One should expect the Administration's posture to prefer persuasion over force and, when diplomacy and sanctions fail, to favour the employment of military force with as much precision as possible.

Meanwhile, a new US defence strategy is in prospect, compelled in part by pending defence cuts but also reflecting emerging power relationships across the globe. Without taking its eye off Europe and the Middle East, and conscious of the security problems in the Americas, US policy is pivoting towards the Asia-Pacific region.

The United States remains the essential bulwark of international peace and security, fully capable of exerting its influence in every corner of the globe, and delivering overwhelming force as and when it chooses. US doctrine now recognizes five domains of warfare: land, sea, air, space and cyberspace. Any attack on the United States in any of these domains could expect to meet with a swift response. US officials have made it clear that an attack on critical infrastructure through cyberspace would be treated no differently than an attack against a US warship or the downing of a US aircraft. This broader interpretation of the meaning of "attack" has implications for US allies. Absent a clear definition of what a cyber-attack actually means, the always vexed question of what constitutes an attack under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty sufficient to trigger collective action has suddenly become a lot more complicated.



The United States is in economic difficulty, not strategic decline. Getting its economic house in order will be a challenge. The federal government cannot continue to spend \$4 trillion a year, take in \$2 trillion, and hope to winnow down the deficit with anything like the agreement the parties have been trying to negotiate in Washington: reducing expenditures by \$1 trillion over ten years without increasing revenues. But once there is a plan in place to balance the budget, investor confidence will return and translate into economic recovery. For all the attention accorded the US federal debt, in the range of \$15 trillion, its dimensions should not be exaggerated. Only about a third is foreign debt, and though China is the single largest foreign creditor (just ahead of Japan) the amount owed China (\$1.1 trillion) is significant but hardly the financial weapon sometimes portrayed.

Nor is the US military budget especially culpable. As a percentage of the federal budget and as a percentage of GDP, US defence spending in recent years has been lower than at any point since the Korean War — despite having to finance operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. Even the currently envisioned cuts only return US defence spending to 2007 levels and manning to 2003 levels.

Key nations to watch in 2012

As in the United States, political developments, fiscal realities, and long-war fatigue will leave their imprint on others in 2012.

- In Britain, general elections are not scheduled for another two years but they could be called any time if the Conservative/Liberal Democratic government falls apart. So far, Prime Minister David Cameron and Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg have proven adept at managing the strains within their coalition. As for many other nations, fiscal realities have dampened both the UK's willingness and ability to deploy forces overseas. Planned cuts in defence spending will lower the UK defence budget by 8.6% by 2015 and personnel levels by 18% by 2020, and reduce or eliminate certain capabilities.
- In France, conservative President Nicolas Sarkozy faces a stiff challenge from socialist François Hollande in the April 22 presidential elections. Hollande currently leads in the polls, but there are several other prominent individuals of various political persuasions also in the race. If there is no clear-cut winner, a second round of voting would be held on May 6. Meanwhile, Sarkozy has announced a draw-down of France's 3900 combat forces in Afghanistan: a first contingent of 1000 will depart in 2012 and the balance in 2013, leaving behind "a few hundred" to help train Afghan security forces.
- In Germany, elections are scheduled for September 2013 with Eurozone issues likely to dominate the think-space of policy makers in the run-up. Chancellor Angela Merkel is personally riding high in the polls, while her Christian Democratic Union party along with its Bavarian wing, the Christian Social Union, also retain strong backing. However, popular support for her Liberal Free Democratic coalition partner is weak and the Chancellor is thought to be entertaining the idea of a grand coalition with her Social Democratic Party opponents who are more insular in their international policy sentiments.
- Within the European Union generally, economic issues are affecting defence and security policy as austerity measures reduce members' defence budgets across the board.
- Greece's debt crisis threatens to become a civil and social crisis as the impact of deep austerity measures take effect. The possibility of Greek default remains extremely high and the wider effects are incalculable. In the spring, the coalition government of Lukas Papademos will have to hold elections.
- In Russia, President Vladimir Putin's re-election on March 4 does not appear to be in doubt, though there is growing discontent with his manipulation of the political system which could spill over into renewed protests not excluding violent ones. But if he doesn't win an absolute majority on March 4, it is anyone's guess what might happen in a run-off election on March 25.
- China is due for a new general secretary of the Communist Party, but this is not expected to change that country's outlook and intentions in Asia-Pacific — precisely the reason the United States and others are paying increased attention.



REDUCING DEFENCE EXPENDITURES WHAT THE PERCENT REDUCTIONS MEAN IN REAL TERMS:

Though many nations have announced reductions in defence spending and forces capabilities to meet the demands of fiscal pressures, the following illustrates what budget reductions mean to US and UK capacity and strategy.

UNITED STATES

Army

- Reduction from 570,000 to 490,000
- Elimination of 11 army brigades

Marine Corps

- Reduction from 202,000 to 182,000

Navy

- Two-year delay in the development of a new ballistic missile submarine
- Retirement of seven cruisers and two amphibious ships
- One-year delay (at least) in the purchase of 12 new ships
- Reduction in the number of destroyers

Air Force

- Delay in the production schedule for new fighter aircraft
- Termination of production of the F22 Raptor fighter
- Divestment of over 130 transport aircraft
- Scrapping of six tactical fighter squadrons and one training squadron
- The beginning of negotiations on base closures

UNITED KINGDOM

In October 2010, as a result of its Strategic Defence and Security Review, the UK announced cuts to all three services. In future, the UK's largest overseas deployment is expected to number no more than 30,000 personnel, including maritime and air force units as compared to the 45,000 it was able to deploy and sustain in Iraq.

British Army

- Reduction from 102,500 to 95,500
- Closing of British bases in Germany by 2020
- 40% cut in the number of Challenger 2 tanks to just over 200
- 35% cut in the number of heavy artillery guns to an estimated 87

Royal Air Force

- Reduction from 38,000 to 33,000
- Scrapping of the Nimrod maritime patrol project (after spending £3.2 billion and the first aircraft being completed)
- Retirement of the C-130 fleet 10 years earlier than planned
- Reduction in the original order for 22 Chinook helicopters to 13
- Retirement of the Harrier (including RN Harrier) during 2011 to maintain the Tornado as the RAF's main strike aircraft until the Typhoon matures. In future, the Typhoon and the F-35 Lightning II will constitute the RAF's fast jet fleet
- Retirement of the Sentinel R1 (airborne early warning) once it is no longer required to support forces in Afghanistan

Royal Navy

- Reduction from 35,000 to 30,000
- Decommissioning of flagship aircraft carrier *Ark Royal* "almost immediately" rather than in 2014, along with its complement of Harrier aircraft. These measures are to save money towards the construction of two new *Queen Elizabeth* class super carriers though only one is guaranteed to be built. The F35B intended for carriers was changed to the F35C to save on acquisition and life cycle costs
- One of the *Albion* class landing platform dock ships placed at extended readiness
- Withdrawal from service of HMS *Illustrious* (helicopter carrier) in 2014
- Decommissioning of one of the landing ship dock vessels
- Reduction in the number of nuclear warheads carried on the UK's submarine-based deterrent force from 48 to 40, and reduction in the number of operationally available nuclear warheads "from fewer than 160 to no more than 120." Modernization delayed by four years
- Reduction to 19 ships in the surface fleet of frigates and destroyers



The International Security Agenda

The organizations on which the world relies most for international leadership will hold summit meetings in 2012. NATO leaders will meet in Chicago in May, as will G8 leaders. Key decisions must come from these summits, particularly on the future of the Afghan mission, the application of the new NATO Strategic Concept, and cooperative options to address the Eurozone crisis. The larger G20 group will hold a summit in Mexico in June. It will be a busy summer. At the UN General Assembly in the fall, we can expect the usual political theatrics — though this year without Muammar Gaddafi. Below the leadership level, there will be an important meeting of the IAEA Board of Governors in Vienna March 5-9 at which the situation in Iran will likely be discussed and further action proposed.

What of the problems leaders will be grappling with; the outlook is not especially reassuring.

In the last 20 years, the liberal democracies have found themselves involved in more conflicts than at any time since World War II, contributing to coalition efforts in the 1991 Gulf War, the wars in the Balkans, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the Libya intervention. Small wars and inter-communal strife appear to be endemic to certain regions of Africa, Asia and the Americas. For the most part, however, any interventions contemplated by Western states in these more peripheral regions would be driven by humanitarian considerations rather than fears the conflicts might escalate with global effect — with the exception of four possible conflict scenarios in Syria, the Arabian Gulf, on the Egyptian-Israeli border, and on the Korean peninsula.

Of course, a successful terrorist attack on the United States, whether the source were clearly identified or only suspected, would change everything.

Conflict scenario 1: Syria

The most probable scenario for early hostilities is Syria's current crisis descending into a full-fledged civil war and possibly spilling over into any or all of the five countries with whom it shares a border: Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Israel.

The Assad regime is reckoned by the UN to have killed more than seven thousand people since the revolutionary wave of the Arab Spring spread to Syria, and it has consistently resisted all entreaties to modify its actions or cede power. In the process, it has alienated almost every nation and international institution it has been in contact with, notably its cultural kin in the Arab world and the Arab League itself. While there are few paragons of democracy to be found among them, Arab governments understand the difference between suppressing unrest and slaughtering thousands in full view.

With the butchery continuing unabated and diplomacy an abject failure, an international military intervention would appear to be almost inevitable. Until recently, one could have expected that three conditions would have to be met:

- Some source of authority, likely the Security Council, would have to legitimize an international intervention.
- A group of states would have to be willing to contribute the military wherewithal.
- The Syrian resistance would need to coalesce, be recognized as an organized opposition, and hold ground as their Libyan counterparts did in Benghazi.

In light of the Assad regime's widespread, systematic and relentless attacks on civilians, however, an argument could be made that a threshold has been crossed and that crimes against humanity are now the issue. In such a case, humanitarian action need not await the approval of a paralyzed Security Council or any other international institution. Its legitimacy would flow from the moral authority vested in all humanity to protect the innocent from state-condoned murder on a vast scale. So would the obligation on states to take whatever measures they could, however confused the situation on the ground.



Conflict scenario 2: The Arabian Gulf

The most dangerous scenario in 2012 involves Iran, where the ayatollahs have set a course that leads to hostilities if Iran continues to block full international inspection of its nuclear programs and refuses to halt its uranium enrichment efforts. Iran has been declared to be in breach of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and its frequent assertions that its nuclear programs are intended only for peaceful civilian purposes carry little weight internationally when secret programs have been uncovered and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has reported extensively on “Possible Military Dimensions of Iran’s Nuclear Programme.”

By most accounts, Iran is well along the road to developing a nuclear weapon and may soon be far enough advanced to detonate a rudimentary nuclear device sometime in the near future. The IAEA reports that Iran is developing the technology to mount a newly developed nuclear weapon on its medium-range Shahab 3 missile and deliver it on a target. Sabotage and sanctions so far appear only to have slowed progress, not halted it.

These developments pose a threat to other states in the region especially Saudi Arabia, Iran’s main Sunni rival in the Muslim world, and of course Israel. The regime’s hostility towards the United States may also motivate a desire to one day strike against the US, in the Gulf or elsewhere.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY:

Report by the Director General to the Board of Governors (GOV/2011/65) 8 Nov 2011

Possible Military Dimensions of Iran’s Nuclear Programme Extracts

The Agency has serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran’s nuclear programme. After assessing carefully and critically the extensive information available to it, the Agency finds the information to be, overall, credible. The information indicates that Iran has carried out activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device.

Instances of procurement and attempted procurement by individuals associated with the AMAD Plan of equipment, materials and services which, although having other civilian applications, would be useful in the development of a nuclear explosive device have either been uncovered by the Agency itself or been made known to it. Among such equipment, materials and services are: high speed electronic switches and spark gaps (useful for triggering and firing detonators); high speed cameras (useful in experimental diagnostics); neutron sources (useful for calibrating neutron measuring equipment); radiation detection and measuring equipment (useful in a nuclear material production environment); and training courses on topics relevant to nuclear explosives development (such as neutron cross section calculations and shock wave interactions/hydrodynamics).

Iran had been provided with nuclear explosive design information.

In 2008, Iran told the Agency that it had developed EBWs (exploding bridgewire detonators) for civil and conventional military applications and had achieved a simultaneity of about one microsecond when firing two to three detonators together. The Agency recognizes that there exist non-nuclear applications, albeit few, for detonators like EBWs ... Notwithstanding, Iran’s development of such detonators and equipment is a matter of concern, particularly in connection with the possible use of (a) multipoint initiation system ... that can be used to initiate effectively and simultaneously a high explosive charge over its surface.

... Iran may have planned and undertaken preparatory experimentation which would be useful were Iran to carry out a test of a nuclear explosive device. In particular, the Agency has information that Iran has conducted a number of practical tests to see whether its EBW firing equipment would function satisfactorily over long distances between a firing point and a test device located down a deep shaft ... (including) a document, in Farsi, which relates directly to the logistics and safety arrangements that would be necessary for conducting a nuclear test.

... the project appears to have consisted of a structured and comprehensive programme of engineering studies to examine how to integrate a new spherical payload into the existing payload chamber which would be mounted in the re-entry vehicle of the Shahab 3 missile ... additional work was conducted on the development of a prototype firing system that would enable the payload to explode both in the air above a target, or upon impact of the re-entry vehicle with the ground.



In response, the United States has knit together a firm coalition of concerned states who have imposed an increasingly comprehensive array of economic sanctions seeking to contain Iran's access to technology, to arrest its ability to finance continued nuclear research, and hopefully to inflict such damage on its economy that Iran will be dissuaded from continuing its weapons-related programs and return to the bargaining table on verification measures. It is too early to know whether the sanctions will have their desired effect. Sanctions represent a mid-course between diplomacy and the application of force, and their effectiveness historically has been a function of how tightly they can be applied and how economically vulnerable is the state they are targeting. With their uneven record of success, prudence suggests some sort of military intervention may be the only resort.

Political change may also offer hope. There have been revolutions in Iran before, there were huge demonstrations following the disputed presidential election in 2009, there is open tension between the "supreme leader" Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, and the country is gearing up for parliamentary elections on March 2.

Unless sanctions achieve their purpose or the revolutionary theocracy in Tehran collapses or is overthrown, conflict is almost certain.

Israel, perceiving an existential threat, will not let the Iranians succeed. There is nothing in Israel's history to suggest it will sit on its hands while a mortal danger develops. If necessary it will use force, and the Israeli military have quietly practiced long-range air strikes to demonstrate they have the capability to hit Iran. The fact that most assessments conclude Iran's acquisition of a nuclear weapon is still some distance off may not matter. Wars can be triggered as much by perception as reality. If Israel believes that the sanctions imposed on Iran are not working, or not working fast enough, and that the window of opportunity for effective military action is closing, their calculation would be to launch a pre-emptive attack sooner rather than later. It is highly possible such a scenario could play out in 2012.

Israeli governments have sometimes bowed to outside pressure, particularly from the United States, and refrained from steps they might otherwise have taken, such as advancing further into Egypt and Syria during the 1973 war or responding to the Scud-missile attacks launched against Israel from Iraq during the 1991 Gulf War. But, sufficiently alarmed, Israeli governments have been quite willing to take actions which they knew would generate international criticism. Notable examples include Israel's pre-emptive attack on Egypt in 1967 and its destruction of Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor in 1981 and Syria's al-Kibar nuclear facility in 2007.

President Barack Obama, in his State of the Union address on January 25, stated "that no option is off the table" implying that the United States too has not discounted the use of military force against Iran. In Tehran, the statement may have been ignored; in Jerusalem, it could have been read as tacit US support for Israel's own use of force.

Were military action to ensue, the breadth and depth of a conflict in the Gulf are difficult to predict, which is why most wish it to be an option of last resort. Much would depend on who undertakes the strikes; whether they are directed at Iran's secret nuclear installations alone, its entire nuclear infrastructure, its military capabilities, and/or its leadership; and what the collateral damage might be. Equally unpredictable are how vociferously the Iranian regime responds, the nature of the retaliatory actions it undertakes — these could range from conventional military responses in the region, to the mobilization of Hezbollah in Lebanon, to the activation of terrorist cells outside the region — and the support the regime receives from the population.

We should take for granted that the Iranians are capable of closing the Strait of Hormuz and would try to do so. But it is unlikely they could do so for any considerable period of time, even with the threat posed by the asymmetric and swarming units Iran has developed. In 1988, when an Iranian mine in the Gulf damaged a US warship, the US launched a retaliatory operation in Iranian territorial waters, its largest surface naval engagement since the Second World War. The result was prompt destruction of Iranian naval and intelligence facilities located on two oil platforms and the sinking of an Iranian frigate, a fast



attack gunboat, and three armed speedboats. Another Iranian frigate was damaged and forced to withdraw. The outcome of any new Iranian attack would not be very different, but even action short of actual hostilities could interrupt the transit of oil for a few days or weeks and materially impact international oil prices.

All the signs point to 2012 being a critical year in constraining Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. One can only hope that sanctions work or that the regime changes course, and that military means prove unnecessary.

Conflict scenario 3: The Egyptian-Israeli Border

A third scenario for destabilizing action with the potential for conflict in 2012 would be Egypt renouncing its non-aggression treaty with Israel and remilitarizing the Sinai. The 1979 treaty constituted Egyptian recognition of the state of Israel and ended the hope of hardliners that Arab states might one day be able to mount another two-front attack on Israel. The demilitarization of the Sinai Peninsula effectively created a buffer zone which ruled out the possibility of another surprise attack.

Islamist radicals, who never accepted these arrangements and murdered the Egyptian leader who negotiated them, undoubtedly now see the possibility of undoing them – if they can intimidate a new government in Cairo into doing so or manage to take control of it themselves. Much would have to happen before such a scenario could materialize. But it is not a possibility to be dismissed lightly either.

The Muslim Brotherhood's Freedom and Justice Party (FJP) was the biggest winner in Egypt's 2011 parliamentary elections taking 47% of the seats, while the even harder-line Salafi parties came in second with 24%. The deputy leader of FJP has since said the party would not engage in any dialogue with Israel, would not recognize Israel "under any circumstances", and would take "legal action against the peace treaty with the Zionist entity."

A second source of potential conflict which could be provoked by Egyptian action — actually inaction — is the Gaza Strip. In June 2007, Israel and Egypt jointly imposed a blockade on the Strip after the militant Islamist group Hamas seized power. Both the northern and southern access points were tightly controlled, severely restricting the types of people allowed to cross and closely inspecting cargo to prevent smuggling of weapons and other contraband. In May 2011, however, Egypt effectively ended the blockade by lifting virtually all travel restrictions at the southern crossing at Rafah – allowing Hamas to bring in fighters and weapons almost at will.

Egypt is still in a great deal of flux and its future is a large unknown. Possibilities are not necessarily probabilities. Democracy may not yet have fully taken root, but it seems unlikely that the vast majority of Egyptians would want to see their revolution fail and that they would willingly agree to trade one form of despotism for another, especially one that came at the expense of their economic aspirations. Meanwhile, few appear to have any appetite for a war against Israel. For the Egyptian military, the termination of the non-aggression pact with Israel is a red line they do not want to see crossed.

Conflict scenario 4: The Korean peninsula

North Korea is also capable of causing big trouble, but only if the Chinese lose their grip on the high-risk game they are playing in North Asia. Programs to expand North Korea's nuclear weapons arsenal and long-range missiles are far advanced, posing a threat to South Korea and Japan, to US forces in the Pacific, and sometime in the future to North America. The new Kim regime, if not tethered by the Chinese, could succumb as its predecessors did to the temptation of initiating limited military actions designed to provoke, unnerve, and extract concessions. But the 27-year old "military genius" now at the helm may not be as astute as his ancestors in knowing when to quit.

A false move on the Korean peninsula could be exceptionally dangerous. No region of the world is as heavily laden with armed forces and the world's military powers are all in the vicinity. The order of battle appears to favour the North over the South, and South Korea's capital Seoul lies only 50 kilometres from the 250-kilometer long and 4-kilometer wide Demilitarized Zone which has separated the two counties



since 1953. The North also has the backing of China on its northern border. On the other hand, North Korea's economic problems including food shortages and corruption have undoubtedly undermined the combat effectiveness of its armed forces, and much of its military equipment is of some vintage. In contrast, South Korea's armed forces are highly professional, modern and well-equipped, and backed by 29,000 US forces in country and another 20,000 in Japan and at sea — including a forward-deployed carrier group. Japanese and Russian forces in the vicinity further complicate the military scene.

Afghanistan

In the vast expanse loosely described as the Asia-Pacific region, most of the world's attention has been focused on NATO's ten-year long campaign in Afghanistan. It will be developments in Pakistan, however, which will determine whether peace ever comes to South Asia.

In 2011 in Afghanistan, NATO concluded its tenth full year of campaigning and embarked on the first year of yet another refocusing of effort — this one an exit strategy in all but name. In 2002 the emphasis had been on hunting down Al Qaeda fighters; in 2003-06 on establishing the foundation of an Afghan state and in aiding President Hamid Karzai to adopt reforms; in 2006-08 on a search and destroy mission against resurgent Taliban forces migrating to a more classic counter-insurgency campaign featuring a “more comprehensive” approach towards the region as a whole; and in 2009 on a strategy which stressed regular forces protection of the population and special forces operations against insurgent commanders including in the border regions of Pakistan, while accelerating Afghanistan's capacity to assume responsibility for its own security. Accompanying the latest strategy was an increase of 51,000 US forces effectively doubling the size of the US contingent in Afghanistan to 99,000. NATO allies raised their contributions to close to 36,000.

In November 2010 at a summit meeting in Lisbon, NATO leaders agreed on a strategy to create the conditions for an “irreversible transition” to full Afghan responsibility for security in four years. The new phase was to begin in some provinces and districts in early 2011, with the objective of having the Afghan national security forces leading and conducting security operations in all provinces by the end of 2014. The main task would be to accelerate the training of Afghan military and police. NATO leaders also signed a long-term “partnership” agreement with Afghanistan, pledging “sustained practical support to Afghan security institutions and committing to a sovereign Afghanistan which would “never again be a safe haven for terrorists.” In return, the Afghanistan government pledged to actively carry out its security, governance and development responsibilities including “addressing corruption” and respecting “human rights, in particular the rights of women.”

In the event, NATO was able to report some successes on the security front in 2011. The first phase of the transition to Afghan leadership had begun in July with NATO forces transferring responsibility in three provinces and four cities; there were discussions under way about a second tranche of handovers; and US, NATO and Afghan officials were negotiating a “strategic partnership” to govern the longer term. In consequence, Afghan national security forces had assumed responsibility for security in provinces and districts accounting for about half the population of the country. The target to expand the Afghan National Army (ANA) to 171,600 and the Afghan National Police (ANP) to 134,000 by October 2011 had been reached on schedule with force levels continuing to grow thereafter. Afghan soldiers and police were training two-thirds of the new recruits. Popular support for the army and police had risen to new heights according to an Asia Society opinion poll, though the police still lagged far behind the army due to the continuing taint of corruption.

Protection of the population may have been the key to the new strategy, but the security situation remained anything but settled in 2011. Cross-border attacks by the Haqqani Network in Pakistan were up by more than 500% and IED attacks by 20%. Insurgent assaults on relatively soft urban targets and suicide bombings contributed to some of highest coalition forces losses ever, 566 in total in 2011. The Americans, as always, took the bulk of the fatalities (418), the month of August their most costly of the war to date (71).



Afghan casualties are less closely tabulated, but they are estimated to have been 1,155 for the Afghan security forces in 2011 and in the range of 1,500 for civilians in just the first half of 2011. NATO reported 131 assassinations in the first nine months of 2011, an increase of 60% year to year. Among those killed were Ahmed Wali Karzai, the provincial council chief in Kandahar (and the president's half brother); Ghulam Haidar Hamidi, the mayor of Kandahar; and Burhannuddin Rabbani, a former president of Afghanistan and senior Tajik leader who headed the Afghan Peace Council and was a key figure in the national reconciliation process.

As 2011 came to close, the picture in Afghanistan was not especially bright and the outcome remains in doubt. On the positive side, operations against insurgents have produced some good results and development assistance has helped to transform parts of the country. But governance remains weak and corruption is still rampant. The near collapse of the Kabul Bank prompted the regime to prosecute some of the Karzai-allied fraudsters who were responsible, but the motive was mostly to allow the International Monetary Fund to resume its credit program in December and unlock large amounts of donor funds. Karzai himself ended the year at odds with the Taliban with whom he was trying to hold peace talks; with the Pakistanis over what he called their "double-dealing"; with the Americans over his comment that he would support Pakistan if it were attacked by the United States; and with just about every foreign government and organization trying to help his afflicted country.

International support is waning and with it the likelihood that the NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan (NTM-A) will unfold as planned. By all accounts – including the assessments of the Canadian officers placed strategically throughout the NTM-A command structure and the 950-strong contingent of Canadian trainers — the mission has been helping to turn out increasing numbers of Afghan national security forces who are acquitting themselves well in the field. But there are several threats to the mission which bear watching between now and 2014:

- The new Afghan National Army (ANA) has been drawn mostly from the Northern provinces. Without more recruits from the southern Pashtun regions, the ANA will be less an instrument of national unity than of continued tribal division – replicating the divide between the Northern Alliance and the Taliban in the 1990s.
- Without improvements in the civilian leadership and in Afghan governance, there is a risk the ANA could prove the undoing of the nascent democracy in Afghanistan. The ongoing struggle between the president and parliament, the tainted elections, the arbitrary executive decisions and decrees, the slow pace of government reforms, and the continued evidence of incompetence and corruption have all contributed to a widespread feeling among the population that the Army is the only national institution to be trusted. Whenever a national army comes to be viewed as the only institution that works, the danger of a coup exists. In Afghanistan, where the populace's understanding of democracy has been seriously weakened by decades of political turmoil, it is a possibility not to be ignored.
- The United States will continue to progressively draw down combat forces between now and the end of 2014. In June 2011, President Obama declared that the US troop surge of 2009 had accomplished most major US goals and that there would be a drawdown of 10,000 troops by the end of 2011 and a further 23,000 by September 2012. In February 2012, US Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta suggested all US combat troops may be out of Afghanistan by the middle or end of 2013 – a year ahead of the NATO-agreed timetable, leaving an unspecified number of training and support staff in place. Whether the US will leave any forces behind after 2014 to deal with Pakistan-origin issues remains unknown at this time. Pressure to accelerate the US withdrawal still more rapidly could arise were US forces required to deal with a conflict involving Iran, a crisis in the Middle East, or trouble on the Korean peninsula. Many will point to how badly the Afghanistan mission suffered in 2003 when the United States' strategic focus shifted to Iraq.
- Other contributing nations may not be willing to stay until the end of 2014 either. Fiscal pressures, war weariness and additional casualties could compel any number of NATO governments to accelerate their withdrawal from a war which is fast losing public interest and support. No government wants



to find itself having to explain why its soldiers had to die in a war that's due to end soon. France's decision in January to accelerate its withdrawal may be only the first of many.

- Finally, the Afghan government and the ANA cannot survive in the short to medium term without heavy financial support from outside, support that is difficult to mobilize because of the fiscal state of many economies. The NATO and G8 summits in May 2012 will set the tone for what is to come in Afghanistan post 2014.

Pakistan

In the final analysis, the fate of the 35 million Afghans lies in the hands of the 175 million Pakistanis on their Eastern border. The Afghan insurgency largely operates out of Pakistan, where it has been able to count on the political disarray in that country and the tacit support of radical Islamist sympathizers and elements in the Pakistani military. Pakistan has suffered from one political or military command crisis after another for years, leaving large tracts of territory ungoverned, permitting extremist movements to flourish, and exporting its instability to neighbours on both sides. It is an open question whether the current civilian leadership can survive let alone take effective measures against extremists. Another military coup is always in the cards in Pakistan. A constant worry is the security of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. There are reports that Pakistan is stepping up its protective measures and that the United States is working on contingencies in case these fail.

How Pakistan's domestic situation plays out in 2012 is impossible to predict, but there are any number of scenarios — another large-scale terrorist attack, a political assassination, the return from exile of former president and army chief of staff Pervez Musharraf, a major natural disaster — which could cause political events to spiral out of control again and precipitate another round of violence and mayhem. To the grief of Pakistanis and Afghans alike.

Not to be forgotten, even though it has diminished as a possible tinderbox in recent years, has been the relationship between Pakistan and India. The dispute over Kashmir has found some semblance of accommodation though it is still an irritant and remains far from being definitively resolved. Indian suspicions that Islamabad tolerates — if not actively supports — Pakistan-based extremists operating against India, such as the Lashkar-e-Taiba who conducted the attacks on Mumbai, are matched by Pakistani fears of India's intentions in Afghanistan. In the absence of substantive talks, mediated or not by third parties, it might not take much for the slow improvement in relations between the two nations to vanish in an instant. And of course, border disputes remain between India and China which, while not a source of tension at present, should be considered in a wider negotiation in the region.

China: today and in ten years

No geopolitical trend in the Asia-Pacific region, or anywhere else for that matter, holds such potential for transforming the international security situation as developments in China.

China's economy has been booming and along with it Beijing's ability to finance a buildup of its armed forces. China's military budget has grown markedly over the last ten years and was second only to that of the United States in 2010. Much of the spending has been dedicated to long-needed reforms and modernization, but it has also generated additional military capabilities — along with anxieties on the part of others. So far, China's armaments program has served mainly to enhance China's ability to defend itself, to provide localized superiority in areas close to the Chinese mainland, and to project a small amount of power regionally. But it is China's potential global reach a decade from now which worries analysts most.

- The People's Liberation Army (PLA) is the largest army in the world. Its prime mission over the years has been to consolidate the rule of the Communist Party of China, in the process becoming a political force itself. In 1989, some 300,000 PLA troops were used to put down the uprisings surrounding the Tiananmen Square protests. Otherwise, the Army serves mainly to deter and defend against any encroachments on China's landmass. At present, it does not have the ability, or the traditions, experience or doctrine to engage in expeditionary operations.



- The Chinese Air Force equally has critical limitations. As presently constituted, it would appear that its main aim is to deter outside forces from restraining China's freedom of action by ensuring air superiority for a limited period of time in a defined area. It does not have the ability to project beyond its immediate region. The air force does have some excellent aircraft in service, but the numbers are not great and the best are still reliant on other nations such as Russia for critical components. Individual aircraft may be the equal of their US counterparts in one-on-one scenarios, but none are a match for the F22 Raptor acknowledged as the best fighter in the world. Nor do the Chinese have anything like the numbers to match the Americans in the Asia-Pacific region. The US Navy's 11 carriers combined have more strike aircraft than the entire Chinese airforce, without considering additional aircraft aboard amphibious assault ships in the region and the 350 aircraft at 11 bases in Japan, the Republic of Korea, Guam and elsewhere.
- The Chinese Navy is larger than the US Navy in total ships, but like its army and air force counterparts it is still limited in the type of operations it can conduct. For the near term, its role is to prevent outside forces from constraining China's hand in areas it considers its own territories and waters. The Navy has one carrier that it is only starting to learn how to use and only one blue water amphibious ship capable of carrying a battalion of 800. This compares to nine US amphibious ships each capable of carrying a 2000-man Marine Expeditionary Unit and embarking up to 20 strike fighters (over and above US carrier aviation). China has a very large fleet of submarines, but the vast majority are conventional diesel-electric boats which are by nature limited in range and ability. The Chinese Navy can send and support a frigate fleet over long distances with the support ships it presently has, but that fleet is vulnerable because of all the other capabilities the Navy lacks.

In 2009, China's defence minister Liang Guanglie laid out a hugely ambitious modernization plan. The plan includes an air force capable of "a combination of offensive and defensive operations", rocket forces of both "nuclear and conventional striking power", and a navy that would push beyond the near island chains that ring China's coasts and become a true blue water navy. More recently, China's official Xinhua news agency quoted Premier Wen Jiabao to the effect that China's navy should "make extended preparations for warfare."

China's intentions remain obscure. For years, US defence analysts have asked China to clarify what strategic interests it is seeking to protect through its armaments program, without ever receiving a clear expression of these. Taiwan is obviously an important part of Beijing's calculus; it is considered a Chinese province and hence an internal Chinese matter. So is maritime traffic in waters China believes are its own; over 30% of world sea-borne commerce transits waters off the coast of China, much of it vital to China's continued economic growth.

Forced to extrapolate from such indicators as Beijing's political claims, its actions, and its weapons development programs, analysts have concluded that China considers vast areas of the East China Sea (between itself, Japan and the Koreans), the Taiwan Strait, and the South China Sea (shared with the Philippines, Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam) as territorial waters and the islands within as sovereign Chinese territory (the Paracels, the Spratlys, and the Scarborough Reef). If so and China presses its case, the near-universal opposition to its claims portends trouble down the road. With increased naval capabilities, China will not be hindered by the same force limitations which stymied and humiliated it during past crises in the Taiwan Straits and the South China Sea.

In the Strategic Guidance for the US Department of Defense released in January 2012, Washington announced that US economic and security interests necessitated a "rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region." China's emergence as a regional power had the potential to affect US interests "in a variety of ways" and the United States would have to "continue to make the necessary investments to ensure that we maintain regional access and the ability to operate freely in keeping with our treaty obligations and with international law." Hence the US "pivot" represents a response to continued uncertainty over China's intentions and something of a warning – without classifying China as an enemy or telegraphing a build-up of US forces in the region.



In light of China's studied ambiguity and the need to take precautions against unwanted conflict, disruption of important trading connections or harm to close allies, the US strategy has much to commend it. In the near term, its effects will be limited though not insignificant: the stationing of a US Marine contingent in Darwin, Australia to grow over five years from 250 to 2,500; increased US naval and air activity; and the possible re-establishment of a US military foothold in the Philippines. Over the longer term, it could lead to new alliances — initially in the form of bilateral treaties but conceivably also in the form of a wider collective defence agreement — potentially involving Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, and Vietnam. China, predictably, is not amused.

Southeast Asia

Southeast Asia is generally stable. Due to its geographical location, the region is an important area for trade and transport with vital sea-lanes carrying 32% of world oil net trade and 27% of world gas net trade. It is also rich in natural resources. This richness, however, is at the root of some of the problems the region is encountering with China.

Four states play a security role in the region, and Southeast Asia's strategic interest in them lies mainly in whether they contribute to or pose a risk to the overall security of the region:

- China is the key regional trading partner, and trade between China and the region has grown exponentially. In general, the states of the region see China as an attractive source of investment and a destination for goods. But China also represents a potential threat because of its maritime and territorial ambitions in the South China Sea. China has concerns of its own, not least the vulnerability of its increasingly important energy supply lines flowing through Southeast Asian choke points such as the Malacca Straits. If the Strait of Hormuz is important to many European and Western nations, the Malacca Straits are of equal importance to China.
- During the whole of the post-Cold War period, the states of the region have seen the United States as the principal guarantor of their security. This has been the case even for former adversaries such as Vietnam which has emerged as America's fastest growing trading partner; for the Philippines which forced the United States in the early 1990s to close important military bases there (Subic Bay Naval Complex, Clark Air Base); and especially Singapore, fiercely independent since 1958 but now offering to host US naval facilities.
- Japan, the other Asia-Pacific economic superpower, has been eclipsed in Southeast Asia by China, in part because of Japan's economic difficulties and in part because of its longstanding reluctance (recently eased by a constitutional amendment) to send its "self-defence" forces offshore in support of international peace operations.
- India is the rising influence in the region, due to its growing global economic weight and the build-up of its military capabilities. India must address domestic issues and its relationship with Pakistan before being able to concentrate more on political and security issues further afield, but India's increased naval power is beginning to make its presence felt regionally and represents a potential future counterweight to China in the region. India is also working to recalibrate its relations with Russia after what was seen as an unnatural and ultimately failed partnership with the old Soviet Union.

Lacking in the region has been an overarching security architecture to replace the old Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) dissolved in 1977. Current security relationships are an amalgam of regional groupings such as the ASEAN Regional Forum and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and assorted hub-and-spoke bilateral relationships. It seems only a matter of time, however, before democratic states join together in a collective security arrangement committed to political freedom and open markets.



Africa

Much of the African continent still suffers from a litany of problems; these include chronic food and water shortages, poor public health and education, impecunious and corrupt governance, and ethno-religious disputes. All will have to be addressed by the continent itself with only limited help from outside. The developed world, exhausted from war, suffering from donor fatigue, and struggling with the consequences of its own diminished economic performance, will proceed cautiously in any intervention it might contemplate. The days of open-ended and condition-free development assistance from Western states are waning if not gone altogether. Increasingly, African nations will have to rely on “non-traditional” donor countries such as the oil-rich Gulf States or China, or on their own means. There is a desperate need for the African Union to enhance its ability to intervene effectively and to live up to its ambition of finding African solutions to African problems.

East Africa is in a particularly weak condition, with Islamist extremist groups such as Al Qaeda and Al Shabab fomenting religious strife, posing a threat to Ethiopia and Kenya, prolonging the miseries in Somalia, and in general obstructing efforts to resolve the region’s ills. The spill-over could impact France’s close economic and defence ties with Djibouti and the US base there. Ethiopia, in some respects the heart of East Africa, has a population of about 80 million evenly split between traditional Christian and Muslim communities. After a long period of civil conflict, the country has been developing well, with the best trained and equipped military in the region. If coexistence breaks down between the communities, the ensuing conflict would likely engulf the rest of East Africa.

In West Africa, Nigeria with a population of 158 million, is exhibiting signs that the long-simmering strife between the religious communities there could degenerate into a form of civil war. This could well compel Western intervention in some fashion.

In South Africa, Nelson Mandela’s vision of blacks and whites sharing the land in harmony seems very distant. The country is now run by increasingly narrow-minded and unequal successors, while communal animosities, corruption and crime continue to rise. Elements on both sides have the ability to be both armed and dangerous.

Much has been written recently about the covetous eyes China has cast on Canada’s enormous reserves of oil, gas, minerals, and lumber, about the strides China has taken to acquire interests in Canadian resource extraction companies, and about the security implications of these investments. China has also shown an increased interest in the Arctic and its resources. Rather less attention has been paid to the heavy investments China has been making in Africa and to the plans it has to protect these investments over the long term including military means.

To maintain the growth rates China has been able to achieve in recent years — some doubt these are sustainable — China requires competitive and easy access to natural resources to fuel its production-based economy. It can count on some competitive advantages, such as a large internal market (a population of 1.3 billion) and relatively low labour costs. But it is not rich in raw materials and ten years from now may be importing up to 70% of its energy requirements.

China’s economic influence in Africa has grown rapidly, in the process displacing that of the United States and former colonial powers. Its strategy has been to operate with patience and “understanding” of the problems Africa confronts, befriend its leaders, avoiding public criticism of their human rights practices, offering aid to construct and improve critical infrastructure, and negotiating contracts for the multi-year supply of raw materials at cut-rate prices reflecting present rather than future global prices. With assured access and their cost of goods guaranteed to be under market value, China appears intent on acquiring port facilities on the Indian Ocean and, in due course, a blue water navy to protect its interests.

The continent of Africa today represents over \$20 billion in goods traded and tens of billions in services provided by a growing number of Canadian firms, in addition to Canada’s many public and private development projects. Canada has an interest in a stronger African Union able to apply African remedies to African issues. Canada also has an interest in promoting the development of democratic states, in



helping to build professional and capable militaries which do not take the law into their own hands, and in suppressing criminal enterprises. Piracy off the coast of Somalia and increasingly off the coast of West Africa is a symptom of failing economic structures, failing governments and imbedded inequities frequently exploited by terrorists, religious extremists and criminal organizations. Investing in the solution of problems now will obviate the need for significant action later such as the on-going costly NATO and EU anti-piracy missions off the Somali coast.

The Americas and the Caribbean

The majority of security issues in the Americas and the Caribbean stem from the actions of criminal organizations and their involvement in the highly lucrative narcotics trade which feeds on social and economic inequities throughout the region.

Even US military concerns and programs have as their objective the interdiction and destruction of transnational criminal organizations whose tentacles frequently reach into the governing apparatus of states in the region. As a result, US military and security ties have tended to focus on training, elimination of corruption, fostering the rule of law, and development assistance to raise the most impoverished to a standard where criminal or gang activity are not the only means out of economic hardship.

Mexico is of special importance to both the United States and Canada. The principal concern is the ongoing war between the government and the narcotics cartels, and the exportation of that conflict to other states in the region and to other parts of the world. The cartels have expanded operations to Europe, particularly in Italy and Spain, and operate as many as 10 bases in West Africa which include airfields and jet cargo planes able to route 50% of all non-US bound cocaine through the region. Their war with the Mexican Army has driven some of the cartels to seek safer refuge across the border in Guatemala where the US government estimates some 70% of the country is now controlled by criminal organizations employing violence, political corruption and infiltration of already weak national institutions. The Brookings Institution warns that “without proactive, timely efforts, the violence will spread throughout the Central American region.” There is fear that this influence will penetrate weakened governments in the Caribbean as well, particularly Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica. Jamaica is rapidly becoming a major transit point for narcotics into the eastern seaboard of the United States and Canada, including being a hub of value-added refining operations in the narcotics value chain.

The US Department of Justice calculates that the wholesale revenues realized by the Mexican cartels range between \$14 and \$40 billion dollars. Deaths attributed to the narcotics war exceeded 12,000 in 2011 alone — many times the casualties sustained in Afghanistan. It is little wonder, then, that US authorities consider the Mexican drug cartels the greatest organized crime threat to the United States. Mexico’s battle with narcotraffickers directly affects Canadian security. Mexican authorities report 150 Canadians have died violently in Mexico, and a certain amount of gang-related violence in Canada can be traced to the activities of Mexican cartels. The effects of the drug war have been felt in places like Vancouver where rising cocaine prices have led to an upsurge in gang violence over control of the market. Likewise, police in Canada can trace surges in homicidal activity in major population centres such as Toronto to the vitality and freedom extended to gangs with narcotics interests in Jamaica.

From a national security standpoint, US military planners believe that, in the worst case, pressure from the cartels across the range of government institutions in Mexico could produce such instability within a decade that there might have to be an American military response, if only to protect the US homeland. It is a looming crisis whose dimensions should not be underestimated.

The good news is that, apart from Mexico and transnational crime, there is no state-based conflict or organized insurgency in the Americas. With the exception of the tensions between Colombian and Venezuela, and the reduced FARC insurgency in Colombia, it is the internal fragility of Venezuela which is of greatest concern. Venezuelan society is split along class and economic lines, exacerbated by the deeply polarizing policies of President Hugo Chávez. The president’s international policies are confused and unpredictable, paradoxically courting Iran and Russia while antagonizing the United States and the US business interests whose capital fuels the country’s much needed internal social reforms.



Haiti remains a special case. While the world contributed much to Haiti after the 2010 earthquake, the results have been haphazard at best, just sufficient to stabilize the situation and allow rebuilding. With the recovery so tenuous, however, it might not take more than another natural disaster or political confrontation to tip the country back into crippling crisis mode. Were that to happen, another international intervention would probably be unavoidable.

Few fully appreciate how enormous was the contribution of international military forces to the rescue effort in Haiti 2010.

US, CANADIAN AND FRENCH FORCES DEPLOYED TO HAITI IN 2010:

<p>UNITED STATES</p> <p>Ground Units 82nd Airborne Division Brigade Combat Team 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit</p> <p>Naval Units USNS <i>PFC Dewayne Williams</i>, 1st Lt <i>Jack Lummus</i> – Roll-On/Roll-Off Container Ships SS <i>Cape May</i> – Heavy-lift ship SS <i>Gopher State</i> – Crane ship MV <i>Huakai</i>—High-speed ferry USNS <i>Sumner</i>– Oceanographic survey ship USS <i>Nassau</i>, USS <i>Bataan</i> – Amphibious assault ships USS <i>Ashland</i>, USS <i>Gunston Hall</i>, USS <i>Fort McHenry</i>, USS <i>Carter Hall</i> – Dock landing ships USS <i>Mesa Verde</i> – Amphibious transport dock ship USNS <i>Comfort</i> – Hospital ship USNS <i>Grasp</i> – Salvage ship USNS <i>Big Horn</i> – Fleet replenishment Oiler USS <i>Higgins</i> – Frigate USS <i>Underwood</i> – Destroyer USS <i>Normandy</i>– Guided-missile cruiser USNS <i>Sacagawea</i> – Dry-cargo ship 6 U.S. Coast Guard cutters Total = 26 Ships, 48 helicopters, 20 fixed wing</p> <p>Air Force 19 million lbs cargo – equivalent of 118 C-17 flights</p> <p>TOTAL TROOPS AT PEAK = 20,000</p>	<p>CANADA</p> <p>Ground Units R22eR Bn TF HQ and Sigs DART</p> <p>Navy 2 Ships plus helicopter</p> <p>Air Force 1 C17 1 C130 6 CH 146 helicopters</p> <p>TOTAL TROOPS AT PEAK = 2,000</p> <p>FRANCE</p> <p>Ground Units 2 Regiments 1 Fd Hospital</p> <p>Naval Units 1 Landing Ship/Ferry 1 Amphibious Assault Ship</p> <p>Air Units 3 CASA transports 2 C130 Herc transports 1 military Airbus (A310) 1 Dash 8</p> <p>TOTAL TROOPS AT PEAK = 2,000</p>
---	--

Strategic Outliers

The foregoing attempts to discern international trends and developments which may impact on the international security environment and, ultimately, on the security of Canadians. But some events are simply impossible to foresee, much as they may consume leaders' attention in future.

Some of the most important developments in world history, in fact, took those who were supposed to know about them completely by surprise – several in the last couple of decades alone: the dismantling of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, and the attacks of September 11, 2001. More recently, few believed that the demonstrations prompted by the self-immolation of a Tunisian food vendor would grow into an Arab Spring engulfing a dozen countries. Many of those who witnessed Western countries intervene in Iraq and Afghanistan dismissed the possibility those same countries would go into Libya.



Natural disasters are to be expected periodically, but some are of such character and consequence as to surprise and dismay us in equal measure. In 2011, the earthquake and tsunami in Japan killed 25,000, crippled segments of the Japanese economy and produced a nuclear crisis that was barely contained. The earthquake in Haiti killed ten times as many, including the leaders of the UN mission tasked with reconstructing the country after the political chaos of 2004. In Canada, the country has been struck by electricity blackouts, ice storms, floods, fires and hurricanes which called on the Canadian Forces to deploy in large numbers. Some 14,000 deployed during the 1998 ice storm.

Clearly, foresight and planning are important. But so is a degree of capability and readiness on the part of those we count on to be available for the unknowns.

Crisis management

Will leaders be able to control things in 2012? The outlook is not particularly auspicious.

The United States, on which the world relies most for the management of international crises, has indicated that it will no longer serve as the world's lone policeman or the banker for international security operations. It is out of Iraq and on its way out of Afghanistan. The role it played in Libya was vital, but with as low a profile as Washington could engineer, and its preferred strategy elsewhere favours diplomacy and sanctions. US leaders, however, have sometimes been driven by circumstances to do what they wish to avoid. The situations in the Middle East, Iran and North Korea might just provide such circumstances in 2012.

In the past, two European states, Britain and France, have demonstrated the fortitude and muscle required to take on adversaries, though their individual capacities are limited and their preferred modus operandi has been collective action — with the rare exceptions where post-colonial relationships still existed. Such operations, depending on the cause, can usually count on the support of at least a small number of other liberal democratic states including Canada and Australia. Germany, having abstained on Libya in 2011, is not likely to participate in actions which might require combat in 2012; it may, however, be prepared to make troops available for operations in permissive and uncontentious environments as it did recently in Lebanon.

Absent participation from such countries, NATO would find it difficult to act. Nor could the G8 and G20, deliberative bodies with mostly economic and financial preoccupations. As for the UN Security Council, the world body most responsible for the preservation of international peace and security, the most that could be expected is that it would be no more reactive in 2012 than in the past: it will certainly not be more pro-active. Relations between the five permanent members have been in a trough over Iran, Libya and Syria, and there is no international leadership to be discerned among the current non-permanent members: Germany, Portugal, India, Pakistan, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Guatemala, Morocco, South Africa and Togo.



CANADIAN INTERESTS

Canada's national interests are at stake in these developments.

- The security and freedom of Canadians, the first and most important responsibilities of government, are endangered when ruthless regimes are striving to get their hands on nuclear weapons and missiles to threaten states in their region and ultimately North America; and when terrorists are plotting against us and our friends.
- The economic well-being of Canadians, a trading and resource-rich people, is endangered when allies and trading partners cannot rein in their sovereign debt; when economic sanctions disrupt and distort international commerce and finance; when international oil supplies are threatened or cut off; and when the competition for resources becomes a struggle between the strong and the weak.
- The stable world order without which Canadians could not live in peace and prosperity is endangered when the UN Security Council is unable to fulfill its mandate to maintain the peace; when NATO members disregard their responsibilities to the Alliance on which they depend for their security; when major powers act out of narrow self-interest rather than the greater good; when the laws and conventions which serve as the foundation for a rules-based international security system are allowed to atrophy rather than adapt to the times; and when Western governments cannot bring themselves to intervene in small disputes before they become big ones, kill thousands, and involve dozens of states.
- Promotion of the values most responsible for bringing peace, order and good government to so many parts of the world including Canada — respect for the dignity of the individual, the rule of law, and government with the consent of the governed — is endangered when radicals employ subterfuge, coercion and violence to advance ideologies contrary to the most fundamental beliefs of Canadians; when international agencies to protect human rights are captured and turned against those who actually respect human rights; and when democratic states are reluctant to participate in the battle of ideas.

In keeping with these interests, the Strategic Outlook for 2012 concludes that Canada's own international security agenda should focus on the following:

1. A National Security Strategy

In Canada, most of the attention in the first half of 2012 will likely be on the federal budget and its effects – a development yet to transpire at the time of this writing. In the lead-up to the budget, there has been speculation that all sectors of government could expect to see significant reductions in expenditures in aid of achieving balanced budgets by FY 2014-15. These would include spending cuts related to Canada's foreign policy operations and national defence programs. There has been little discussion, however, of the options which might then present themselves and how Canada's international security interests could best be served in future years. In short, questions of national security strategy have yet to be addressed and, as the dust settles post-budget, policy makers will have to decide what course Canada should follow given the strategic outlook this report has described.

In the immediate future, regrettably, Canada will once again find itself with few long-term markers to guide it through the decisions it may have to take in 2012 on emerging issues engaging its security interests. About the only certainties are that Canadians will expect their government to do "the right thing" when a crisis arises, to work with Canada's closest allies to develop a consensus on the way forward and, in the event military measures are required, to act within a coalition.

Recommendation 1

The government should follow up on its initiative of establishing a National Security Committee of Cabinet and commission the preparation of a comprehensive National Security Strategy for Canada.



2. National Defence

Canada's defence budget has doubled in the last ten years and now exceeds \$20 billion a year. The new resources have gone to fighting in Afghanistan and more recently in Libya, to smaller CF deployments across the globe, to replacing equipment lost in battle – and, finally, to beginning the long process of modernizing the army, navy and air force. With “transformation” likely to reduce the defence budget in the order of 15%, and with limited room for economies (the transformation of 1994 cut \$7 billion and 30,000 CF personnel), the CF will only be able to do “less with less” in 2012 and beyond.

This situation begs for policy clarity on a number of fronts:

- What are the government's expectations in respect of the capabilities of the Canadian Forces in the event they are called on to participate in a new NATO or coalition operation this year or next?
- In a budget-constrained military, will decisions already taken regarding new equipment purchases have to be revisited and new choices made driven by affordability, return on investment, and emerging strategy?
- Can previous sacred cows such as general purpose combat capability be maintained or is some degree of specialization needed across various elements of the Canadian Forces? For example, do we need specialized units and if so, what kind?
- What is the balance to be struck between domestic and expeditionary capabilities?
- Given that Canada will not engage in high-intensity full-spectrum military operations on its own, are there defence enablers or capabilities that should be considered only in the context of collective security operations?
- What trade-offs may have to be made between traditional priorities such as the commitment to NATO and emerging priorities such as defence against cyber attack and ballistic missiles, sovereignty in the Arctic, security relations with partners in the Americas, and the geopolitical shifts under way in the Asia-Pacific region?
- As a practical matter, will a new balance have to be struck between the weight placed on the three services (more navy and air force, less army?) and will forces have to be realigned between the East and West coasts of Canada?

Recommendation 2

The Canada First Defence Strategy will soon be four years old. It needs to be updated if it is to continue to serve its purpose of ensuring that the Canadian Forces have the people, equipment and support they need to meet existing and emerging security challenges. Before engaging in a re-write, the government should consider a series of first principles to guide the work and define more precisely the contribution the Canadian Forces are expected to make to the nation's security.

Recommendation 3

Reductions to the National Defence operational budget create significant pressure on the ability to generate, employ and sustain capabilities. The cost to acquire and support new equipment begs the need to rationalize capital spending with the longer term ability to deliver all elements needed for a viable capability — personnel, infrastructure, maintenance, training, etc. Accordingly, the Defence Investment Plan should be critically evaluated to ensure that the scope, timing and relevance of new acquisitions correspond to their operational sustainability and future affordability.

Recommendation 4

The growth in the DND budget has outstripped the Department's capacity to gain approvals and to deliver the capital program, with significant dollars remaining unspent at year-end. To address this, the government should permit reprofiling of lapsed capital funds to future years when the available funding will align more practically to actual project spending projections.



Recommendation 5

In light of the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons and inter-continental range missiles, it is time to revisit the issue of Canadian participation in the ballistic missile defence of North America.

3. The United States

A top priority for Canadian defence and security policy will be remaining close enough to the United States to offer Canadian perspectives on its deliberations and decisions. Canada is uniquely positioned to influence the direction of the Administration's thinking on international security issues. Its standing is high in Washington because of its economic performance and its contributions to the campaigns in Afghanistan and Libya, and Canada represents one of the few countries the United States will count on for moral and material support should a future crisis arise. Ottawa should already be talking to Washington about future collaboration. In equal measure, Canada should be discussing future contingencies with partners in the coalitions of the willing which have emerged both inside and outside NATO, especially the United Kingdom, France, Australia and New Zealand.

Recommendation 6

The government should redouble its efforts to raise Canada's public profile in the United States, so that Canadian advice on international security issues carries the weight it deserves.

Recommendation 7

Canada should begin discussions with both the United States and other democratic allies on new international architecture better suited to, indeed specifically designed for, the security environment of the 21st century. The doctrines, laws and institutions on which we have relied for our collective security over the decades are all well past their prime.

4. International Crises

In 2012 and the years immediately following, Canada is very likely to be faced with a host of decisions related to the crises in the Middle East, in the Arabian Gulf, and on the Korean peninsula. More proactive engagement on the part of the government is warranted.

Recommendation 8

The National Security Committee of Cabinet should maintain a close watching brief on the conflict scenarios described earlier, and ensure Foreign Affairs and National Defence are developing suitable contingency plans.

Recommendation 9

The government should undertake high-level political discussions with Israel, Egypt and Turkey, along with corresponding staff talks, to ensure it has a good grasp of the positions of the major parties to the various disputes in the Middle East and is in a position to influence their decisions.

Recommendation 10

Given the rising importance of the Arab League in addressing a number of regional security issues, the government should strive for Canada to be accorded official observer status at the Arab League.

Recommendation 11

The government should ensure that the Prime Minister, Ministers and senior officials always have the expertise and information they need to make timely and well-informed decisions on international security issues. Among the measures the government should consider are:

- *Expanding the Canadian Defence Attaché Network across the globe and developing greater "foreign area officer" expertise within the Canadian Forces.*
- *Building up international security expertise within the Department of Foreign Affairs, in particular recognizing a particular political-military "stream" within the Foreign Service Group.*



5. Afghanistan

Canada has made an extraordinary contribution to the peace and stability of Afghanistan, and over the years Canadians have found many ways of expressing their appreciation for the courage and ingenuity displayed by their men and women in uniform, their diplomats and their aid workers. With the final phase of the engagement under way, however, public interest appears to have all but disappeared. In Parliament, there is little mention of the 950 Canadian Forces personnel leading the way in training the Afghan army and police to assume full responsibility for the security of their country. When the Governor General, the Minister of National Defence, and the Chief of the Defence Staff visited the troops at Christmas, not a single journalist was present — reflecting in equal measure where Afghanistan now ranks in the public mind in Canada (as in most NATO nations) and how the Department of National Defence has chosen to communicate with the Canadian public on this issue.

Recommendation 12

At the forthcoming NATO Summit in Chicago, the government in conjunction with Canada's allies in the 10-year long campaign in Afghanistan should argue forcefully that the decisions of the Lisbon summit be respected and allies abide by their commitment to provide the Afghan government the training and financial support it needs to become the guarantor of its own security post 2014. Failing to do so would be an affront to the legacy of the more than 2800 allied men and women in uniform who have lost their lives in Afghanistan – and to the 35,000 Canadians who have served in that country.

6. Pakistan

Pakistan is on the brink. This should matter to Canada, for developments there will largely determine whether the enormous Canadian and allied effort in Afghanistan succeeds and shapes the future security of the region. Canada also has long-standing ties with Pakistan stretching back to independence in 1947 including once close military-to-military links. Pakistan is a member of the Commonwealth and currently holds a seat on the UN Security Council.

Recommendation 13

The Prime Minister and senior ministers should make a special effort in 2012 to connect with their Pakistani counterparts and explore avenues for assisting Pakistan to resolve its many problems. The government should also encourage the United States, India and Pakistan to re-examine the old idea of a regional security treaty guaranteed or overseen by outside parties.

7. The Americas

The government has regional and country programs to explain Canada's official presence in every region of the world and to guide the activities of the many departments and agencies of government involved. But there appears to be a disconnection between the government's expressed interests in the Americas and the priorities assigned to the Canadian Forces there.

Mexico is clearly Canada's priority in the hemisphere. Other priorities in the region include major trade and investment partners such as Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Peru; prime destinations for Canadian tourism such as Cuba; the threats to Canada stemming from transnational criminal organizations operating out of Jamaica, Guatemala and Colombia; and the ongoing plight of Haiti.

Recommendation 14

The government should develop a defence and security engagement plan for the Americas to ensure greater unity of purpose and effort between departments and agencies in this area.

8. Asia-Pacific

Canada's interests in Asia-Pacific cover the gamut from security and prosperity to international stability and the advancement of freedom and democracy. With the Northern Gateway and other initiatives reflecting Canada's growing commercial interests in the region and with immigration across the Pacific now exceeding that across the Atlantic, the political stability and the security of trade routes in Asia-Pacific are now as much concerns of Canada as they are of nations more often associated with the region. But just as the region is becoming more important strategically to Canada, it is also drawing additional economic, security and military attention from others seeking to preserve and enhance their own inter-



ests. It would not be surprising to see Russia pay more attention to its previously neglected Pacific hub centered on Vladivostok (the site of the next APEC Summit). India too has a growing stake that will compel greater engagement in the affairs of the region to secure important trade routes especially through disputed waters.

Recommendation 15

Following the Prime Minister's visit to China in February, the time is right for a comprehensive review of Canada's strategic interests in Asia-Pacific. In order to improve the deployability of the Canadian Forces into the region, enhance Canada's diplomatic influence and expand Canada's trade with the region, the government will have to recalibrate the various dimensions of Canada's engagement in Asia-Pacific:

- *In defence, distance and geography should inform a review of capital programs related to shipbuilding, airlift, and expeditionary capability, and the balance of commitments between East and West.*
- *In foreign policy, the government should begin exploring with allies the parameters of new collective security arrangements in Asia-Pacific.*
- *In trade policy, the government should continue to pursue opportunities to establish new free trade zones and ensure competitive access to markets for Canadian products.*

9. Africa

Africa does not top the list of strategic issues to be watched in 2012, but it is an integral component of the interconnected world in which security and defence strategy much be developed. Canada should not take the position that it can remain uninvolved in the continent on the grounds of the limited means and capabilities available to it. Canada ranks among the ten leading nations with interests and investment in Africa.

There is one area which deserves close watching by Canadian policy makers in 2012. That is the recent Canadian International Development Agency initiative to parallel Canadian international development goals and funding with Canadian business interests in Africa, primarily mining-extractive industries and oil companies, in partnership with Canadian non-governmental organizations. Given that some of the firms in question have encountered problems in the past in meeting public expectations in respect of their comportment and commitment to corporate social responsibility, the government should take care to ensure that Canada's international reputation is not compromised. The linkage being made holds the prospect of improving in fundamental and permanent ways the effectiveness of Canada's assistance to Africa; but the risks need to be managed carefully and the situation monitored assiduously.

Recommendation 16

Political stability and the continued advancement of democracy in Africa are in Canada's interest. Within its means, the government should consider:

- *Increasing Canadian military and police capacity-building programs in Africa, especially in locales where development funding is being directed to achieve political leverage,*
- *Assisting the African Union to become a more effective regional security organization and mediator/peacekeeper through the provision of diplomatic and military advisors and mentors; and,*
- *Leveraging its unique position as a bilingual nation, Canada should take a more active role in la Francophonie in building international partnerships which would contribute to peace initiatives in Africa.*



INTERNATIONAL CALENDAR 2012 - KEY DATES:

JANUARY

- 16** - CARICOM/Canada Trade Development Agreement (4th Round)
- 23** - African Union Summit
- 23** - Conference on Disarmament 2012 session (Geneva)
- 25** - World Economic Forum, annual meeting (Davos, Switzerland)
- 30** - EU Heads of Government Summit (Brussels)

FEBRUARY

- 2-3** - NATO Defence Ministers Meeting
- 3** - Munich Security Conference (48th)
- 8** - US Department of Justice Cyber Security Conference
- 27** - Human Rights Council, 19th session (Geneva, Switzerland)

MARCH

- 1** - Deadline for new European Union Treaty Agreement on Deficit Reduction
- 2** - Iran – Parliamentary elections
- 4** - Russia – Presidential elections (second round if necessary March 25)
- 5-9** - IAEA Board of Governors (Vienna, Austria)
- 23** - German Marshal Fund Brussels Forum
- 26** - Nuclear Security Summit
- 29** - Arab League Summit (Baghdad, Iraq)
- 29** - BRICs summit (Delhi, India)

APRIL

- 14-15** - Summit of the Americas/OAS (Cartagena, Colombia)
- 20** - World Bank/IMF Spring Meetings
- 21** - UNCTAD XII Doha (Qatar)
- 22** - France – Presidential elections (second round if necessary May 6)

MAY

- 1** - WTO General Council
- 2** - First anniversary of the death of Osama bin Laden
- 19-20** - G8 Summit (Chicago)
- 20-21** - NATO Summit (Chicago)



JUNE

- 10, 17** - France – National Assembly elections
- 18-19** - G20 Summit (Los Cabos, Mexico)
- 20** - Rio + 20: UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
- 30** - Egypt – Presidential elections

JULY

- 3** - CARICOM Heads of Government (Saint Lucia)
- 22** - XIX International AIDS Conference (Washington, DC)
- 25** - WTO General Council
- XX** - ASEAN Regional Forum (Phnom Penh, Cambodia)

AUGUST

- 27-30** - Republican Party National Convention (Tampa Bay, Florida)

SEPTEMBER

- 3-6** - Democratic Party National Convention, (Charlotte, North Carolina)
- 8-9** - Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Summit (Vladivostok, Russia)
- 14** - United Nations General Assembly, Opening of 67th session
- 23** - World Bank/IMF Fall Meetings

OCTOBER

- 3** - WTO General Council
- 7** - Venezuela - presidential election

OCTOBER (continued)

- 12** - World Bank/IMF Annual Meeting (Tokyo, Japan)
- 14-28** - 50th anniversary of the ending of the Cuban Missile Crisis
- XX** - La Francophonie Summit (Kinshasa, DRC)
- XX** - Conference of Defence Ministers of the Americas (Montevideo, Uruguay)

NOVEMBER

- 6** - United States – Presidential and Congressional elections
- 29-30** IAEA Board of Governors
- XX** - Halifax International Security Forum

DECEMBER

- 19** - WTO General Council
- XX** - Leadership convention for African National Congress (ANC), South Africa

“XX” denotes date TBA



