

Canadian
Forces
College

Collège
des
Forces
Canadiennes



ENSURING “NEVER AGAIN” FROM BECOMING “NOT AGAIN” – THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTING MASS ATROCITY PREVENTION DOCTRINE IN THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

LCdr J.M. Lisi

JCSP 44

Exercise Solo Flight

Disclaimer

Opinions expressed remain those of the author and do not represent Department of National Defence or Canadian Forces policy. This paper may not be used without written permission.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2018.

PCEMI 44

Exercice Solo Flight

Avertissement

Les opinions exprimées n’engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent aucunement des politiques du Ministère de la Défense nationale ou des Forces canadiennes. Ce papier ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation écrite.

© Sa Majesté la Reine du Chef du Canada, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2018.

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 44 – PCEMI 44
2017 – 2018

EXERCISE *SOLO FLIGHT* – EXERCICE *SOLO FLIGHT*

**ENSURING “NEVER AGAIN” FROM BECOMING “NOT AGAIN” –
THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTING MASS ATROCITY
PREVENTION DOCTRINE IN THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES**

LCdr J.M. Lisi

“This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions, which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied, except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.”

Word Count: 4652

“La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.”

Compte de mots: 4652

ENSURING “NEVER AGAIN” FROM BECOMING “NOT AGAIN” – THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTING MASS ATROCITY PREVENTION DOCTRINE IN THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

INTRODUCTION

I say to all those leaders: Do not look the other way, do not hesitate ... It is within your power to prevent a genocide.

– Nelson Mandela, Live 8 Johannesburg speech

There are few more heinous acts committed by humankind than that of genocide. And yet despite the creation of the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted in 1948, and a multitude of other similar documents, (i.e. Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1987 (a.k.a. Proxmire Act), and the Responsibility to Protect Principle of 2005) genocides have since occurred and the previous vow by the international community of “never again” has indeed been broken.

Evolving mass atrocity prevention from principle to practice is complicated and typically “...rests on the invocation of moral norms and duties to others.”¹ History has proven that generally states do not act altruistically. As such, to ensure an issue is prioritized, the benefactors of the principle need to frame that issue as a matter of a state’s own national interest.² The power of an institution to prevent mass atrocities is only as strong as its political will, and political will is created by politicians who respond to political pressure.³ Understanding this reality is vital in garnering support for the institution of policies and doctrine like mass atrocity prevention.

¹ Muareen S Hiebert, “Genocide Prevention and Western National Security: The Limitations of Making R2P All About Us,” *Politics and Governance* 3, iss. 4 (2015): 12.

² *Ibid.*

³ Samuel Totten, *Impediments to the Prevention and Intervention of Genocide* (New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2013), 36.

Historically genocides have typically occurred under the auspice of war; ironically with both the perpetrators and the liberators wearing uniforms.⁴ “War represents a significant evolution of violence, which makes further violence easier.”⁵ Because of this, militaries are often considered an instrument of national power and therefore can play a vital role in the prevention and intervention of mass atrocities if so enabled. This fact alone should warrant a focused effort by states to develop appropriate doctrine for their armed forces.

Canada prides itself as a leader in global human rights and peacekeeping, however it has done little in the way of formalizing a mass atrocity prevention policy or providing complementary doctrine or training. This essay will express the requirement for the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) to develop a mass atrocity prevention doctrine and associated training by examining the origins, warning signs and stages of genocide as well as current genocide prevention policies and doctrine throughout the world. This essay will conclude by exploring Canada’s current Foreign Policy and how it translates to the CAF in mass atrocity prevention as well as provide recommendations on potential initiatives and training that could be established.

SECTION 1: ORIGINS, WARNING SIGNS AND STAGES OF GENOCIDE

A full understanding of the origins, warning signs and stages of genocide has, and will continue to, assist in developing policies and doctrine on the prevention of genocide. Band-Aid solutions will not suffice for such a complex issue, but a greater understanding of the nexus between past and current human behavior and associated actions will help immensely.

⁴ I. William Zartman, Mark Anstey, and Paul Meerts, *The Slippery Slope to Genocide*, 38.

⁵ *Ibid.*

The term “genocide” was created in 1944 by a Polish Jewish lawyer named Raphael Lemkin based on the Greek word for race, “geno”, and the Latin word for killing, “-cide” and was defined as “a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups.”⁶ However, although the term was coined in 1944 with reference to the Holocaust, genocide had taken place many years prior.⁷ Since then, the definition of genocide has been a relatively contested concept, but for the purpose of this essay, will refer to the definition as delineated in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide as:

...any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- a. Killing members of the group;
- b. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- c. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- d. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- e. Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.⁸

One of the first documented cases of genocide occurred on the north coast of Africa in a city called Carthage in 146 BC.⁹ The genocide that occurred at Carthage was an act of Roman

⁶ United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, “Holocaust Encyclopedia,” last accessed 05 May 18, <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007043>

⁷ United to End Genocide, “Past Genocides and Mass Atrocities,” last accessed 28 April 2018, <http://endgenocide.org/learn/past-genocides/>

⁸ United Nations General Assembly, “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment on the Crime of Genocide: Resolution 260 (III),” last modified 09 December 1948, <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%2078/volume-78-i-1021-english.pdf>

aggression fueled by both greed for the farming land that surrounded the city as well as for revenge for previous wars, and resulted in over 150,000 Carthaginian deaths of a total population estimated between 200,000 and 400,000 people.¹⁰ Since then, a number of genocides have occurred in places such as Armenia, Germany, Bosnia, Cambodia, Rwanda and Darfur.¹¹

With the number of genocides that have occurred throughout the world, scholars have attempted to understand if there are certain enabling conditions, indicators or warning signs associated with genocide with the hope of preventing future atrocities.

The United Nations Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide (OSAPG) has produced a document that outlines eight “common” and six “specific” risk factors of genocide as well as their associated indicators.¹² Generally speaking, these indicators can be found within the following broad themes: nation building, historic inter-communal hostility, economic upheaval, social and political mobilization without effort to cross-socialize with other subgroups, hate propaganda, prejudiced legislation and state repression.¹³ Elements of all these themes can be found within most, if not all, of the genocides throughout history.

Additionally, a common thread interwoven throughout these themes is vulnerability, with regards to both perpetrators and victims. Difficult life conditions, whether economic, political, or societal, have a pronounced effect on people when they feel their security, identity or autonomy is threatened and in turn they tend to look to groups for a sense of belonging.¹⁴ Over the course of history, perceived or real inequality created a divide and produced a number of susceptible

⁹ Ben Kiernan, “The First Genocide: Carthage, 146 BC,” *Diogenes* 51, no. 3 (2004): 27, https://gsp.yale.edu/sites/default/files/first_genocide.pdf

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹¹ United to End Genocide, “Past Genocides and Mass Atrocities,” last accessed 28 April 2018, <http://endgenocide.org/learn/past-genocides/>

¹² Adam Jones, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2017), 751-757.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ I. William Zartman, Mark Anstey, and Paul Meerts, *The Slippery Slope to Genocide: Reducing Identity Conflicts and Preventing Mass Murder*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 36.

groups within society. The only things that seemed to reduce this vulnerability were parity and mutual identification.¹⁵

Susceptible groups can be distinguished in different ways; gender, age, and sexual orientation are just a few. Gender as a discriminate factor in genocide is referred to as “gendercide.” Adult men of “battle age” have historically been the perpetrators of genocide, often succumbing to the pressure inflicted by the repression (i.e. the indicators as previously stated) that often precedes the genocide.¹⁶ Conversely, men have also been the targets of genocide based on the idea that they are capable and battle ready and therefore considered a threat. Or, in the case of patrilineal societies, where descent is traced through the father, men are also considered targets in an effort to end the lineage chain.¹⁷ Alternatively, but in the same vein, because of women’s ability to bear children, they have also been targeted to promote the complete annihilation of a race as well as for sexual violence.¹⁸

Similarly, Dr. Scott Straus, a notable scholar in the study of genocide prevention, relates macro-level predictors of genocide to power, and attributes instability and conflict, ideology, and previous discrimination and unpunished violence against certain groups, as primary risk factors that can cause genocide.¹⁹

In addition to the warning signs of genocide, are eight comprehensive stages as outlined by Dr. Gregory H. Stanton, founder and president of Genocide Watch. Stanton explains that although not linear, the eight stages of genocide are predictable and can be stopped with

¹⁵ Manus I. Midlarsky, *The Killing Trap: Genocide in the Twentieth Century*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 372.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 757.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 627.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 629.

¹⁹ Scott Straus, *Fundamentals of Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention*, (Washington: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2016), 55-59.

preventative measures.²⁰ These stages become extremely important in the understanding of how genocides unfold and therefore how they can be prevented or stopped.

The first stage is “classification” whereby people are separated into categories by distinguishing traits related themes such as religion, ethnicity or nationality.²¹ This creates an “us versus them” mentality that forms the basis of divisiveness between the masses. The differences do not have to be large to have an impact but inherently an “us versus them” mentality will lead to the devaluation of “them” and sets the framework for antagonistic behaviour.²²

The second stage is “symbolization” with which names and or symbols are applied to the classifications previously identified in the first stage.²³ This only serves to highlight the perceived differences between the groups and can become extremely significant especially when the next stage; “dehumanization”, is enacted.²⁴

The “dehumanization” stage is a defining stage. Perceived classes delineated by symbols both have, and currently exist, without genocidal actions associated with them. However, the dehumanization of one class by another crosses over a tenuous line that can spiral in a negative way very quickly. Dehumanizing another human being associates them with animals or disease and the normal human aversion to murder is suppressed.²⁵ “It is hard to imagine how anyone

²⁰ Gregory H. Stanton, “The 8 Stages of Genocide,” last accessed 23 Apr 18, <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/8stagesofgenocide.html>

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² I. William Zartman, Mark Anstey, and Paul Meerts, *The Slippery Slope to Genocide: Reducing Identity Conflicts and Preventing Mass Murder*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 36.

²³ Gregory H., Stanton, “The 8 Stages of Genocide” ...

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

could participate in the wholesale slaughter of a group of defenseless people he believed to be exactly like himself.”²⁶

“Organization” is the fourth stage of genocide and speaks to the groups of people that plan and execute the genocide.²⁷ Whether formal or informal, these groups tend to be generated from the state and typically are trained and armed militias or army units.²⁸

With continued perseverance, the different classes are further driven apart through the “polarization” stage. Laws and propaganda are just a few methods that support the extremist groups in their aim to divide and conquer.²⁹ Control over the media is a powerful tool that has been utilized in a number of genocides by soliciting support from the masses and instilling fear in the dominant groups by stating the victim group presents a mortal threat to their survival.³⁰

Stages one through five set the groundwork for the sixth stage: “preparation.” Having been classified and dehumanized, victims are usually stripped of their personal belongings, and are sent to ghettos or work in concentration camps where they face extremely harsh conditions and often lack the basic necessities to sustain life.³¹

Considered the most ostensible stage of genocide is the “extermination” stage. Often swiftly enacted, the mass killing of the ostracized group occurs usually by armed forces or militias or even groups seeking revenge.³² Once commenced, the extermination can be very difficult to stop and often requires significant and often multinational armed intervention to end.

²⁶ Benjamin A. Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century*, ed. J. Art and Stephen M. Walt, (New York: Cornell University Press, 2004), 17.

²⁷ Gregory H., Stanton, “The 8 Stages of Genocide” ...

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Benjamin A. Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century*, ed. J. Art and Stephen M. Walt, (New York: Cornell University Press, 2004), 35.

³¹ Gregory H., Stanton, “The 8 Stages of Genocide” ...

³² *Ibid.*

But however horrific the actual extermination stage is, often perceived as even more damning is what Stanton outlines as the eighth stage that occurs after a genocide; “denial.”³³

In the “denial” stage, attempts are often made to remove evidence of the atrocities, and perpetrators tend to refute any wrong-doing and instead place blame on their victims. With perpetrators often not being held accountable for their crimes, survivors of the genocide are further punished by this injustice which can set the stage for the perpetuation of future genocides.³⁴

The importance in understanding both how and why genocides occurred and also how they have evolved throughout history is absolutely essential in establishing methods to prevent them. Prevention at the earliest stage possible is definitely the goal, but not necessarily easy to accomplish. Often international assistance or intervention can only be enacted in later stages (dehumanization, organization, polarization, extermination) so as to not impede on the sovereignty of states. However, a number of policies and doctrine have since been drafted with prevention at the forefront of their aim that will be discussed in the next section.

SECTION 2: GLOBAL EFFORTS IN GENOCIDE PREVENTION DOCTRINE

Preventing mass atrocities such as genocide is a complex undertaking, but because significant research has been done on the topic along with an increase in media reporting, public awareness has greatly heightened since World War II and the Holocaust. The international

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*

community walks a fine line between the protection of basic human rights and the protection of sovereignty so as to not interfere in the internal affairs of a state.³⁵

At the basis of mass atrocity prevention is a series of treaty-based and customary international law. International human rights law is primarily comprised of multiple human rights treaties which “...assert that individuals are endowed with rights no matter who they are or where they live; they are endowed with such rights by virtue of being human.”³⁶ Not to be confused with international human rights law is international humanitarian law (commonly known as the Geneva Convention), which dictates the obligations of states and participants during times of armed conflict, with a primary objective of outlining the appropriate treatment of civilians and non-combatants.³⁷

However, even with the development of these legal frameworks, the international community struggled to understand how to prevent and better react to mass atrocities. And so in the 2001 International Commission on State Sovereignty (ICISS) report a new concept was introduced called the “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) with follow-on doctrine drafted in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document and endorsed by all member states.³⁸ R2P clearly articulates the international community’s commitment to protect not only their own population, but also the general population located outside of its own borders and is comprised of three main requirements: “...the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react, and the responsibility to rebuild”.³⁹

³⁵ Scott Strauss, *Fundamentals of Genocide...*, 114.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 117.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 188.

³⁸ United Nations, “Responsibility to Protect,” last accessed 23 April 2018, <http://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/about-responsibility-to-protect.html>

³⁹ Rebecca Salk, “Strengthening the Responsibility to Prevent: Reforming the United Nations’ Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention Efforts Through Emphasis on Rule of Law,” *Georgetown University of International*

Initially the concept of protecting those outside a state's borders was considered somewhat contentious as state sovereignty was perceived to be threatened; however the doctrine clearly conveyed the primary intent with three distinct aspects of responsibility: the primary responsibility borne by the state to protect its own population from mass atrocities, the responsibility of the international community to support the state in achieving their responsibility to protect their own population, and the responsibility of the international community to take "timely and decisive" action when a state has "manifestly failed to protect" their own population.⁴⁰

Critics argue that R2P is reactionary, specifically with regards to states acting outside their own borders, as the doctrine states that the action can only be taken when a state "manifestly" fails to protect its citizens. However during the 66th UN General Assembly meeting in September 2012, then Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon retorted that "Prevention is at the core of the responsibility to protect..." and "The use of force must be a measure of last resort, carried out in a proportional manner and bearing in mind the balance of consequences."⁴¹

Understanding the importance of R2P, President Obama placed the prevention of mass atrocities at the center of his Administration's agenda stating that prevention was not only a moral responsibility but also a core national security interest.⁴²

In an effort to ensure the United States (US) Government was better prepared to prevent and respond to mass atrocities, President Obama then ordered the formation of the Atrocities

Law 46 (2015): 563-564, <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/law-journals/gjil/recent/upload/zsx00215000561.PDF>

⁴⁰ United Nations, "Responsibility to Protect,"...

⁴¹ United Nations, "World Not Fulfilling 'Never Again' Vow, Secretary-General Tells General Assembly Meeting on Responsibility to Protect," last modified 03 September 2012, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2012/ga11270.doc.htm>

⁴² James P. Finkel, "Atrocity Prevention at the Crossroads: Assessing the President's Atrocity Prevention Board After Two Years," *Center for the Prevention of Genocide Series of Occasional Papers*, no.2 (September 2014): 5.

Prevention Board (APB) in 2012.⁴³ This would lay the groundwork for the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017 with which the sole aim is “To help prevent acts of genocide and the other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.”⁴⁴ The Act required the Secretary of State to establish a Mass Atrocities Task Force which was to be made up of designated representatives from a number of State Departments, including the Department of Defence (DoD), and who was required to produce a report every three years for the following six years.⁴⁵

In 2008, four years prior to the creation of the Mass Atrocities Task Force, a bipartisan Genocide Prevention Task Force co-chaired by then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, and then Secretary of Defense William Cohen, submitted a report entitled “Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers.” The report contained a number of recommendations, one of which made reference to the employment of military operations.⁴⁶ The recommendation highlighted the need to “...leverage all instruments of national power...” for both preventative and interceptive measures and that “...genocide prevention and response be incorporated into national policy guidance and planning for the military and into defense doctrine training.”⁴⁷

And so in 2010 a collaborative effort between Harvard Kennedy School's Carr Center for Human Rights and the US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute ensued to

⁴³ United States Senate, *115th Congress: Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017* (Government Publishing Office, 22 June 2017), <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/s1158>

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Madeleine K. Albright, and William S. Cohen, “Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers,” (Washington: United States Institute of Peace, 2008): xviii.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

develop the “MARO – Mass Atrocity Response Operations: A Military Planning Handbook.”⁴⁸

The handbook reflected the requirement for the US military to cease focusing solely on the preparation for major conventional operations and recognize that MAROs require unconventional thinking and tailored responses to account for the uniqueness that each one presents.⁴⁹

The handbook is quite detailed with a similar planning framework that would be utilized for conventional operations, including sections dedicated to mission analysis, courses of action, and plan design and implementation.⁵⁰ It also includes information on what distinguishes MARO situations from conventional operations as well as the potential operational and political implications.⁵¹ The MARO handbook was adapted into DoD doctrine in June of 2013 as part of an update to its doctrine on Peace Operations, and was considered a significant milestone in the evolution of mass atrocity prevention.⁵²

Multiple other countries around the world have also attempted to impart national mechanisms to prevent mass atrocities. The Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation’s (AIPR) mandate is to provide both educational and technical support to states that wish to develop or strengthen their national mechanisms.⁵³ In an effort to satisfy obligations under R2P policy, national mechanisms work to initially conduct a system-wide assessment of a state’s

⁴⁸ Sarah Sewall, Dwight Raymond, and Sally Chin, *MARO: Mass Atrocity Response Operations: A Military Planning Handbook*, (Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, 2010).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵² Secrecy News, “DoD Releases Doctrine on Mass Atrocity Response Operations,” last updated 06 June 2013. <https://fas.org/blogs/secrecy/2013/06/dod-mar/>

⁵³ The Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation, “National Mechanisms for the Prevention of Genocide and other Atrocity Crimes: Effective and Sustainable Prevention Begins at Home,” last accessed 27 April 2018, http://www.auschwitzinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/AIPR_National_Mech_Booklet_2015.pdf

current atrocity prevention measures.⁵⁴ Once this assessment is completed, policies are developed to reinforce the state's resilience to mass atrocity crimes.⁵⁵ Although national mechanisms may differ from state to state there are common themes that exist throughout: risk assessment and early warning, training programs at both the local and national levels, policies focused on the protection of vulnerable populations, and open communication with both regional and international organizations.⁵⁶

Countries such as Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Mexico and the US currently have national mechanisms typically in the form of a Committee or Commission similar to the US' Atrocities Prevention Board.⁵⁷ While other states, such as the Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Argentina, and Paraguay, have emerging national mechanisms yet to be completely stood up.⁵⁸ These few examples showcase the global effort and subsequent priority that is being placed on this issue.

As in most global issues, education and training is often a significant aid in promoting awareness and innovation for prevention. Academic institutions such as Columbia University and George Mason University have developed an Education and Training Program on Genocide Prevention (EGGP) aimed at mid-level government personnel from around the world to provide them with the skills to be "effective agents for the prevention of genocide" as well as linking genocide prevention networks at the regional, national, and international level to promote a "cross-fertilization" of knowledge and practices.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Earth Institute Columbia University, "Genocide Prevention Program (GPP)," last accessed 23 April 2018, <http://ac4.ei.columbia.edu/research-themes/past-projects/genocide-prevention/>

The Budapest Center for Mass Atrocities Prevention takes education one step further. In an effort to mainstream R2P education and believes varying levels of instruction starting with “prosocial learning” in primary schools, “proactive learning” in secondary schools, and “training the future trainers” in universities, in the hopes that they may be able to alter the mentality of a whole society, preventing atrocity crimes all together.⁶⁰

Institutions and programs such as these, along with various numbers of committees and commissions who support acts decreed by law, emphasize the international importance placed on genocide prevention.

SECTION 3: THE CANADIAN CONTEXT

Canada seems to have an intermittent relationship with mass atrocity prevention efforts. Established in 2006 by Senator Roméo Dallaire, the Canadian All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Prevention of Genocide and Other Crimes Against Humanity (a.k.a. the Genocide Prevention Group (GPG)) was established.⁶¹ The GPG is comprised of members from both the House of Commons and the Senate and works alongside the Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies at Concordia University with an aim to “...ensure that Canadian parliamentarians have the support and resource they need to address some of the most serious conflicts afflicting the globe.”⁶²

⁶⁰ Budapest Center for Mass Atrocities Prevention, “Why Education is Important in Atrocity Crimes Prevention,” last accessed 23 April 2018, <http://www.genocideprevention.eu/trainings-and-education/>

⁶¹ Prevention Genocide, “All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Prevention of Genocide and Other Crimes Against Humanity,” last accessed 07 May 2018. <http://www.preventiongenocide.org/>

⁶² *Ibid.*

In 2014 the GPG exhibited a renewed effort to promote genocide prevention, which yielded a bilateral relationship with the British All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Prevention of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity (APPG) in an effort to establish national mechanisms for the prevention of atrocity crimes primarily through information exchange.⁶³

However, concrete outputs from the GPG seem few and far between with the last publicly announced event having taken place in April of 2017. Interestingly though, the GPG hosted a meeting comprised of parliamentarians, veterans, NGOs, academics, UN experts and peace practitioners on 21 March 2017 titled “Canada’s Role in Conflict Transformation in Understanding Genocide Prevention and other Crimes against Humanity – Cases including Syria and the Central African Republic.”⁶⁴ A few key conclusions drawn from the meeting were especially pertinent to the CAF; the acknowledgment that transformative approaches are required when dealing with different phases of conflict, and that when necessary, military intervention must be aligned with Canadian values and conducted in conjunction with other peacekeeping strategies.⁶⁵ In addition, it recognized the requirement for a federally controlled peace institution to advance the GPG’s mandate, much like the proposed “Department of Peace” (a Canadian citizen campaign promoting a federal department to increase peacebuilding capacity.⁶⁶)⁶⁷ However, no known collaboration has surfaced between the GPG and the CAF to draft doctrine to support the efforts made at the meeting.

⁶³ Aegis Trust, “UK and Canadian MPs to collaborate on genocide prevention,” last updated 10 June 2014, <https://www.aegistrust.org/uk-canadian-mps-collaborate-genocide-prevention/>

⁶⁴ Prevention Genocide, “Canadians respond to where and how government spending for the Responsibility to Protect civilians at home and abroad: GPG and Irwin Cotler convene in a round-table in Parliament with survivors of Burundi, Rwanda, Syria alongside parliamentarians, veterans, and UN experts in Canada’s role in Conflict Transformative approaches,” last updated 24 March 2017, <http://www.preventiongenocide.org/lang/en/archives/3883>

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ The Canadian Peace Initiative, “Welcome to the Canadian Peace Initiative,” last accessed 07 May 2018, <http://canadianpeaceinitiative.ca/>.

⁶⁷ Prevention Genocide, “Canadians respond to where...”

In addition to the recommendations that stemmed from the meeting hosted by the GPG, the Young Diplomats of Canada drafted a policy paper critiquing Canada's Foreign Policy in relation to mass atrocity prevention.⁶⁸ The paper highlighted mass atrocity best practices similar to those previously articulated in this paper, including an institutional government structure to increase awareness and coordinate action (not unlike Obama's APB), specific military doctrine that addresses mass atrocity prevention (similar to the MARO Handbook), and designating mass atrocity prevention as a distinct focus of a state's foreign policy.⁶⁹ The policy paper's resulting analysis of Canada's Foreign Policy as it related to mass atrocity prevention, was that it fell short and required significant effort to achieve the impact it professed to desire.⁷⁰

Not necessarily as a result of the critique, but certainly could be considered reasonable effort by the Canadian Government to improve on their perceived shortcomings, was the announcement by Prime Minister (PM) Justin Trudeau along with his Minister of Foreign Affairs of the adaptation of Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy (FIAP). The policy "...seeks to eradicate poverty and build a more peaceful, more inclusive and more prosperous world" with the belief that "...promoting gender equality and empowering women and girls is the most effective approach to achieving this goal."⁷¹ However, the policy is very clear to state that a feminist approach to foreign policy does not mean that the focus is solely on women and girls, but that by directing efforts to women and girls, is actually the most effective means to addressing the root causes of inequality and exclusion that affects everyone.⁷²

⁶⁸ Young Diplomats of Canada, "Mass Atrocity Prevention in Canadian Foreign Policy," last updated 23 August 2014, <http://youngdiplomats.ca/journal-index/2015/2/10/mass-atrocity-prevention-in-canadian-foreign-policy>

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Global Affairs Canada, *Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy* (Ottawa: GAC Canada, 2017), vii.

⁷² *Ibid.*

As previously stated, inequality creates a social divide that produces vulnerable or susceptible groups. Canada's FIAP aims to reduce that divide through the promotion of human dignity, inclusive governance, greater participation of women in peace and security operations, mitigation strategies for environmental and climate action and the increase in access to economic resources for women.⁷³

So how does the FIAP translate to the CAF and mass atrocity prevention? Soon after the FIAP announcement by the PM, Canada hosted a UN Peacekeeping Defence Ministerial in Vancouver where over 550 delegates attended to discuss, pledge and reaffirm past pledges regarding global peacekeeping principles and initiatives.⁷⁴

With a common understanding that women play a vital role in achieving long-term and sustainable piece, all the discussions held during the Ministerial considered methods of empowering women in peacekeeping roles.⁷⁵ Illustrating a serious commitment to this theme, Canada launched the "Elsie Initiative on Women in Peace Operations."⁷⁶ This initiative promotes the development of methods in overcoming any barriers that prevent women's participation in peace operations with a goal of doubling the current participation rate of women by 2020 along with appropriate funding to assist in achieving this goal.⁷⁷

And so in an effort to make good on the initiative to increase women's participation in peacekeeping operations, the CAF is expected to target female servicewoman for the upcoming

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Department of National Defence, "The 2017 UN Peacekeeping Defence Ministerial concludes in Vancouver with 46 new pledges for UN peacekeeping operations," last updated 01 January 2018. https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/news/2017/11/the_2017_un_peacekeepingdefenceministerialconcludesinvancouverwi.html

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Global Affairs Canada, "The Elsie Initiative on Women in Peace Operations," last accessed 07 May 2018, <http://peacewomen.org/sites/default/files/The%20Elsie%20Initiative%20on%20Women%20in%20Peace%20Operations%20%7C%20Prime%20Minister%20of%20Canada.pdf>

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

mission to Mali.⁷⁸ It will be interesting to see the resultant composition of the CAF contingent that deploys to Mali, as females currently only represent 15 percent of personnel in the CAF as a whole.

As previously emphasized, education remains a focal element of mass atrocity prevention. Not only does the CAF currently not have mass atrocity prevention doctrine, it makes no specific mention of it in its latest Defence Policy document released in 2017, *Strong, Secure, and Engaged*. However, the Defence Policy does speak to the CAF's ability to make "...concrete contributions to Canada's role as a responsible international actor..." and that the CAF "...will be able to support conflict prevention, mediation, and post-conflict reconstruction, with an emphasis on human rights and, in particular, gender and equality."⁷⁹ What this translates to in the form of action is not clear at this time, but will likely be associated with peace support operations.

There is also very limited access to educational advancement or professional development in the area of mass atrocity prevention for military members. CAF members currently have access to two courses that discuss mass atrocity prevention of which both are taught by the same professor. However, in general, Canada as a whole does not have very many "experts" that can speak professionally on the topic and currently no Centre of Excellence or central institution exists that can connect academics, researchers, professionals, politicians or citizens interested in the topic.

⁷⁸ Lee Berthiaume, "Canada's Mali mission will emphasize deployment of female peacekeepers," *The Canadian Press*, 18 September 2018. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/politics/canada-s-mali-mission-will-emphasize-deployment-of-female-peacekeepers-1.3848176>

⁷⁹ Department of National Defence, *Strong, Secure, Engaged: Canada's Defence Policy* (Ottawa: National Defence, 2017), 61.

Although not necessarily intuitive, in the US, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) adequately fulfills this role. The USHMM is world-renowned for its work in awareness, remembrance, prevention and educational resources.⁸⁰ Although Canada has the Canadian Museum for Human Rights located in Winnipeg and the Canadian War Museum in Ottawa, neither specifically address genocide prevention nor are networked with other educational institutions.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that there is much left to be desired with regards to Canada's, let alone the CAF's, efforts regarding mass atrocity prevention. The issue requires concerted effort on a broader and combined scale that encompasses a coordinated whole of government approach and utilizes best practices and emerging institutional reforms that other countries such as the US have already established.

Mass atrocity operations are very different from conventional warfare or insurgency operations, and they do not necessarily fit neatly under the same umbrella as peace support operations. Therefore, designated doctrine truly is required to properly conduct MARO.

However, arguably Canada's closest ally, the US, is already light years ahead of where Canada should be in order to truly convey its stance as a leader in human rights promotion. It would be markedly easy for Canada to follow the US' lead and utilize their framework and doctrine, including the MARO Handbook, with a few adjustments in order to conform to Canadian and CAF nuances.

⁸⁰ United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, "Homepage", last accessed 07 May 2018, <https://www.ushmm.org/>

The USHMM provides a phenomenal example as a national Centre of Excellence and the Canadian Museum for Human Rights would be the obvious selection to house similar programmes, should the desire exist to do so. Having a central institution that could bring together subject matter experts from academia and the whole of government would be ideal to support a Canadian initiative on mass atrocity prevention.

The GPG already exists but certainly could be bolstered and could also take the lead on liaison between international, national, and whole of government institutions and the CAF.

The CAF has already demonstrated immense commitment to causes it prioritizes. Operation HONOUR was stood up to prevent and combat Harmful and Inappropriate Sexual Behaviour (HISB) within the institution.⁸¹ In relatively short order, policies, doctrine, training and support centers were created to ensure mission success. The CAF could have similar successes if they utilized similar concepts for mass atrocity prevention. Existing training for Operation HONOUR such as bystander training, could potentially be altered and customized with little effort for use as MARO training. As more research is conducted on the topic there is an increase in the number of educational courses. The CAF could look to provide their members with more opportunities for professional development and higher learning with regards to mass atrocity prevention which, if established as a Centre of Excellence, could also be coordinated through the Canadian Museum for Human Rights.

⁸¹ Government of Canada, “Canadian Army using Bystander Training from TED Talk in support of Operation Honour,” last update 23 January 2017, <http://www.army-armee.forces.gc.ca/en/news-publications/national-news-details-no-menu.page?doc=canadian-army-using-bystander-training-from-ted-talk-in-support-of-operation-honour/iw7nt9c3>

The CAF command structure could also be used in its current state with Strategic Joint Staff (SJS) taking the lead on the development of mass atrocity prevention within the CAF as well as potentially acting as a liaison body with the GPG.

With the knowledge and resources the international community has available to them today, there should be absolutely no reason why “never again” cannot be an absolute reality. The International community as well as Canada owes it to themselves to not repeat errors of the past. A combination of political will and appropriate prioritization can go a long way in promoting a substantial Canadian and CAF effort in mass atrocity prevention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aegis Trust. "UK and Canadian MPs to collaborate on genocide prevention." Last updated 10 June 2014. <https://www.aegitrust.org/uk-canadian-mps-collaborate-genocide-prevention/>
- Albright, Madeleine K., and William S. Cohen. "Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers." Washington: United States Institute of Peace, 2008.
- Brunstetter, Daniel R. "Trends in Just War Thinking During the US Presidential Debates 2000-12: Genocide Prevention and the Renewed Salience of Last Resort." *Review of International Studies* 40, vol. 1 (January 2014): 77-99.
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/1476202881?pq-origsite=summon>
- Budapest Center for Mass Atrocities Prevention. "Why Education is Important in Atrocity Crimes Prevention." Last accessed 23 April 2018.
<http://www.genocideprevention.eu/trainings-and-education/>
- Canada. Department of National Defence. "Canadian Army using Bystander Training from TED Talk in support of Operation Honour. Last updated 23 January 2017. <http://www.army-armee.forces.gc.ca/en/news-publications/national-news-details-no-menu.page?doc=canadian-army-using-bystander-training-from-ted-talk-in-support-of-operation-honour/iw7nt9c3>
- . Department of National Defence. *Strong, Secure, Engaged: Canada's Defence Policy*. Ottawa: National Defence, 2017.
- . Department of National Defence. "The 2017 UN Peacekeeping Defence Ministerial concludes in Vancouver with 46 new pledges for UN peacekeeping operations." Last updated 01 January 2018. https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/news/2017/11/the_2017_un_peacekeepingdefenceministerialconcludesinvancouver.html
- . Global Affairs Canada. *Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy*. Ottawa: GAC Canada, 2017.
- . Global Affairs Canada. "The Elsie Initiative on Women in Peace Operations." Last accessed 07 May 2018.
<http://peacewomen.org/sites/default/files/The%20Elsie%20Initiative%20on%20Women%20in%20Peace%20Operations%20%7C%20Prime%20Minister%20of%20Canada.pdf>
- Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict. *Preventing Deadly Conflict: Executive Summary*. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1998.
- Colombant, Nico. "Hours After Obama Oslo Speech, US UN Ambassador Talks of Genocide Prevention." *Voice of America News*. 11 December 2009.
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/190587886/C1FBBCFE3F6E4672PQ/1?accountid=9867>

- Croucher, Ashleigh. "The International Community and the Prevention of Genocide." Last accessed 28 April 18. <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/09/14/never-again-all-over-again-the-international-community-and-the-prevention-of-genocide/>
- Earth Institute Columbia University. "Genocide Prevention Program (GPP)." Last accessed 23 April 2018. <http://ac4.ei.columbia.edu/research-themes/past-projects/genocide-prevention/>
- Evans, Gareth. *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2008.
- Finkel, James P. "Atrocity Prevention at the Crossroads: Assessing the President's Atrocity Prevention Board After Two Years." Center for the Prevention of Genocide Series of Occasional Papers, no.2 (September 2014): 1-37.
- Hiebert, Maureen S. "Genocide Prevention and Western National Security: The Limitations of Making R2P All About Us." *Politics and Governance* 3, iss. 4 (2015): 12-25. <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/politicsandgovernance/article/view/317>
- International Commission on the Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Responsibility to Protect*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001.
- Johansen, Robert C. "The Impact of US Policy toward the International Criminal Court on the Prevention of Genocide, War Crimes, and Crimes against Humanity." *Human Rights Quarterly* 28, iss. 2 (May 2006): 301-331. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/204638842/2C5BD34A4E5E4D0EPQ/1?accountid=9867>
- Johnston, Geoffrey. "World Shirks Responsibility." *The Kingston Whig-Standard*. 25 August 2016. <http://www.thewhig.com/2016/08/25/world-shirks-responsibility>
- Jones, Adam. *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Kiernan, Ben. "The First Genocide: Carthage, 146 BC." *Diogenes* 51, no. 3 (2004): 27-39. https://gsp.yale.edu/sites/default/files/first_genocide.pdf
- Kuperman, Alan J. "Suicidal Rebellions and the Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention." *Ethnopolitics* 4, no. 2 (June 2005): 149-173.
- Midlarsky, Manus I. *The Killing Trap: Genocide in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Naumann, Klaus. "The Responsibility to Protect – Humanitarian Intervention and the Use of Military Force." *Canadian Military Journal* 5, no. 4 (Winter 2004-2005): 21-30. <http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo5/no4/humanitarian-eng.asp>
- Posner, Eric A. *The Twilight of Human Rights Law*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

- Prevention Genocide. "All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Prevention of Genocide and Other Crimes against Humanity." Last accessed 07 May 2018.
<http://www.preventiongenocide.org/>
- Prevention Genocide. "Canadians responds to where and how government spending for the Responsibility to Protect civilians at home and abroad: GPG and Irwin Cotler convene in a round-table in Parliament with survivors of Burundi, Rwanda, Syria alongside parliamentarians, veterans, and UN experts in Canada's role in Conflict Transformative approaches." Last updated 24 March 2017.
<http://www.preventiongenocide.org/lang/en/archives/3883>
- Salk, Rebecca. "Strengthening the Responsibility to Prevent: Reforming the United Nations' Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention Efforts Through Emphasis on Rule of Law." *Georgetown University of International Law* 46 (2015): 561-587.
<https://www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/law-journals/gjil/recent/upload/zsx00215000561.PDF>
- Secrecy News. "DoD Releases Doctrine on Mass Atrocity Response Operations." Last updated 06 June 2013. <https://fas.org/blogs/secrecy/2013/06/dod-mar0/>
- Senate Foreign Relations Committee Ranking Member. "Sens. Cardin, Young Lead Bipartisan Bill to Bolster US Leadership in Genocide, Atrocity Prevention." Last updated 18 May 2017.
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/1899597752/459BCF8A3B8A4058PQ/1?accountid=9867>
- Sewall, Sarah, Dwight Raymond, and Sally Chin. *MARO: Mass Atrocity Response Operations: A Military Planning Handbook*. Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, 2010.
- Shaw, Martin. *Genocide and International Relations: Changing Patterns in the Transitions of the Late Modern World*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Stanton, Gregory H. "The 8 Stages of Genocide." Last accessed 23 Apr 18.
<http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/8stagesofgenocide.html>
- Strauss, Scott. *Fundamentals of Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention*. Washington: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2016.
- . "Contested Meanings and Conflicting Imperatives: A Conceptual Analysis of Genocide." *Journal of Genocide* 3, no. 3 (2001): 349-375.
- Theriat, Henry C. "The MARO Handbook: New Possibilities or the Same Old Militarism?" Last accessed 27 April 2018.
<http://muse.jhu.edu/article/426333/pdf?/?/www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/article2461214.ece>

The Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation. “National Mechanisms for the Prevention of Genocide and other Atrocity Crimes: Effective and Sustainable Prevention Begins at Home.” Last accessed 27 April 2018. http://www.auschwitzinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/AIPR_National_Mech_Booklet_2015.pdf

———. “Training Resource Manual for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention in the Great Lakes Region of Africa.” Last accessed 23 April 2018. <http://www.auschwitzinstitute.org/training-resource-manual/>

The Canadian Peace Initiative. “Welcome to the Canadian Peace Initiative.” Last accessed 07 May 2018. <http://canadianpeaceinitiative.ca/>

Totten, Samuel. *Impediments to the Prevention and Intervention of Genocide*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2013.

United Nations. “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment on the Crime of Genocide: Resolution 260 (III).” Last modified 09 December 1948. <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%2078/volume-78-i-1021-english.pdf>

———. “Outreach Programme on the Rwanda Genocide and the United Nations: Preventing Genocide.” Last accessed 05 May 18. <http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/rwanda/pdf/bgpreventgenocide.pdf>

———. “Responsibility to Protect.” Last accessed 23 April 2018. <http://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/about-responsibility-to-protect.html>

———. “World Not Fulfilling ‘Never Again’ Vow, Secretary-General Tells General Assembly Meeting on Responsibility to Protect.” Last modified 03 September 2012. <https://www.un.org/press/en/2012/ga11270.doc.htm>

United States. Senate. *115th Congress: Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017*. Government Publishing Office, 22 June 2017. <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/s1158>

———. Senate. *Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1987 (the Proxmire Act)*. Government Publishing Office, 04 November 1988. <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/100/s1851/text>

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. “Holocaust Encyclopedia.” Last accessed 05 May 18. <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007043>

United to End Genocide. “Past Genocides and Mass Atrocities.” Last accessed 28 April 2018. <http://endgenocide.org/learn/past-genocides/>

Valentino, Benjamin A. *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century*, edited by Robert J. Art and Stephen M. Walt. New York: Cornell University Press, 2004.

World Learning Organization. "Genocide Prevention in the Real World: A Tale of Four Countries." Last accessed 27 April 2018. <https://www.worldlearning.org/media/press-room/speeches/genocide-prevention-in-the-real-world-a-tale-of-four-countries/>

Young Diplomats of Canada. "Mass Atrocity Prevention in Canadian Foreign Policy." Last updated 23 August 2014. <http://youngdiplomats.ca/journal-index/2015/2/10/mass-atrocity-prevention-in-canadian-foreign-policy>

Zartman, I. William, Mark Anstey, and Paul Meerts. *The Slippery Slope to Genocide: Reducing Identity Conflicts and Preventing Mass Murder*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.