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Dear Globalists,

This spring semester came and went! Yale’s mask mandate was partially lifted after Spring Break and a lot of us were able to see each other face-to-face for the first time in a long time. Yale and the world beyond have been in constant motion and we’re all just trying to keep up. For this issue, then, we selected the theme FLUX. According to Oxford Dictionary, “flux” can mean:

1. The action or process of flowing or flowing out
2. The rate of flow of a fluid, radiant energy, or particles across a given area
3. Continuous change or movement

The articles featured in this issue explore ongoing conflicts and tensions in Canada, Ukraine, Turkey, and related geographies. In “Hot Wheels: Canada’s Trucking Industry’s Response to covid-19,” Bloom discusses Canadian truckers protesting vaccination mandates and contemplates the larger issue of how governments ought to respond to civil protests. In “Turkey’s Turn Back,” Gunn probes into Turkey’s complicated position amidst the Russia-Ukraine conflict. Relatedly, Tedla’s “The Policies are Immigrating: Eastern Europe and the American Right” highlights the Eastern European influence on the American right’s response to migration flux and ideology around the “ideal” migrant.

Thank you to our writers—Dylan Gunn, Ezana Tedla, and David Bloom—for their diligent work and critical insights. Thank you to our editors— Margaret Hedeman, Mahesh Agarwal, and Sandhya Kumar—who made this issue possible. Thank you to the creative brain behind it all—Sid Hirschman! We look forward to the future of the Globalist and possibly resuming our tradition of international reporting trips.

Have a great summer!

With love,
Martina & Victory
Hot Wheels
Canada’s Trucking Industry’s Response to COVID-19

by David Bloom
THRONGS OF WORKERS shut down key roads in protest of a law they believe is unjust. Their protest punches above its weight, and despite their relatively unpopular views, the protestors manage to disrupt traffic in the capital city and some cross border trade. The protestors remain mostly peaceful, but as the economic costs mount, the government invokes emergency powers. Police clear protestors under the threat of force, and the intelligence agency freezes the bank accounts of many protestors and their sympathizers who donated to the cause. The streets are cleared, and order is restored.

Was the government right to crack down on the protest? For many people, the answer might depend on the protestor’s cause. I suspect that most liberals, myself included, would condemn a crackdown on a protest for the religious rights of an oppressed minority or against police brutality in a heartbeat. When you agree with the protest’s goals, there isn’t any moral dilemma: if a protest’s goals are good, it is bad to stop the protest from achieving their goals.

It is far more uncomfortable to ponder these questions when you disagree with the protest group’s aims and politics. Between January 28th and February 20th, a majority of Canadians faced this exact choice when a group of truckers blockaded key roads and disrupted traffic in central Ottawa. The law they believed was unjust: a requirement that anyone who crosses the US-Canada border, including truckers, be vaccinated against COVID-19. There is no doubt that these truckers represented a fringe view in Canadian politics. A plethora of polls show that a majority of Canadians support vaccine mandates, and disagreed with the protestor’s aims. Indeed, 90% of truckers are vaccinated, so even within their occupation, the protestors held a minority view. Given the economic costs the protestors have imposed, one can hardly blame most Canadians for opposing the protests. The Retail Council of Canada estimated that Ottawa’s biggest shopping mall lost CA$20 million of revenue in the first week of protests alone, while the closure of the Ambassador Bridge between the US and Canada may have cost $850 million in lost revenue for the auto industry.

By February 14th, the Canadian government was fed up, and Prime Minister Justin Trudeau invoked the Emergency Act, a law that grants law enforcement new powers to arrest the protestors and freeze their bank accounts. Most protestors in Ottawa dispersed peacefully, but the police did have to use pepper spray to disperse some stragglers and arrested those who refused to leave.

While it may have been the popular thing to do, it was wrong to invoke the Emergency Act.

By stretching the letter of the law, Trudeau has set a dangerous precedent that lowers the threshold for the application of force against peaceful protests in the future.

Temporary economic disruption is not sufficient cause to justify cracking down on an otherwise peaceful protest, especially when the most dangerous and potentially violent elements of the protest were already being suppressed by law enforcement.

The Emergency Act simply was not meant to be invoked in response to protests which, like the trucker protests, do not threaten Canada’s national security. The Emergency Act is to be invoked when a situation either “seriously endangers the lives, health or safety of Canadians and is of such proportions or nature as to exceed the capacity or authority of a province to deal with it,” or “seriously threatens the ability of the Government of Canada to preserve the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of Canada.” The trucker protests, which were domestic in nature, nonviolent, and did not threaten or target the effectiveness of Canada’s
military, were clearly not a threat to Canada’s “sovereignty, security, and territorial integrity.” While they may have “seriously [endangered] the […] safety of Canadians,” local police forces would have been capable of responding, since police ordinarily have the authority to arrest and investigate illegal behavior, and did not require the extra powers the Emergency Act granted them. For example, the police set up a hotline to coordinate their responses to incidents of hate speech, and arrested individual protestors who violated laws around carrying weapons or vandalizing public property. Despite the fact that the Act does not specify that economic disruptions qualify as a national emergency, one of the Federal Governments’ stated reasons for invoking the Emergency Act was to “protect jobs, trade, and our economy.”

By stretching the letter of the law, Trudeau has set a dangerous precedent that lowers the threshold for the application of force against peaceful protests in the future. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association has filed an application to declare the invocation of the Emergency Act illegal in Canadian Federal Court. If the court rules in favor of the government, any future government which finds itself facing an unpopular and economically disruptive protest, regardless of the protest’s cause, will have the option to invoke the Emergency Act and quash the protest. Moreover, if future governments know that the current government’s loose interpretation of the Emergency Act stood, they may be tempted to stretch the letter of the law further and crack down on protests which they argue threatens national security in other ill-defined ways besides economic harms.

To be clear, this is not an argument in favor of the trucker protests, or their aims. You can believe that a vaccine mandate for travelers who cross the US-Canada border is a sensible and legitimate policy, while still believing that the Canadian government’s response to the trucker protest was illegitimate. The reason why is simple: the precedent set by invoking the Emergency Act is not confined to the protests that you disagree with. Imagine that an indigenous group uses similar protest tactics to oppose the construction of an oil pipeline over their land. Now imagine the Canadian government, invoking the precedent that Trudeau has just set, argues that Canada’s energy industry is part of its national security interests, and uses the Emergency Act to clear the protestors and freeze the bank accounts of allies who donated to them. There is no reason to think that, going forward, this scenario is less likely than crackdowns against ‘bad’ protests that advocate for goals that liberals may disagree with. Even people who are vehemently opposed to the goals of the Canadian truckers should be dismayed to see the Trudeau government assuming Emergency Powers to suppress their legitimate expression of discontent with the laws they live under.

David Bloom is a first-year in Timothy Dwight college and can be reached at david.bloom@yale.edu.
The Policies are Immigrating

Eastern Europe and the American Right

by Ezana Témla
“EVERY SINGLE MIGRANT poses a public security and terror risk,” Orbán, the Prime Minister of Hungary, said describing his view of migrants and refugees from North Africa and the Middle East during a 2016 press conference in Moscow. But this demeaning and fearful sentiment toward refugees is not only felt by the Hungarian government. The migrant crisis of the last decade has continued to be one of the main threats to the unity of the European Union. Poland, Hungary, Greece and other countries in Southern and Eastern Europe have been reluctant to welcome more migrants.

The American right wing stance over immigration has shifted in the past twenty years, as differing factions have fought over migration to the US. The immigration rhetoric of Bush-era Republicans has become alien to the now post-Trump line on what to do on the border. The centrality of migration and who constitutes a “real” American is a newer trend in the ideologies of the US right wing. However, focusing solely on American politics leads to a myopic conclusion about this change. Instead, we ought to consider a broader question: how has the framing of immigration in Eastern Europe influenced the American right wing?

To be an hegemonic power implies that one’s domestic politics have significant implications on peripheral spheres. The US has been projecting its power in this fashion for nearly a century. However, this aspect of American influence can leave us with a unidirectional view of political change. Agency in global affairs, in this view, is largely held by the US. For example, the idea that regime change only occurred because of American politicians’ decisions to invade Iraq. American media certainly perpetuates this view of international agency. But it is a mistake to portray our domestic politics as if there were only Americans coming up with American ideas to debate with American politicians. Regardless if we like it or not, and as much as the US and its people shape the course of international affairs, we are also shaped by them.

The course of right wing politics and populism has had similar, broad shifts since the Great Recession over a decade ago. Largely, this ideology has been the common convictions around hostility towards immigration, a rise in nationalism and skepticism of the globalization of the past quarter-century. Over the past ten years, Orbán, Trump, Bolsonaro, and other right wing populists have risen to power due to this appeal. Yet, the right wing in the United States has not been the origin of all these changes. In immigration, the governments of Poland and Hungary have been at the forefront of this shift. In those countries, there is a construction about what it means to be a part of a nation that has inspired the American right.

Immigration is central to this nationalistic worldview. Within the countries themselves, it marks the difference between those who are truly a part of the culture, language, and tradition and those who are not. Orbán, again is upfront about this, stating, “western Europe had given up on ... a Christian Europe, and instead experiments with a godless cosmos, rainbow families, migration and open societies.” Central to this ideology is an idealized portrayal of Europe as pure, homogeneous, and Christian. Those who do not fit into that mold are excluded from their national projects.

The Hungarian government, led by Orbán and the ruling Fidesz have taken the most extreme reaction to migrants. One of their laws to combat migration, the ‘Stop SOROS’ Act, punished those who would give aid to migrants. Beyond the immediate impact on refugees and migrants seeking asylum and shelter in Hungary, and in parts of Eastern Europe, these actions are part of a larger ideological assertion. The leaders of these right-wing parties are asserting what the composition of the country ought to be. Broadly, they have justified their demographic goals with their increasingly ethno-nationalistic narratives. Homogeneity and conformity is the goal, and anything that can taint that must be avoided in this worldview. These governments are pretty explicit about this attitude. In Poland, fomenting the fear of migrants is central to the strategy of the ruling Law and Justice party. This past summer, Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki appealed to his base by stating he
would protect “holy Polish territory” against thirty Afghan refugees trapped between Poland and Belarus. The ambition of these governments to create a homogenous population chases a past glory that never existed.

In real time, this distinction is revealed in the differing responses most European governments have had to migrants from Ukraine. The European Union was able to enact an immediate amnesty policy for Ukrainian cities and migrants fleeing. This reaction, of course, is in sharp contrast to the fractured responses in Eastern and Southern Europe to migrants from North Africa and the Middle East. Poland in particular has been aggressive in accepting Ukrainian refugees displaced from the Russian invasion. Their treatment, unlike the one given to Middle Eastern and African immigrants, is one of solidarity as millions of Ukrainians have to uproot their lives. The leaders of the countries with a large influx of Ukrainian refugees, justified these differences because of common European and ‘Christian’ identity. They are drawing the line between ‘legitimate’ migrants and the alien other.

Resistance to immigration in the United States is driven by issues independent of the ones in Eastern Europe. Historically, this resistance played a significant role in shaping the development of American politics. The Know Nothings, of the mid-19th century, were the most upfront in xenophobia being foundational to their political ideology. But the role of Eastern Europe in the American discourse is twofold. Firstly, Hungary, Poland, Greece, and other similar governments provide a blueprint for ethno-nationalist justifications of anti-immigration policies. Secondly, elements of populist right-wingers themselves acknowledge being inspired by those countries.

Tucker Carlson, the widely watched right-wing populist commentator, even went so far as to produce a film about Hungarian politics. His film, “Hungary vs. Soros: Fight for Civilization” was a right wing American summary of the ideology of the Hungarian government. Carlson’s film emphasised the fence Hungary built on its borders to dissuade migrants from entering the border. Above all, the film portrayed Hungary as a conservative aspiration: homogenous, secure, and structured. It provides a not-so-hidden message: the United States should emulate their policies. In the government as well, the language of former President Trump on immigration reflected something close to envy held for the immigration policies of Eastern Europe. Trump’s speech at the UN, written by Stephen Miller, commended the Polish government and people for “standing up for their independence, their security, and their sovereignty.”

The polices passed by these Eastern European right-wing continue to inspire the American right. Framing the development of American conservatism in an international context is vital to understanding the course of American politics. As the rise of such nationalism occurs in the United States, we are left with an incomplete picture if we refuse to acknowledge the influence behind our discourse.

Ezana Tedla is a first-year in Jonathan Edwards college and can be reached at ezana.tedla@yale.edu.
This article is an excerpt from a policy proposal on Ukraine-Turkey relations for the Yale Policy Institute.

AND SO PAX EUROPA IS DEAD AND BURIED. At the end of last year, I was engrossed in researching American relations with Turkey for a paper with the Yale Policy Institute. But as December came along and news of Russian troop build-ups were complemented with reports of coup plots, it was clear that all of Europe was about to change. Tracking the impact of this terrifying sequence of events on Turkey suggests we are at a crucial turning point: Turkey has the potential to turn away from increasing Russian cooperation and reorient back toward its NATO Partners.

For Turkey, the 20th century was marked by its interface with the West: from WW1 enemies to NATO allies. Turkey—and especially its predecessor, the Ottoman empire—has always played a vital role in the geopolitics of the Middle East and Eastern Europe alike. With the empire’s dissolution, Turkey lost the power to command international events individually; however, their centering on trade lines connecting Europe and Asia still granted them regional influence in the near east. In the Cold War, both the United States and the Soviet Union were quick to observe the importance of this influence.

While the USSR made claims to Turkish-controlled
land, the US provided them with funding from the Marshall plan. They quickly joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Despite remaining reasonably consistent, Turkey’s presence in NATO did cause occasional headaches. Most important was in 1974, when they invaded Cyprus and resulted in Greece leaving NATO’s military command for half a decade. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Turkey and the West lost their shared enemy, the motivation animus for the alliance. In light of this, an alliance with the West—particularly Britain and France, who carved up their land after WW1—became less appealing.

Some Turkish opinions similarly soured on the United States after their Middle Eastern interventions in the early 21st century. Not only did the war touch Turkey’s borders, but they interpreted America’s support of Kurdish populations against the Saddam Regime as an affront to Turkish sovereignty. In the meantime, Turkey normalized relations with the Russian federation. Energy quickly became a topic for close relations as Russia correctly identified Turkey as a significant potential consumer. But these relations were far from smooth sailing: the promise of a post-cold war multipolar world inspired these aspiring great, yet firmly regional, powers to seek influence in dynamic conflict areas—most notably, the Middle East. In the Syrian civil war, Russia, drawing on Soviet connections to the Assad regime and access to air and naval bases here, supported the regime. Meanwhile, the Turkish government supported an amorphous collection of anti-government—notably non-Kurdish—forces. In 2015, after Russia intervened, the Turkish air force shot down a Russian plane that violated its airspace. Despite an immediate flurry of sanctions and adjacent responses, the economics won out, and relations gradually normalized. Such has generally been the formula for Russo-Turkish relations in other conflict regions such as Nagorno-Karabakh, Cyprus, and Libya: tense head butting that never rises enough to seriously impede economic ties. The culmination of this general cozying up came in 2017 when Turkey moved to purchase the Russian S-400 missile systems from Russia, in what many interpreted as a rebuttal to NATO—and resulted with American sanctions.

But despite the Western narrative, Turkey is far from a simple Russian pawn, with the Council on
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Foreign relations succinctly describing its goal as foreign policy independence. And throughout this complex jostling, one topic has consistently positioned Turkey directly against Russian interests: Ukraine. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Turkey was one of the first nations to recognize Ukrainian sovereignty, and the two have enjoyed fruitful eco-

The United States must emphasize to Turkey that there is no better time for decoupling than now.

conomic relations ever since, including a very recent free trade agreement. Beyond these economic ties, Crimea and Eastern Ukraine have long been home to thousands of Turkish Tatars—the cultural sovereignty and security of whom is a significant priority for Turkey. Since 2014, Putin's war on Ukraine has rested on the cultural inseparability of Ukraine from Russia—first Crimea and then the whole nation. The argument that Ukraine is an ethnically homogenous region indistinguishable from Russia has posed issues for these Turks. These fears were warranted, as, since the invasion, Crimean Tatars have been subject to land ejection, widespread discrimination, and reports of torture at the hand of state authorities. For all these reasons, Turkey vehemently condemned the invasion and annexation of Crimea in 2014, although preferring to abstain from sanctions. They have since played an indispensable role in the subsequent modernizing of Ukraine's military, supplying them with Bayraktar drones crucial in attacks on Russian Generals and military convoys.

More than a particular aspect of bilateral relations, Turkey has a broad and existential interest in the stability of the Black Sea. There has been an explosion in trade in the region since the 1990s, and Turkey very explicitly recognizes the sea—and particularly their own situation on its entrance—as central to their economic future. While figures are still uncertain, this conflict is already wreaking havoc on activity; a recent World Bank report listed a litany of wartime circumstances as detrimental to the region's economic future. In the short term, the decimation of Ukrainian coastal cities, the impact of sanctions on Russia, and the understandable aversion of investors and shipping companies to an active war zone are blunting once optimistic economic predictions. And the long-term shrinkage of both the Ukrainian and Russian economies, significant players in regional supply chains, complicates any discussion of the long term. In addition to these financial interests, Turkey has long feared what a war in the Black Sea would require of its role as steward of the Bosporus. As the invasion began, they quickly acted to shut the Black Sea to all entering naval warships that were not already based there. While Turkey certainly opposes a Russian victory, they still abstain from sanctions and have attempted to position themselves as mediators in the conflict. Their closing of the Bosporus provides a good microcosm for their mindset: they want to end the war but are wary about picking sides. Turkey should be very aware of the precariousness of this position, and the United States can do much to push them to the NATO line.

The United States must emphasize to Turkey that there is no better time for decoupling than now. Decoupling from Russia is understandably scary for any nation, Turkey especially. Yes, the two have enjoyed productive economic relations in recent years, but they have nearly always been strained by conflict. While many hope the failures of this invasion will serve as an expensive lesson, Russia can no longer be considered anything approaching a stable force in international relations. Many believe that Russia launched this invasion partly because of its increased isolation from the world economy following the annexation of Crimea. Now that they are even more thoroughly an economic pariah—some say the most sanctioned country in the world—military force may increasingly become their only language for power projection. Continuing to nurture economic relations with the federation could tether Turkey to its sinking ship. Now is the perfect time for decoupling, taking advantage of this significant dip in bilateral economic activity before the situation gets too dire. While Turkey's financial situation makes further shocks less than ideal, Erdoğan's nationalism could help this pill go down smoother: with the proper appeals to history, this war can easily be understood as an existential threat to Turkey.

Energy, of course, remains the most uniquely
crucial bilateral issue mandating amicable relations. But this partnership is increasingly growing a lot more nuanced than previous assumptions of energy dependency suggest. An excellent recent article from RAND explored the possibility that Russia invaded Ukraine to stop their plans to harvest natural gas. They came down quite decisively against the premise but, more importantly, observed that the oft-cited pre-war reliance of European countries on Russian energy has not translated advantageously into Russian wartime influence. It’s quite telling that Putin was quicker to threaten nuclear war than decrease gas exports. Russia recently shut off exports to Bulgaria and Poland over their failure to make deadlines for paying in rubles, but these nations make up only a tiny part of Russian energy exports. Meanwhile, the importing giants like the UK and Germany are going full steam ahead with plans to entirely stop Russian oil imports by the end of the year. Even if Russia were to shut the tap, at this point, that would only solidify there is no going back. The RAND article observes that in the face of sanctions on every other part of Russia’s economy, European dependency on Russian energy has transformed into Russian dependence on Europeans buying their oil. Turkey is in a slightly different position outside the EU, but as the money stops flowing into Moscow, energy consumption will similarly reverse in Ankara’s favor. As EU nations consume less Russian energy, Russia will become increasingly dependent on continued exports to other markets. In trying to compensate through increased exports to China and India, Russia has slashed oil prices. The lack of adequate intercontinental LNG infrastructure puts further roadblocks on this Asian pivot. In light of this, it stands to reason that Russia will be increasingly dependent on its existing exports to Turkey. However, Turkey should be wary of seeing this as a win for their independent foreign policy and over Russia. If Europe successfully goes forward in its energy decoupling, the condemnation of Turkey’s unwillingness to do the same will become increasingly forceful. Turkey should act now to preempt this shift in attitudes, perhaps by announcing plans for energy decoupling at their own pace or cooperating with the EU to develop alternatives—anything to gain goodwill. Remaining passive would likely turn Western condemnation and Russian reorientation into a problem.

And with an eye to the long term, Turkey should recognize the long-term economic benefits of siding with Ukraine and the West. There is now significant reason to hope for a positive Ukrainian outcome. As Russian aims pivot from regime change to securing land in the south and east, many have begun to wonder about the toll such an unsuccessful war is having. Most poignantly was the sinking of the Moskva, Russia’s Black Sea capital ship, which came the same day as Putin publicly acknowledged the negative effect of sanctions. Russia will likely explore options for replacing Moskva, given its importance in planning coastal operations. Turkey will hopefully identify their stranglehold here, presenting them with an opportunity to cut back the war without actually acting, merely performing their duty under international law. I surmise little American pressure will be needed on this point, but we can certainly supplement opposition to Russia. In the short term, America should press forward with attempts to relocate Turkish S-700s to Ukraine and replace them with Patriot missile systems. While America should not be overly desperate, it could do well to remember that Turkey purchased these weapons precisely because America would not sell them our Patriot missiles. More importantly, in the long term, America and the EU must herald the economic recovery of countries in the Black Sea region. If the supplying of weapons and aid to Ukraine is any indication, goodwill is strong. To rebuild the Ukrainian economy, a new Marshall plan of sorts, more narrow but just as deep, should be considered. As the other major western aligned power on the Black Sea, these efforts must invoke the Turkish government. Ironically, this combination of regional funding and the existential threat from Russia would replicate the circumstances that brought Turkey into NATO in the first place.

Dylan Gunn is a first-year in Pauli Murray College and can be reached at dylan.gunn@yale.edu.