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Welcome to Volume IX of Globus Mundi, the official publication of the Department of Political Science and Global Studies at Cosumnes River College. This year, our transfers are Ali Alukrafti, Turab Bukhari, Isaac Coleman, Chez Demoulin, Russell Gardner, Corey Hurly, Ella Lockhart-Ralston, Majika Mann, Zainab Mojaddedi, Bradly Monceaux, Brenna Murray, Brandon Plath, Ezatullah Sabawoon, Alejandra Sepulveda, Carlie Stanfill, Summeye Tarhan and Peter Weller. Their transfer institutions are listed on page 5, in “Valete.” We honor them for their accomplishments.

EVENTS

This year, our department hosted many good events. We started the year by inviting the campus to a showing of “The Great European Disaster Movie,” as part of our fall Global Studies course, “Modern Europe & the Unification Process.” The film discussed the issues associated with keeping the EU unified in the face of Brexit. Additionally, we showed “Exodus,” a powerful film on migration into the EU by people escaping the horrors of ISIL. As we progressed into fall, we hosted “1968,” “An Evening with Tonya Williams,” “Steven Ellner, Ph.D. on Ending US Sanctions Against Venezuela” and the “2018 Midterm Elections Forum.” “1968” was born from a discussion with Sociology Professor Nym George – last April 4th, the 50th anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. He was a hero to both of us; I mentioned I would be very distraught on June 4th – the 50th anniversary of RFK’s assassination. We decided to ask a few colleagues to join us and present the events of one of the most transformational years in American history – and they did. Beth Huffman (Political Science), Jim West (Photography), Diana Reed and Alex Peshkoff (History) each presented their takes on events in Europe, images from the year that was, women’s history and Mexico. A few weeks later, our Dean, Tonya Williams, Ph.D. sat down for an interview about her research, career and life’s journey. Our students were inspired to hear about Tonya’s work in social justice and to see how similar Tonya’s background is to theirs. A few weeks later, History Professor Alex Peshkoff and I hosted Steven Ellner, Ph.D. as he presented a compelling argument about the need to end US sanctions against Venezuela. His data, personal experiences and first-hand accounts of the pain and suffering in Venezuela left us all hoping for an end to sanctions and an end to Nicolas Maduro’s rule. A week prior to the 2018 midterm election, Beth Huffman and I, along with our Dean, Tonya Williams and Professor Dan Aseltine (California Politics), hosted an election forum at which candidates and propositions were discussed, questions taken and projections made. This event, perhaps more than others, was appreciated by students as many in attendance had no idea about the issues or positions candidates had. Traditionally, we start spring semester with an analysis of the State of the Union speech but given the politics surrounding this year’s speech, we weren’t able to. We ended the 2018-2019 year with our sixth annual Colloquium.

We were fortunate to have two major field trips this year. The spring Global Studies class on “African Politics” travelled to the MoAD (Museum of the African Diaspora) in San Francisco and “Revolutions & Ideologies” travelled to the “International Museum of Propaganda” in San Rafael. Both trips added invaluable dimensions to their respective courses. Alumni met a few times for dinner and also managed to attend a few events notably at the SF World Affairs Council, San Francisco’s Chinese New Year’s Parade and exhibits at the DeYoung Museum and MOMA, also in San Francisco.

MODEL UN

This year’s team, CRC’s sixth, represented France at the 69th
MUNFW Conference held in Burlingame. The team was led by Carlie Stanfill and Isaac Coleman – President and Vice-President, respectively. This year’s team roster was made up of Hawa Amiri, Ammar Ansari, Turab Bukhari, Maya Diaz-Villalta, Corey Hurley, Nick Dodgion, Malika Mann, Alejandra Sepulveda, Karanbir Singh and Summeye Tarhan. We were extremely lucky to secure a diplomatic briefing from Emmanuel Lebrun-Damiens, France’s Consul General in San Francisco. The team travelled to San Francisco and was received by the Consul General in the Consulate where, for two hours, he presented his perspectives on French policy and negotiation tactics. Our team was able to ask questions and interact with him as part of their preparation for the conference. We are grateful to him and his wonderful staff for allowing us to visit. *Merci beaucoup!* As always, we owe tremendous thanks to our VPI, Robert Montañez, Dean Tonya Williams, Claudia Leal and Katie DeLeon for all they do to support CRC’s Model UN.

**COLLOQUIUM**

This year, Beth hosted our sixth annual Colloquium and had two exceptional presentations. The first, “Arctic Scramble: The Race for Polar Resources,” by Isaac Coleman, focused on the significance of resources and geopolitical considerations as part of climate change. Isaac’s interest in researching his article and developing his presentation is tied to his service in our nation’s Navy, something we’re all grateful for. Chez Demoulin’s presentation, “Water Wars: Conflict Over a Vital Resource” followed. Chez discussed increasing water scarcity as a consequence of over-population, poor irrigation policies and resource management and the potential for war.

Colloquium, as always, concluded by listing our transfers and where they’ll be next year. (Colloquium is available for viewing on the departmental webpage.)

**ALUMNI NEWS**

Traditionally, this section appears as its own article. This year, as a one-time event, I’ve decided to roll it into this space. Students mentioned below have either come to visit us, called or emailed their updated information. We thank them all for remembering our program.

Emily Bills has finished her first year of law school at UC Davis. One down, two to go!

Ryan Blivhode, a student I was fortunate to have in a class years ago, graduated from University of Michigan and has been accepted at the London School of Economics.

Gabriela Castillo is an Assembly Fellow in the office of Assemblyman Miguel Santiago (53rd District).

Brittany Cox has graduated from Stanford University with degrees in Medical Biology and International Relations. Brittany applied to – and was accepted by – our nation’s ten best medical schools (Harvard, Johns Hopkins, University of Pennsylvania, UCSF, Columbia, UCLA, Stanford, et al.). Next year, she’ll attend UCSF Medical School where she’s been conducting research while a student at Stanford.

Travis Fama graduated from UC Davis with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science.

Giselle Garcia graduated from UC Davis with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and will be attending USF Law School in the fall.

Darren Grant is currently attending University of Colorado’s Josef Korbel School of International Studies.

Ryan King was promoted to the position of Chief of Staff for Communications in Nevada Senator Catherine Cortez-Masto’s office.

Michael Lee relocated to New York City where he’s currently selling real estate. He’ll enroll in CUNY once residency is established.

Yuleima Lozano is preparing to take the LSAT and apply to law school.

Daniel Lumbang graduated last year from San Francisco State University with a BA in International Relations. He’s relocating to Denver, CO to work for Zillow.

Taylor Martin, my former Teaching Assistant, has graduated from University of San Francisco with a Master’s Degree in International Relations. She’ll be taking the LSAT in fall.

Candi Moreno has also graduated from University of San Francisco with a Master’s Degree in International Relations.

Ryan Neach was hired as a teacher at Christo Rey School in Sacramento. A natural and gifted teacher, he continues to teach for us, too.

Adelkhan Niazi is graduating from San Francisco State with a BA in International Relations as he concurrently enters the Masters program. He thinks he can tie my record and finish in a year. HA!

Grace Rascher graduated from University of Washington. She’s taking a year off before applying to graduate school.

Sulemain Shahryar is in a Ph.D. program at UC Davis, studying political science.

Josh Slowiczek graduated from the University of California Berkeley with a Masters Degree in Journalism.

Francis Smiley graduated from University of Colorado’s Josef Korbel School of International Studies with his MA and is at the US Army War College where, through its internal think tank (HSD), works on DoD policy for SECArmy and others.

Jon Sweeney, currently attending UC Santa Barbara, is currently travelling the world as an extension of his study abroad requirement. So far, I’ve gotten pictures from Romania. London, Morocco and Washington, DC. He graduates this coming year and intends to pursue work in the finance sector.

Nimra Syed has graduated from UC Davis School of Law. Now, the California Bar Exam. Good luck, Nim!

Kaveh Toofan, with whom I had dinner in Rome last summer,
has moved to Washington D.C, where he was hired with the Center for American Progress, working in their national security and international policy division. Kaveh is a UC Berkeley graduate (BA in Political Science).

Kevin Woldhagen, currently works as a case officer for the IRC. He’s sitting for the LSAT this fall and intends to apply to law school next year. He’ll specialize in human rights/refugee law once he’s passed the bar.

VOLUME IX

Once again, we’re fortunate as a publication to be able to draw on student artistic talent. This year’s covers were drawn by Corey Hurley – who did the covers for Volume VIII. “Still Just A Dream” is a reflection of current events as they pertain to US immigration policy and the fantasy of a border wall (“… paid for by Mexico”). The back cover, “Executive Time,” plays off Plato’s allegory of the cave in an unique – and scary - way. Corey leaves CRC for UC Santa Cruz to continue her studies in International Relations.

Brenna Murray served as this year’s Editor. We all thank her for her relentless pursuit of excellence in editing and will miss her next year as she leaves CRC for UC Berkeley to study political sociology.

Turab Bukhari wrote an unique article on a little discussed topic in IR, the situation facing Sikhs. “Khalistan: The Answer to Sikh Suffering?” examines the history of this issue, incorporating regional hegemonic considerations. Turab was in Model UN this year and leaves CRC for UC Riverside to continue his studies in IR. He will be greatly missed.

Aymaan Sumandi discusses the rise of Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia and the consequences of this puritanical branch of Islam in his article “The Wahhabi State: Saudi Arabia, Islam and the World.” Aymaan returns next year to complete his studies prior to transfer.

Continuing with religion as a theme, Kenny Lam contributes “Religion in Atheist China.” Kenny’s article focuses on restrictions on religious freedoms in China. Kenny returns next year to complete his studies prior to transfer.

While not tied to religion, LGBTQ rights are often denied in the name of religion. Peter Weller’s article, “LGBT Advocacy in the Middle East,” looks at the disconnect between state policies, religion and reality in the Middle Eastern states of Israel, Palestine, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon. Peter served as TA to History Department Chair Professor Gabriel Gorman this year and provided humor and humanity to all of us since starting at CRC. He leaves to UC Santa Cruz in the fall to pursue his studies in IR. He’ll be missed.

“The War in Yemen,” by Ali Alukrafti, examines policy machinations of Gulf States and the US in the context of this terrible war, a conflict marked by bombings of innocent civilians, starvation, chaos and despair. Ali leaves CRC for UC Berkeley to continue his studies in IR. Ali is esteemed for his generosity of spirit and time, his commitment to truth and his work ethic. I will miss his presence, contributions and friendship greatly and look forward to his visits. Salam, habibi.

Chez Demoulin’s article, “Water Wars: Conflict Over a Vital Resource,” a great example of academic discipline intersectionality, was presented at colloquium this year. Chez, a member of this year’s Model UN, leaves CRC for UC Davis to complete her studies in International Relations.

Our other colloquium presentation, by Isaac Coleman, was based on his article “Arctic Scramble: The Race for Polar Resources.” Isaac leaves CRC for UC Santa Cruz to complete his studies in IR. Listing Isaac’s internships, responsibilities and activities over the course of these last two years could fill a separate volume of this journal. Accordingly, I’ll list a few things: Isaac was our dedicated subject tutor in CRC’s Tutoring Center, VP of Model UN, TA to History Professor Alex Peshkoff and a campaign staffer. More than anything else, Isaac’s dedication to his peers, this department and CRC made him “the glue” that held it all together. To say that he’ll be missed is an understatement.

Alejandra Sepulveda, a presenter at last year’s colloquium and member of this year’s Model UN, wrote “Identity Within the Ottoman Empire and the European Union.” Alejandra’s article examines the similarities of the Ottoman Empire’s drive to create a common identity in its empire to the problems the EU is facing on the same subject. Alejandra transfer to UC Berkeley to complete her studies.

My TA and President of CRC’s Model UN, Carlie Stanfill, submits “Lost Tribes in Brazil: A Glimpse Into Untouched Lives.” Carlie’s article examines the fate of Amazon Basin tribes in Jair Bolsonaro’s economic plans. Carlie leaves CRC for UC Santa Cruz.

NEXT YEAR

Our plans for next year are likely surprise most people. First, we will create an Associates of Arts Transfer Degree for political science and international relations students seeking transfer to the UC system. The decision to do so was not arrived at easily. Second, we will be writing an Associates of Arts Transfer Degree for California Politics for students interested in transferring to CSUS’s California Politics program. A revamped schedule with the goal of expanding online offerings is under review and will, for me, result in massive curriculum revision with an eye to development of online content. Volume X of this journal will be comprised of faculty submissions. Our events series and off campus activities will depend on interest and opportunity moreso than plans from this year into next. Last, our current student leadership system will be redesigned.
CONCLUSION

Future editions of Globus Mundi will follow yearly. Students, alumni and faculty will be asked to submit papers for consideration on topics from international relations, economics, history and theoretical issues as they pertain to global affairs.

Inquiries regarding Globus Mundi should be directed to Professor Martin Morales, Chair of the Department of Political Science & Global Studies at (916) 691-7114 or, via email, at moralem@crc.losrios.edu

We look forward to your continued readership.
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India has been the poster child for colonialism since the 18th century. Even though India was officially founded on August 15th, 1947, there is a dark past that follows from even prior to its creation. The fight for India’s independence was carried out by Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs. Sikhism is a monotheistic religion that was founded by Guru Nanak Dev Ji in the early 15th century. Sikhs follow the teachings of ten Gurus, or teachers, who were considered messiahs, or messengers of God. Their holy book is the Shri Guru Granth Sahib which compiles the teachings of these Gurus. The foundation for Sikhism was mainly established with the fifth Guru, Guru Arjun Dev Ji, who was born in 1563. He was the first Guru to compile the teachings of Sikh text, thus creating the first Sikh scripture, the Adi Granth. The Adi Granth later transformed into the Shri Guru Granth Sahib; Guru Arjun Dev Ji also established Amritsar as the capital of Sikhism. During Guru Arjun Dev Ji’s era, Sikhism was considered to be a major threat to the rulers of Hindustan. In 1606, Guru Arjun Dev Ji was violently executed for his faith and teachings. Due to his horrific execution, his son, Guru Hargobind Ji made the decision to militarize the Sikh people with the main focus being to defend Hindu and Sikhs from attacks. Over time, Sikhs fought a number of battles in order to not only preserve their religion but Hinduism as well, in an effort to defend them both from persecution. From this point on, the Sikhs and the political leaders of Hindustan, formally known as India, came to a peaceful treaty, which wasn’t long lasting. The Mughals were an empire that ruled over most of northern India from the early 16th to the mid-18th century. The Mughal empire’s leader, Aurangzeb, began using force to convert his Hindu and Sikh subjects to Islam. In 1675, the ninth Guru, Guru Tegh Bahadur Ji, was arrested and violently executed, he was succeeded by Guru Gobind Singh Ji, considered to be the last Guru to lead the Sikhs. In 1699, due to violence against Sikhs and Hindus, Guru Gobind Singh Ji formed a military group consisting of Sikh men and women known as the Khalsa. The intention for this militia was to make sure that the Sikhs weren’t left undefended and that they could defend their faith. Guru Gobind Singh Ji created the khandey de pahul, the Sikh rite of initiation, for every member who wanted to join the Khalsa. He also created the Five K’s which are Five rules that every Sikh must live by. The Five K’s are: Kesh (uncut hair), Kara (steel bracelet), Kanga (wooden comb), Kaccha (cotton underwear), and Kirpan (steel sword or knife). Over time, these Five K’s became a symbol of the Khalsa and for modern day Sikhs, a way to connect with those warriors.

The majority of Sikhs are located in the large state of Punjab, to the northwest of India. To the west is Pakistan’s Punjab, and international border bisecting the two. Looking closely at India’s struggle to free itself from British control, it can be seen that Sikhs played a major role. Many people who died for their country were Sikh. In February, 1919, the British government passed the Rowlatt Act, which allowed some political cases to be prosecuted without juries or even without a trial. This caused national outrage throughout Hindustan. Mahatma Gandhi disagreed with The Rowlatt Act and organized a national protest movement against it. Prominent Indian leaders, Dr. Satya Pal and Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlu, were arrested and exiled by the British government which caused even more anger.
When news reached Amritsar, the people decided to protest. On April 13, 1919, a large nonviolent crowd of 10,000 men, women, and children gathered in an enclosed field known as the Jallianwala Bagh. Some were protesters while some had come to celebrate the Sikh festival, Baisakhi. Throughout the entire field, there was only one way in or out. British Brigadier General Reginald Edward Harry Dyer was put in charge of keeping this protest under control and peaceful. When the crowd assembled at Jallianwala Bagh, Dyer and his men sealed off any means of escape. Without giving any warning to the people, Dyer and his men opened fire into the crowd with the intent to kill and shot until their ammunition ran out. To date, it still isn't confirmed how many people were actually killed, but according to one British report, 379 people were slaughtered and 1,200 wounded; according to the Indian government's report, over 1,500 Sikhs were killed in this slaughter. After the massacre ceased, Dyer and his men withdrew, leaving the lifeless and wounded behind. Shortly after the shooting, the state of Punjab announced martial law.

The government of India ordered an investigation into this attack and the British government created a committee to investigate. After reviewing all the evidence, the Hunter Commission, the British government's committee, came to the conclusion that Brigadier General Dyer was in the wrong and forced him to resign from the British military. In Britain, many people condemned Dyer's actions though some sympathized with him. In 1920, Winston Churchill, Secretary of War, gave a speech in the House of Commons in which he said that Dyer was guilty for his actions. Instead of agreeing with Churchill, the House of Lords praised Dyer and gave him a sword, on which read "Saviour of the Punjab." His supporters also gathered money for him.

After these inhumane events took place, Gandhi didn't act right away because he feared more violence would take place and many more would be killed. Soon after, Gandhi began to organize and implement his nonviolent protests, known as Satyagraha. This became a philosophy to combat British policies through nonviolent means. From 1920-1922, Gandhi unsuccessfully led the Noncooperation Movement which tried to have the British government grant India the power to self-govern. This was Gandhi's first step in his plan of nonviolent change.

The revolutionary fighter, Udham Singh, witnessed the massacre and decided he would avenge his fallen Sikh brethren. Udham Singh was a member of the Ghadar Party, a party formed of immigrant Punjabi-Sikhs, who wanted to liberate India from British control. Udham Singh traveled around the United States to raise funds to support the Ghadar Party. He then traveled to London in 1933 to assassinate the former Lieutenant Governor of Punjab, Michael O'Dwyer, holding him responsible for the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre. In 1940, Singh snuck into London's Caxton Hall with a revolver hidden in his coat and shot O'Dwyer twice, killing him. Singh was tried and sentenced to death. Today, Udham Singh is considered to be the avenger of the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre.

The next revolutionary whose execution sparked national outrage was Bhagat Singh. Bhagat Singh joined the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association, an Indian revolutionary political party, at an early age. His goal, similar to the other Punjabi revolutionaries, was to liberate India from British control. Singh's close friend, Lala Lajpat Rai, was killed by the British police, so he and his friend, Sukhdev, decided to assassinate the Superintendent of Police, James Scott, in Lahore, but they mistakenly killed the Assistant Superintendent, John Saunders. Singh fled from Lahore to Calcutta where he threw a small bomb in the Central Assembly Hall while chanting words of freedom. He was arrested, and soon after the investigation, they realized that he had also killed the Assistant Superintendent a year earlier. Bhagat Singh along with his two friends, Sukhdev and Rajguru, were executed on March 23, 1931. This sparked national outrage because the Sikh community felt that Gandhi had betrayed them by allowing
Singh and his friends to be hung by the British. The hanging of Bhagat Singh, Raiguru, and Sukhdev is still a major point of debate for Sikhs, because they claim that Nehru and Gandhi did nothing to help them.

This caused major protests to break out and many Sikhs turned against Gandhi, labeling him a traitor. From 1920 to 1925, the Gurudwara Reform Movement took place. This movement was led by Sikhs hoping to peacefully acquire control of Sikh Gurudwaras, or temples. The Gurudwaras were controlled by government appointed Mahants (clergymen) and worked for the British against the Khalsa Panth, a group consisting of baptized Sikhs. The Sikh political party, the Akali Dal, (Army of Devotees of Akal), supported gaining control of the Gurudwaras. The Sikh Gurudwara Act was passed in 1925, which stated that the Mahant-controlled Gurudwaras had to be returned to Sikh control.

After India was liberated from the British, the Punjab Suba movement, emerged; this was a call to create a state for the Sikhs, led by Akali Dal. Through this movement, Sikhs spoke out about their mistreatment and the need to have independence. After many rejections from the Indian government, the Indian government soon accepted the Punjab Suba demand which created the state of Punjab.

Sikhs believed that the sacrifices they made for the independence of India would help lead to their freedom, too. The first step taken to make the Sikhs feel as though they were safe was taken by a Hindu nationalist priest, Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya. He declared that every Hindu family should raise their son as a Sikh. In 1947, a Hindu nationalist group, opposed to Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya forbade this practice. The Arya Samaj began to convince Hindu families to no longer speak Punjabi but Hindi instead, creating the first divisions in Punjab. Malviya praised Sikhs in order to show that he could be trusted. No one in his family had become a Sikh as he preached to other Hindu families. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, too, gave Sikhs hope with promises he made them that they would one day be free. The founder of Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, created his own Muslim League Party rather than joining the Indian National Congress, demanding that Pakistan be created for Muslims. Jinnah also tried to persuade the Sikh leader at the time, Master Tara Singh, to do the same for Sikhs. Sikh leaders brushed off a warning made by Jinnah stating that they trusted Nehru and the Indian Congress to give them freedom. Sikhs were promised a higher status and more independence in the newly liberated India. Many Sikhs believed that Gandhi disliked Sikhs from the beginning, claiming he disliked their tenth Guru, Guru Gobind Singh Ji, stating Gandhi claimed he was a misguided philosopher.

In 1984, a bloody battle erupted between Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale, a pro-Khalistan revolutionist, who wanted freedom from India. He preached to the Sikhs that the Hindus were taking advantage of them and killing them, and they needed to stand up for their rights. He believed that the only way to stop Sikh suffering was for Punjab to become an independent country. His supporters started to become more active in protests which soon led to violence. Indira Gandhi had tried to make Bhindranwale an ally of hers due to his high status within the Sikh community, but instead, he turned against her. He openly criticized her and her father’s mistreatment of Sikhs. Soon after, Bhindranwale took over the Golden Temple, the most important and holy site for Sikhs. While occupying the Golden Temple, Bhindranwale made political statements calling for Khalistan to be formed. Khalistan translates to “the land of the pure” in Punjabi; in response Indira Gandhi announced she would be sending in the military, in what became known as Operation Blue Star. The day after her speech, the Golden Temple was surrounded by the Bihar Regiment, which began firing at the Akal Takht, the Sikh shrine in the Golden Temple Complex, with guns and tanks. Bhindranwale had a retired Indian army officer, Shabeg Singh, overseeing the defense of the Akal Takht. The Indian army started to fire the tank’s weapons causing direct damage to the Akal Takht. According to Sir Mark Tully, a reporter for the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), the Akal Takht was drenched with blood and also had forty-two bodies inside, including Bhindranwale’s. According to eyewitnesses, a total of 8,000 Sikhs were martyred there. According to another source, the three-day operation caused over 700 deaths and ninety of them were in the army.

The Indian army suffered 331 casualties in comparison. After the operation took place, many Sikh soldiers rebelled against the destruction of their holy shrine. As a result Indira Gandhi gave the police the permission to kill any “suspicious” Sikhs. Indira Gandhi soon became a symbol of injustice and hate for the Sikh community. Six months later, she was assassinated in her garden by two of her Sikh bodyguards leading to anti-Sikh riots. Over 8,000 people were killed. The leaders of these revolts against Sikhs were never convicted for their crimes.

The increase of hate crimes against Sikhs in India, have led to calls for Punjab to secede and become Khalistan. After partition between India and Pakistan in 1947, Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs were at war against one another. With Muslims trying to flee to Pakistan and Hindus and Sikhs trying to escape toward India. Hindus began attacking Sikhs because they didn’t seem any different to them than Muslims. The Sikhs that fled West Punjab, now in Pakistan, had to leave behind all of their belongings. The Sikhs, while escaping from Pakistan, were also being massacred by the Muslims. People who were once neighbors and friends had become enemies. The number
of innocent people dying, regardless of their religion, was too high. Over ten million Muslim, Hindus, and Sikhs were displaced in what is considered to be the largest mass migration in history.\textsuperscript{13}

From 1970 to 1992, there was a major movement calling for the liberation of Khalistan. In this period, approximately 25,000 people were killed, mainly Sikhs. Davinder Singh Parmar was one of the first people to call for the establishment of Khalistan in 1971, but failed to gather many supporters or generate much news. In 1970, Parmar came into contact with Jagjit Singh Chohan who then started the Khalistan movement. At a London press conference, Jagjit Singh raised the flag of Khalistan to get coverage for his cause. In 1971, after the Indo-Pakistani War ended, Chohan went to Pakistan and toured historic Sikh Gurudwaras. While there, he openly discussed the movement and how Sikhs wanted their own country. The Pakistani media covered this news extensively, giving life and attention to the idea internationally. That year, Chohan traveled to the United States, to further discuss Khalistan. He even went as far as putting an ad in the New York Times, in which he told the Sikh world about the idea of an independent state of Khalistan.\textsuperscript{16}

Slowly, the Khalistan movement began to turn violent. Many Sikh activists started to stand up against police brutality from the Indian government. This led to Operation Blue Star in 1984 and sparked even more outrage in the Sikh community, gaining the Khalistan movement more supporters. Shortly after the military intervened in Punjab, leading the Khalistan movement to be pushed underground. and while it was underground, the military was killing “suspicious” Sikhs who were considered traitors of the state or anyone who said that Khalistan should be formed. More than 40,000 people died during the military’s intervention. Slowly, the fire that led the Khalistan movement started to die out; Chohan later died in 2007.\textsuperscript{17}

To create some peace between the Indian government and the Khalistani resistance, the Punjab Accord, or Rajiv-Longowal Accord, was passed in 1985. This was an agreement between Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, son of Indira Gandhi, and Harchand Singh Longowal, the President of the Akali Dal, and lists eleven steps that would lead to peace. The Indian state of Chandigarh was set as Union Territory which split Chandigarh between the states of Punjab, Haryana, and Himachal. Many Sikhs were against the signing of this accord because they felt they had once again been betrayed by one of their own. Not even a month had passed since the signing of the Punjab Accord when Longowal was assassinated by Sikh militants who declared him a traitor.

Throughout this time, the Indian government accused the Pakistani government of supporting Khalistani revolutionaries by training, arming and providing them with key intelligence. Pakistan denied these allegations. The reason the Indian government accused Pakistan was because they openly allowed Sikhs to visit the country. According to the Pakistani government, this was due to the fact that a large amount of religious Sikh shrines were in Pakistan, and they would host Sikhs to come and visit them. In 1981, five Sikh men hijacked a flight going from Jammu to New Delhi and took it to Lahore. The goal was to pressure the Indian government to release Sikh political prisoners who were arrested because they spoke out against the Indian government. The Pakistani government rapidly deployed a squad of Special Services Group (SSG) commandos to the airport, who went in disguised as aircraft cleaners and arrested all five hijackers and freed the hostages. This was probably the first time the Indian government commended Pakistan on an operation. During Pakistan General Ziaul Hak’s rule, he had Sikhs visit him frequently. It was also said that whenever the Sikh guest left, they were given some sort of souvenir to take with them. This drew much anger from the Indian government leading to more allegations against the Pakistani government.\textsuperscript{18} Like before, the Pakistani government denied that they or their intelligence agency, Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), had anything to do with the arming of the Khalistani revolutionaries.

The Khalistan movement stagnated but quickly picked back up. The Sikhs for Justice (SFJ) have planned a Khalistan referendum for 2020 and to ask the United Nations for help. The belief is that this referendum will lead to the end of the mistreatment of Sikhs in Punjab, India. If Khalistan were to become independent, India would be giving up a portion of their territory, and lose revenue being made from Punjab. There is a danger that would cause a major split in India, maybe even weakening the country because of the loss of land and Indian citizens, potentially, turning against one another. The support for this referendum has been coming from Sikh groups in the United States and Canada. The referendum ultimately states that Sikhs are the natives of Punjab, have a religion different from India, and have the right to self-govern. Even today, article 25(b)(2) of the Indian Constitution, says that Sikhs are a part of the Hindu religion.\textsuperscript{19} Sikhs also claim they are still being forced to be married under the Hindu Marriage Act which undermines the Sikh religion. The Indian government fears that Sikh youth will lead some sort of independence movement against the government, similar to that of 1984. Khalistani activists believe that the Indian government is behind the drug epidemic in Punjab. They say that the reason why these drugs are so easily accessible to the youth is because the government provides it to them, keeping them from gaining enough power to revolt against the government. Furthermore, Sikh prisoners who have served their jail time are still not being released and whoever speaks out against the Indian government has been arrested. One of the greatest fears for the Indian government is that if Punjab decides to self-govern, other states will follow in its footsteps and this will slowly lead to the disintegration of India. Many Sikhs in India are too afraid to support
this movement because they face unjust imprisonment.

If the 2020 referendum succeeds major concerns will emerge. India believes this will benefit Pakistan as India would be losing a major part of its territory. Further, there would be a neutral border between them if Khalistan is formed and there would be nothing to stop India or Pakistan from reclaiming the territory. It is also unknown if the referendum will be fair and without corruption. When questions arise over whether Khalistan would be able to support herself as a state, people should consider how Pakistan became a sovereign state: it split from India and slowly built itself up to become a nuclear power. The state of Punjab has enough money to support itself and its economy.

If Khalistan is created, this would be an answer to Sikh suffering and prevent genocide against Sikhs. With international support from pro-Khalistan groups in the United States and Canada this idea can become a reality. If the United Nations supports this referendum and allows it to go to a vote without any interference from the Indian government, it is likely to pass. Sikhs have suffered throughout history and it's time for it to end. Sikhs are deserving of equality experienced by Hindus and Muslims in the region.

medical biology may have added another year for her at Stanford but given how the world is today, I know she's entertained.

ENDNOTES


Islam. So many different emotions, thoughts, and ideas are attached to this one name - the name of the fastest growing religion in the world. To some people, Islam represents peace, serenity, and faith. To others, it represents the polar opposite: violence, oppression, and fear, with terms such as “Islamic Fundamentalism”, “jihadist”, and “Radical Islam” entering the daily vocabulary of Western society. Opinions about Islam vary wildly - its followers believing it to be the path to salvation, and its opponents decrying it as a relic of a primitive, even savage, era. But there is one topic, at least in the United States of America, upon which most people seem to agree: Saudi Arabia. For the most part, the American government has maintained strong economic and defense ties with Saudi Arabia. The merits of this alliance are clear: American access to oil, as well as a stable partner in a region characterized by its instability. But American public opinion on Saudi Arabia is less than consistent with government views; according to a 2018 Gallup poll, most of the American public views Saudi Arabia negatively. This reflects on the United States’ view on Islam. Logically, the birthplace of Islam, the home of the Two Holy Places, should be a bastion and shining representation of what Islam should be.

At face value, Muslims around the world are tied intimately to Arabia. In fact, one of the five Pillars of Islam is the Hajj, which is the pilgrimage to Mecca every physically and financially able Muslim is expected to partake in at least once in a lifetime. Given the importance that Mecca holds to Muslims around the world, it seems reasonable to expect that the country that hosts it holds a measure of respect approaching or even equal to it. But as recent events have demonstrated, the truth is far more complicated than what reason would suggest.

In 2018, the brutal killing of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi brought the ire of the international community upon the Saudi Arabian government, who, according to the CIA, orchestrated the assassination and disposal of Khashoggi’s corpse at the Saudi embassy in Istanbul. Among the most vocal of condemnations came from Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, especially considering that the alleged assassination had taken place in Istanbul, albeit on Saudi consular grounds. Granted, Saudi-Turkish relations were never particularly friendly politically, but both countries maintained strong economic ties and mutual membership in the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). Being that both countries and their leaders are strong supporters of Islam, it would stand to reason that both leaders would share a degree of solidarity. Coincidently, Saudi Arabia has been waging war in Yemen, another Muslim majority state, since 2015. This war has kicked off one of the worst humanitarian crises of the modern era. Once again, both the perpetrators and the victims are Muslims. Herein lies apparent a fact that so often escapes the notice of the Western public: Islam and Saudi Arabia are not the same. Islam may be Saudi Arabia’s religion, but Saudi Arabia does not represent the 1.8 billion human beings who adhere to the Islamic faith.

In order to understand the connection between Islam and Saudi Arabia, it is necessary to examine, if briefly, the origins of Saudi
Arabia, as well as the nature of Islam within it. In and of itself, Islam in Saudi Arabia is a topic of controversy within the greater Muslim community; many Saudi practices seem to clash with or even contradict those seen in other Muslim communities around the world. Most people have heard the terms “Wahhabi” and “Salafist” in association with Saudi Arabia, but know little of the background, let alone context, of these terms. Thus, it is vital to the understanding of both Islam and Saudi Arabia to examine the backgrounds of Arabia, and the dominant sect of Islam within it.

Islam may have originated 1400 years ago in Arabia, but it did not originate in Saudi Arabia. At the time, Arabia had no unified form of government. Historians tend to portray the region as a sort of void, an anomaly in a part of the world dominated by two major empires: The Byzantine Empire and the Persian Sasanian Empire, which had been at war for the better part of four centuries. In reality, the war between the two empires had indeed bled into the Arabian Peninsula, by way of the Jewish, Persian-aligned Himyarite Kingdom, located in modern day Yemen, and the Aksum Kingdom situated in northern Ethiopia, which supported the Byzantine Empire. The two kingdoms served as surrogates in the war between the two major empires and fought to secure trade routes for their respective allies. But north of the Himyarite Kingdom lie the region where Islam was born: the Hijaz, home to both Mecca and Madinah, known today as the Two Holy Cities.

When the Prophet Muhammad came bearing the religion of Islam in the Hijaz, it quickly spread over the Arabian Peninsula. By the death of Muhammad, Islam had already propagated across half of the Arabian Peninsula through a series of military victories and political alliances. Ten years after the Prophet’s death, Islam had spread as far as North Africa and had managed to strike a crippling blow to the mighty Persian Empire, which would not have a monarch of its own until 1499, who himself was a Muslim. The first four rulers of the Islamic nation, known as al-Khulafāʾu ar-Rāshidūn, or the Righteously Guided Caliphs, were four of the Prophet Muhammad’s closest companions: Abu Bakr, Umar Bin Al-Khattab, Uthman Bin Affan, and Ali Bin Abi-Talib. Under their reign, Islam flourished and spread to the regions of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Persia. The subsequent caliph who rose to power in 661, Muawiyah, drastically overturned the precedent set by the four previous caliphs by appointing his son, Yazid, as his successor. In 680, Yazid, known as a frivolous drinker, much to the abhorrence of many traditionalists, thus began the Umayyad Dynasty, which would go on to hold the caliphate for the next century.

Yazid’s appointment ushered in a divisive era among Muslims. When he took power, the people of the caliphate were far from unanimous in their support for him. A large population vocally advocated for the appointment of Ali’s son, Hussein, as the successor to Muawiyah. Aside from being seen as a more pious man, Hussein was the Prophet’s grandson, making him part of the Ahl Al-Bayt (Blessed Household of the Prophet). Knowing that Hussein posed a threat to his caliphate, Yazid moved to block Hussein’s attempt to garner support in the Iraqi city of Kufa, which had become the seat
of government since the time of Uthman. He sent a detachment of four thousand troops who intercepted Hussein’s party of seventy-two men and their families in a town known as Karbala, a name that has become synonymous with tragedy in Islamic history. Yazid’s troops then killed Hussein and his companions, and the grandson of the Prophet’s body was brought before Yazid. This event came to be memorialized by many Iraqis Muslims and later led to the formation of the second-largest sect of Muslims, the Shi`a, or Shites, who renounced the first three caliphs, and saw Ali, Hasan, and Hussein as the rightful heirs to the caliphate. Shiite Muslims constitute approximately 10-13% of the current Muslim population, and conflict between the Shiite sects and the greater Muslim community, also known as the Sunnis, persists to this day.9

To this point, there has not been mention of either Wahhabism or Saudi Arabia; both of the aforementioned subjects would not appear on the world stage for over a thousand years after the events described previously. That is, Wahhabism and Saudi Arabia are relatively new concepts to both Islam and the world at large. To explain the history of one is to explain the history of the other; the rise of Wahhabism but is intimately intertwined. Wahhabism has been described by Western thinkers as “extreme” or as “conservative” Sunnis”10, although throughout history, many renowned Sunni scholars have denounced the Wahhabi sect. The very fact that Wahhabism is now considered to be a Sunni faction can be seen as a testament to the wide meaning that the term Sunni has taken on; in effect, any non-Shiite is classified as a Sunni.11

The modern puritanical movement that is now known as Wahhabism originated with a man named Muhammad Bin Abdul-Wahhab. Muhammad Bin Abdul-Wahhab was born in 170312 13 in a province of Arabia known as the Najd region, which lays east of the storied Hijaz regions where Islam originated 1,000 years prior. The region was noted for its barren nature, both in its topography and its intellectual history; historical records show that few, if any, notable scholars hailed from the region.14 Muhammad Bin Abdul-Wahhab’s father was a judge in a city known as al-`Uyayna, and became Bin Abdul-Wahhab’s first teacher.

At the time of his upbringing, it was said that many Arabs had forgotten the teachings of Islam and began incorporating the worship of trees perceived as sacred and tombs of saints into the Islamic faith. An educated man, Ibn Abdul-Wahhab saw the error of his people’s way and sought to guide them back to the true practice of Islam. He studied for several years in the city of Madinah, where he took a particular interest in the writings of a prolific scholar named Ibn Taymiyyah, whose views heavily influenced his own. Many of the groups Ibn Taymiyyah disapproved of can be seen reflected in modern Saudi politics: Christians, Sufis, and Shiites. But where Ibn Taymiyyah opposed certain forms of Sufism, Ibn Abdul-Wahhab held an almost universally negative view of Sufis.15 After his studies, Ibn Abdul-Wahhab returned to his birth city of al-`Uyayna. With the death of his father, who, incidentally, was largely critical of his son’s views, in 1740, Ibn Abdul-Wahhab was able to directly influence the population of the region. He formed an alliance with the city’s ruler Uthman Ibn Mu`ammur, who swore loyalty to Ibn Abdul-Wahhab’s views.16

Under the protection of Ibn Mu`ammur, Ibn Abdul-Wahhab began to disseminate his teachings among the people of al-`Uyayna. He began by cutting down trees which people believed to be sacred and progressed to the controversial demolishing of the tomb of Zayd Bin Al-Khattab, one of the Prophet’s companions who had died in battle in that region. The destruction of historically significant tombs and monuments has continued to the present, although tombs related to the Saudi royal families are usually preserved.

What separated Ibn Abdul-Wahhab from other reformist movements in Islam was his exceptionally rigid view of innovation, known as Bid`ah, and his practice of Takfir, or the denouncement of Muslims as disbelievers.17 Ibn Abdul-Wahhab implied in his teachings that 600 years prior to his appearance, Arabs in general had practiced Shirk, or polytheism, the direct opposite of monotheistic Islam. In addition, those who did not heed his teachings were counted among the ranks of apostates and thus, subject to death.18 It was this rigid mindset and interpretation of Islam that coerced Uthman Ibn Mu`ammur to expel Ibn Abdul-Wahhab from al-`Uyayna, despite having provided him with protection for years. This expulsion was far from the end of Ibn Abdul Wahhab. Instead, he went on to find an even more powerful ally. His name was Muhammad Bin Saud.

Muhammad Bin Saud, namesake of the modern Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, was the ruler of a small city named al-Dir`iya.19 After Ibn Abdul-Wahhab’s expulsion from al-`Uyayna, Ibn Saud welcomed him into his city. Like Ibn Abdul Wahhab, Ibn Saud was a native of the Najd region and hailed from a family who had proven adept in trade and politics, having risen to prominence in the region some 250 years prior. Around 1745, Ibn Saud and Ibn Abdul-Wahhab entered into a mutually beneficial agreement: Ibn Abdul-Wahhab would recognize the legitimacy of Ibn Saud’s political ambitions, and Ibn Saud would commit himself to Ibn Abdul-Wahhab’s interpretation of Islam. The agreement forged between the two men endures to this day; Wahhabism is widely recognized as the “official” sect of Islam in modern-day Saudi Arabia. In 1746, the alliance formally proclaimed a holy war against those who did not share their views of monotheism; effectively, any person, even other Muslims, who did not follow the teachings of Ibn Abdul Wahhab, was labelled as guilty of shirk (polytheism).20 Thus began the Saudi-Wahhabi conquest of the Arabian Peninsula.
Although the original Saudi state lasted for a relatively short time, it bore witness to terrible atrocities, mainly against other Muslims. In 1802, Wahhabi forces raided the city of Karbala, located in southern Iraq. To Shiite Muslims, Karbala was seen as a holy city, the site where their forefather, Hussein, was martyred. The attack took place on the 10th of Muharram, which is when Shiite Muslims gather to honor Hussein. Cavalry and infantry swept in and killed two thousand Shiites in a matter of hours, before demolishing the tomb of Hussein.21 Carrying this momentum into the storied Hijaz region, in 1803, Wahhabi soldiers sacked the city of Ta‘if and again swept through the city, killing hundreds and destroying tombs of the Prophet’s companions.22 By 1806, they had seized control of Mecca and Madinah, placing them squarely in control of the Hijaz. Their reign ended in 1812, when the Ottoman Turk government dispatched troops to oust the Wahhabi army.23

The Wahhabi-Saudi state was established for a second time, if only for a short period of time (1824-1834).24 It is the third incarnation of the nation in 1938, under Abdul Aziz bin Abdul Rahman, that persists to the present day. Unlike previous attempts to unite Arabia, this third Saudi state was supported by the discovery of a major international commodity: oil.25 Suddenly, countries around the world were eager to strike lucrative deals to extract “black gold” from Arabia. British and American companies vied to establish dominance in the lucrative oil market, flooding the region with money and resources never before seen in Arabia. Through the petrodollar, Saudi Arabia expanded its influence both regionally and internationally, all the while spreading the Wahhabi interpretation of Islam championed by its rulers.

Before delving into the specifics of Wahhabism, it is important to note that most adherents to the teachings of Wahhabism are averse to being labelled as “Wahhabis”.26 Aside from the nominally derogatory nature of the title, followers of Ibn Abdul-Wahhab’s teachings believe that labelling themselves as followers of a certain man detracts from the pure monotheism they profess to believe in. Instead, they prefer to be referred to as al-Muwahhidun or Ahl al-Tauhid, which means “the asserters of the divine unity”.27 But through this title, Wahhabis not only lay exclusive claim to the concept of Tauhid (monotheism) that Islam is built upon, but also condemn all other Muslims as misguided or even tainted by shirk (polytheism).28

Opposition to Wahhabism, both from within and without Islam, is nothing new. Since its inception, Wahhabism has been criticized heavily for a multitude of reasons. Wahhabism in and of itself can be considered an anomaly; its teachings are not necessarily revolutionary in the grand scale of Islamic history.29 It might have faded into history as just another attempted reformist movement were it not for two factors: the location of the Wahhabi movement in Nejd, providing ample access to the Hijaz region, and its alliance with the Saudi royal family and the vast amount of wealth afforded to them by the oil industry. As a direct result of the economic boom brought on by the discovery of oil, Saudi influence, and with it Wahhabism, has spread around the world, with Wahhabi literature easily accessible and widely circulated. In recent decades, Saudi Arabia has spent “an estimated $200 billion of its oil wealth…strenuously propagating its hard-line theology around the globe”.30 Saudi Arabia’s University of Islam in Madinah teaches Wahhabi doctrine to foreign students, encouraging them to speak out against other Islamic ideologies in their respective countries.31

Clearly, Wahhabism and Saudi Arabia are intimately intertwined. But can it be said that Saudi Arabia and Wahhabism represent a majority, or even large minority, of the Muslim population? From a purely statistical standpoint, Wahhabs represent less than 5% of the worldwide Muslim population and are overwhelmingly located in Saudi Arabia.32 Nevertheless, Saudi Arabia holds an inordinately large influence within the Muslim world, as the birthplace of Islam, but also within the larger global arena, as a major exporter of oil. As a result of the latter, Saudi Arabia has always enjoyed support from Western powers, an arrangement that has been criticized as hypocritical in nature; Western powers such as the US and the UK wax eloquently about spreading freedom and liberty, while simultaneously supporting financially and militarily a regime known for its record of human rights violations.

Saudi Arabia’s history has never been one of peaceful beginnings, as evidenced by the atrocities committed by the Saudi-Wahhabi troops in Karbala and Ta‘if.33 In accordance with Wahhabi teachings, the Saudi government demolished over 98% of historically significant landmarks within the country.34 These landmarks include tombs, ancient mosques, and houses that stood since the era of the Prophet. Conversely, the domain of Mohammad Bin Saud and Abdullah Bin Abdul-Wahhab has been transformed into a tourist attraction. That legacy endures to the present day. Although thoroughly condemned by the Saudi government, Osama Bin Laden was ostensibly a product of Wahhabi doctrine35; in fact, fifteen of the nineteen hijackers on 9/11 came from Saudi Arabia. Because of Wahhabism’s tendency to inspire ideological extremism,36 as well as its penchant for forbidding many spiritual and ritualistic traditions of Islam, certain elements in Muslim-majority countries have declared their opposition to Wahhabist influence.

One such group is located in Indonesia. With a Muslim population of 225 million, the largest population of Muslims in any given country, Indonesia’s opinions and rulings on Islam hold considerable power. Said Aqil Siraj, the leader of a prominent Indonesian social organization known as Nahdatul Ulama, released the following statement, affirming that Wahhabism “poses a threat to the continuing existence of NKRI (Republic of Indonesia)”.37 That...
certain groups in Indonesia oppose Saudi Wahhabism is of little
surprise; Indonesia hosts a diverse variety of Islamic interpretations,
many of which incorporate spiritual and mystical beliefs adapted
from local and Sufi traditions, the likes of which Wahhabism is
sharply critical of. Additionally, Saudi Arabia has a long history of
mistreating foreign workers, especially from southeast Asian and
African countries. Indonesia in particular has drawn attention with
several high-profile cases alleging abuse, such as the Saudi execution
of Tuti Tursilawati, who killed her Saudi employer after he allegedly
abused her.36

Another mistake commonly made when discussing Wahhabism
is associating or equating it with the broader understanding of Sunni
Islam. As mentioned previously, that Wahhabism is considered
Sunni at all is a testament to the loose meaning of the term Sunni; in
effect, anyone who is not a Shiite is automatically classified a Sunni,
when in fact, many Sunni clerics have condemned the creed and
doctrine espoused by Wahhabism since its inception. In the 1790's,
as Wahhabism was gaining power in the Arabian Peninsula, the chief
religious judge (qadi) of Mecca, "penned a Fatwa [legal ruling] ruling
them [Wahhabis] firmly outside the form of Islam".39 During that
approximate time period, the prominent scholar al-Haddad al-Alawi
released his opinion about Wahhabism, describing its "departure
from the foundations of Islam" as "unquestionable".40

Modern Sunni clerics have also expressed their condemnation
of the Saudi-Wahhabi strain of Islam. One of the most decisive
expressions of Sunni Islam's "divorce" from Wahhabism came
during the 2016 International Conference on Sunni Islam. Held
in Grozny, Chechnya, the conference hosted over 200 scholars
from several countries, among them the Grand Imam of Al-Azhar
University, the Grand Mufti of Egypt, and the Grand Mufti of Syria.
Notably, the organizers of the conference deliberately excluded
Saudi Arabian scholars, as well as other scholars who preached
Wahhabi Islam. Furthermore, the conference published a final
communiqué that established the official interpretation of Ahl al-
Sunna, another term for Sunni Islam. This communiqué, while not
directly addressing Wahhabism by name, condemned Salafi-takfirists
as "erroneous ideologies that claimed to derive their beliefs from
divine revelation."41 Any doubt over the targets of these statements
was erased when Saudi writers and media figures hotly condemned
the conference and its participants.42 Here, finally, is decisive proof
that Sunni Islam sees itself a separate from Wahhabism. Despite
the conference's significance, press coverage of the event was very limited;
few western media sources reported on it. When considered in the
greater historical framework of Islam's relationship with Wahhabism
and Saudi Arabia, the implications of the conference become clear:
since its dawn, Wahhabism has never been accepted as a popular
form of Islam. Wahhabism owes its current power and influence to
Saudi Arabia, which in turn gained its power through geographical
coincidence, placing it close to the birthplace of Islam, while also
sitting on plentiful oil reserves. Stripped of these two factors, it
quickly becomes clear that Wahhabism and by extension Saudi
Arabia does not represent the common interest of the Muslim people.
Saudi Arabia may portray itself as Muslim, but not all Muslims are
Saudi Arabian, and modern society would do well to heed the
difference.

WORK CITED
1. Michael Lipka and Conrad Hackett, "Why Muslims Are the World's
Fastest-growing Religious Group," Pew Research Center, April
fact-tank/2017/04/06/why-muslims-are-the-worlds-fastest-growing-
religious-group/.
Americans? Not So Much," NPR, March 19, 2018, accessed January 28,
trump-may-love-saudi-arabia-but-many-americans-do-not.
Khashoggi Killed,” The New York Times, last modified November 17,
crown-prince-khashoggi.html.
4. Mark Lowen, "Jamal Khashoggi: Trump 'demands Answers' on Missing
Saudi," BBC News, October 10, 2018, , accessed January 29, 2019,
5. Dates That Made History: The Hegira, dir. Dennis Van Waerbeke and
Patrick Boucheron, perf. Patrick Boucheron, Amazon Prime, July 1,
September-24-622-D/dp/B07FJ5PTQT.
6. Mark Weston, Prophets and Princes: Saudi Arabia from Muhammad to the
7. Ibid, 77-78
8. Ibid, 78-79
Religion & Public Life Project, April 30, 2018, accessed January 18,
2019, http://www.pewforum.org/2009/10/07/mapping-the-global-
muslim-population/.
11. Ibid, 6
12. Weston, "Prophets and Princes", 86
13. Algar, Wahhabism, 5
15. Ibid, 8-10
16. Ibid, 16-17
17. Jamil Effendi Siddqi Al-Zahawi, The Doctrine of Ahl Al-Sunna Versus
the Salafi Movement (Mountain View, CA: As-Sunna Foundation of
18. Ibid, 25
19. Algar, Wahhabism, 17-18
20. Ibid, 19
21. Ibid, 22-23
22. Al-Zahawi, The Doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna, 30
23. Algar, Wahhabism, 25-28
24. Weston, Prophets and Princes, 106-107
25. Ibid, 123-28
26. Algar, Wahhabism, 1
27. Ibid, 2-3
29. Algar, Wahhabism, 2-3
31. Algar, Wahhabism, 44
32. Hussein, The House of Islam, 129
33. Algar, Wahhabism, 37-38
34. Sally Johnson, ""Saudi Arabia Destroyed 98% of Its Cultural Heritage."
35. Husain, The House of Islam, 129
   Wahabisme Dan Implikasinya Bagi Deradikalisasi Pendidikan Islam."
38. Gethin Chamberlain, "Saudi Arabia’s Treatment of Foreign Workers
   under Fire after Beheading of Sri Lankan Maid," The Guardian, January
   world/2013/jan/13/saudi-arabia-treatment-foreign-workers.
40. Al-Zahawi, The Doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna, 26
41. "Concluding Statement," proceedings of International Conference:
   Who Are the Ahl Al-Sunna?, Grozny, Chechen Republic, 2, August
42. Abbas Kadhim, "The Sunni Conference at Grozny: Muslim Intra-
   sectarian Struggle for Legitimacy," The Huffington Post, September 18,
   entry/57d2fa63e4b0f831f7071c1a.
Religion plays a key role in how a person develops, as well as how they view and interpret the world around them. It offers a unique perspective when viewing morality, society, and politics. For many civilizations that have existed there has been a recognition of religion. Since then, religion and politics have intertwined, intermixed, and butted heads. As Mahatma Gandhi once stated, “Those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means.”

Through the lens of political socialization, religion has been used as a tool by the people to determine political culture, which in turn impacts the political system. In response to the rise of state-endorsed atheism and the idea of separation of church and state, modern states act, react, and produce different policies relating to religion. The People’s Republic of China (PRC) has recently been in the headlines for their unethical treatment of religious groups such as the Tibetan Buddhist monks, Uyghur Muslims, and even various sects of Chinese Christians.

It is crucial to note that government should reflect the overall culture and morals of the people they represent. In order to understand why the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) is allowed by the people to commit these atrocities, there needs to be a foundational understanding of the political culture, the types of religion that are accepted within the PRC, and the Chinese constitution.

Religion is the opiate of the masses, and that religion is a tool used by the aristocracy to manipulate the proletariat. This happens to be what Karl Marx’s view that religion is the opiate of the masses, and that religion is a tool used by the aristocracy to manipulate the proletariat. This happens to be what
the CCP is doing: using religion as a means to manipulate people.

LOCAL RELIGION

When Mao Zedong unified mainland China on October 1st, 1949, he issued his own unique interpretation of Communism in the form of the “Red Book.” Mao’s desire was to start a true new beginning, through the elimination of any cultural remnants of Imperial China as well as casting out any foreign ideas. In the early years of communist rule, organized religion was ruthlessly suppressed and infiltrated by informers. Strict limits were placed on what was allowed and what wasn’t. Priests were arrested, exiled, killed, or forced to renounce their profession. Monks were expelled from their monasteries. Religious worship retreated into homes, family groups, and small communities. Rituals and ceremonies were performed secretly in back rooms or outdoors on makeshift altars. Religious activists traveling as tourists quietly set up prayer circles in other communities and countries. Despite the campaigns pushed by Mao, Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism continue to persist behind closed doors. The current CCP leadership has taken a different approach regarding the sanjiao. Mao was so vehemently anti-Confucius that, after he died in 1976, it took nearly thirty-years for Confucianism to come out of hiding. In 2005, Chinese president Hu Jintao unveiled his Confucius “harmonious society” slogan without mentioning the sage by name. It was left for Hu’s successor, Xi Jinping, to officially rehabilitate Confucianism in a 2014 speech marking his 2,565th birthday. Confucianism is now front and center of Chinese political rhetoric, indicating that the government has the ability to discourage oppressed religions, while at the same time possessing the power to endorse and make religion mainstream again.

TIBETAN BUDDHISM

According to the CCP, Tibet has always been part of China. Tibetan and the various Chinese dynasties have had interactions with each other, such as political marriages and depending on the dynasty, some sort of Tibetan tributary system. However, Tibet has always maintained a sense of autonomy. Most Tibetans view themselves as ethnically, linguistically, and culturally different than most of China; this is evident in their religion. For centuries, Tibetan Buddhism, with its vast network of monasteries and nunneries, has been a central component of economic, social, political, and religious life in Tibet. Many of the region’s religious sites date to the seventh century. Political and religious authority have been closely intertwined, particularly since a Dalai Lama began ruling the Tibetan Plateau in the mid-17th century. The unique religious traditions of Tibetan Buddhism—its religious texts, dances, tantric practices, and the philosophical debates that are central to monastic education—differ significantly from the form of Mahayana Buddhism practiced widely in other parts of China. For example, in Tibetan Buddhism, lay practice typically involves making offerings at temples, reciting prayers, maintaining a home shrine, celebrating annual festivals, and completing pilgrimages to sacred sites in Lhasa or elsewhere on the plateau. These activities are quite common and visible in Tibetan areas of China. Of course, these cultural differences did not deter the CCP for claiming the whole of Tibet. In 1950, PRC troops crossed the Yangtze river into Tibet proper. The CCP claims that they are not only reclaiming old lands that rightfully belong to China, but they also claim they are liberating Tibet from a backwards feudal society. The effect this had on the locals was not unexpected: they viewed it as invasion not liberation. Through the incorporation of Tibet into the greater PRC, the CCP seeks to politically control the Tibetan people. As evidenced by the Chinese government imposing a wide array of controls on Tibetan monastics and lay believers. They have become increasingly intrusive, encroaching on areas of life that had previously been left unmolested. Travel restrictions and an extensive apparatus of surveillance—via security forces, informants, closed-circuit television, internet and mobile phone monitoring, and even drones—have created a stifling and intimidating environment for many Tibetans’ religious practice. Ubiquitous propaganda posters and slogans in public places and monasteries remind clerics and laypeople of official regulations on religious management, demands to prioritize loyalty to the state, and penalties for violating rules like carrying prayer beads or other religious symbols into government buildings or schools. On top of this, the CCP took charge of trying to limit the religious doctrine itself. On August 3rd, 2007, the CCP’s State Administration for Religious Affairs (SARA) issued the State Religious Affairs Bureau Order No. 5, requiring that all monasteries monks must fill out the application to reincarnate or to reincarnate after the Dalai Lama.” In 1995, a list of possible candidates for the next Panchen Lama was sent to the Dalai Lama (living in exile in India). In May 15th of that year, Gedhun, had been recognized as the 11th Panchen Lama. Two days later, the Chinese government abducted the child and his family. None of them have ever been seen or heard from again. The abduction and later the replacement of the Panchen Lama is part of China’s efforts to ‘stabilize’ Tibet by controlling its religion and breaking the Dalai Lama’s influence. Not only are they attempting to use their puppet Panchen Lama to control and influence Tibetans today, but when the time comes to find the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama, they will use him to try and legitimize the appointment of their own pro-China candidate as the next leader of Tibetan Buddhism. The PRC learned its lesson from
the failed Cultural Revolution. Instead of stomping out and outlawing religion; they instead decided to use religion against the Tibetans, given the fact that the Tibet people are closely tied to religious affiliations.

CHRISTIANITY (CATHOLICISM)

Since the 1980’s, China has seen a significant growth in Christianity. There are three state-regulated christian organizations and many underground house churches of widely varying sizes. In 2010, the Pew Research Center estimated that there were 67 million christians in China, roughly 5% of the total population; others estimate this number to now be closer to 100 million, with unregistered churchgoers outnumbering members of official churches nearly two to one. Meanwhile, the Beijing-based Chinese Academy of Social Sciences’ estimate is far smaller, tallying 29 million Christian believers. The Vatican has not had diplomatic ties with China, home to some 10 - 12 million Catholics, since 1951. Its recognition of Taiwan and a dispute over the appointment of bishops have been major sticking points. However, as a sign of potentially warming relations in 2018, the two sides reached a provisional agreement in which Pope Francis recognized several Chinese state-appointed bishops who had been excommunicated. Just like Tibetan Buddhism, the CCP wishes to use Catholicism to control its citizens. In 1957, the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association was created in order to provide state supervision on Catholicism in mainland China. The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association oversees its own bishops and ministers that are independent from the Vatican, and all sermons must pass through the approval of the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association. Failure to do so or disobeying the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association might result in the closure of the church or the arrest of the bishop. Despite talks with the Vatican in 2018, it seems nothing significant has changed, however; the agreement with the Vatican seemed to legitimize Chinese rule over its Catholic citizens. Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Pietro Parolin, who oversaw the Church’s negotiations, concedes that it is not a good agreement but stresses its historic significance for unifying the Chinese Catholic Church with the Pope as head. Beijing, however, seems intent on seeing unity on its terms and relegating the Pope as a figurehead of the Church in China. The text of the agreement remains secret but it reportedly gives the officially atheist Chinese government the right to nominate bishops and grants the Pope veto power. A papal veto could lead to more vacant dioceses than the twelve at present. And, if September, 2018 is a precedent, then the Pope only has the right to rubber-stamp: Pope Francis admitted into full ecclesial communion all seven government bishops who were excommunicated or otherwise deemed canonically illegitimate in Church eyes and appointed two of them to replace “underground” bishops as diocesan heads. No other appointments were made. Pope Francis teared up in welcoming these bishops into the Church and for the unity this seemed to suggest. With this agreement the CCP hopes to put on a facade of religious freedom and tolerance. But it is a big production meant to make sure the people are loyal to the state.

CHRISTIANITY (PROTESTANTISM)

Protestantism differentiates itself from Catholicism due to the numerous sects and organizations with foreign, or unclear leadership. Despite Protestantism being one of the five legal religions, its diversity leads to the many underground Protestant churches. The CCP made it clear that it will not tolerate any religion that is under foreign influence. The SARA requires all churches to be registered and monitored by the CCP. The PRC looks down on Christianity since it is a religion brought over by foreigners during the Era of Humiliation, which can be defined as the decline of the Qin empire. It is difficult for these organizations to be approved by SARA, hence they go underground. Unregistered churches, such as the Conditional Church, Basement Church and others, do not enjoy the same tolerance from the government and are constantly watched by the local police. The leaders of these churches are frequently interrogated, their teaching materials are confiscated, and members are persecuted. The government claims that punishment is “meted out in accordance with the law to those who know of the matter but did not report and to those who masterminded the scheme.” Protestantism might be one of the more persecuted religions in the PRC because it contrasts President Xi Jinping’s agenda of promoting Chinese ethics and nationalism. Its foreign background makes the government more fearful, and in order to secure their interest, the CCP uses the system of SARA and other bureaucratic systems to effectively and legally shut them out of Chinese society.

ISLAM

Despite Islam being considered a foreign religion, its presence in China throughout history is essential. Since the 5th century, the Silk Road offered direct cultural and religious exchanges. Under the Tang and Yuan Dynasties, China was one of the most tolerant and richest places on Earth. Today, Xi Jinping has expressed an ambition to reopen a New Silk Road by building a series of railways and roads connecting Central Asia to the Middle East to China. Western China is inhabited mostly by the Uyghur people, a group more related to Turkish ethnic groups than to the Han Chinese; also most of the Uyghur people practice Islam. In order to take control and limit the autonomy of China’s western provinces, Xinjiang, the westernmost province where Uyghurs reside, is an area of special concern due to its region’s ethnic and religious ties to Middle East as well as an increase attacks against government
workers and civilians in recent years. The government attributes the violence to the East Turkestan Islamic Movement (ETIM), a militant Islamic separatist group but some experts say that the threat posed by ETIM is exaggerated or even doubt the group’s existence. Most Uyghurs do not support the ETIM, but they are frustrated with the Chinese government because they face discrimination for having a different religion, language, and culture than the typically wealthier Han Chinese. The government has blamed militants for a variety of attacks, including bombings, and vehicle and knife attacks; according to human rights researchers, some of these attacks were likely spontaneous expressions of discontent and not orchestrated.13

The CCP is using Islamic extremism to conveniently assert more control in its westernmost province which will be crucial in the development of the New Silk Road. Elsewhere in China, the Hui Muslim community has not experienced the same harsh treatment in comparison to the Uyghur Muslims, although they have reported an increase of government surveillance. This explains the CCP interest in western China for economic purposes. China has pledged $1 trillion in loans and investments to its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), a plan to build a vast web of roads, railways, ports, and pipelines across nearly seventy countries on three continents, tracing the ancient paths of the Silk Road. The goal is to spur commerce and interconnectivity, while also advancing Chinese strategic interests and influence. Xinjiang, a huge, resource-rich swath of desert and mountains on China’s western periphery that shares borders with six countries, is an essential BRI hub and gateway to the rest of Eurasia. Experts warn that the harsh crackdown here, which Chinese officials argue is needed for stability, exposes a basic contradiction – and weakness – underlying China’s push to assert itself as a world power.14

Reeducation camps are typically used to get rid of key community and religious leaders, thus giving the CCP more direct rule over the Xinjiang province and the Uyghur people.

INTERNATIONAL REACTION

The CCP’s actions against various religious groups have not gone unnoticed. Several nations have voiced their discontent with the atrocities committed by the CCP. Although, given the fact that the PRC is a prominent member of the United Nations (UN) Security Council, and that the PRC possesses vast economic power, nothing can really be done.

The formal and most vocal way is denouncing China at the United Nations. China was sharply criticized for its mass detention of members of the Muslim Uyghur community at a United Nations Human Rights Council meeting on November 6th, 2018 — but the country pushed back, saying that the condemnation was politically motivated. Western governments, including those in Europe, the United States, and Canada, had the harshest words for China. The United States chargé d'affaires, Mark Cassayre, demanded that China “abolish all forms of arbitrary detention” for Uyghurs and other Muslims minorities, and that China release the “possibly millions” of individuals detained there. Members of the UN Human Rights Council from Africa and the Middle East didn’t offer vocal criticism, but the confrontation between China and Western UN member states is the latest development in a long-simmering crisis.15

Other countries do not speak out against the PRC considering that the PRC possess immense economic power. Pakistan would not speak out for fear of angering an ally which is providing billions in loans and investment. “The Eastern superpower is using its diplomatic and financial clout to shut off criticism,” said Sophie Richardson, China director of Human Rights Watch. “Few ideas have been so successfully marketed in the last couple of decades as the Chinese government’s notion that you can’t criticise it publicly without it making the universe collapse around you,” said Ms. Richardson.16 China is considered a world power. Not many other countries would criticize it, let alone demand action to take place.

CONCLUSION

The power given to the party is absolute, and that possession of power means there is little hope for change in China’s religious communities. The CCP uses religion to stimulate its political agenda and interest. This can be seen through the promotion of the unity and respect for aspects of Confucianism, controlling the religious doctrine of Tibetan Buddhism and Catholicism, or even the crackdown on Islam and Protestantism. Despite the outrage expressed by the international community, the CCP will continue to use religion as a tool to control, manipulate, and regulate the different religious groups scattered across China.

ENDNOTES


7. Ibid.


9. Ibid.


The Middle East is arguably one of the most complex regions to study from the standpoint of political science. This region has a long and rich history filled with conflicts, political intrigue and religious and ethnic diversity. As the nations that comprise the Middle East continue to grow, their relations become increasingly more connected and complex. However, there is one topic that rarely, if ever, is discussed and that is the status of the various Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) communities in the region. Study of LGBT communities helps shed light on the Middle East nations, further develop their identities, and demonstrate what makes them unique. While this may seem like an odd observation to make, the status of LGBT communities offers a new perspective on the region that hasn't been explored enough in the context of the identities of each of these countries.

When policy is made and laws passed, they either promote or hinder the growth of LGBT communities in order to reflect cultural norms. The obvious exception to this comes in the form of authoritative states that adhere to the desires of government rather than the will of the people. Should these views be negative, then the battle for LGBT civil rights can be an uphill one in which people’s freedoms can be at risk. When it comes to LGBT communities in the Middle East there appears to be three views on how different societies treat individuals from these groups. In some regions, being a part of the LGBT community is illegal and punishable by death, while in other areas, members of the LGBT community openly celebrate Pride month; however, even when it appears as though the civil liberties of the LGBT community are protected it can be more complicated than those appearances suggest.

Due to how important state sovereignty is, even when there are blatant violations of human rights being committed, there are few ways for another state to intervene without causing serious blowback. From there, the burden of fighting for the LGBT populace falls to advocacy groups dedicated to changing laws. The fruits of their labors can be seen in countries such as Lebanon and Israel where gay citizens enjoy a more accepting government. However, in Saudi Arabia being gay carries more of a risk due to recent changes in their legal system, as well as vague laws regarding “immoral acts”. Even though these are varying views regarding LGBT peoples, it demonstrates the different stances that are being taken today in the Middle East. While advocating for expanded civil rights for LGBT communities is not a new challenge, in the modern era advocacy groups such as Arab Foundation for Freedoms and Equality (AFE) have made tremendous strides in this endeavor. Working throughout North Africa and the Middle East, AFE is a regional advocacy group that works to promote civil liberties for the LGBT community. One problem that exists for advocacy groups such as AFE is government crackdowns; when crackdowns do occur, often the only way for movements to survive is to go underground while civil rights leaders leave the country until the danger has passed. When a government goes through a crackdown, they are generally searching for, and arresting, anyone that may pose any type of threat to the state or society at large. Even if the threat isn’t real, crackdowns can be used in
various circumstances as a means of a party solidifying control. But in countries where the government makes arresting LGBT advocacy groups a priority, this exacerbates their need for more continued advocacy of LGBT communities.

There is a global consensus that state sovereignty must be respected and each state must be allowed to pass laws and develop without fear of unwanted foreign interference. However, in order to be allowed onto the United Nations (UN), these countries must adopt and uphold the Charter and resolutions of the UN. UN resolutions are aimed at expanding and protecting both human rights and state sovereignty. Once a member of the UN, states may claim to uphold humanitarian laws only to use this as a veil to hide their totalitarian nature. Saudi Arabia is one such nation, with a list of human rights violations so long that other member states of the United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC) wish to remove or even block Saudi Arabia from being a part of the UNHRC until they enact serious change. This further adds to the need for groups such as AFE to operate in an expanded capacity as they are a nongovernmental organization (NGO), fighting for necessary change for LGBT communities to enact this kind of change. As a result, groups like AFE have become the new voices for equal treatment of minorities across the region. While the cooperation between NGOs and governments does help to provide change, it ultimately comes down to the NGO’s to take the wheel and steer this change. Afterall, when it comes to governments, their interests may shift suddenly in new directions, especially when elections occur. Since advocacy groups such as AFE operate independent of the agendas of governments, this allows for greater consistency in their message and actions. It goes without saying that there is still the possibility for an advocacy group to have a dramatic shift in position too. However, sudden changes like that are rare and are to be considered the exception for how most NGOs operate.

There are three approaches that states adopt regarding the LGBT community and civil rights. One such approach is to discriminate against LGBT communities in various ways to keep them repressed. Some countries have enacted laws that outlaw homosexuality and use vague terminology as a basis to prosecute men and women on the grounds of their sexual identity. In Saudi Arabia, judges use loose interpretation of the law to justify convicting members of the LGBT community with “immoral acts”. While it is not written in their constitution that being gay is explicitly illegal, it still is grounds for courts to prosecute members of the LGBT community. In states where it is not illegal and there are no formal civil protections, these communities are at the mercy of their legal system and, more specifically, the judge. These vague laws leave the interpretation of the law up to the personal bias of the judge.

Should laws not be accepting of the LGBT community, this could easily lead to individuals of this community being brought to court over their sexuality. This is best exemplified with the case of a wedding video that went viral in Saudi Arabia showing a marriage between two men. On January 11, 2018, the recently married couple, as well as some of their wedding guests, were arrested by Saudi Arabia for “using social media to solicit homosexual acts”. After their arrest, the Bureau of Investigation and Public Prosecution pressed for the death penalty for these men and their wedding guests. There was no further information about the fate of these men or their guests following the arrest.

While this may seem like an unjust move on the part of the Saudi government, this is an example of how they have adopted policy to allow for their more authoritative style of governing to take hold. Between the expansion of their laws allowing easier access to the death penalty and the lack of rights afforded to the defense during their arrest or even during their case, the LGBT community in Saudi Arabia is very much at the mercy of the government. Due to the authoritarian nature of the government, when people are arrested, the legal system leaves many loopholes that negatively affect the defendant and make stating their case that much harder, even impossible. By not allowing lawyers to always be present, not allowing access to evidence and not informing a person of the charges against them, going to court may become futile at best or a quagmire at worst. To only further the difficulty faced by civil rights advocates, and LGBT community members, Saudi Arabia also has other similarly dangerous laws regarding NGO’s. To further solidify its control the government adopted a policy that allows it to disband any NGO at any time 2016. Due to how this policy extends to any NGO, when it comes to LGBT advocacy groups, this creates a dilemma should any group gain too much momentum. Should a group become too prominent in Saudi Arabia then the government may dissolve them under pretenses justified by the current policy. Should the government decide that an advocacy group is possibly changing the political landscape, they have the legal justification to reverse any and all progress made. Prominent advocates, such as George Azzi, winner of the 2018 Felipa De Souza Award, fear entering the country even when the government isn’t going through a crackdown due to the possibility of arrest. The Felipa Award is for any individuals, or groups, that have made significant progress in advocacy of sexual rights and sexual identity in areas of the world where homosexuality and transgender people are heavily stigmatized or even outlawed. This leads to advocacy groups that operate in Saudi Arabia remaining largely underground and divided, since causing too strong of a ripple in society can lead to easily being arrested, detained, and potentially executed. Ideally, policy would be passed to reflect the will of the people; however, when the government becomes authoritative then policy and laws are passed to reflect the will of the government, even
if it comes at the expense of the people.

While LGBT communities are openly prosecuted in Saudi Arabia, the situation in Israel is more complicated than the government would have people believe. The second view of LGBT communities is to weaponize the very protections that advocacy groups and individuals have fought for. Over the years, Israeli LGBT communities have enjoyed a steady expansion of their rights and civil protections due to the efforts of individuals and advocacy groups, such as Aguda: The Israeli National LGBT Task Force. However, what makes the case of Israel so complex is how they simultaneously grant rights to Israeli citizens while denying them to Palestinians. The problem is in Israel’s continued occupation of the Palestinian territories and the “Brand Israel” campaign. Even though there are advocates for members of the Palestinian LGBT community, their struggle for expanded freedoms is difficult because of the occupation of Palestine. Furthermore, when it comes to the expansion of Palestinian LGBT civil rights, this takes second place in most people’s minds to ending Israeli occupation. While this may at first sound alarming to advocates of LGBT rights, the reality is that due to the length of the Israeli occupation, wars fought over Israeli occupation, and other human rights violations against the Palestinians, this causes most Palestinians to see ending Israeli occupation as the priority. While it is not illegal to be gay in Palestine, there aren’t any protections for those who face social stigmas. Because of how dangerous it is to be openly gay in Palestine, when someone is outed as being homosexual, their only option is to turn to Israel.

When gay Palestinians flee to Israel, their presence contradicts the “Brand Israel” campaign. What the “Brand Israel” campaign represents is somewhat sinister in nature despite the message the Israeli government was trying to send the world about Israel. Starting in 2007, the Israeli government began researching and developing a campaign aimed at straight young men between the ages of 18-35 to change how they viewed Israel in the world, its immediate goal was to attract tourism. Later, the targeted demographic shifted from straight young men to gay young men. In 2009, the International Gay and Lesbian Travel Association called Israel a “world gay destination”; this drew tremendous criticism from the international community and other LGBT advocacy groups, such as the Lebanon based advocacy group Helem, who called for a boycott of Israel over this campaign based on charges of hypocrisy. Even though Israel is protecting gay Israeli citizens, this same protection is not extended to gay Palestinians seeking asylum. This campaign was a means of distracting from the tensions of Israeli occupation a result, the term ‘Pinkwashing’ came into being: ‘Pinkwashing’ came about due to the travel association proclaiming that Israel wasn’t trying to ignore the conflict but rather to promote LGBT awareness. This may seem like a credible retort to accusations about the “Brand Israel” campaign, but at the same time in Tel Aviv, a report was published that completely countered everything that was being disseminated. In 2008, the report “Nowhere to Hide” was published by Tel Aviv University, which documented attempts made by gay Palestinians to enter Israel seeking asylum. While they arrived expecting to enjoy
the same freedoms that their Israeli neighbors have, the reality was the total opposite: instead of encountering the loving open arms that Israel was advertising, they were turned away. Often, when gay Palestinians would try and seek asylum in Israel, especially when tensions were particularly high, they would be deported and taunted by the authorities. Suddenly this image of Israeli acceptance of the gay community becomes much more questionable. While it may be argued that the “Brand Israel” campaign was an effort to promote LGBT rights and offer safety to other gay people in the Middle East, this wasn’t the result of the campaign. Another glaring contradiction to this image of Israel being a gay friendly nation state comes from their intelligence agencies and what kinds of information they try to uncover to leverage cooperation between Palestinians and the Israeli military (IDF). Playing off social stigmas that exist in Palestinian society surrounding homosexuality, Israeli intelligence will try to uncover and exploit any Palestinian who may be hiding their true sexuality. Once any compromising information is uncovered, this is then used to blackmail them into feeding information to the Israeli military. Because this is a common concern for many Palestinians, it leads to the breakdown of trust between the people which in turn makes the efforts of LGBT advocacy groups even more difficult as people can’t be sure who is and isn’t working with the IDF.

Even members of Hamas aren’t immune to this level of investigation or social stigmas. This breakdown of trust is best demonstrated with the 2014 execution of Mahmoud Ishtiwi. Mahmoud Ishtiwi had been a member of Hamas for most of his adult life, where he eventually rose to the rank of commander in the organization. He held this position until his arrest and execution over accusations of using money designated for his unit as hush money for an affair he had with a man. The justification used to execute him was on the grounds that Israel may have been blackmailing him into leaking information about a prominent member of Hamas, which led to the attempted assassination of Mohammed Deif on August 20, 2014. Again, Israel contradicts its previous statement about being a progressive gay friendly nation by using others’ sexuality against them in their conflicts with Palestine or by deporting members of the Palestinian LGBT community seeking asylum.

Another contradiction to the message of acceptance of the LGBT community comes with the resignation of a member of the Israeli Knesset. Yigal Guetta was forced out of office in 2017 because he had attended the wedding of his nephew to another man which, when revealed, prompted five rabbis to publish a letter calling for his resignation. It is important to keep in mind that Israel does have protections for their LGBT citizens. However, with their policy and treatment of LGBT peoples of other nationalities their acceptance becomes selective to say the least. On one hand, the Israeli government has protections for the Israeli LGBT community and proclaim to the world of their acceptance; on the other hand, they deny this acceptance to members of the Palestinian LGBT community, peoples under their occupation.

The situation in Lebanon is eerily similar to, but not identical to, what is happening in Israel regarding LGBT rights. In Lebanon, there still exist stigma against homosexuals, however, the government isn’t trying to exploit the progress that has been made for their own agenda. In 1991, Lebanon ratified major changes to their constitution regarding the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. By ratifying the Declaration of Human Rights, Lebanon agreed to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, which enshrine freedom of sexuality, speech, and the right to a fair trial. To further add to the reputation of Lebanon as a gay friendly nation, numerous LGBT advocacy groups are based out of the country. As with Saudi Arabia, when these rights are absent or not enforced, it makes the task of advocating for LGBT groups significantly harder. By allowing for the beginning of protections for the LGBT community, this opens the door for them to grow and bring about positive social change which seems to be the case in Lebanon.

Unfortunately, LGBT advocacy in Lebanon still has challenges to overcome in order to bring about real equality for LGBT citizens. One such obstacle is allowing for a Lebanese Pride parade to occur. What Pride parades represent is the acceptance of society of LGBT communities to the degree where people may celebrate publicly. On the surface, this may seem trivial in comparison to the changing of policy that will protect LGBT communities; however, the importance of the parade rests not in its actual occurrence but rather in what it represents to the LGBT community and advocacy efforts overall. Earlier in 2018, the Beirut Pride parade was canceled after the organizer of the festival was detained by the authorities and ordered to cancel the parade and any remaining activities planned. By canceling the parade, the Lebanese government sent a strong message that while LGBT communities have made serious progress, they still haven’t achieved equality just yet. With the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into the Lebanese constitution, the way is still being paved for advocacy groups to continue their work using the legal institutions that are now in place. From this point of view, Lebanon is slowly growing to be more accepting of LGBT communities, similarly to how Israel has grown to accept Israeli LGBT communities.

Across the Middle East, there are different approaches to LGBT communities, rejection of LGBT rights as is occurring in Saudi Arabia, weaponization of LGBT rights in Israel, and the gradual acceptance of LGBT rights that is occurring in Lebanon. However, the aforementioned countries are not the only ones to adopt these stances on LGBT rights. Across the region, every civil society has grown to develop their own unique perspectives on LGBT communities. The
one unifying factor among them are the advocacy groups that work tirelessly to bring about the advancement of sexual rights. Even in the more progressive of countries, these changes often come about as the result of advocacy group efforts. It is very rare to find a country whose society accepts LGBT communities without great effort from advocates; however, because of the progress that has been made in countries like Lebanon, and even in Israel regarding Israeli citizens of the LGBT community, room is left for hope that countries such as Saudi Arabia will eventually also begin to accept LGBT citizens on a larger scale. No matter which country’s LGBT community is being examined, the level of acceptance has most often come through the efforts of advocates.
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Yemen is an Arab country located at the end of the southern Arabian Peninsula. It borders the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the north, Oman in the northeast, and the Gulf of Aden in the south. The landscape of Yemen is covered with jagged peaks and plateaus. The highest elevation is known as the Jabal An-Nabi Shu'ayb, which is 12,028 ft above sea level. Yemen is the breeding ground for ancient traditions from over 3000 years ago. In fact, it’s known for its astounding Biblical and Quranic civilizations encompassing Minoan, Sabaean, and Himyarite as well as the prodigious wealth that followed. However, before Islam reached the borders of Yemen, majority of its population preached the religions of Judaism and Christianity. It wasn’t until that the Arab conquests made their way in the Arabian Peninsula, that many Yemenis began to convert to Islam. In the early stages of Islam, Yemen was one of the most crucial territories for Muslims due to its placement of influence and trade routes. The concept of Islam alone created conflicts for it was divided in two main sects – Shiites and Sunnis. The followers of Ali Bin Abi Taleeb (aka the son in law of Prophet Mohammad) are known as Shiites, who believe that only Ali and the descendants (or ummah) of the prophet could lead the Muslim world. Nonetheless, the Yemeni population today consists of Sunni with smaller numbers of Shiites, Jews, Christians and Hindus. The focal point of this disquisition will be the war in Yemen and how it’s economic conditions, religious conflicts, and proxy wars have continued to ignite the contention in this historically complex region.

Yemen was occupied by many invaders throughout history. From the 1500s until the British invaded Aden in 1839, Yemen was under the control of the Ottoman Empire. The British acknowledged the significance of the Port of Aden because it would allow them to control the Red Sea and it was crucial to their trade with India.1 In 1839, the British government took control of the Port of Aden and used it for fueling shipping purposes. When the Suez Canal, a waterway that connects the Mediterranean Sea with the Indian Ocean via the Red Sea, was opened in 1869, the British understood if the Ottomans controlled the access of the Red Sea, it would be impossible to protect their interests between Europe and India via the Middle East. The British then established the Port of Yemen as one of their colonies. Yemen was then divided into two regions: the British in the south and the Ottomans in the north, until the empire collapsed following World War I.2

In the northern region of Yemen, there was a Shiite leader known as Imam Yahya bin Hussein Qassim Al-Rassi, who was a descendant of prophet Mohammed. Al-Rassi fought and won independence for the north and established the Yemen Arab Republic. In 1962, the British government attempted to create the Federation of South Arabia by convincing the Sultan of Oman to join but were unsuccessful. Essentially, Great Britain wanted to create a government loyal to them, so that their interests in the region wasn’t tampered. The British government promised to withdraw its military forces from Aden and the southern region of Yemen, as well as establish an independent state by the end of 1968.3 After the British withdrew from the southern region, the government gained its independence.
and was known as the People’s Republic of Southern Yemen.

After three years of independence, the government in the south revolutionized into a Communist regime. The People’s Republic of Southern Yemen was changed to the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY). The hostility between the North and the South continued until the collapse of the USSR in 1991, leaving the South with no financial and political support.

The process of amalgamation began in 1988 when both presidents of Yemen Arab Republic, YAR, and PDRY met to reduce tension between the two countries. One of the conditions before the unification was that both countries divide the ministry positions equally among them. In other words, both countries govern the new Republic of Yemen equally. Since the unification of the north and the south on 22 May 1990, the Republic of Yemen is considered the youngest state in the Middle East. The merger was one of the greatest steps to stop the bloodshed between the YAR and PDRY. They chose Sanaa as the capital for the new Republic of Yemen. In the same year, Yemen was given a temporarily seat at the UN.

In 1990, Iraq occupied Kuwait under Saddam Hussein’s regime, and Yemen rejected the interference of the West to resolve the issue between Iraq and Kuwait. The government of Yemen rejected the idea of using force to kick out the Iraqi army in Kuwait. The president of Yemen, Ali Abdullah Saleh, had a strong relationship with Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi president at that time. The rich Arab Gulf states invited the West to help them defeat Saddam Hussein; however, were appalled and exasperated when Yemen decided to side with Iraq. The Saudi government understood that president Saleh might be part of Saddam Hussein’s conspiracy to occupy Saudi Arabia after Kuwait. This led to Saudi Arabia’s retaliation of immediately deporting all Yemeni workers back to Yemen and cutting off all financial aid. Over a million Yemenis were left without work due to the massive deportation. Hence, leading to an inevitable economic crisis that further prompted individuals to protest against their government.

The new government of Yemen deployed more than 35,000 troops to keep law and order during this time. In 1994, a civil war in Yemen broke out again for several months between the North and the South, costing Yemen around two billion dollars. After several weeks of chaos, the southern region of Yemen claimed its independence once again and the northern region attempted to retake the country by attacking the South.

Yemen followed the path of its sister countries in the Middle East during the Arab Spring. Poverty and government corruption were the main reasons behind the idea of the Arab Spring. The Arab Spring in Yemen had its own roots compared to other Arab countries in the Middle East. Ever since Yemen has had a single government, it never truly experienced stability due to the constant civil wars that broke out between the North and South after its unification. In 2004, Houthis in the north of Yemen were not happy with central government functionality. They revolted against the government and started the revolution. The Yemeni government and Houthis fought a total of six brutal battles from 2004 to 2010. Saleh’s government became weak and could not defend themselves or support the Yemeni
Hadi fled. The Saudi government did not want to see a militia with Houthis’ militia in Yemen and had to act immediately after President Saleh was established in 1982 by the Iranian government.11 Hezbollah was a similar ideology to Hezbollah. Hezbollah is a Shiite militia that created when Israel invaded part of Lebanon. Hezbollah is holding back from Yemen due to the great loss against Israel in 1967.9 government in Yemen. Shortly after, the Egyptian troops had to leave because the Houthis forced him to flee Yemen and seek refuge in Saudi Arabia. Houthis managed to win over many wars as well as occupy large areas in Yemen.

Saudi Arabia, among other countries, has a long history of interfering in Yemeni civil wars. For instance, in 1962, a group of Yemeni army officers led a coup to overthrow the kingdom of Imam Mutawakkilite. The coup aimed to change the government from a Kingdom to a Republic. Gamal Abdul Al-Nasser, the president of Egypt at that time who also was seen as the leader of the Arab world, backed the officers who led the coup by sending troops to Yemen. The USSR supported the Egyptian military with weaponry in order to overthrow the government in Yemen. On the other side, the Saudi Arabians, Jordanians, Israelis, and British supported the royalists because they thought that royalists were the right people to govern Yemen. The American government supported Saudi’s militarily to fight the coup and restore the Yemeni government because they did not want to see Yemen as part of Abdul Nasser’s new empire. President Kennedy did not support the royalists because he thought that they were hopeless and acknowledged the republican government in Yemen. Shortly after, the Egyptian troops had to withdraw from Yemen due to the great loss against Israel in 1967.9 The 1967 war is known as the six days war. Israel defeated the Arabs and doubled its size in Palestine.10

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia acknowledged the threat of the Houthis’ militia in Yemen and had to act immediately after President Hadi fled. The Saudi government did not want to see a militia with a similar ideology to Hezbollah. Hezbollah is a Shiite militia that was established in 1982 by the Iranian government.11 Hezbollah was created when Israel invaded part of Lebanon. Hezbollah is holding seats within the Lebanese government where it was created.12 The Saudi government became concerned that the Iranian government was supporting and pushing Houthis to control the government in Yemen. Saudi Arabia took the lead position to form a coalition to fight Houthis and restore Yemeni government under Hadi’s presidency. In 2015, the Saudi government launched a coalition consisting of Bahrain, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Egypt, Sudan, Jordan, and Morocco.13 The Middle Eastern and African countries feared the increase of the Iranian influence in the region.14 The Iranian government involved in many Arab countries such as Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Qatar, and Yemen. The Saudi government named the coalition as the Operation Decisive Storm. The Operation was focused on airstrikes against Houthis and their allies in Yemen. Obama’s administration was not part of the coalition; however, the former president, Obama, ordered his administration continued to support the Saudi government with intelligence support for the air strikes.

Houthis live on the northern side of Yemen. They are Shiite who are known as a Zaydi Shiite. They are twenty-five percent of the total Yemeni population. However, they are the majority of the population in northern Yemen. Zaydi Shiites is considered one of the Shiite branches within the Shiism sect; however, they are different from Shiism in Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon. Zaydi Shiites ruled north of Yemen for more than one thousand years without facing any challenges. They claim that they descend from the Prophet of Islam, Mohammed, via his daughter Fatima and her husband Ali who governed Yemen in the early stages of Islam. The Houthis are named after their leader, Hussein Badr al-Din al-Houthi, who was killed by the Yemeni government in 2004.15 The Houthis movement began in the 1980’s. Their original goal was to protect the Zaydi Shiites from Sunni extremists, who till date believe that Shiites of any kind are not Muslims. Now, the Houthis would like to govern their own territories as they did before the unification of Yemen. Houthis criticize president Ali Abdullah Saleh’s administration for not resolving issues regarding high unemployment rates and corruption. Saleh was against the American presence in the Middle East until 9/11. After that, he became a supporter of the U.S government’s involvement in the Middle East especially since the U.S. was giving his administration millions of dollars.16

Iran has goals to achieve in expanding in the Middle East due to its involvement in Iraq, Lebanon, Syria and Yemen. Saudi Arabia and Iran are in a proxy war over expanding their influence in the region. Both are trying to be the leader of the Muslim world. Saudi Arabia is leading a Sunni coalition against the Shiites in Yemen. Iran does not want to be an easy target for Saudi Arabia and Western powers; therefore, Iran is supporting all the Shiites states in the world with no conditions.17 Iran is trying to encircle Saudi Arabia by supporting Houthis militia that would function similarly like Hezbollah in Lebanon.18 Shiite Islam is ten percent of all Muslim, and majority of the Shiite population is located in Iran, Iraq, and Bahrain. However, Shiites are also spread throughout Yemen, Qatar, Kuwait, UAE,
Azerbaijan, Turkey, Syria, Pakistan, Lebanon, India, and Afghanistan but are considered the minority. In the 1980s, while Iran was fighting a war with Iraq, it supported the Shiites in Lebanon and supported Afghanistan’s fight against the USSR’s invasion in 1979. In 1991, Iran also supported the attempted coup in Iraq, by the Shiites, to overthrow the regime of Saddam Hussein. Iran supported the Shiite of Bahrain during the Arab Spring in 2011. Iran is still supporting the Shiite in Syria with their civil war against ISIS and other extremist Muslims. The government of Saudi Arabia would not like to see any Iranian influence in Yemen since Saudi Arabia shares a border with Yemen. Without the Iranian support, Houthis would have been destroyed a long time ago. Saudi Arabia did not think that the war in Yemen would take that long because Houthis were not an organize army, and no military technology. Clearly, the Saudis coalition failed miserably to eliminate the Houthis in Yemen and end the civil war. Saudi Arabia accused Iran of smuggling arms to Houthis, but Iran rejected the Saudi accusation. Iran has not declared its arms support to Houthis. The Iranian government thinks that Saudi Arabia is trying to use them as a scapegoat for their failure to control the situation in Yemen. Not to mention, Iran is shipping their arms to Houthis via Somalia using fishing boats, which is hard to identify since there are many of them. With this intension, Iran managed to send long-range distance ballistic missiles which has the ability to target Saudi cities.

The Saudi coalition began their campaign of bombing in Yemen against Houthi rebels in 2015, which resulted in massive civilian deaths. In the early of 2016, the death of civilians estimated to be fifty-six thousand. Saudi coalition forces targeted any Houthis present; they boomed schools, hospitals, funerals, and even mosques. Also, the Saudis bombed Hodeida port which is the main source of food and other foreign aid importations. People have starved to death due to Saudi’s bombing of Hodeida port. The Yemeni people have been struggling with poverty for a long time and are in the midst of a humanitarian crisis; the Saudi bombing aggravated the situation. Saudi Arabia and its allies claimed that they are helping the Yemeni government to control and restore stability in the country when in reality they caused massive causalities and millions of people left without homes, food or water.

The United States of America has supported the Saudi government since World War II with weapons and military training. They currently support Saudi Arabia in Yemen. The technology that the Saudis and the Emiratis used in their bombing campaign in Yemen were primarily American. According to the State Department, the Saudi army received military equipment, training on special operation, and intergrade air and missile defense system from the United States. In addition, the U.S. government provided Saudi government with a number of military advisors and training on how to strength cyber defenses.

In recent years, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has bought more weapons from the U.S than any other country in the world, which makes them crucial to the American economy. In 2015, Washington signed an arm deal with Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, worth more than 115 billion dollars. This particular arm deal equipped Saudi with U.S. manufactured military equipment’s such as the tanks and F-15. It also provided training on how to use the apparatuses. In 2017, Saudi purchased military equipment that was worth more than 129 billion dollars. Many countries did not scrutinize the Saudi bombings in Yemen because Saudi was one of their largest customers in purchasing their military apparatus’s. The United Kingdom is the second largest arms exporter to Saudi Arabia. Right after the Saudi and Emiratis started the bombing campaign in Yemen, the British government signed an arm deal with Saudi Arabia worth more than 3.5 billion dollars between 2015 and 2016. Both the US and the UK are benefiting from the selling of arms to Saudi Arabia, but they completely ignore how
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In the early stage of the crisis in Yemen in 2014, the United Nations Security Council issued two resolutions, 2201 and 2216, condemning Houthi rebels in Yemen. The Arab Gulf countries were authorized by the UN to form a coalition to seize arms shipments and also to inspect any incoming vessels to Yemen. The UN resolution helped the Saudis convince their allies to begin the bombing campaign in Yemen in 2015. Therefore, the Saudi coalition managed to expand their involvement by interfering militarily in Yemen.

On August 25, 2016, the United Nations issued a report condemning the Saudis for the bombing campaign in Yemen due to the humanitarian crisis. According to the UN report, within a year of the Saudi coalition, there were 3,799 civilians that were killed and 6,711 injured as a result of the Saudi airstrikes in Yemen. The report also estimated more than three million were forced to leave their homes and three million children and women were suffering from cholera disease. The UN report showed the devastating attacks on residential areas, markets, schools, and religious places. The UN asked the international communities to step in and stop the Yemeni suffering.

The war neither stopped, nor did the Saudi coalition stop their bombing campaign. According to the UN report, poverty reached up to 79% of the total population in Yemen, and the GDP dropped to 61% since 2015. There are more than twenty-two million people in the need of humanitarian support and protection. The war is leading the Yemeni people to famine disaster. The UN fears that the war in Yemen could become the worst famine in the world in 100 years. People in Yemen are suffering from food and water shortages. A majority of people do not know whether they will get their next meal or not. The malnutrition has reached 90% since the Saudis began their bombing campaign in Yemen. Due to the war, more than sixteen million people do not have secure access to water because a majority of the water pipes are destroyed. The literacy rate is decreasing among women and children whereby more than 25% of children have no school and more than 48% of women are illiterate. The UN estimated that more than 44% of marriages in Yemen are under the age of fifteen and 72% of girls get married under the age of eighteen. The war left more than two million people displaced. Millions of people fled Yemen because of violence, and famine. Based on the United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, report, there are more than eleven million children in Yemen need of aid, and every ten minutes, a Yemeni child dies due to the poor economic and baffling political conditions. The UN called the war in Yemen the worst anthropogenic humanitarian crisis of our time. And yet, the Saudi government and their allies have not stopped and there are no international sanctions against them. Even Non-Profit Organizations (NGO's) are not able to deliver humanitarian assistance due to the conflict. Therefore, the war in Yemen has to stop regardless of what the Saudi government fears because it is the largest catastrophic humanitarian disaster in the world.

The consequences of the war in Yemen gave Al-Qaeda and other Islamic groups to find their new home in Yemen. For example, Houthi’s relationship with Iran is strengthening over time especially since the Saudi coalition bombing began. From the start of the bombing campaign in 2015, Houthis have strengthened their relationship with Hezbollah in Lebanon more than any time before.

Yemen did not experience a period of stability after their unification in 1990. The country went into civil war after the unification of North and the South. Zaydi Shiites Houthis felt that they were discriminated by the central government of Yemen. After the unification, the country suffered a high rate of unemployment and government corruption. The Arab Spring came to the Middle East, and it was the perfect time for the Yemeni people to demonstrated and demand a change the regime. The massive protests resulted in the forced resignation of President Abdullah Saleh and the transfer of power to vice president Hadi. President Hadi was forced by Houthis to flee Yemen, and he went to Saudi Arabia. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and its allies began their bombing campaign in Yemen to prevent Houthis from controlling the Yemeni government. The Saudi government thinks that if Houthis govern Yemen, it will allow Iran to have a foothold on the Arabia Peninsula and expand their territories. Iran is the greatest enemy to the kingdom of Saudi Arabia since the establishment of the kingdom. Saudi Arabia had to establish a coalition and began their bombing campaign against the Houthis in Yemen. The Saudi-led coalitions did not bring any sort of peace to the region other than distraction. People of Yemen starved to death and other are struggling due to famine. Women and children are left with no education. The majority of the Yemeni people in Yemen have no access to healthcare. Mike Pompeo, the U.S secretary of state, supported the peace talks proposal by the UN and called for an end to the war in Yemen. The United States realized the damages that the Saudi coalition caused in Yemen; therefore, the House of Representative voted to stop the military support to the Saudis in their bombing campaign in Yemen. Eighteen Republican in the Senate voted with Democrats members in the House. With political pressure from the U.S and international community, the Saudi-led collation would end the war in Yemen. Yemen has been completely destroyed by Saudi bombing campaign.
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WATER WARS: CONFLICT OVER A VITAL RESOURCE

CHEZ DEMOULIN

WATER AS A RESOURCE

The Earth is the single most unique planet in the observed universe due to the fact that it is covered with an abundance of liquid water. In fact, around 71% of the Earth’s surface is covered in liquid water. However, 97.2% of all surface water is contained in our oceans; in other words, most of the Earth’s water is not available for freshwater consumption. Only about 2.8% of Earth’s water is freshwater, to be allocated to a global population of 7.5 billion people. Of the 2.8% of freshwater, about 68.7% is frozen in glaciers and ice sheets, 30.1% is ground water, 0.9% is found in various forms and a mere 0.3% is liquid freshwater found at the surface. Theoretically, there is plenty of water, 326 million-trillion gallons to be exact. In actuality, humans depend mostly on water that comes from rivers and lakes, which is only three tenths of a percent of all water on the planet. That 0.3% of freshwater is distributed in various ways: 70% is used for agriculture, 20% is used for industry, and just 10% is for domestic usage. The Earth is a “closed system,” which essentially means that no more water will ever be coming in and the water we have here now, and have had for billions of years, will never be leaving. For that matter, “running out” of water is a misconstrued concept. Running out of water does not mean that eventually humans will suck up the entire resource until the planet goes dry. What running out of water actually refers to is the limitation or restriction of an individual’s ability to access that small percentage of freshwater via lakes and rivers. In recent years, overpopulation and climate change are two leading factors that have caused water scarcity in freshwater lakes and rivers. Water scarcity has resulted in limited or restricted access to water and has since become the subject of security concern.

OVERPOPULATION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

With ever growing cities and severe changes in precipitation patterns due to climate change, the world is now faced with one of the most pressing issues of our time: the very real possibility that our access to water is becoming more limited. In combination of higher demand and less supply across the globe, access to water is becoming increasingly difficult to attain in various parts of the world. Worldwide, per-capita water use is increasing at twice the rate of population growth. At the same time, water availability per person declines as population and individual demand increases. World population growth since 1970 has depleted water supplies by one third. Higher temperatures and rates of evaporation, as well as shrinking levels of precipitation, have caused severe droughts in places like Ethiopia, Eritrea, India, Pakistan, China, Iran, Uganda, Sudan and several other countries. Competition for water is more present now than ever before and the implications for what may persist in the wake of resource scarcity is unnerving. Although the international community is taking serious notice of this issue, many resolutions have come up short. The problem still remains: competition over access to water has every potential to create tension, cause stress and uncertainty, and end in war and tragedy.

WATER AS A HUMAN RIGHT

Due to its scarce yet vital nature, it is important that water is well
managed in order to sustain the constant demand. However, water is considered a basic human right, so efforts to conserve can often go unacknowledged. According to United Nations A/RES/64/292, "the human right to water entitles everyone to sufficient, safe, acceptable, physically accessible and affordable water for personal and domestic uses." Amina Mohammed, Deputy Security General at the United Nations, has stated one of the biggest problems that needs to be addressed is the common misperception that water is available in bountiful amounts for everyone to use because you can turn a tap. The shocking reality, however, is by 2040, most of the world won’t have enough water to meet the demand year-round. For this reason, the UN Security Council has recently turned its attention to the relationship between water scarcity as a root of conflict for transboundary nations that share a single source of water.

WATER AS A ROOT OF CONFLICT

On October 26, 2018 Security Council members met at the Arria-Formula meeting to address the concern of water related security risks as the root of potential conflict. In stating its primary concern, the UNSC documented, "Water stress threatens communities directly, and it can contribute to the outbreak of violent conflict and instability within and among societies." Miroslav Jenča, Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, stated, "given the significance of water as a resource, water risks are inevitably also security risks. However, the relationship between water stress and security risk is nonlinear; the same can be said for climate change." 

In examining the roots of conflict, evidence shows that resource scarcity has a negative correlation with conflict; meaning as resources decrease, conflict increases. Since humans receive most of their water from rivers and lakes, most civilizations have been built around these ecosystems. In fact, around 90% of the world’s population lives less than 10 kilometers away from a freshwater resource. Three quarters of United Nation’s member states share rivers or lake basins with their neighbors. Such members include: Chad, Niger and Nigeria at the Lake Chad basin, Egypt and Sudan at the Nile river and Turkey, Syria and Iraq at the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. Most of the conflict over water is happening at these “transboundary” rivers and lakes.

At the Lake Chad Basin, climate change has dramatically transformed the entire area and exacerbated conflict. Lake Chad has shrunk to a tenth of what it was in 1960, and according to Nigerian officials, the lake may completely dry up in the next 20 years. Conflict began when herdsmen were forced to migrate south to find new pastures and water for cattle, due to drought diminishing their usual grazing flats. The migration has led to conflict between herdsmen whose cattle are being stolen and farmers whose land is being encroached upon, conflict which has ended violently.

Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria surround the Lake Chad Basin, which is considered one of the worst conflict zones in Africa. In the wake of mass migration, militant groups such as Boko Haram have taken the opportunity to establish themselves in abandoned lands around the Lake Chad Basin. On top of more than 2,000 people killed over the dispute between herders and famers, Boko Haram has committed mass atrocities in the region in pursuit of taking over the territory. Nearly fifteen million civilians have been affected by Boko Haram’s ongoing insurgency, leaving 27,000 dead and more than 2.4 million displaced since 2009.

The Nile river passes through 11 countries, terminating in Egypt. The Nile is the only source of water for the 40 million farmers in Egypt’s desert nation, so when Ethiopia drew up plans for building a hydrologic dam of massive scale further upstream, Egypt went on the defensive. This isn’t the first time that Egypt has been vigilant in protecting its portion of this resource either; the conflict has been ongoing for centuries. In fact, historically, Egypt has threatened to go to war with Ethiopia if Ethiopia ever barricaded the Nile. While Egypt was preoccupied by the Arab Spring, Ethiopia began to build the Grand Renaissance Dam. Although the Ethiopian government promised Egypt there was nothing to worry about, Egypt had two major concerns. First, during the time that Ethiopia would build up the reservoir behind the dam, in theory, they have the potential to cut Egypt off for a year, due to the fact the reservoir will have the capacity to hold a year’s worth of water before being released. Second, Ethiopia’s dam would allow Sudan to massively increase the amount of water it usually receives. Prior to the Grand Renaissance Dam, Sudan’s smaller dam only provided water for a few months, but Ethiopia’s new dam further upstream allows for a year-long flow, first through Sudan and then into Egypt. In addition to sharing more water with Sudan, in 2010, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Tanzania signed the Entebbe Agreement, calling for a redistribution of the water to include the countries further upstream. Although Sudan and Egypt refused to recognize this petition, it is unlikely these nations will give up especially since Egypt is reported to be receiving more water than agreed upon in 1959. Not only do more countries want a share of the water, but as of 2011, Sudan has split into two states, further thinning availability. On top of it all, due to climate change in the region, the Egyptian government projects water availability to fall even further over the next few years, to what the UN defines as “absolute scarcity” — a condition that exists when there is not enough of a resource in existence to satisfy existing demand for it.

The Euphrates-Tigris basin, shared by Turkey, Syria and Iraq, has been a source of conflict since the 1950’s. Similar to the situation concerning the Nile, Turkey has begun to capitalize on the water source by building irrigation plants and producing hydroelectric
energy dams; one of the most contentious undertakings is the Southeastern Anatolian Project (GAP), which is comprised of 22 dams and 19 hydroelectric plants.28 Parallel to Egypt’s concern, Syria and Iraq are two downstream countries critical of Turkey’s powerful ability to cut off a significant amount of the Euphrates output. The concerns aren’t far-fetched either, as Turkey already cut off the Euphrates flow into Iraq in 1990 after Iraq invaded Kuwait.29 Tensions have only heightened in the last decade.

In 2013, the Islamic State, referred to as ISIL or ISIS — a Salafi jihadist militant group— set out its quest for control of hydroelectric power in Syria. In May 2013, ISIS took control of the Russian-built Tabqa Dam, which allocates water to five million people, including Syria’s largest city, Aleppo.30 At that time, militant groups cut off clean water supplies for a million people in Aleppo. The UN has recognized the conflict as a humanitarian crisis. In both Syria and Iraq, armed militias have begun to use water as a weapon of war where they deliberately cut, pollute or destroy the water supply as strategies to exhort pressure.31 The Islamic State also captured the Fallujah Dam in Iraq in April of 2013, and the destructions that came after is thought to be strategically deliberate. After the dam was captured, though reports vary, it is understood that the dam was initially closed. The closing of the dam caused Najaf, a Shiite holy city 160 kilometers away, to be without water. In addition, eastward overflow of the dam’s reservoir flooded some 500 square kilometers of farmland and thousands of homes, stretching as far as Abu Ghraib, about 40 kilometers away on the outskirts of Baghdad.32 Though it may have been the Sunni rebel’s goal to deprive Shiite communities downstream of water, security analysts suggest the eastward flooding was a deliberate act to repel Iraqi government forces attempting to retake the dam.”33 Nickolay Mladenov, the UN Secretary General’s special representative in Iraq, called the flooding deliberate and demanded the restoration of legitimate control of the river.34 However, negotiations may all be a waste if the river disappears in the coming decades. In 2009, research from Japanese and Israeli climatologists predicted drought is likely to be permanent and the Fertile Crescent, which has sustained the region for thousands of years, “will disappear this century.”35

MAKING THE CONNECTION: OIL AND WATER

In the pursuit of illustrating the severe consequences when an essential resource is restricted in accessibility, it is imperative that the parallel be made between water and oil as a source of deadly conflict and war. Some of the same states which have been previously discussed, especially in the Middle East, are no stranger when it comes to conflict over resources. Though not always explicitly stated, access to oil has been the source of conflict for centuries. Some of the deadliest wars have been the result of either attempts to gain access to oil or the result of when the resource is in withheld from usual access. When trying to understand a state’s concerns about diminished access to vital resources such as water, it is useful to study the issue in the context of oil. Jeff Colgan’s, author of Fueling the Fire: Pathways from Oil to War, Colgan states “Between one-quarter and one-half of interstate wars since 1973 have been connected to one or more oil-related causal mechanisms.”36 Oil has shaped the preconditions of war and breeds conflict in eight distinct ways:

“(1) resource wars, in which states try to acquire oil reserves by force; (2) petro-aggression, whereby oil insulates aggressive leaders such as Saddam Hussein or Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini from domestic opposition, and therefore makes them more willing to engage in risky foreign policy adventurism; (3) the externalization of civil wars in oil-producing states ("petrostates"); (4) financing for insurgencies—for instance, Iran funneling oil money to Hezbollah; (5) conflicts triggered by the prospect of oil-market domination, such as the United States’ war with Iraq over Kuwait in 1991; (6) clashes over control of oil transit routes, such as shipping lanes and pipelines; (7) oil-related grievances, whereby the presence of foreign workers in petrostates helps extremist groups such as al-Qaida recruit locals; and (8) oil-related obstacles to multilateral cooperation, such as when an importer’s attempt to curry favor with a petrostate prevents multilateral cooperation on security issues. These mechanisms can contribute to conflict individually or in combination.”37

It is possible that in a similar fashion, limitations to usual access to water could develop in the same ways. The Oil Embargo of 1973 by the Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), illustrates well the idea that uneven control and unpredictable management and allocation over a vital resource used for industries can have the same dramatic consequences, if not worse, when it is substituted with a product that is vital for life, such as water.

During the Arab-Israeli war in 1973, OPEC used their unequivocal control of access to oil fields as a strategic weapon to punish countries such as the United States, the Netherlands, Portugal and South Africa for providing military and financial aid to the Israelis. Thus, the Oil Embargo or Oil Crisis of 1973-1974 cut off distribution of oil to specific nations, as well as limited the production of oil altogether. Just as a human would die without water, industries and economies crumbled without access to oil. In total, the world uses about 97 million barrels of oil per day.38 The United States in particular takes up about 20% of the world’s share of oil consumption.39 Of the United States’ 7.3 billion barrels total petroleum consumption, 47% is used for motor gasoline (including ethanol), 20% is used for distillate fuel (heating oil and diesel fuel), and 8% is used for jet fuel.40 But oil isn’t just used for fuels, it is in products that range from asphalt to plastic and it is used in the
making of chemicals and synthetic materials. Moreover, oil is the world's driving force; it keeps industries and economies afloat. Oil supplies 33% of all energy, and the demand is ever growing: 67 million barrels per day in 1990, 77 million barrels per day in 2000, and 91 million barrels per day in 2014.43 For this reason, when an embargo on such an integral resource is implemented, the world comes to a screeching halt. When the embargo hit, economies suffered immediate effects. Fuel shortages hit the United States nationwide. The same would be true if countries faced limited or no access to water. Inflation-adjusted oil prices went up from $25.97 per barrel in 1973 to $46.35 per barrel in 1974.42 According to the U.S. Department of State, "The United States, which faced a growing dependence on oil consumption and dwindling domestic reserves, found itself more reliant on imported oil than ever before, having to negotiate an end to the embargo under harsh domestic economic circumstances that served to diminish its international leverage."43

In comparison, areas with dwindling water sources are becoming more dependent on the countries or regions where the source of the water is more concentrated. Countries who hold concentrated water sources (i.e. the head of a river, upstream dams, or lakes) will have strategic political power over countries who do not and can influence policy and increase the potential for war. Examples of conflict over oil range from the Pacific War, Stalingrad, the Iran-Iraq Tanker War, Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, and the U.S. wars in Iraq.44 Michael T. Klare, author of Resource Wars and Blood and Oil: The Dangers and Consequences of America's Growing Petroleum Dependency, states, "We live in an energy-centric world where control over oil and gas resources (and their means of delivery) translates into geopolitical clout for some and economic vulnerability for others."45

Goldman Sachs has taken keen notice on the issue since 2015. The investment bank has called water "the petroleum of the next century."46 In fact, Goldman Sachs has been positioning itself to be the leader in water investments since 2006, becoming one of the biggest infrastructure investment fund managers capitalizing on key industries such as water utilities, water engineering companies, and water resources worldwide.47 In July 2012, Sachs bought Veolia's UK water utility business (£1.2 billion) that serves over 3.5 million people in Southeast England. Other banks such as JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Deutsche Bank, among others, are also consolidating their control over water.48 Jo-Shing Yang, at the Centre for Research on Globalization, found that "Wealthy tycoons such as T. Boone Pickens, former President George H.W. Bush and his family, Hong Kong's Li Ka-shing, Philippines' Manuel V. Pangilinan and other Filipino billionaires, and others are also buying thousands of acres of land with aquifers, lakes, water rights, water utilities, and shares in water engineering and technology companies all over the world."49 In an article published by Credit Suisse, a Swiss multinational investment bank, CIO Burkhard Varnholt writes, "Water is a precious and scarce resource. In the next few years, major investments in water infrastructure will be necessary. Water thus affects the core of the infrastructure super trend. For cautious investors, investing in water is doubly exciting."50 Desalination and wastewater treatment are becoming mega million-dollar investments for banks in the face of projected severe water scarcity by 2025. More frightening however, the possibility of privatizing access to water can lead to the same crisis as the OPEC Oil Embargo; only, this time, the consequences will be deadly.

**POLICY INITIATIVES AND PROJECTIONS**

The United Nation's goal in combating conflicts at transboundary water sources is by shifting the conversation away from water as a means for transportation and focusing attention on the importance of establishing parameters for water in the context of use, development, protection, and conservation of water resources.51

Over 3,600 treaties and agreements over such matters have been signed. However, the issue then becomes a countries ability to establish workable monitoring provisions, enforcement mechanisms, and specific water allocation provisions that address variations in water flow and changing needs (i.e. population growth, increased demand and climate change). The 1997 United Nations Convention on Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses focused on two key principles: (1) equitable and reasonable use and (2) the obligation not to cause significant harm to neighbors.52 On December 11, 2011, the United Nations General Assembly adopted A/RES/65/124 on transboundary aquifers which encouraged states "to make appropriate bilateral or regional arrangements for the proper management of their transboundary aquifers."53 As most UN resolutions do, the responsibility falls to implementation at the domestic level. In places like India and regions in South Africa, water crises are often attributed to lack of government planning, increased corporate privatization, industrial and human waste, and government corruption.54

One of the most significant problems surrounding the issue of water is that it is underpriced and undervalued. A report from the Centre for Research on Globalization, states "A key issue of water is that the true value of water is not recognized…Water tends to be undervalued around the world…Perhaps that is one of the reasons why there are so many places with a lack of supply due to a lack of investment."55 Researchers from Oxford University, declare that water should be revalued due to two main reasons: it is vital for development and it is increasing in scarcity.56 A study led by Oxford University established new framework for policy initiatives and reports that managing water requires parallel and coordinated action across four priorities: measurement, valuation, trade-offs and capable
institutions for allocating and financing water. From the study, co-author Richard Damania reports that “... Current water management policies are outdated and unsuited to addressing the water related challenges of the 21st century. Without policies to allocate finite supplies of water more efficiently, control the burgeoning demand for water and reduce wastage, water stress will intensify where water is already scarce and spread to regions of the world - with impacts on economic growth and the development of water-stressed nations.” To symbolize new initiatives to revalue water, in 2017, four rivers were granted legal rights: the Whanganui in New Zealand, Rio Atrato in Colombia, and the Ganga and Yamuna rivers in India. The granting of rights to freshwater sources is a profound start to representation and protection for vital resources. Erin O’Donnell, from the University of Melbourne states the unprecedented event “compels us to re-examine the role of rivers in society and sustainable development, and rethink our paradigms for valuing water.”

INTO THE FUTURE

As climate change and overpopulation wither away the Earth’s freshwater resources, the world is now faced with the most pressing issue of our time. More than 2 billion people live in regions facing extreme water scarcity. The need for effective bilateral policy, as well as revaluing water altogether, will be the first items on the agenda for the UN Security Council and the UN General Assembly in the coming years. Water scarcity will affect everyone in the next 25 to 30 years. During that time, conflict will increase in likelihood, the wealthy will capitalize by privatization, but more importantly the people, the Earth, and hundreds of ecosystems will pay the ultimate price.
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Anthropogenic climate change has had a profound effect on the modern political sphere, from being a cornerstone of international affairs such as the Paris Climate Accords, to urging a collection of twenty-one teenagers to file a lawsuit against their government for causing climate change and violating "the youngest generation’s constitutional rights to life, liberty, and property." None of the effects of climate change have nearly as crucial an impact on the world as the melting of the polar ice caps. Ecological ramifications aside, the melting of the ice caps will, within the next decade, allow for the use of Arctic resources and for transit across the world's northernmost ocean. In early 2017, a Russian tanker was able to cross the Arctic Ocean in the dead of winter without the aid of an icebreaker for the first time. These melting polar caps have not only allowed for the travel across the Arctic Circle, but they have also revealed a plethora of oil, natural gas, and mineral deposits. With the melting of the ice caps, it opens new trade routes and provides access to resources that will revolutionize the modern political and economic playing fields.

As of now, the Arctic Circle is a focus for ecological preservation and conservation under the umbrella of the Arctic Council, an international organization with eight member states and multiple non-governmental organizations. This, however, seems to be changing, as the Russian Federation has pushed a military agenda and ramped up production of naval bases in the Arctic. Russia has invested $320 million towards the development of icebreakers that will allow for trade with their neighbors along the routes that pass through the Arctic Circle. If trade along the Northern Sea Route (NSR) is encouraged, this will cut down the time and distance required for trade between Western Europe and East Asia by nearly 40%. While trade is a significant benefit for Russia as the Arctic Circle melts, it is far surpassed by the advantage associated with the natural resources uncovered by the retreating ice caps. Russia has been investing heavily in exploring the Arctic Ocean. Energy alone accounts for $275 billion in spending. A project designed to transport liquified natural gas to the UK from Russia cost $150 billion of that alone. The two largest fleets of icebreakers in the world belong to Russia and Finland, with Russia owning forty with five under construction and six more planned and Finland possessing only seven. This massive fleet of icebreakers and a rapidly increasing military presence in the region allow Russia to dominate the Arctic and can quickly lay claim to the natural wealth in the area, a speculated thirty-five trillion dollars’ worth of resources under the retreating ice.

Russian investment into the region can be seen through the lens of two major political theories, the realist and the neoliberal perspective. The neoliberal perspective encourages trade over domination, one designed to forge international cooperation and achieve a mutually beneficial connectedness among the members of the international community. With this lens, Russia is seen as a state bent on international cooperation and development in the region, not one focused on conquest and domination. As a reformist state, Russia is dependent on the international order to exist in the fashion...
that it does, particularly in the Arctic, because maintaining peace is key to Russian economic development. The argument for the neoliberal perspective is based entirely on Russia being a reformist state. Said states are those who do not seek to upset the international order and establish themselves on top entirely but instead seek to reform the law and rules in such a way that it also can benefit themselves as well as the regional hegemon. As the Arctic is the world's newest battleground, there is no established hegemon. Russia is a dominant power within the Arctic and, as a reformist state, would seek to benefit the US as global hegemon as well as themselves over the Arctic. For Russia to be a power in the Arctic under a neoliberal ideal, they need to enforce soft-power projection. They need to establish a sense of economic superiority over other states in the region, something they are consistently able to do when compared to neighboring states. Russia is the state most able to become a permanent hegemon in the region due to over half of the expected Arctic resources being within two-hundred miles of the Russian coast. This very fact has led some scholars to classify Russia as being a reformist state because they do not need to demand more of the resources throughout the region. Russia has even used international assistance in the development of the region, from partnering with the United Kingdom (UK) based British Petroleum to attempting to work with North America's company ExxonMobil. Russia has sought cooperation from western states; however, due to Russian aggression in Ukraine and the subsequent sanctions that resulted, most western nations find it difficult to work through the sanctions and continue to trade. As a result, Russia has turned their interests for international cooperation away from the West and has begun seeking Chinese assistance to continue exploration.

China has provided money to many Russian firms that are focused on development in the Arctic, such as the Yamal firm, which began transporting liquified natural gas across the Arctic. The Chinese Polar Silk Road was never designed as its own project but as an extension to the international Belt and Road Initiative that has stretched through Europe and into Africa and the rest of the developing world. China has invested $12 billion into the Yamal project to establish a claim to the energy resources that are available with the melting of the ice caps, unlike building islands like they do in the South China Sea. Chinese ambitions to establish close ties with the Russian government seem to be reciprocated; Putin and Xi Jinping have been seen to be strengthening their relationship and provide each other with all the benefits from trade, with Russia even building natural gas lines into China to provide for the nation. The Polar and Navigation Committee, established by the Chinese government, has stated to the world that their purpose is the uptake of polar ships and polar expeditions to “help better ‘understand, protect, and exploit the polar region.” In September, China and Russia teamed up to send several scientists on another scientific Arctic expedition. As of October 2018, China has conducted nine separate Arctic expeditions for scientific purposes. The rise of Chinese backed Russian exploration and exploitation should be causing alarm bells to ring in the Western world; however, the current American administration is heavily denying the effects that climate change has on the world. As such, the Trump administration is focused on limited exploration into the coastlines of Alaska and tapping into oil reserves nearby.

The other perspective is one that seems to be a bit more accurate. In the realist approach, Russia is an aggressive power seeking to regain their spot as one of the great powers of the world, and seeing the Arctic as a replacement for the loss of Eastern European hegemony after the fall of the Soviet Union. There are even a few Russian academics, Alexander Dugin and Artur Chilingarov particularly, who advocate for imperialist policy in the Arctic, calling it their Manifest Destiny, with Chilingarov even encouraging Russia to stop negotiations and just seize the area. Pavel Baev and Sergei Medvedev both see Russian involvement in the region as nationalistic and believe that any pretense of economic cooperation is inherently false. This view is predicated on the massive amount of military buildup in the region as well as an analytical view on Russian history. Russia is a state that consistently struggled with maintaining a position of power and has had very little success with any form of liberal politicization; as such, it has always maintained a deep vein of realist political belief and a mercantilist economic one. As early as 2000, the official Russian policy in the Arctic was one that stated: “all activities in the Arctic should be tied to the interests of ‘defense and security to the maximum degree.” With this as the directive for the development in the Arctic for nearly twenty years, it is difficult not to argue that the Russian government does not have cooperation entirely in mind. Even with the acceptance of a fully fleshed-out policy in 2008, stating that Russia seeks a peaceful and cooperative region in the Arctic, the mass buildup of troops and the modernization of the military there following a 2013 policy shows that official documentation may say one thing, but the state’s actions change the implications. An aspect of realism is a focus on military buildup and the use of force to control locations that are rich in resources. US Senator Dan Sullivan of Alaska has focused heavily on the Russian buildup as being of primary concern to the United States. Russia has developed a new Arctic command, thirty-four new brigades and ports, and forty icebreakers, compared to one American icebreaker and two naval ports. This amassing of Russian military forces has resulted in an increase in American military presence in the region as well. Former US Secretary of Defense James Mattis, in June of 2018 was quoted as saying, “certainly America has got to up its game in the
Arctic," and multiple Coast Guard admirals have discussed the unease over Chinese and Russian influence in the Arctic and the fear of Russian investment focused "heavily in commercial infrastructure and in military infrastructure" in the region. The US is the only nation with a foothold in the Arctic that could stand as a rival to the Russia, echoing the Cold War. Many have speculated that this increase in a military presence within the Arctic is reminiscent of the Soviet Union’s presence; this is, however, untrue. When comparing the current armed forces to that of the Soviet Union in the 1980’s, there is a marked difference of over three-hundred less naval vessels in the region and greater than two-hundred aircraft during the 1980’s. However, Russia has been heavily investing in the modernization of their military equipment in the region with naval and aerial forces being a primary concern for the Russian strategy. The Russian government possesses one aircraft carrier, a vessel that is key to any naval strategy and used as a force for power projection, which is currently stationed in the Arctic. Of the original six nuclear-powered ballistic missile Typhoon-class submarines, the world’s largest submarine, only one is still currently commissioned as a war vessel and is stationed in the Arctic Circle, again showing the importance of maintaining a powerful military presence in the region.

This buildup of military forces from Russia makes the Arctic one of the next major hot spots for conflict in the world. This propensity for conflict is only further aggravated by the largest North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) exercise since the Cold War occurring in October of 2018. NATO is comprised of twenty-nine nations and this exercise consisted of all member states of NATO and two additional states, Finland and Sweden, leading to a thirty-one-state exercise off the Russian coast. The last time a large exercise like this was performed was during the Cold War, a time of open hostility between the US and the Soviet Union. According to the Russian Defense Minister this exercise was primarily an “offensive military action.” Considering Russian annexation of the Crimea and Russian involvement in Ukraine, which NATO has repeatedly condemned, this military action was seen by the Russian government as a threat to their sovereignty. Russia was granted an observer status over this exercise and was welcomed by the NATO Secretary-General “as long as they behave professionally and avoid dangerous situations and behavior.” Russia has also recently practiced drills with their allies, China and Mongolia, and this reactionary response can lead to a rapid escalation of force between the two alliances.

The melting ice provides another trade route for the Russian economy to use, one that has the potential to be critical for East-West trade. Trade is one of the most significant benefits for a modern liberal economy. The US, for example, benefits greatly from trade, with nearly eleven million jobs established as a result. For Russia, exports are centered in mineral products and metals, accounting for over two-thirds of Russian exports. The expansion of trade throughout the world has resulted in a higher quality of life and interdependence between nations, reducing warfare and international conflict. Considering that the current economic condition in Russia results
in higher domestic crime rates and strife, opening a new avenue for trade along an ocean which they possess more than half of the conterminous coastline should result in an improved quality of life for the people and ideally, the establishment of a robust middle class.\textsuperscript{45} The development of the NSR is beneficial to more than just the Russian Federation; China, Japan, and any other far-eastern state can potentially benefit greatly from this new route as it can cut travel distance up to five thousand miles and up to a week from travel time.\textsuperscript{46}

These benefits hinge on the melting of the polar ice caps. However, melting comes with environmental concerns. Rising coastlines result in the flooding of current coastal trade ports around the globe and the reduction of the shoreline; climate change leads to an increase in the strength of storms jeopardizing shipping potential across the region and posing a threat to entire fleets.\textsuperscript{47} Climate change has the problematic effect of an overall rise in temperature. In Russia, this can create mass pest infestations, as the long Siberian winters in which these animals once died out are steadily decreasing in severity.\textsuperscript{48} The melting of the ice caps lends itself to many adverse effects regarding Russian infrastructure in the high latitudes as well. As permafrost melts, the buildings and pipelines and other forms of infrastructure are endangered by the weakening of the ground beneath them.\textsuperscript{49} Overall, the negatives for the Russian state are focused primarily on a vulnerable infrastructure system, the loss of a few sets of food chains as some migratory birds will lose nesting grounds, and the possibilities of increased drought in the lower latitudes.\textsuperscript{50} As these northern areas of Russia are mostly populated by indigenous peoples, the state would need to either employ these people or relocate them. These groups account for just under two million people.\textsuperscript{51} Russia is not a state with a history of respecting any groups of people apart from native Russians, so there should be very little concern from the stance of the government.

These negatives are far outweighed by the potential benefits for the Russian economy and people, however, as it is one of the only nations that seem to benefit from climate change due to its latitudinal location. Russia will have a more secure agricultural sector as the Arctic and tundra lands retreat further north, allowing for more arable land.\textsuperscript{52} The vast expanse of Siberia can become a breadbasket for the nation as the tundra and taiga move northward due to more prolonged summer periods.\textsuperscript{53} If Russia invests properly in the needed infrastructure upgrades, it is almost certain that Russia can not only benefit from greater access to resources and agricultural products, but even from tourism.\textsuperscript{54} It is projected that the tourism sector of Russia would increase by nearly a third with just a 1°C overall increase in average temperature.\textsuperscript{55} While Russia encompasses more than half of the Arctic, it is not the only state to benefit from the previously mentioned points. Canada and the Scandinavian states will also be able to pull resources from the region and use their northern ports for trade. Canada is attempting to play both sides of the story. The Canadian government is heavily focused on preservation for the native people that live in the Arctic and the environment itself, as well as mapping the region in order to exploit the raw mineral resources that are known to exist in the Arctic Circle.\textsuperscript{56} The Scandinavian nations maintain a similar stance to each other all meaning that they wish to maintain the ability to extract resources but attempt to do so in an environmentally friendly and sustainable fashion.\textsuperscript{57, 58, 59, 60}

These Arctic resources can significantly change the international pecking order as has been seen historically. Great Britain maintained its world power status because of their control of colonies and the 1885 Berlin Conference. This conference carved up the most resource-rich continent in the world: Africa. Nearly a third of the continent was granted to Great Britain, which was roughly double their rival, France, and none of it was in the Sahara Desert.\textsuperscript{61} This allowed Britain to pull massive amounts of resources from the continent, which furthered British power throughout the world.\textsuperscript{62} The control of so much of Africa, as well as an entire continent and subcontinent, Australia and India respectively, provided excessive amounts of wealth. However, the political beliefs at the time of this empire led to extreme rivalries between nations and a refusal to work together. The historic rival between nations and a refusal to work together. The historic rival to Great Britain was the French colonial empire, one that was more focused on their control of Indochina, their Southeast Asian colonies. The late 1890’s saw a shift in the position of Indochina, as France decided to become more invested in what they could collect from the region rather than just saying they had something on the map.\textsuperscript{63} France was able to dominate the region quickly and used opium, rice, and rubber to propel themselves to a position of power.\textsuperscript{64} The French government was able to become the world’s largest producer of rubber in the 1900’s, surpassing the Belgian Free Congo State.\textsuperscript{65} Access to these natural resources helped to keep the French and British as the world’s great powers, even at the expense and exploitation of the people that lived where those resources were but due to imperial overstretch, these empires both collapsed under their own weight.

Roughly one percent of the Russian population would be harmed by extracting the resources of the Arctic. Nearly a quarter of the world’s untapped fossil fuels are found within the region.\textsuperscript{66} Places with large amounts of fossil fuels are lucrative because they own something that the world needs; if Russia has access to all of the oil in the Arctic, this will triple the number of oil reserves Russia can tap into.\textsuperscript{67, 68} As seen in Saudi Arabia in the 1970’s, when they took control of their reserves, oil money can drastically change a government’s direction. Not only does the Arctic possess 13% of the world’s oil reserves, but it also owns nearly a third of the world’s natural gas.\textsuperscript{69} Russia already controls 35% of the European gas market and is set to increase to over 40% by the end of next year.\textsuperscript{70} As of today, Russia is on par with Qatar...
as the world's largest producers of natural gas. With the melting of the ice caps, Russia would significantly increase its natural gas output and far exceed any other producer.

The result of a melted Arctic Circle means great things for Russia. Nearly 55% of Russian exports are fossil fuels, with 12% from rare earth minerals. As the ice melts and the Russian government continues to pull the fossil fuels from the Arctic Circle, the Russian economy will only become more dependent on fossil fuels. The First Law of Petropolitics, as posited by Thomas Friedman, is that the more money that an authoritarian leader can pull from oil or fossil fuels, the less freedom that the populace has. This has proven more than correct regarding Vladimir Putin; even with sanctions imposed on his nation, he has resisted any change within his nation and maintained control. With a growing reserve of fossil fuels to pull from and an increased dependence on Russian natural gas in Europe and even China, Russia is poised to rise in power quickly. While it is hopeful that the nation might be inflicted with an empowered middle class demanding political power, it is highly unlikely considering the shape of the Russian economy today. Medium-sized businesses cannot grow in this nation due to domination from the government and powerful Russian oligarchs. These oligarchs are the ones who are pushing for Arctic exploration as they are the ones who benefit from such ventures, they have the money to spend in an effort to make more. While the science behind global warming is overwhelmingly supported by the scientific community in both Russia and the US, there is a sincere belief in climate denialism. Climate denialism is the belief that climate change is either not occurring or being vastly oversold to the public. In Russia, since 2012, the media has been heavily focused on arguing against the established view of climate change by the scientific community, with only 8% of Russians supporting the belief in climate change. This is linked directly with Putin's return to power, his support of Arctic exploration, his conservative-realist view of the world, and the benefits associated with a warmer climate for Russia. As Russia is the greatest beneficiary from climate change, it stands to reason that the nation would fight against anything that would resist the chance for glory. Any attempts made by the Russian government regarding climate change do not focus on reversing or halting the effects; instead, they focus more on how to function in a world that has been irreparably damaged by it.

If there were only one major power affected by climate denialism, then the world could work together in order to mitigate the changes caused by anthropogenic climate change; however, Russia is not alone in this denialist belief. The United States has a large percentage of their population who also deny that anthropogenic climate change exists. Without hegemonic support, certain international treaties, such as the Paris Climate Accords, have little to no backing. It has been discovered by numerous American intelligence agencies that Russia had direct involvement in the 2016 Presidential election in the US in support of the conservative candidate. With the fallout of this discovery came the removal of hundreds of fake accounts throughout many social media platforms that are linked to Russian agencies trying to push the right-wing conservative ideals and defend some of those stances, denialism being key among them. These claims have leaked their way into the mind of the average conservative, white male throughout the US, as studies have shown that a majority of this demographic believe that recent temperature increase is not due to human activity, there is no scientific consensus on climate change, and that its effects are being grossly exaggerated by current media platforms. Of all other demographics, less than a third believe that climate change is not caused by anthropogenic processes compared to nearly 60% of conservative, white males. Of all the people interviewed only 35% believe there is no scientific consensus on climate change compared to 59% conservative, white males. Twenty-nine percent of the total study believes the media overexaggerates climate change versus 65% within the demographic. While just over half of this demographic are climate deniers, the percentages rise into the seventies when focused down on those who claim to understand climate change well. As government sanctioned hackers have specifically targeted the conservative American population, it is difficult not to assume that this denialism is also a part of their misinformation campaign.

The governments of the Arctic Circle are investing billions of dollars into exploiting the region for its resources, for what could potentially be trillions of dollars in returns, with Russia being the most proactive of the members of the Arctic Council. Chinese money has helped to further Russian investments and has resulted in closer ties between these two non-western states. This Sino-Russo economic alliance will result in a higher status for both states, and the lack of American intervention in the region will end with a “fall from grace” scenario for the US. The other primary states of the Arctic Council are more focused on the establishment of sustainable development rather than exploitation of the region and together cannot compare to the expansion of the Russian military and economic growth in the region. Historically speaking, it is well known that resource availability has helped a nation to establish itself as a world power, and the resources under the Arctic ice will be no different. Russia will be able to tap into this treasure trove of resources, and because Russia is already equipped to pull this form of resources, they will be able to utilize these quickly and help the oligarchic government of Russia to maintain power. If this is a neoliberal Russia with an eye on international cooperation and peaceable solutions then the world has little to fear from a reinvigorated Russia; if however, this is the realist leaning Russia, as it has been throughout most of its own history, then the world would
do well to fear this newly emboldened state as they dominate the world’s natural gas and other energy resources.
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Identity is influenced by a variety of factors, therefore leading to its duplicity and multiple definitions. Identity branches out to a series of more specific types of identities, some of which are cultural identity and collective identity. In addition to this, identity can also be defined in relation to land or landscape. Berger defined identity as being “the actual experience of self in a particular social situation... the manner in which individuals define themselves. As such, identity is part and parcel of a specific structure of consciousness.”1 Differing from Berger’s definition of identity, Hans Mol (1978) distinguishes two types of identities: one which forms based on primary interactions with communities, and the second taking root in social interactions outside of an individual’s primary community.2 A major component to the formation of an individual’s identity is based upon society and social interactions, as it pertains to culture, norms, and values. The influence culture has on identity is defined through cultural identity. Neil Campbell and Christine Berberich define cultural identity as being “…a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as ‘being,” and coming “from somewhere, [having] histories... [and undergoing] constant transformation.”3 Therefore, reflecting the importance culture plays in the formation of identity.

Similar to identity having the possibility to undergo transformations, landscape is also in a constant cycle of transformation. Landscape can be defined as both a tangible and visible entity, and also as an entity that is imagined. However, when landscape is discussed in relation to identity, it is defined as reflecting society, culture, and practices.4 Therefore, leading to the intertwinement of identity and landscape, since landscape identity is formed through an exchanging of cultures and beliefs.5 Hence, emphasizing the importance of landscape when it comes to the formation of identity, especially when referring to cultural identity. In groups that share a common landscape and cultural identity, the concept of a collective identity is also formed.

A collective identity aids in defining how a group distinguishes themselves from other groups. Therefore, leading to the concept of “Us” versus the “Others.”6 The distinguishing features between the inside and outside group may be real or imaginary, but help form cultural characteristics for each group. Thus, allowing for differences to be recognized, and an exclusion of those differing views to then form the “Other” group. Coinciding with collective identities, collective representations characterize a shared group’s images that are socially developed about the social world.7 Collective representations function as a way for groups within a society to distinguish themselves from the “Other,” therefore, allowing them to orient themselves in the outside world. Both collective identities and collective representations further the development of an individual’s identity in relation to society; however, as they can be real or imaginary, they may lead to collective stereotypes, which may lead to a rise in nationalistic thinking.

Corresponding to the establishment of a collective identity and representation, the concept of the “Other” naturally results in the idea of an opposition. Thus, with the presence of an opposition, the likelihood of the inside group creating stereotypes about the outside...
Another group’s beliefs leading to nationalism has been experienced furthering the “Us” versus “Them” mentality, and leading to a surge in and beliefs are introduced to already established societies. Hence, multicultural personalities, different, often contradicting, values start to move away from individualistic practices while developing. This is especially true if the inside group feels as if their culture, norms, and values are being threatened by the outside group.

As the perceived threat to an individual’s cultural identity progresses, characteristics of nationalism begin to arise. As the real or imaginary threat begins to destabilize the group, nationalism provides a sense of stability and security. Therefore, nationalism allows for a resurgence of a united community characterized by wholeness and continuity. Thus, removing the fear of destabilization and alienation within the group. Maintaining wholeness and continuity, while eliminating alienation and destabilization, is critical to a group’s cultural identity. Nationalism and culture are so closely related due to culture’s role as a key element in the group’s history, and the forming of attitudes, ideas, and identity. However, while territorial lines may contribute to nationalism, characteristics such as language and religion play a larger role. As globalization continues, and societies start to move away from individualistic practices while developing multicultural personalities, different, often contradicting, values and beliefs are introduced to already established societies. Hence, furthering the “Us” versus “Them” mentality, and leading to a surge in nationalistic movements.

The feeling of a threat to a group’s identity due to the integration of another group’s beliefs leading to nationalism has been experienced in multiple occasions through history. During the Ottoman Empire’s rule through the Middle East, southeastern Europe, and North Africa, attempts at universalism were made, thus leading to a rise in multiple movements, often fueled by nationalism. Although the Ottoman Empire attempted to create a single, unified identity, the differing cultures resulted in moving further away from integration. In modern day, and recent history, similar goals and repercussions are being displayed through the actions of the European Union (EU). Europe is composed of multiple cultures, each claiming different identities, thus the changes made by the EU lead to perceived threats by different groups. So, as the EU attempts to create a European identity, a rise in nationalism, along with globalization, will contribute to similar failures the Ottoman Empire experienced.

The Ottoman Empire began to rise as a major power in the Middle East following the loss of power of the Seljuk Turks. This allowed leaders, such as Osman I, Orkan, and Muhammad II, to expand the Ottoman’s control over the Turkish dynasties. The continued successes in the acquisition of land allowed the empire to continue its growth, and resulted in a 400-year hold on power throughout the Middle East. Due to the Ottoman’s attainments of land in areas such as Eastern Europe and Northern Africa, they were able to extend the reach of Islam to religiously differing regions. Continued expansion resulted in the becoming of a more culturally and religiously diverse empire. Despite this, the Ottoman Empire was able to maintain a flexible administrative rule. However, it still heavily maintained its roots and based itself around Islam. This was displayed by the continued belief that the leader must be responsible for enforcing the laws and values of Islam. Therefore, the legal system was Islamic through the implementation of shari`ah.

In conjunction with this, the millet system was set into place for organizing the differing beliefs and practices. In order to maintain a stronger and more organized control over the whole empire, religious communities were organized into millets. The three non-Muslim groups mainly present – Judaism, Greek Orthodox Christianity, and Armenian Christianity— maintained a fair amount of autonomy. However, the system lacked uniformity, and regardless of the freedom given, non-Muslim communities continued to experience social discrimination. Therefore, as diversity continued to develop and with the presence of an Islam-based law, problems began to arise. Thus, new approaches to reforms and policies were taken.

Similarities to the millet system and its shortcomings can be seen within Europe’s religious structure, specifically in France. As a secular state, French society experiences the introduction of a multitude of differing cultural beliefs and views. As of 2016, 39.6 percent of the France’s population declared itself as non-religious, 51.1 percent as Christian or Catholic, 5.6 percent as Muslim, and 0.8 percent as Jewish. The driving factor to the introduction of new cultures to France is the influx of immigrants arriving to the country, as a result of high amounts of domestic strife occurring in developing nations around Europe. However, as new beliefs are introduced to the society, old ones may begin to be challenged or changed, thus causing internal and external conflicts. In 2015, the Paris attack contributed to the surge in racism and hate speech against religious minorities. Ultimately leading to an overall rise in hate crimes being experienced in France, as reported by the ODIHR, 1835 hate crimes were experienced in 2016, in comparison to the 1662 in 2014. Although, a secular state promotes religious diversity, established beliefs, often religious ones, may undermine minorities.

From 1839 to 1876, what became known as the Tanzimat, the Ottoman Empire’s social, political, and economic structure was drastically transformed. During this era, the reforms were heavily influenced by a European model. The Tanzimat, led by Rashid,
Ali, and Fuad Pasha, declared a series of reforms for the empire; including, the calling of complete equality between Muslims and non-Muslims when it came to implementing the reforms.20 Reinforcing this decree, the Hatt-i Sharif of 1839, was the Hatt-i Humayan of 1856. The Hatt-i Humayan reemphasized the equality of all religions when it came to things such as military service, state school admission, and state employment.21 The objective of the 1839 and 1856 decrees were to disintegrate the millet system, while further uniting the Ottoman Empire as one. By removing millets, the idea of Ottomanism, or a common Ottoman citizenship, was introduced; therefore, moving towards a secularist society, and removing the large emphasis of religion.22

However, these two decrees and the Nationality Law of 1869 would only begin the rise in revolts against the empire, which were often fueled by nationalistic ideals. Seeking to create a Europeanized societal model in a society with innately religious ideals dating back centuries would later prove to be unsuccessful for the Ottomans. The ideas of universalism and secularism could not succeed in Ottoman society, especially considering how large of an area the empire encompassed. Although the goal of these reforms was to promote inclusiveness and move towards modernization, it ignored the core values of the society. At the core of society was religion, and by disregarding religion, the people and their norms, values, and beliefs were disregarded; hence, leading to different groups to feel their culture being threatened, ultimately powering nationalistic movements.

In order to protect their cultural identity from the perceived threats, whether they were real or imaginary, various revolts against the empire were led by multiple groups. As a key component of cultural identity, religion plays a major role in nationalistic movements. At the core of the nationalistic movements in the Ottoman Empire was religion due to the series of secularist and universalistic reforms. In order to bring back the sense of a united community, groups such as the Young Turks were created. Stemming from similar ideals of the Young Ottomans, the Young Turks aimed to bring back traditional, core Islamic ideals. At the peak of the influence of the Young Turks, Abdul Hamid's rule of the empire was deemed tyrannical furthering the feelings of a threat to groups' cultural identities.23

In 1889, the Young Turks would form the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), based on an anti-Hamidian sentiment, and with hope of reestablishing the constitution of 1876. As Hamid lost support from the military, these same officers would start to form an opposition against his rule. The opposition was formed in light of the belief that Hamid and his rule weakened the military and their ability to uphold Ottoman power in Europe, leading to the notion of the Young Turks “revolt” being rooted in patriotism, or Ottomanism. During the CUP’s rule, nationalism and Islamism would be deeply embedded into society. This led to nationalism in various groups, as displayed by a rise in Arab nationalism through the formation of the Party of Ottoman Administrative Decentralization.

Ultimately, with the rise in nationalism throughout various communities, nation-states would begin to form, along with constitutional governments that would impact the future of the Ottoman Empire. Although movements such as those led by the Young Turks resulted in the beginning of constitutional governments in the Middle East, the splintering off by various groups within the empire, led to the decentralizing of government, leading to the loss of power, ultimately contributing to their fall. Although the Ottoman Empire held great militaristic power that resulted in their large acquisition of land, the attempts to reform society failed. The focus on creating a single identity, Ottomanism, while promoting secularism in a religiously centered and diverse society would only contribute to their collapse as a major power. The societal reforms were not successful due to the importance of a cultural identity, which is heavily influenced by religion. Groups were not able to separate
themselves from their already consolidated collective identities and become part of a new collective identity, which not only differed from their previous one, but also threatened their collective identity.

Similar to the Ottoman Empire, Europe encompasses a large culturally diverse area. Each country in Europe conserves its own cultural identity backed by decades, even centuries, of history, often leading to strong feelings of patriotism to one's collective identity connected to their country. In addition to the strong connection to a collective identity, many of these European countries once gained independence from a larger power, leading to even stronger feelings of patriotism. Considering that these countries were once culturally different from their colonial power, yet still forced to identify under a different collective identity from their own, once they obtained independence the concept of "Us" versus "Them" was greatly reinforced.

In light of facing years of conflict and war many European nations felt a need to establish peace amongst the continent, especially following the failure of the propositions at the Congress of Vienna. The Congress of Vienna convened in an attempt to establish the desired peace in Europe following the Napoleonic Wars. The idea of a unified Europe had arisen from a variety of sources, such as in Rousseau's proposal for a European Federation; and in "On the Reorganization of the European Community" in 1814 by Comte de Saint-Simon that called for common institutions amongst a federal Europe. While these ideas circulated Europe, Napoleon attempted to unify Europe through the Napoleonic Wars, but the use of military force only resulted in a rise in nationalism within states. Therefore, the Congress of Vienna set up political boundaries to achieve the goal of long-term peace in Europe; however, the boundaries did not take nationality into consideration. Resulting in later issues to arise as it pertained to boundaries. The proposed boundaries set up by the Congress of Vienna would last until World War I's (WWI) beginning.

Following WWI, the need for European integration grew in popularity amongst nations that were now facing the consequences of the war. Germany's inability to meet demands placed onto them by the Treaty of Versailles, ultimately resulted in the rise of Nazi Germany. The rise of Nazi Germany along with the economic recession in Europe would further prevent the desired European integration. Following the end of World War II (WWII), Europe was left economically devastated. Leading to a series of economic plans to help with reconstruction and to rebuild economic stability.

In addition to economic programs, Europe would create a union to promote collective defense. In 1948, the Treaty of Brussels between the United Kingdom, France, and the BeNeLux countries was created and outlined the Western European Union (WEU) for the promotion of collective defense. The WEU not only addressed collective defense amongst each other, but also promoted integration in Europe. Later, in 1949, these same countries found it necessary to transfer the Western Union Military Organization to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Further attempts for a unified Europe were displayed by the Congress of Europe in May 1948, that resulted in the creation of the Council of Europe in 1949. The Council of Europe was created with the goal of allowing for unity amongst European, however it was not strong enough to provide a solid organization for an actual unified Europe, resulting in the Treaty of Paris in 1951, which created the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC).

The ECSC would prove to be successful in modeling that power could be transferred to a supranational organization, and that there would be a greater possibility of integration with this. Following the attempts of the ECSC, was the Treaty of Rome in 1957 creating the European Economic Community (EEC). The institutions put into place by the EEC provided a much stronger framework for a unified market throughout Europe, and ultimately integration. To further promote European unity and make it concrete, the Single European Act (SEA) in 1987 was created. SEA set a structure into place for the European government by expanding the European Parliament's powers; and giving more powers to the European Council. Not only did SEA set these institutions into place to solidify the unification of Europe, but also set the date for European integration to occur in 1993.

Following the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and with the same goal of completing integration as SEA, the Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1991. Maastricht facilitated the change from the EC to the European Union, which was solidified with the Treaty of Lisbon in 2007 and also created the convergence criteria for countries to be admitted to the EU. The signing of Maastricht allowed for even further economic and political integration amongst the European nations, as it affirmed the need for economic criteria, resulting in the creation of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) that proposed the euro as a common currency. However, this proposal would cause a rise in nationalism as some countries, like Britain, did not want to give up their own currency for the euro. Stemming from the same nationalism, Britain would later make the decision to leave the EU in 2016.

In light of a politically, militaristically, and economically unified Europe, the concept of a European identity began to arise. This concept arises from the desire to shift away from the labeling of "They," and instead have all Europeans refer to each other as "We." However, it is not a set defined identity, thus making it a complex concept to transpire into a comprehensible subject matter. Three different theories are proposed outlining the European identity as it pertains to the differing national collective identities. The first theory labels the European identity as being an addition to the already established national collective identities. The next theory, argues
that the European identity will continue to develop, and eventually restructure and dissociate from the existing national collective identities.\textsuperscript{27} Lastly, the third theory believes in an integration of the European identity with national identities. However, these three theoretical positions still reflect a weak European identity in comparison to the established national identities.\textsuperscript{28}

Along with this decision and the wave of immigration into European countries, nationalism amongst the countries has dramatically increased. At the beginning of the international migration, European countries believed the incoming immigrants were simply passing by. However, most immigrants did not have the intentions to leave these European countries, preceding to their belief of being able to maintain their own collective identity and culture in these European countries.\textsuperscript{29} By continuing to uphold their own collective identity and culture, the ideals of European society and European Union are at odds with those of immigrant communities. Essentially, bringing about the rise of political movements rejecting integration of immigrants into European society.\textsuperscript{30} The introduction of a new culture and identity to an already established culture and identity poses a perceived threat to the European countries’ cultural identity. In addition to the perceived threat to the stability of the identities, the idea of the “Other” is strongly present in society, enabling the formation of collective stereotypes, which only further fuel the perceived threat, and ultimately nationalist tendencies.

Not only has the international migration resulted in a rise in political movements rejecting integration in Europe, and promoting nationalism, but the inability for European countries to share a single cultural identity amongst themselves has also produced a nationalist mindset. The EU currently consists of about 500 million citizens, all with different religions, languages, histories, values, etc.\textsuperscript{31} Therefore, the presence of longstanding national loyalties hinder the possibility of obtaining the European identity being strived for.\textsuperscript{32}

Furthermore, impeding the successful formation of a European identity is the importance of landscape, which is being considered as a tangible entity that reflects society, culture, and practices when together with identity.\textsuperscript{33} Due to the EU lacking a set geographic outlined polity with varying borders and institutional set-up of integration, the ability to identify with a landscape, and hence a collective identity, is being impeded.\textsuperscript{34} Therefore, because socio-territorial identities lead to territorial separation, which correlates with cultural separation, being able to push these formed identities to the side and relate to a new, single one becomes fairly difficult for some European countries.

As a result of collective and cultural identities being so integral to an individual’s identity formation, any threat, real or imaginary, heavily influences actions taken by the individual and their group. When these established identities are challenged, problems such as nationalism begin to arise. As exhibited by the Ottoman Empire’s attempts to move towards inclusiveness and integration within a significant area, group’s national identities are difficult to transform. Although, the reforms towards secularism and universalism had the intention of giving equality to all religious groups in the empire, the reforms caused a perceived threat for groups. Brining a rise in movements against the empire, which would ultimately contribute to their loss of power and eventual collapse.

The Ottoman Empire’s actions to create a common identity from multiple national identities, and the repercussions they faced, can be applied to the fate of the EU as the creation of a common identity is pursued. Similar to the Ottoman Empire, Europe is made up of multiple national identities, therefore making it difficult to accommodate all into a single, European identity. Therefore, as attempts are made to create a European identity, movements to counter this start to occur; and many of which are driven by nationalism and patriotism. An integrated Europe is beneficial economically, politically, and militarily to the nations because it would allow for collective security, and facilitate trade, thus creating more wealth for the nations. However, each nation has historic and cultural roots dating back centuries, and most have gained independence from a larger power at some point in history causing nations to be highly nationalistic as to where they come from and who they are. So, if complete European integration is to be successful it has to be solely focused on creating general commonalities that still allow nations to keep what defines them.
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Indigenous tribes are located throughout the Amazon forest and are fairly well-known in Brazil. Their culture has existed for centuries and has shaped the history of the South American continent. The population of these tribes, however, is now declining. Research has shown that of the many indigenous groups inhabiting the Amazon forest in the 1900’s, only one third remain in existence. As the number of tribes declines, the non-indigenous population continues to grow. From 1960 to 1990 the number of non-indigenous people living in Brazil has increased from 2 million to almost 20 million. This increase has had a negative impact on the indigenous populations.

Non-native population growth has greatly altered land use and development in South America. There has been a great influx of industrial mining and logging. In 1996 alone, Asian corporations invested over $500 million in the Brazilian timber industry. The mining and logging throughout Brazil, and the Amazon rainforest as a whole, escalates deforestation, endangers wildlife, displaces tribes, and threatens the future of the forest. Commercial infrastructure, such as roads built to accommodate the miners and loggers, displaces wildlife and changes the natural environment drastically. Contact with the outside world introduces new diseases and new threats. All of this impacts the already fragile indigenous population. The long-term outlook is grim. Forecasting models predict that the Brazilian Amazon will be fundamentally altered by development and future land-use within the next twenty years.

This is a significant loss that must be addressed in order to prevent further decline of these populations. The loss of these tribes means the loss of unique cultural diversity and anthropological information. This loss may inhibit a future generation of conservationists, who depend on intimate knowledge for the rainforest. The need to address this problem is both critical and urgent. The time is short.

Historically, contact with outsiders has brought violence, pain and death in South America. Today’s surviving indigenous tribes, having escaped early contact with settlers, are currently at risk of this same fate. The ancient indigenous groups of the Amazon have survived with very little interaction with the outside world. Brazil has a large indigenous population that is estimated to be approximately 310,000 people. Most of these tribes prefer to keep to themselves, even limiting interaction with other nearby tribes. This way of living is what they know and what they desire; however, it poses many risks to them. They have not developed necessary immunities to common diseases, they are vulnerable to intruders entering their territory, they risk exposure, starvation, and much more.

Officially, most South American countries prohibit all contact with isolated populations in order to avoid contact-related death. This position is based on the assumption that these tribes are happy and healthy without government influence or public interaction. However, these laws often contain loopholes. Some countries waive this restriction for developmental purposes and government gain. Policies in Brazil, Peru, and Columbia allow exceptions for emergency situations.
Unofficially, people from all over the world hear about these tribes and attempt to intrude on their land and on their way of life. Each year, tribal lands are invaded by curious onlookers, thrill-seekers, and even missionaries. When these intruders are killed, the tribes are portrayed as savages, when in reality they are the ones being intruded upon and placed at risk. Some intruders prey upon native land and resources. They are not afraid to kill in order to make a personal gain. Others may carry diseases and infections. With the mounting threats to native peoples, it is obvious why their numbers are decreasing. What is less obvious is why these tribes aren't receiving more protection from the government for their groups and their land. Currently the Yanomami tribe, one of the largest isolated tribes of the South American rainforests, is at risk. Located in southern Brazil and southern Venezuela, they have experienced many intruders threatening their health, land and lives. Some of these threats come from gold miners working on their land illegally, bringing diseases such as malaria, and polluting rivers and the forest with mercury. The Yanomami people have not been introduced to viruses such as influenza, measles, or chicken pox. This means that they have not developed necessary immunities to fight these diseases and are therefore very susceptible to them.

Contact with the outside world has therefore proven deadly to the tribe. In Peru, oil explorations in the 1980 introduced diseases that wiped out more than 50% of the isolated Nahua tribe. A similar tragedy occurred in the mid-1990s within the Murunahua tribe. Contact with illegal loggers spread a cold which killed half of their population. Many people within these tribes did not even know what a cold was until they were dying from one.

In addition to the threat of newly introduced diseases, these lost tribes are experiencing danger in the form of intruders. Currently, an American missionary is being questioned for allegedly entering the territory of an uncontacted tribe in Brazil. Officials from FUNAI, the Brazilian government’s Indigenous Affairs Department, are questioning Steve Campbell, who could be tried for genocide for this crime. Campbell entered their land in an alleged attempt to monitor the tribe and to teach them to use the Global Positioning System (GPS). While people such as Campbell may have good intentions, their trespass leaves tribal people at risk and threatens the lives of entire populations.

The gold miners and other laborers are the most common form of intruders. Despite the questionable legality of their entry, they often enter the tribal territories with little-to-no regard for how it will affect the uncontacted tribes that they forcibly make contact with. With numerous new projects also comes the creation of new highways, updated roads, and necessary infrastructure that continues the deforestation and displacement. For example, cattle-ranchers entered the Akuntsu tribe’s land in Brazil’s Amazon in the mid-90’s and slaughtered almost the entire tribe. In their quest for monetary gain they disregarded the lives of the men, women, and children they were murdering in the process. FUNAI later found that the tribal houses were bulldozed to cover-up the crime and tribal lands utterly destroyed. Today, only five people from the Akuntsu tribe are still alive to tell the story, and they are forced to occupy the only remaining portion of their land.

Intruders also have a negative impact on the land itself. As previously mentioned, gold miners illegally entered the Yanomami tribe’s land and polluted their land and water with mercury. Consequently, the fish were negatively affected and the rates of mercury poisoning among members of the Yanomami tribe rose alarmingly. Now, it must be determined whether future generations of plants and animals will also be negatively affected. Cattle ranchers destroy the forest. Cattle ranching is the largest driver of deforestation in the Amazon. Over 450,000 square kilometers of former Amazon forests in Brazil have been converted to cattle pasture. The deforestation then furthers the displacement of tribes.

Advocacy groups within Brazil who monitored deforestation last year recognized 4,600 acres of deforested land within indigenous territories alone. With less land and more exposure, these tribes are further at risk of annihilation.

Government policy has become an additional source of threats. Brazil’s president, Jair Bolsonaro, took office in January 2019. He is a right wing, nationalist politician, who has made many racist statements against the indigenous tribes occupying Brazil’s Amazon Forest. He demonstrates complete disrespect and disregard for all indigenous peoples throughout Brazil. In 2015, Bolsonaro stated that, “the Indians do not speak our language, they do not have money, they do not have culture. They are native peoples. How did they manage to get 13% of the national territory?” Since he began his presidency, Bolsonaro declared war on the indigenous tribes by taking their land demarcation away from FUNAI and allowing the Agriculture Ministry to take over, whose new head opposes tribal land rights.

This puts these indigenous tribes in a very hard position because they either have to agree to losing their land protection and protection of rights in general, or actively act against their
government. They are left no choice, as loosing those protections forces them to face genocide. Brazilian people are left torn, as they feel that the tribes are the greatest protectors of their natural world, and their president is actively working against that. The Aruak, Baniwa and Apurinã tribes in Brazil have already defended themselves, stating that they do not believe the decision was just and that they will defend their sacred land, even if it means dying for it. The tribes made a joint statement in which they said, "we don't want to be wiped out by this government's actions. Our lands play a vital role in maintaining biodiversity. We are people, human beings, we have blood like you do, Mr. President".

Survival International (1969) is a tribal rights organization that serves as a protector of indigenous peoples and their land. It formed as a response to the appalling crimes committed against indigenous tribes throughout history. This organization has been the only group protecting and advocating for these tribes, other than the tribes themselves, who have actively protested the new policies. Survival International has stood by the tribes and has continued to defend them, even as their own government will not.

As this issue persists and continues to worsen with the new presidency in Brazil, it begs the question of where these tribes will go when their land is stolen from them. Upwards of 517,000 natives, almost two-thirds of Brazil's indigenous population, live on reservations. This represents 12.5% of the country's territory. Bolsonaro would be displacing hundreds of thousands of natives. Where could they go? If they enter the public, they will be exposed to diseases that they do not have immunities to fight. If they refuse to leave, they will die defending their land. There are no positive ways to move forward with the decision the Brazilian president has made. The true impact of Bolsonaro's policies may actually be underestimated. Uncontacted tribes are continuously discovered, most recently in August 2018. Drones captured the images of these isolated tribes, which were never seen before. Another recently found group has been called Piripkura, or the 'butterfly people', describing the way that they move throughout the forests during their lifetime. It is unknown what this tribe calls themselves and the Piripkura name was given to them by their neighbors, the Gavião Indians. The FUNAI first contacted this tribe in the 1980's, when it featured about twenty members. After that initial contact, the tribe returned to the secluded life they were accustomed to and three members have just recently made contact once more. In 1998, a member of this tribe emerged into the public for the first time to receive medical attention and while hospitalized, made a statement that in the recent past, his people had much larger numbers and he then described how they had been massacred by white people. This demonstrates that atrocities that are unknown to the public still occur and have occurred in the past.

The members of the uncontacted groups living in the state of Acre, in northwestern Brazil, are probably survivors of the rubber boom, when many Indians were enslaved. The American tire company, Goodyear, discovered vulcanization – which is a process that makes rubber hard enough to use for car tires. This resulted
in a rubber boom and a huge demand for Amazonian rubber. The mass production of Ford vehicles followed shortly after. In 12 short years, it was estimated that nearly 30,000 indigenous people of the Amazon had been enslaved, tortured, and even murdered in order to provide rubber for Europe and the United States. The uncontacted groups living in Acre today are descended from the survivors of this enslavement. They were said to have escaped the mistreatment by fleeing up the rivers and the stories of this struggle were passed down generationally. Not much more is known about this group. Given their previous encounters with outsiders, they prefer to remain hidden deeply within the forests and avoid contact.

With so little known about the tribes, it is hard to determine who exactly will be affected by the increased influx of industrial workers and the decisions of the president. As these tribes continue to decline in numbers, die off, and even relocate, they will take a large portion of Brazil’s culture and heritage with them.

One of the reasons that ordinary people continue to invade the tribal land is due to curiosity and interest. Simple topics such as what these tribes eat and how they live become a widely popular topic of interest. The interest sparks new ideas and a desire to learn, which leads to invasion of territories and subsequent issues that arise. But that is neither the only way nor the best way to learn more.

Information on these tribes can be found through research provided by Survival International. The information provided by this organization helps prevent people from seeking it on their own. Survival International discusses everything from weapons, food, housing, and day-to-day life of uncontacted and contacted tribes of the Amazon, especially in Brazil. One interesting aspect is their creation and use of enormous bows and arrows. It was reported that an arrow was discovered from one of the lost tribes that measured four meters in length. Abandoned camps have been found that help describe their way of life, such as the fact that many empty turtle shells are found, meaning that they frequently eat tortoises. As interest in these tribes is sparked, it is important to recognize the strong need for their protections and the overall respect for their culture, land and privacy above all else.

Between the lack for security for tribes and tribal lands, and the greed fueling the development of the Amazon, protection of the tribal people throughout Brazil is much needed. Thus far, FUNAI has been an important advocate for these indigenous peoples, yet now Bolsonaro is stripping their job title from them. This is dangerous for the natives throughout Brazil. The work done by FUNAI was always in support of the native tribes and kept their best interest in mind. This will not be the case with the Agricultural ministry taking over management of the reservations.

Bolsonaro will not necessarily have the last word, however. Social platforms are frequently utilized to show support for the tribes, and disdain for the president’s decision. Raising awareness and working with Survival International with advocacy and support helps protect the indigenous populations and their land. As time moves forward, Bolsonaro’s greed and the greed of others like him will become more perceptible. It is already clear that they have one thing in mind; what will be best for their own gain. These tribes are struggling to survive, and have rights to their land, safety, and freedom. They deserve better policies in place to protect them from presidential decisions that end with the deaths of thousands of native Brazilians. This an ongoing issue that needs global attention.
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