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مرحبا بكم في جامعة جورجيا الأمم المتحدة

Welcome delegates,

 On behalf of the University of Georgia, allow me to welcome you to the twenty-fourth session of the University of Georgia Model United Nations Conference (UGAMUNC XXIV) and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). I am an alum from South Forsyth High School in Cumming. I am a first-year student at the School of Public and International Affairs currently on track to graduate with a joint Bachelor’s/Master’s degree. This is my first year on the Model UN team and my first time chairing this committee.

 Cherien Abou-Harb will be co-chairing the committee this session. She is a fourth year Environmental Health Science major also pursuing a certificate in Global Health. Cherien is an alum of Clarke Central High School in Athens. She is on the Executive board for another organization on campus, Students for Justice in Palestine, and balances her time between all of that and Model UN. She is on track to pursue a degree in Environmental Law and will be applying to be a Double Dawg by the end of this year. This is her first year on Model UN and her first time co-chairing a committee.

 This background guide contains the three topics that this committee will be covering over the duration of this conference: Indian membership in the OIC; the use of police torture of criminal suspects in member states, and preventing the humanitarian crisis in Yemen. I would like to remind delegates that these topics are not simply simulations; they are constantly relevant to the international community. As such, the University of Georgia holds each delegate to a high standard of ethical behavior, and I personally expect every participant to behave in a professional and respectful manner to the chair, staff, and fellow delegates in the discussion of these topics.

 Should you have any questions regarding this committee or the conference in general, do not hesitate to contact Cherien or myself. We will ensure that you are well-prepared for this conference.

We look forward to hosting you in February,

مع سلامة وخدحفظ

Karan Noble Jacob

Chair of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation: UGAMUNC XXIV

karan,jacob@uga.edu



1. **Expansion of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation to the Republic of India**

*Foundation of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation*

In September of 1969, the Rabat Islamic Summit convened in Morocco with two representatives of Africa, Niger and Somalia; Asia, Malaysia and Iran; and the Arab world, Saudi Arabia and Morocco; although Pakistan made a last-minute request to attend with the credential of being the largest Muslim state. The summit was initially called to discuss “the struggle for control of Muslim holy sites in Jerusalem” following an arson attack on the Al-Aqsa Mosque, the third holiest site in Islam; however, the summit expanded to the goals of founding Muslim solidarity, protecting Islamic holy sites, aiding the Palestinian cause, preventing radical racial discrimination, and improving economic cooperation between these represented states (CFR). Today, the Organisation for Islamic Cooperation is the second largest inter-governmental organisation, second only to the United Nations, currently comprised of fifty-seven member states and is tasked with representing the 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide[[1]](#footnote-1). The requirements to become a participating member of the organisation, established in 1970, require that the state have either a Muslim majority population or a Muslim head of state. This rule has been waived for certain West African nations who have a non-majority significant Muslim population. Additionally, observer status has been granted to certain nations who have significant Muslim populations, including Russia and Thailand, but India has not yet been granted observer or permanent status.

*Dispute between India and Pakistan in the OIC*

The Republic of India reported 1.2 billion residents in the 2011 provisional census report. Hinduism is the largest religion, constituting 79.8% of the population, whereas Islam is the second largest, constituting 14.2% of the population. However, 11% of all Muslims, to the tune of 172 million people, live in India[[2]](#footnote-2). As such, India has stated that it has always been interested in the affairs of the organisation and wishes to be included in a meaningful way. The Islamic Republic of Pakistan has 207 million residents, and is therefore the largest Muslim state in the OIC[[3]](#footnote-3). Pakistan has continuously blocked any inclusion of India in OIC affairs, citing organizational procedure that no hopeful member can be inducted while having a quarrel with an existing permanent member. At the Rabat Summit in 1969, India was invited to attend to conference, but was disinvited the following day after the Pakistani ambassador threatened to leave. India has since not been invited to attend any of the following summits[[4]](#footnote-4). Over the forty years that the OIC has met, Pakistan has focused its efforts on bringing to attention the Kashmiri conflict, specifically accusing India of human rights abuses in the Jammu Kashmir region. In step with solidarity, the OIC has referred to India’s involvement in Kashmir as “Indian occupation”, which has drawn ire by the Indian government. India has officially disputed these claims, and has accused both Pakistan and the OIC of negligence towards the Indian-Muslim population.

*The Kashmiri Conflict*

 The Kashmiri Conflict has been a nationalistic flashpoint between Pakistan and India since the partition from 1947 to 1948. The state of Jammu and Kashmir, informally referred to as “Kashmir” in its totality, was originally a sovereign kingdom lodged between Pakistan and India that rejected the new dominion proposed by the British viceroy in conjunction with Mahatma Gandhi. In October of 1947, Pakistani militants entered and occupied the state for one week before the king of Kashmir asked former Viceroy and then Governor-General Louis Mountbatten for assistance. Mountbatten agreed[[5]](#footnote-5) to aid the resistance against the Pakistani invaders on the condition that Jammu and Kashmir accede to India. When the king agreed, Indian soldiers were deployed to Kashmir with the orders of preventing further occupation but were unable to expel occupiers from the territory[[6]](#footnote-6). India pled the United Nations to assist with the matter, which resulted in the UN resolution that asked Pakistan to order the occupiers to vacate, which Pakistan refused. The “First Kashmir War”, or the Indo-Pakistani War of 1947-1948, was resolved by a ceasefire supervised with the UN that divided the left one-third of Kashmir to Pakistan and the right two-thirds to India. The Shimla Agreement of 1972 renamed this the “Line of Control”. While India has officially claimed that the entire Jammu and Kashmir falls inside its territory, it has also petitioned the United Nations to formally accept the Line of Control as the internationally recognized border. Pakistan has continuously refused to accept this border, and has insisted that Kashmir have its own referendum on whether it identifies with India or Pakistan. Pakistan claims that Indian occupation of Kashmir isolates the Muslim majority. It also claims that such a border would fail the native Kashmiris, who have been fighting for independence since 1989. Pakistan has also suggested that India could control Pakistani irrigation and water supply, since the Indus River Basin forms in the Indian-controlled Kashmir, and could cripple Pakistani agrarian economy. While this was officially settled in the 1960 Indus Waters Treaty, this has remained a sticking point for Pakistani claims for annexation and independence. Currently, India controls the Jammu region, the Kashmir valley, Ladakh, and the Siachen Glacier; which Pakistan refers to as Indian-occupied Kashmir. Pakistan controls the “Northern Areas”, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, and the valley below the Siachen Glacier; India refers to this as Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. China also controls a small region called Aksai Chin and a territory received from Pakistan through the Trans-Karakoram Trace in 1963, which India disputes. Effectively, India and Pakistan control 43% and 37% of Kashmir, respectively. Despite the several treaties regarding the border of Kashmir, both India and Pakistan have made it illegal for maps to exclude Kashmir as their respective territories. Pakistan has claimed at the OIC and the UN that India has committed human rights abuses in Kashmir and has fought for Pakistani annexation or independence[[7]](#footnote-7).

*The Modi Administration and Hindi-Muslim Riots*

 In February of 2002, a train carrying several hundred Hindu pilgrims was torched, killing sixty Hindus. At the time Chief Minister, Modi announced that it was a premeditated and international attack on Hindus by the Muslim community. The following day, the Hindu majority party called for a riot through the entire state, and was following by anti-Muslim violence. In response to the violence, the state government ordered a curfew with shoot-on-sight orders enforced by the army in twenty-six cities. The official government count stated that 790 Muslims and 254 Hindus were killed, but independent estimates claim that 2,000 were killed, and 150,000 people were forced into refugee camps[[8]](#footnote-8). The state government faced resistance in the Supreme Court when it was announced that compensation for Muslims was only half that of Hindus. In 2008, the Supreme Court opened a special investigation team to investigate the state of Gujurat and Modi’s complicity in the events that occurred. Several lawsuits claimed that the Modi administration and the BJP covered up abuses of power and crimes against humanity by instructing rioters and police towards Muslim properties and allowed the rape and murder of Muslims in refugee camps. Scrutiny increased when Modi’s Minister of State Maya Kodnani was convicted for her participation in one of the massacres that took place in the riots; Modi’s administration initially claimed that they would seek the death penalty for Kodnani, but reversed that decision in 2013. The special investigation team concluded that Modi was not complicit in the riots, The Supreme Court upheld that decision several times following countersuits. Following his election to Prime Minister[[9]](#footnote-9), Modi’s right-wing agenda that prioritizes Hindu nationalism has been criticized as internationally alienating Muslims, such as with the “beef ban” that has allowed police to detain and arrest Muslims who purchase or consume beef. It should be noted that this beef ban has mainly had success in Northern India where the populations are entirely or majority Hindu, but has been less successful or wholly unenforced in cities in Southern India, where there is a more even distribution of Hindus, Muslims, and Christians. Nevertheless, many international scholars and analysts have accused Modi of allowing a pogrom and sponsoring state-terrorism.

*Indo-African Relations*

Historically, African and India have enjoyed a beneficial political, economic, and social relationships. Under the British mandate, Indian port cities, such as Mumbai, were centers for ivory trade. India and various African nations found political unity in the decolonization movement, which began with Mahatma Gandhi’s stay in South Africa. After Indian independence, India became heavily invested in Africa[[10]](#footnote-10), socially as a part of the non-alignment movement, and economically as the Indian government and Indian-owned businesses invested and expanded to African countries. During the Cold War, many Eastern African countries had economies largely focused on Indian businesses and imports. Relations between India and African countries briefly suffered as a result of destabilized African governments and inward-focused domestic Indian policy. An example of such is the reformation of Uganda under Idi Amin Dada, whose decision to nationalize all Ugandan business by seizing Indian-owned or operated firms and giving control to native Ugandans caused the collapse of the national economy from 1971-1979. In the twenty-first century, Africa has become India’s sixth largest trading partner, and India is Africa’s fourth largest trading partner. As of 2015, trade between Africa and India totaled $90 billion USD. In the last decade, private Indian firms have looked to expand in Eastern Africa, including Airtel. The Indian government has also allocated $5.4 billion USD in loans to developing infrastructure for African nations[[11]](#footnote-11). Socially, many Indians have immigrated to East Africa, and around 40,000 Africans live in India, but concerns of racial discrimination against Africans in India have come to light.

*Questions to Consider*

1. Consider your nation’s relations with India since the 1947 partition. How have political, economic, and/or social relations with India benefitted or negatively impacted your country?
2. Outside of your representation in the OIC, does your country have an official position on Muslim action in India?
3. All but one of the members in the OIC are members of the UN. Does your country benefit better from an OIC position or a UN position?

*Notes from the Chair*

1. Many nations in North and West Africa may not have a history or official position on the Indo-Pakistani conflict and would not stand to lose or benefit from India’s inclusion or exclusion in the OIC. Delegates from these countries should still actively participate in the discussion and try to align themselves with the position that best suits their country’s interests.
2. The Kashmiri conflict has a dense history that dates back to the earliest Indus civilizations. This background guide is a very brief summary of the context that may be relevant to this committee. Delegates should verse themselves in the history of Kashmir and make their own stance on the situation and not wait to follow the sway of the committee.
3. The concepts of nationalism and the treatment of Muslims in India are very sensitive topics approached from both sides of the spectrum. Inappropriate or offensive remarks, even and especially when delivered under the guise of being a delegate, will not be tolerated. Delegates should be wary of how they address other delegates during this topic.

*Additional Resources*

1. Peace Direct is an international charity that operates primarily in conflict zones. They keep detailed records of the histories and current events of conflict zones (<https://www.peaceinsight.org/conflicts/kashmir/>).
2. The Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses is an Indian education institution that has information on current Indo-African relations. Consider any bias in this resource (<https://idsa.in/taxonomy/term/311>).
3. The Asia Society Center for Global Education is a non-partisan educational and informational resource (<http://asiasociety.org/education/india-pakistan-relations-50-year-history>).
4. **Excessive Use of Police Torture in OIC Member States**

*Understanding Torture*

The Organisation of Islamic Cooperation has accepted the definition of “torture” defined by the United Nations in the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in 1984 as “means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions”[[12]](#footnote-12).

*Understanding Enhanced Interrogation*

“Enhanced interrogation” is a law enforcement tactic in which the police agent uses elements of torture during the detention of a suspect[[13]](#footnote-13). Although the use of torture in any capacity under official capacity was made illegal by internationally-accepted law in 1984, governments have been made responsible for continuing torture programs as recent as 2013. Torture tactics became mainstream during World War I, where gathering information was the priority for every country. However, enhanced interrogation became a staple for intelligence services during the Cold War, the first war that was fought with intelligence instead of military. During the 1960s, the CIA published its internal guide to interrogating Communist subversives and enemies of state. The list of tactics discussed in the manual include restrictions, coercion, arrest, prolonged detention, sensory deprivation, threats, fear tactics, debility, pain, hypnosis, narcosis, and malingering. These tactics have been apparent in popular culture, such as with waterboarding and stress positions. Enhanced interrogation and torture tactics are popular in developing pre-modern and modern states[[14]](#footnote-14) where direct democracies do not dictate the powers of government and in which in the government is non-centralized and therefore faces heavy dissent. Such tactics are often used in pre- and modern states by internal security services to protect the central or federal government by preventing fractures to the central government, and are used in post-modern states by external security services to prevent threats to national or international security[[15]](#footnote-15).

*United Nations Reaction to Torture Programs*

 International organizations have taken steps since the 1980s to prevent the mistreatment and cruel punishment of humans in light of the actions taken by governments and non-state actors during the Cold War. The four most important declarations relevant to the topic are as follows:

1. The United Nations adopted the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in December of 1984, which entered into force on June of 1987[[16]](#footnote-16). Fundamental points or motions included in the declaration include:
	1. Provides the current definition of “torture” as previously described in *Understanding Torture* [and] *Enhanced Interrogation.*
	2. Claims a state cannot provide any justification for condoning or authorizing any order that would include torture against any human, including an enemy of the state during times of war.
	3. Dictates no state may expel or extradite a person to a place whether their life will be in danger of being subjected to torture.
	4. Dictates all states are responsible for any act of torture that occurs by any official, representative, or employee of the state or state-aligned service with jurisdiction of the state, including on a state vehicle, such as an airplane or boat, that is in foreign jurisdiction at the time of the event.
	5. Demands all states keep a systematic and public review of interrogation policies and programs in order to prevent a humanitarian crisis, and any interrogation on behalf of the state must be overseen by a qualified superior.
	6. Orders states to provide fair education and trial to any person who files suit against a state or representative of the state for the purposes of accusing the state of violated these described laws.
	7. Notes that no state may supersede these articles.
2. The United Nations adopted the Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance in December of 1992, which entered into force on December of 2010[[17]](#footnote-17). Fundamental points or motions included in the declaration include:
	1. Defines “enforced disappearance” as the arrest, detention, abduction or any other form of deprivation of liberty by agents of the State or by persons or groups of persons acting with the authorization, support or acquiescence of the State, followed by a refusal to acknowledge the deprivation of liberty or by concealment of the fate or whereabouts of the disappeared person, which place such a person outside the protection of the law.
	2. Demands that no exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification for enforced disappearance.
	3. Orders that no order or instruction from any public authority; civilian, military or other, may be invoked to justify an offence of enforced disappearance.
	4. Reminds that each State Party shall likewise take such measures as may be necessary to establish its competence to exercise jurisdiction over the offence of enforced disappearance when the alleged offender is present in any territory under its jurisdiction, unless it extradites or surrenders him or her to another State in accordance with its international obligations or surrenders him or her to an international criminal tribunal whose jurisdiction it has recognized.
	5. Instructs that no State Party shall expel, return, surrender or extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he or she would be in danger of being subjected to enforced disappearance.
	6. Affirms that no one shall be held in secret detention.

*Islamic Reaction to Torture Programmes*

1. The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam was adopted on August of 1990[[18]](#footnote-18). Fundamental points or motions included in the declaration include:
	1. Declares it is the duty of individuals, societies and states to protect this right [to life] from any violation, and it is prohibited to take away life except for a Shari’ah-prescribed reason.
	2. Guarantees safety from bodily harm is a guaranteed right. It is the duty of the state to safeguard it, and it is prohibited to breach it without a Shari’ah-prescribed reason.
	3. Affirms the wounded and the sick shall have the right to medical treatment and prisoners of war shall have the right to be fed, sheltered and clothed; that it is prohibited to mutilate dead bodies; and that it is a duty to exchange prisoners of war and to arrange visits or reunions of the families separated by the circumstances of war.
	4. Declares human beings are born free, and no one has the right to enslave, humiliate, oppress or exploit them, and there can be no subjugation but to God the Most-High.
	5. Claims it is not permitted to spy on him, to place him under surveillance or to besmirch his good name.
	6. Dictates it is not permitted without legitimate reason to arrest an individual, or restrict his freedom, to exile or to punish him; that it is not permitted to subject him to physical or psychological torture or to any form of humiliation, cruelty or indignity; that it is not permitted to subject an individual to medical or scientific experimentation without his consent or at the risk of his health or of his life; and that it is not permitted to promulgate emergency laws that would provide executive authority for such actions.
2. The Arab Charter on Human Rights was adopted on September of 1994[[19]](#footnote-19). Fundamental points or motions included in the declaration include:
	1. Notes that in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation, the States Parties may take measures derogating from their obligations under the present Charter to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation.
	2. Guarantees that such measures or derogations shall under no circumstances affect or apply to the rights and special guarantees concerning the prohibition of torture and degrading treatment, return to one's country, political asylum, trial, the inadmissibility of retrial for the same act, and the legal status of crime and punishment.
	3. Orders that all parties shall protect every person in their territory from being subjected to physical or mental torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment; take effective measures to prevent such acts and shall regard the practice thereof, or participation therein, as a punishable offence; and will not conduct medical or scientific experimentation on any person without his free consent.
	4. Affirms persons sentenced to a penalty of deprivation of liberty shall be treated with humanity.
	5. Dictates every citizen shall have the right to seek political asylum in other countries in order to escape persecution (which shall not be enjoyed by persons facing prosecution for an offence under the ordinary law); and political refugees shall not be extraditable.

*Questions to Consider*

1. As much as torture has been reviled by the international community, the recent trial against the CIA over its enhanced interrogation program has brought to light that the program was occasionally effective. Is torture necessary to protect national and international security?
2. Treaties entered into force by the United Nations do not require a unanimous accession. Delegates should check which international treaties regarding torture, interrogation, and disappearance their represented states have signed, ratified, or abstained.
3. Delegates should look into the legal framework of their nation. Is it feasible to pass effective laws to prevent state torture?
4. Notice that the Arab Charter makes an exception to the protection of human rights in times of national emergency with the provision for an indefinite suspension, which is strictly prohibited in both UN conventions and the Cairo Declaration. Delegates should investigate whether his or her represented nation has taken advantage of such provisions in any convention (not limited to the four mentioned in this guide) to allow torture or inhuman punishment in the past.

*Notes from the Chair*

1. Torture and enhanced interrogation methods are highly sensitive subjects, especially in recent years. Delegates should use their best judgement when preparing for and participating in session and thoroughly think through the consequences of their words.
2. Several major world powers have been accused of using enhanced interrogation in the past decade. While these are not directly relevant to this discussion, it would be prudent to look into these incidents, including the torture perpetuated by the CIA, DGSI, Mossad, and Beijing.
3. The Israeli Mossad is one of the most capable intelligence agencies in the world, but has often been criticized for the use of extrajudicial assassinations and enhanced interrogations. Using this topic as a platform for anti-Israeli agendas is not allowed and will be penalized upon the Chair’s discretion. Mind the topic.
4. Regarding the two subsections of the first section, *Understanding Torture and Enhanced Interrogation*, delegates should learn the foreign policies of the pre-, post-, and modern states and identify which type of state he or she represents. Further, delegates should learn about the internal and external security services in their state.
5. All of these topics are difficult to learn and discuss, especially as this generation has grown up alongside these conflicts. Please take personal care in your research of this topic and know that you are only obligated to have basic knowledge of what is mentioned here. Only research further if you believe you are capable of doing so with safe mind. Your personal safety comes first, and do not make ill use of the internet or other resources.

*Additional Resources*

1. Fifty-six of the fifty-seven members of the OIC are members of the UN. The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment will be relevant to this discussion (<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CAT.aspx>).
2. The Cairo Declaration of Human Rights in Islam was the OIC official response to international reactions to torture. It is as relevant to this discussion as the UN counterpart (<http://www.oic-iphrc.org/en/data/docs/legal_instruments/OIC%20Instruments/Cairo%20Declaration/Cairo%20Declaration%20on%20Human%20Rights%20in%20Islam%20-%20EV.pdf>).
3. Understand how governments view the use of enhanced interrogations by reading the published manuals of torture. The “KUBARK Counterintelligence Interrogation” manual is attached (<http://nsarchive2.gwu.edu//NSAEBB/NSAEBB122/CIA%20Kubark%201-60.pdf>). Please be cautious as some people may find this material sensitive and offensive.
4. **Addressing the Humanitarian Crisis in Yemen**

*The Spark of the Conflict*

In November of 2011, following the surge of government overthrows in the Middle East, President Ali Abdullah Saleh of Yemen signed a UN brokered deal to transfer power to his Vice President, Abdrabbuh Mansour Hadi, sparking the beginning of the Yemen conflict[[20]](#footnote-20). Saleh had ruled the country since 1978, but after pro-democracy groups began calling for the President's resignation due to lengthy reign, he was eventually ousted by Hadi. Within 90 days of this transfer of power, Hadi was required to hold an election for a new President, in which he won due to being the only candidate on the ballot. Hadi is recognized by the International community as the President of Yemen, but Saleh still has a considerable amount of political power over those still loyal to him, especially over the Zaydi tribes that encompass the Houthis. The Houthi Militia is a rebel sect of Shiite muslims fighting against the newly formed government for representation and power. The true leader of the rebel cause however is Abdulmalik al-Houthi. Following President Hadi’s attempts at budget and constitutional reform, Houthi rebels gained popularity and begin to overthrow the new government[[21]](#footnote-21). By September of 2014, insurgents had overtaken the Yemeni capital of Sanaa, forcing Hadi to relocate his government to the port city of Aden. After that, Houthi forces and groups loyal to Saleh tried to take the entire country, and forced Hadi into Saudi Arabia.

*Key International Players in the Crisis*

In 2015, circumstances in an already war torn country took a more tragic turn when Saudi Arabia began backing the new Hadi-run government. When the Houthis (a rebel Shia group) began to gain a considerable amount and power and land, Saudi Arabia took notice and began bombing Houthi captured areas. The Saudi Arabian government has interest in the region due to the Houthis being a Shiite group, threatening the majority Sunni government/civilians in the area. Iran, the largest Shia power in the Middle East, has thrusted its support behind the Houthis, making relations between Iran and Saudi Arabia even worse[[22]](#footnote-22). The United States, a major ally of Saudi Arabia, has placed its support behind the Hadi government. This in turn funds the destruction Saudi Arabia has inflicted on the region which has in turn been pushing the country to famine. Saudi Arabia has accused Iran of sending arms and supplies to the Houthis, but Tehran has denied such claims. The country has a population of 28.8 million with 18.8 million people suffering from food insecurity. Over 50% of the is below the country falls below the poverty line. The death toll has surpassed 10,000, with over 40,000 wounded. This war has also forced more than 3 million people to flee their homes. The majority of the casualties have been civilian deaths[[23]](#footnote-23).

*The International War on Terror*

 The Houthis have officially been declared a terrorist organization by the Yemeni government. On the other side, Saudi Arabia is arming the rebel group Ansar al-Sharia, a militant al-Qaeda group in the region. The US is putting all of its logistical and monetary support in funding Saudi Arabia, which is in turn taking it weapons and resources to arm Al Qaeda forces on the ground fighting the Houthis. This contradicts the US’s international policy on the war on terror and is indirectly funding the growth of this organization and the Salafi ideology. The Salafi ideology is the most prominent contributor to radicalization in the region. This uptick in naval blockades and bombings is pushing Yemen, who already imports over 80% of its food, to famine. Doctors without Borders has suspended its aid after two years, and the blockades are only making it more difficult to get in medical supplies to the region. This is making the recent cholera outbreak very difficult to manage, considering the majority of the disease’s prominence in Houthi controlled areas.[[24]](#footnote-24) The cholera outbreak is being used as a tool to manipulate the Houthis into backtracking and giving up land to the Yemeni government. The airstrikes from Saudi Arabia may be contributing to this problem, but the Houthis are failing to deal with the sewage and garbage filling the streets. There have been attempts by the UN's special envoy for Yemen, Ismail Ould Cheikh Ahmedd, to urge the United Nations to help in the assistance of opening up the international airport in Sanaa and the major ports on the coast. This will hopefully make it much easier for all Yemenis to obtain any sort of aid that they so desperately need.

*Questions to Consider*

1. Who are the major players in this war and what do they have to gain from the continuing destruction?
2. Even before this current conflict, political unrest in Yemen has been a constant struggle. Now, Yemen is said to be past “the brink of no return”, what can your country do to contribute to bringing this country back to adequate standing without being fully dependent on other foreign partners?
3. Does the US’s involvement in wars such as this one make it easier or more difficult to reach a resolution?

*Additional Resources*

1. The World Health Organization is the United Nations affiliate for global health and crisis diplomacy. WHO records of the Yemeni crisis are valuable documentation (<http://www.who.int/emergencies/yemen/en/>).
2. Critical Threats maps most conflicts and provides a brief summary of the conflict histories. The 2017 Crisis Situation Report on the Yemen outbreak is available here (<https://www.criticalthreats.org/briefs/yemen-situation-report>).
3. The United States Department of State keeps an active record of the conflict situation in every country. View the State’s assessment of Yemen (<https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/YemenCrisis.html>).
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