

Human Rights Abuses Against Rohingya

While Burma as a whole suffered terribly under dictatorship, the oppression of the Rohingya has been compounded by overt policies of oppression which are applied almost exclusively to them.

In June 2012 horrific violence erupted in Arakan State between Muslim Rohingya, and the predominantly Theravada Buddhist Rakhine (Arakanese). The violence had been encouraged by racist organisations and individuals, and what could be described as communal violence quickly evolved into organised and systematic attacks against the Rohingya.

The violence has led to the displacement more than 100,000 people, the vast majority of them Rohingya. Human rights abuses reported include "beheadings, stabbings, shootings, beatings and widespread arson".¹

Remit of this paper

The Briefing paper examines Burma's treatment of the Rohingya in the context of international law, treaty obligations, and international guidelines and norms. It examines two particular areas; the general treatment of the Rohingya before the violence which erupted in June 2012, and the response of the government of Burma during and after the violence began.

A detailed consideration of whether these human rights abuses constitute crimes against humanity is outside the scope of this paper. Should the Burmese authorities be found to have perpetrated serious human rights abuses in a widespread or systematic way, then they could potentially be deemed liable for crimes against humanity.

Findings

This briefing paper finds that Burma's treatment of the Rohingya violates at least eight international laws, treaty obligations and international human rights guidelines.

Burma's 1982 Citizenship Law violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and international norms prohibiting discrimination of racial and religious minorities, such as the UN General Assembly Resolution on the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination.

Burma's treatment of the Rohingya violates UN definitions of the rule of law.

The investigation committee set up by the government of Burma violates international human rights guidelines.

Burma and the international community are failing in their duty of Responsibility to Protect.

Brief Background

Rakhine/Arakan State in Burma has been shaped by its turbulent history on the frontiers of powerful kingdoms and empires. Islamic communities are believed to have lived in what is now Arakan State for over a millennium, and there is evidence that an ethnic group called the Rohingya has been in Burma for many centuries.² However, many Burmese reject Rohingya claims to indigenesness and

.....

regard the Rohingya as unwelcome migrants from Bengal. The state-run press studiously refers to 'locals' and 'Bengalis' to distinguish between Arakan and Rohingya.

Also rejected by Bangladesh, the Rohingya have been rendered stateless by increasingly draconian Burmese legislation. The Rohingya are thus caught between two governments that strategically employ misperceptions and prejudice in order to cast them as subhuman. The United Nations Special Rapporteur on human rights in Burma has described the Rohingya as "the most vulnerable and marginalised group in Myanmar."

While Burma as a whole suffered terribly under military rule, the oppression of the Rohingya has been compounded by overt policies of exclusion. 1977's Operation Nagamin aimed to "scrutinise each individual living in the state", "designate citizens and foreigners in accordance with the law" and "take actions against foreigners who have filtered into the country illegally". Rohingya were brutally targeted and thousands fled to neighbouring Bangladesh.

The passing of the repressive Burma Citizenship Law in 1982 stripped the Rohingya of any remaining vestiges of citizenship. As a result of this law the Rohingya are denied access to education and employment, and face unacceptable restrictions on movement, marriage, and reproduction. Many Rohingya children cannot even have their birth registered.

Despite the Burmese authorities' insistence that the Rohingya are 'Bengalis', the Rohingya have a fraught relationship with Bangladesh. Following Operation Nagamin, more than 200,000 Rohingya fled widespread killings, rape, the destruction of mosques and other religious persecution into Bangladesh. The Bangladeshi authorities eventually withheld food aid to the refugees in an attempt to force them back to Burma.³ More than 12,000 starved to death.⁴ Those that survived were forcibly repatriated to Burma. Similar treatment was meted out when over 250,000 Rohingya again fled to Bangladesh in the early 1990s. These refugees reported widespread forced labour, summary executions, torture and rape at the hands of the Burmese military regime.

Many desperate Rohingya have paid traffickers extortionate amounts to set out in primitive, ill equipped, and over-crowded boats in the hope of reaching Malaysia, Thailand or Bangladesh. Harrowing reports have emerged of appalling treatment at the hands of the Thai authorities, including severe beatings and being dragged back out to open sea, being fired upon, and having boat engines confiscated.

Violence in 2012

Violence was sparked on 28 May 2012 when a young Rakhine/Arakan woman was raped and murdered, allegedly by Muslim men. Three Muslim men were subsequently detained. One committed suicide in custody and the other two have been sentenced to death.⁵ There have been no legal repercussions for the killing of ten Muslim men by a Rakhine/Arakan mob.

The government's failure to intervene immediately and provide appropriate protection to people in Arakan almost certainly contributed to the sharp escalation of violence. There is evidence, however, that security forces were directly involved in targeted attacks and other human rights violations against the Rohingya.⁶

On 6 June, the government established a 16-member investigative committee tasked with investigating the killing of the ten Muslims. President Thein Sein declared a state of emergency in Arakan on 10 June. This announcement was accompanied by the evacuation of all international and non-essential humanitarian aid workers from Northern Rakhine/Arakan and Sittwe. Overtly blaming the Rohingya for trouble in the region, President Thein Sein stated on 12 July 2012 that the only solution to the violence would be to send the Rohingya to other countries or refugee camps.⁷

From 12th June 2012, Burmese army units helped to stem violence in Sittwe by guarding groups of displaced Rohingya and calling for residents of Arakan to disarm.⁸ Human Rights Watch reported that the army escorted Rohingya through Sittwe to collect personal belongings before returning to their camps. Yet compassionate acts such as buying rice on behalf of displaced Rohingya ceased in line

with increasing local and government propaganda claiming the violence was perpetrated solely by Rohingya against Arakan.⁹

There is evidence of collusion between Arakan and the security forces. Consistent reports of mass arrests have described Arakan accompanying security forces during raids through predominantly Rohingya areas.¹⁰ Hundreds of boys and men are reported to have been detained, largely incommunicado, and subjected to ill-treatment.¹¹ Following an apparently coordinated attack in which a Rohingya area of Sittwe was burned to the ground, members of the notorious Lon Their paramilitary force opened fire on Rohingya as they tried to extinguish the flames.¹²

Though Rakhine/Arakan have also been displaced by the violence, the forcible relocation of Rohingya appears discriminatory, reflecting the official view that they are not welcome in Burma. Restrictions on movement make the humanitarian situation even more dire, and Rohingya face harsh treatment if they leave the camps.

Authorities are alleged to have prevented some Muslims from burying their dead in accordance with Islamic custom, reportedly cremating many Muslims in Buddhist crematoria.¹³

Suspicion of the Rohingya extends to rumours that the Rohingya staff of international aid agencies have links to international extremist groups such as al Qaeda.¹⁴ In June, fourteen Muslims and Rohingya working for various agencies including the UN and Médecins Sans Frontières, were arrested on vague charges relating to the violence.¹⁵

On 27 July, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay called for an investigation into the violence. Following its three-man, four-day assessment of the situation at the end of July, the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission reported that all humanitarian needs were being met and no abuses were being perpetrated at the hands of the government forces.¹⁶ On 4 August, UN Special Rapporteur on human rights in Myanmar Tomás Ojea Quintana called for an independent and credible investigation into allegations of human rights violations in Arakan. The chair of the Myanmar

National Human Rights Commission dismissed the suggestion as irrelevant for a country that has made a peaceful transition to a new government.¹⁷

On 17 August, two months after the violence started, President Thein Sein announced the formation of a 27-person commission to investigate the situation in Rakhine/Arakan State. The commission includes religious leaders, artists and former dissidents, but no Rohingya representative was included, and no representative of the National League for Democracy, the main opposition party, was included.¹⁸

Illustrating a worrying intention to increase anti-Rohingya measures in the region, the New Light of Myanmar quoted Burma's Minister for Home Affairs, Lieutenant General Ko Ko, as saying: *"Border Regions Immigration Inspection Command Headquarters is tightening the regulations in order to handle travelling, birth, death, immigration, migration, marriage, constructing of new religious buildings, repairing and land ownership and right to construct buildings of Bengalis under the law."*¹⁹

On 26 October, six towns erupted in violence and the Burmese government reported that more than 5,342 houses were burnt. The BBC reported that "testimony from the displaced Muslims paints a picture of planned, organized attacks in October in a number of places at once".²⁰ The Burmese government acknowledged that "whole villages and towns" in Arakan State were razed "while we could not provide full security in some areas".²¹

In his 2012 report to the UN General Assembly, Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar Tomás Ojea Quintana emphasised his particular concern at the "endemic discrimination" faced by the Rohingya, and called for the government to "review and amend laws and policies that deny the Rohingya community its fundamental human rights".²² The Special Rapporteur cited the urgent need to resolve the legal status of the many Rohingya who have been relegated to statelessness, including by revision of the Citizenship Act 1982.²³ He repeated this in his 2013 report to the United Nations Human Rights Council. The recent violence and human rights abuses in Arakan clash with the rhetoric of democratic reform

.....

that has gathered wide international support. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon issued a statement calling on the Burmese government to take effective action to control the violence, and warning that failure to do so could jeopardise the reform process.²⁴ Geo-strategic and business interests have supplanted human rights as priorities in policy-making on Burma, and this precluded much-needed vociferous denunciations of the government by the international community. Until oppressive laws are repealed or significantly amended to fall in line with international norms, the denial of basic rights to Rohingya will continue to fuel instability in Burma.

Incompatibility of the Burma Citizenship Law 1982 with International Human Rights Law

The effect of the Burma Citizenship Law 1982 is to make it almost impossible for the Rohingya to gain citizenship. This violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and international norms prohibiting discrimination of racial and religious minorities.

The legal and practical constraints imposed by the Burma Citizenship Law 1982 render it “almost impossible” for the Rohingya to be recognised as citizens of Burma.²⁵ The Burma Citizenship Law 1982 created three categories of citizens: citizens, associate citizens and naturalised citizens.

Full citizenship is restricted to nationals of specific ethnic groups who settled in Burma prior to 1823.²⁶ Burma does not consider the Rohingya to be a national ethnic group.²⁷ The Rohingya are therefore excluded from full citizenship.

Associate citizenship only applies to individuals who had already applied for citizenship under the Union Citizenship Act 1948.²⁸ The deadline for applying for associate citizenship passed on 15 October 1982. Few Rohingya are believed to have applied because most were unaware of the 1948 Act or of its significance.³⁰ New applications cannot be made.

Naturalised citizenship may be applied for by individuals (and their offspring born within Burma)

who can furnish “conclusive evidence” that they entered and resided in Burma prior to 4 January 1948.³¹ This also effectively excludes almost all Rohingya, since they are in practice unable to furnish the conclusive evidence required. The only documentation available to most Rohingya is a “family list” which indicates the names and dates of birth of each member of a household. The “family list” is insufficient because it does not record place of birth.³²

The fact that the Rohingya are effectively excluded from citizenship is a clear violation of international human rights law. It is a fundamental principle that “everyone has the right to a nationality”.³³ This principle is especially important in relation to children. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child provides in terms that every child “shall have from birth...the right to acquire a nationality”.³⁴ As a party to that Convention,³⁵ Burma is obliged to “ensure the implementation” of every child’s right to acquire a nationality.³⁶ Since it is almost impossible for a Rohingya, and in particular a Rohingya child, to acquire Burmese citizenship, the 1982 Burma Citizenship Law violates the fundamental right to a nationality.

Moreover, since the Rohingya have no other nationality, the effect of the 1982 Burma Citizenship Law is to render them stateless. This is significant because Burma is specifically obliged to ensure a child’s right to acquire a nationality “where the child would otherwise be stateless”.³⁷ Moreover, it runs contrary to many other international instruments which aim to limit statelessness.³⁸

The 1982 Citizenship Law also violates international norms against discrimination. Ever since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 it has been recognised as a fundamental principle that “*everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race...religion*”.³⁹ This principle has been repeated consistently in international conventions.⁴⁰ The rights of children, including the right to acquire nationality, must also be respected “without discrimination of any kind”.⁴¹ This denial of citizenship has profound consequences for the Rohingya. The 1982

.....

Citizenship Law itself provides that citizens shall be entitled to enjoy the rights prescribed by Burmese law.⁴² Non-citizens like the Rohingya are not. This means that the Rohingya are limited in their ability to vote, be elected for public office, move freely with Burma, own land or receive public services such as education.⁴³

Treatment of the Rohingya and the Rule of Law

The rule of law requires respect for human rights. In his 2004 report on the rule of law and transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict societies, then-UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan defined “the rule of law” as:

*[A] principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards. It requires, as well, measures to ensure adherence to the principles of supremacy of law, equality before the law, accountability to the law, fairness in the application of the law, separation of powers, participation in decision-making, legal certainty, avoidance of arbitrariness and procedural and legal transparency.*⁴⁴

The High-level Meeting of the 67th Session of the General Assembly on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels took place at the United Nations Headquarters in New York on 24 September 2012. UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay opened her address to the meeting by describing the rule of law as “the backbone for the protection of human rights” and emphasising that the rule of law must be grounded in human rights.⁴⁵

She continued: *Respect for the rule of law also demands full compliance with the principles of equality before the law, equal protection of the law and the prohibition of discrimination on any ground [...] States must examine their laws and repeal those that are discriminatory in their intent or effect.* The Draft Declaration of the High-level Meeting also emphasises that “human rights, the rule of

law and democracy are interlinked and mutually reinforcing”.⁴⁶

The government has made some statements and Parliament has made some steps towards promoting the rule of law. On 7 August 2012, Aung San Suu Kyi was appointed Chair of a new parliamentary committee on the rule of law and tranquility. Nine of the 15 members belong to military-backed parties.⁴⁷ The Special Rapporteur has noted efforts to reform the Bar Council Act and Legal Practitioners Act, which, it is hoped, will help to promote legal professional standards.⁴⁸

However, the Burmese government is still falling well short of its obligations. In the face of failures to protect the residents of Rakhine/Arakan, to investigate the violence in Arakan independently and impartially, and to address problematic legislation, claims of adherence with the rule of law are duplicitous.

Government Investigation Commission violates international human rights guidelines

On 17 August, after weeks of international pressure and repeated calls from the Special Rapporteur and other high-ranking UN officials, President Thein Sein established a 27-member commission to investigate the violence in Rakhine/Arakan State.

The Commission is mandated to “reveal the truth behind the unrest” and “find solutions for communities with different religious beliefs to live together in harmony”.⁴⁹ Headed by the former director of the Ministry of Religious Affairs Dr Myo Myint, the Commission includes representatives from various religious groups, but no Rohingya.⁵⁰ Two Muslim members were dismissed for “violating commission principles”.⁵¹

In his latest report to the UN General Assembly, the Special Rapporteur welcomed the establishment of the Commission, and recalled his previous demand for an independent, impartial and credible investigation while urging the commission to take appropriate measures to protect witnesses and prevent reprisals.⁵²

.....

In 2005 the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, (now United Nations Human Rights Council) adopted the Updated Set of Principles for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights Through Action to Combat Impunity. These principles demand that States investigate violations of human rights and take appropriate judicial measures against perpetrators, and provide effective remedies to victims.⁵³

The primary principles include peoples' "inalienable right to truth",⁵⁴ the State's "duty to preserve memory",⁵⁵ and "the victims' right to know".⁵⁶ States are obliged to take appropriate action to give effect to the right to know such that the truth may be ascertained and to prevent the disappearance of evidence.⁵⁷ This includes ensuring the preservation of archives concerning violations of human rights and humanitarian law.

The Updated Set of Principles dictates that the impartiality of any Commission must be bolstered by the adequate representation of groups whose members have been especially vulnerable to human rights violations.⁵⁸ In view of the "endemic discrimination" faced by the Rohingya, the legislation that denies their citizenship, and the brutality of the recent violence, it is unconscionable for the Commission not to include any Rohingya.

The Updated Set of Principles further demands that States "undertake institutional reforms and other measures necessary to ensure respect for the rule of law, foster and sustain a culture of respect for human rights, and restore or establish public trust in government institutions."⁵⁹

Ministers in the Burmese government have repeatedly and publicly disputed the right of Rohingya to be in Burma, and the President himself asked for international assistance in removing all Rohingya. These acts, combined with government inaction against those inciting hatred and violence, give official legitimacy to those committing acts of violence. Yet still the government claims impartiality and tries to cast itself as being between two sides.

In August, a coalition of 24 political parties called for the removal of the Special Rapporteur on the

basis that he is biased towards the Rohingya.⁶⁰ Meanwhile, the Commission continues to include members who are known to hold views that the Rohingya should be expelled from Burma.⁶¹

Responsibility to Protect

In September 2005, the UN General Assembly adopted the following statement in its Outcome Document to the 2005 World Summit:

*"Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. **This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it.**"*⁶² [Emphasis added.]

Where an individual state fails to so protect its population, it falls upon the international community to do so:

*The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organisations as appropriate, **should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.***⁶³ [Emphasis added.]

These statements have been endorsed by the UN Security Council.⁶⁴ Last year, in relation to Libya, Security Council Resolution 1970 (2011), in referring the situation in Libya to the International Criminal Court and imposing an arms embargo, targeted sanctions and a sanctions committee, specifically invoked "the Libyan authorities' responsibility to protect its population" (as well as the Security Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security).⁶⁵

At the heart of the responsibility to protect is “the recognition that state sovereignty – the cornerstone of international relations – entails responsibility”.⁶⁶ Events in Arakan State may be described as ethnic cleansing. The Government of Burma is required to protect the Rohingya through appropriate and necessary means. It has manifestly failed to do so.

Summary and recommendations to the international community

Even before the new wave of violence began in June 2012, the situation of the Rohingya in Burma was considered unacceptable and a cause of international concern. Two major rounds of violence have taken place but attacks and harassment continue on a daily basis, and tensions are being stirred up again. No serious steps are being taken by the government of Burma to stop incitement of hatred and violence against the Rohingya or other Muslim communities in Burma.

President Thein Sein has ruled out reform or the repealing of the 1982 Citizenship Law, and international humanitarian access to displaced Rohingya and other Rohingya communities faces restrictions which are leading to preventable deaths. It is clear that at the present time there is no political will and desire from the government of Burma or opposition parties to address the current crisis or the laws and policies that have helped to underpin violence and oppression of the Rohingya.

It is essential, therefore, that the British government and the rest of the international community intervene to provide a combination of pressure where needed, and of assistance, both in terms of humanitarian assistance, and in terms of expertise, for instance relating to reforming laws to bring them into line with international law, and in terms of addressing issues of communal violence and tensions.

The current softly-softly approach being taken by the British government and others in the international community, whereby they seek to influence the government of Burma by ‘befriending’ them rather than applying pressure has demonstrably failed.

There is also a worrying narrative developing in some diplomatic circles that nothing can be done and the issue is too difficult to tackle. This is not only inaccurate but also an abrogation of their responsibilities under international law.

Recommendations to the British government and international community:

1. The British government and international community should increase humanitarian aid to assist Rohingya in Burma, both those who are in camps for the displaced and Rohingya still in their villages. Assistance should also be provided to Rohingya in Bangladesh.
2. The European Union should not lift sanctions against Burma. In its Conclusions of 26th April 2012 the EU Foreign Affairs Council stated that in return for the suspension of sanctions it expected progress in a number of areas including: “addressing the status and improving the welfare of the Rohingyas.” This benchmark has clearly not been met, and in fact the status and welfare of the Rohingya has dramatically worsened in the past year. During his visit to Europe, President Thein Sein said he has ‘no plans’ to revise the 1982 Citizenship Law, stating ‘the law intends to protect the nation’. The EU should roll-over the suspension of sanctions until its own benchmarks have been met.
3. The British government should withdraw the invitation to President Thein Sein to visit the UK. To give President Thein Sein the reward of a high profile visit to the UK at a time when effective ethnic cleansing is taking place in Burma will encourage him to continue to believe he can break international law with impunity.
4. The British government should work with other countries to make a formal complaint about the situation of the Rohingya via the Human Rights Council’s complaints procedures.
5. The British government should ask the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child to request from Burma information relevant to the implementation of Article 7 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, relating to the 1982 Citizenship Law.
6. The British government should work to ensure that the Human Rights Council and UN General Assembly set timelines and benchmarks for

progress in resolutions on Burma. These should include humanitarian access and reform or repeal of the Citizenship Law.

7. Britain, the USA and other countries with relevant experience should share knowledge and skills from their own countries in tackling prejudice and communal tensions.
8. There should be a significant increase in the number of international observers on the ground, and they should provide regular reports to the UN Secretary General and Human Rights Council.
9. The British government and others should apply pressure on the government of Burma to ask Aung San Suu Kyi to visit Rakhine/Arakan state in order to try to help calm tensions.
10. Political parties involved in spreading racist and anti-Muslim information and inciting violence should not be eligible for participation in any capacity building or other kind of assistance being given by the international community.

Thanks to Aidan Ellis, Temple Garden Chambers, and Kirsty Sutherland, for the legal research and analysis in this paper.

Endnotes

1. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, p. 20.
2. In "A Comparative Vocabulary of Some of the Languages Spoken in the Burma Empire" (Asiatic Researches, 1799, p. 234), Francis Buchanan refers to a language "spoken by the Mohammedans, who have long settled in Arakan, and who call themselves Roonga".
3. Carl Grundy-Warrand and Elaine Wong, "Sanctuary Under a Plastic Sheet: The Unresolved Problem of Rohingya Refugees," IBRU Boundary and Security Bulletin, vol.5, no.3, Autumn 1997, pp. 79-91.
4. Human Rights Watch, "The Rohingya Muslims: Ending a Cycle of Exodus?", vol. 8, no. 8, September 1996.
5. BBC, "Q&A: Unrest in Burma's Rakhine State".
6. Amnesty International, "Myanmar: Abuses against Rohingya Erode Human Rights Progress", 19 July 2012; Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012.
7. Radio Netherlands Worldwide, "Myanmar moots camps, deportation as Rohingya 'solution,'" 12 July 2012.
8. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, p. 20.
9. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, p. 22.
10. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, pp. 28-29.

-
11. Amnesty International, "Myanmar: Abuses against Rohingya Erode Human Rights Progress", 19 July 2012.
 12. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, pp. 27-30.
 13. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, pp. 30-31.
 14. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, p. 44.
 15. Human Rights Watch, "The Government Could Have Stopped This", 1 August 2012, p. 43.
 16. The Myanmar National Human Rights Commission, "Statement No. (4/2012) of Myanmar National Human Rights Commission concerning incidents in Rakhine State in June 2012," *The New Light of Myanmar*, July 11, 2012.
 17. Myanmar Times, "Human Rights Body Cool on Truth Commission Proposal", Volume 32 Number 639, 13-19 August 2012
 18. Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, UN Doc A/67/383, 25 September 2012, para. 63.
 19. Ibid.
 20. BBC, "Displaced and Divided in Burma's Rakhine", 9 November 2012.
 21. BBC, "Burma: HRW Satellite Images 'Show Rakhine Destruction'", 27 October 2012.
 22. Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, UN Doc A/67/383, 25 September 2012, para. 64.
 23. Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, UN Doc A/67/383, 25 September 2012, para. 65.
 24. UN News, "Secretary-General Urges Swift Action by Myanmar Government to Stop Vigilante Attacks in Northern Rakhine", 25 October 2012.
 25. Interim Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc A/52/484, 16 October 1997, para. 140.
 26. Section 3 of the Burma Citizenship Law 1982, Pyithu Hluttaw Law No 4 of 1982, defines citizens as "nationals such as the Kachin, Kayak, Chin, Burman, Mon, Rakhine or Shan and ethnic groups as have settled in any of the territories...from a period anterior to 1185 BE 1823 AD".
 27. By section 4 of the Burma Citizenship Law 1982, the "Council of State may decide whether any ethnic group is national or not". In addition to those mentioned specifically in section 3, the Myanmar Government recognises 135 national races of Myanmar. The Rohingya are not amongst them: Amnesty International, Myanmar, *The Rohingya Minority: Fundamental Rights Denied*, May 2004, footnote 26.
 28. Ibid. at section 23.
 29. Interim Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc A/52/484, 16 October 1997, citing Decree No 3 relating to the citizenship law. The Union Citizenship Act itself was repealed by section 76 of the Burma Citizenship Law 1982.
 30. Amnesty International, Myanmar, *The Rohingya Minority: Fundamental Rights Denied*, May 2004, p. 9.
 31. Section 42 Burma Citizenship Law 1982.
 32. Cf Interim Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc A/52/484, 16 October 1997, para. 140.
 33. Article 15(1) of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.
 34. Article 7(1) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The same right is also protected by Article 24(3) of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, which Burma is not a party to.
 35. Burma became a party to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child on 15 July 1991.
 36. Article 7(2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
 37. Ibid.
 38. See in particular: Article 1(1) of the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness; The 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.
 39. Article 2. See also Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity".
 40. See for instance the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination Article 5(d)(iv) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2106 of 21 December 1965; Article 2(1) of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, and many regional human rights treaties including for example Article 2 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights.
-

-
41. Convention on the Rights of the Child Article 2(1). Further, Article 2(2) obliges the States Parties, including Burma, to “take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination”.
 42. Section 12(c).
 43. Interim Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc A/52/484, 16 October 1997, paras 131-133.
 44. UN Secretary-General, Report on the Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies, UN Doc S/2004/616, 23 August 2004, para. 6.
 45. UN General Assembly, Statement by Navanethem Pillay, High Commissioner for Human Rights, 24 September 2012.
 46. UN General Assembly Draft Resolution to adopt Declaration of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Rule of Law and the National and International Levels, UN Doc A/67/L.1, 19 September 2012, para. 5.
 47. Democratic Voice of Burma, “Suu Kyi to Head ‘Rule of Law’ Committee”, 8 August 2012.
 48. Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, UN Doc A/67/383, 25 September 2012, para. 75.
 49. Democratic Voice of Burma, “Gov’t Forms Commission to Investigate Arakan Violence”, 17 August 2012.
 50. Democratic Voice of Burma, “Gov’t Forms Commission to Investigate Arakan Violence”, 17 August 2012; Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, UN Doc A/67/383, 25 September 2012, para. 63.
 51. Democratic Voice of Burma, “Muslims Removed from Arakan Prove for Criticising Gov’t”, 8 November 2012.
 52. Report on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, prepared by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, UN Doc A/67/383, 25 September 2012, para. 63.
 53. Report of the independent expert to update the Set of principles to combat impunity, and Updated Set of principles for the protection and promotion of human rights through action to combat impunity, UN Doc A/CN.4/2005/102/Add.1, 8 February 2005.
 54. Updated Set of principles for the protection and promotion of human rights through action to combat impunity, Principle 2.
 55. Principle 3.
 56. Principle 4.
 57. Principle 5.
 58. Principle 7.
 59. Principle 35.
 60. Democratic Voice of Burma, “Gov’t Forms Commission to Investigate Arakan Violence”, 17 August 2012.
 61. Democratic Voice of Burma, “Gov’t Forms Commission to Investigate Arakan Violence”, 17 August 2012.
 62. 2005 World Summit Outcome, A/60/L.1, para. 138.
 63. 2005 World Summit Outcome, A/60/L.1, para. 139.
 64. UN Security Council Resolution 1674 (2006), S/RES/1674 (2006), 28 April 2006.
 65. UN Security Council Resolution 1970 (2011), S/RES/1970 (2011), 26 February 2011.
 66. IntLawGrrls, “U.N. Legal Counsel O’Brien on the rule of law, international criminal justice, responsibility to Protect”, 29 October 2012.

Published by Burma Campaign UK, 28 Charles Square, London N1 6HT
www.burmacampaign.org.uk info@burmacampaign.org.uk tel: 020 7324 4710



**for Human Rights, Democracy
& Development in Burma**