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Illegal Organ Trade

Organ Disease and Failure

Worldwide, an average of 79 people a day receive an organ transplant; however, 18 people a day will die due to the lack of donors according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The fact is organ disease and failure is a pressing health issue in our world today. The older people get the more chance of organ failure or disease. Connecting to that, the population of 45 years of age and over has risen to 45% (UN publication population); almost have the world’s population. With more seniors there is more risk in contracting these major health issues.
The Organ Trade

Some steal gold and gems, but others steal organs and sell them for a fortune. According to WHO (World Health Organization) “illegal organ trade occurs/happens when organs are removed from the body for the purpose of commercial transaction.” The Human Rights Commission has declared that selling of an organ for profit is illegal. Organ trade is a black market activity, and one of the biggest and most successful. The number of people in need of an organ has increased, to the point where there are not enough donors out there. Hence the black-market organ trade.

As you can see above, in just nine years the number of people who require organs has almost doubled. And those who are in desperate need for an organ will do desperate things. Such as buying a kidney from a complete stranger and not knowing where it came from. Organ trading and trafficking isn't just illegal, it also extremely dangerous—the chances of more harm to both the donor and the recipient increases significantly when an organ trafficker is involved.

Although the UN and WHO have been trying to end organ trafficking, others are trying to legalize it. Organ trade and trafficking creates between $600 million-$1.2 billion per year. Iran is the only country in the world that currently has no law against it and has legalized organ trade. “It is a contained and safe market within only Iran” says Iranian officials; and has created
over 20,000 jobs. Many countries such as India and China have tried numerous times to legalize the selling of organs.

On the other hand if countries legalize the selling of organs it will be create the market to be safer and healthier for those who chose to use it. It will urge countries to create a safe environment for the organ sellers. This would create jobs as well as safe lives. This topic is closely related in principle to the prostitution laws in Canada.

Research shows that illegal organ trade is spiking in numbers, with a report done by Global Financial Integrity (GFI), they estimating that the illegal organ trade will generate profits between $600 million and $1.2 billion dollars per year across many countries, including but not limited to...

- Pakistan
- India
- South Africa
- the Philippines
- Israel
- Colombia
- The Balkan Region
- Turkey
- Eastern Europe
- United States of America
- United Kingdom
• Macedonia

However, one of the main concerns of organ trading, is how to obtain the organs and unfortunately it hasn't been the safest and healthiest way. These traffickers target 'helpless' victims, like children, seniors, and disabled people. Many traffickers will use these people's weaknesses to their advantage. A 6 year-old boy in China is now permanently blind, due to organ trafficking. His eyes were ripped out of his sockets. He was later found on the ground with no eyes. The eyes were discovered and were missing their corneas. This six year old boy, went through so much trauma only for his corneas.

Questions to Consider
1. Do we legalize organ trade and create a safe market, were it is contained?
2. Do we completely create it illegal, due to the risk?
3. What are some positive/negative outcomes of organ trade?
4. Who can improve the organ market?
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**Syrian Refugee Crisis Spreads Instability in Middle Eastern Countries**

**Brief History**

After constant protests and violent confrontations, March 2011 marks the beginning of the Syrian Revolution which has been occurring for over two years. President Bashar Assad, who has been globally viewed as a dictator, has failed to hear the voices of his people. As a result, what first began as peaceful protests have quickly grown into powerful conflicts. What first started in the country as a peaceful movement, inspired by the events of Tunisia and Egypt has become the main issue of Syrian politics. Assad refused listen to the concerns of his people and resistance to rebuild Syrian politics, Damascus now faces major defections in the army. Latest reports indicate, that the country may indeed begin to come apart at its seams.

Because of the on-going problems in Syrian politics and the lack of reform by Bashar Assad, as well as the military, Damascus is facing increased sanctions from both the United States and EU. The people that were once supporting President Assad are beginning to realize that his decisions are not benefiting the people and are fleeing the country in ever-increasing numbers due to safety and stability. This issue is a major refugee crisis for the country’s neighbours such as Turkey, Lebanon, and Iraq, Iran, Jordan, and Egypt. Secretarian views between many Middle Eastern countries is one of the main reasons which ignited the Syrian conflict.
Faced with this reaction by the people, Bashar Assad continues to fail to bring reform to his country. Conditions in the country are beginning to become so wretched that the country could quickly descend into a state of anarchy and become a Middle Eastern version of Somalia. The latest events demonstrate that Damascus has little or no intention of changing its methods for dealing with protests.

**Tension with Neighbours**

**Turkey**

The Turkish government has been one of the most vocal criticizers of former Syrian President Bashar al-Assad since early on in the uprising. Ahmet Davutoglu, a Turkish Foreign Minister, told Turkey's Milliyet newspaper that the country was prepared to join an international alliance for action against Syria even in the lack of the agreement at the UN Security Council.

![Syrian Refugees have reached 1 million](image)

**Saudi Arabia & the Gulf**

The monarchies of the Gulf are said to have been key in funding and supplying the rebel forces fighting against forces loyal to President Assad. Saudi Arabia has been a rival of the Syrian government for years and has been particularly active in pushing for action against Mr. Assad, with former Saudi ambassador to Washington Prince Bandar bin Sultan reportedly trying in recent weeks to garner international support for further support for the rebels. Saudi and countries within the gulf such as Qatar have made it clear that they are not supporters of Assad. The main reason between their tension stems from a political and secretarian view.
Saudi Arabia and Qatar are both conservative countries which can also be referred to as “Sunni” which is a majority sect. The Syrian government is “Shia” which happens to be the minority of the country since the people of Syria are mainly Sunni.

**Israel**

Even though Israel has tried to avoid being a part of the conflict, Israel has carried out three strikes on targets in Syria this year, reportedly to avoid weapons shipments reaching the Lebanese Hezbollah militants, which has a close alliance with the Syrian government. Bombing and gunfire from Syria has also hit the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights, drawing return Israeli fire. Israeli’s fear is instability and an unfriendly regime in Damascus. Furthermore, Israeli officials have condemned the supposed use of chemical weapons by Syrian forces and have vaguely hinted at support for military action. “Our finger must always be on the pulse. Ours is a responsible finger and if necessary, it will also be on the trigger,” Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said.

However, Israeli officials will be aware that any Western action against Syria risks a repeat of events in the first Gulf War in 1991, when Iraq attacked Tel Aviv with Scud missiles in attempt to draw Israel into the conflict and prompt the withdrawal of Arab countries from the war. Reports say sales of gas masks in Israel have risen in response to speculation over military action.

**Lebanon**

Adnan Mansour Lebanese Foreign Minister told a Lebanese radio that he did not support the idea of strikes on Syria, saying: “I don’t think this action would serve peace, stability and security in the region.”

Two bomb attacks in Syria almost killed 60 people in Lebanon in August of 2013 were connected to tensions over the Syrian conflict. The Lebanese Shia militant movement Hezbollah has openly taken part in battle in Syria on the side of the government since Syria’s government is Shia and they share the same views as Hezbollah. Although, there have been reports of some in the Sunni community fighting on the side of the rebels. In addition, the country is already playing host to the largest number of Syrian refugees of any country.
Jordan
Mohammad Momani, an Information Minister told a news agency (AFP) that Jordan would not be used as “a launch-pad” for any military action against Syria.

“Jordan renews its calls for a political solution in Syria and urges the international community to intensify efforts to reach such a solution,” he said. “Jordan's armed forces are capable of defending the country.” Senior military officials from Western and Middle Eastern countries have met in Jordan to deliberate possible military intervention scenarios. Jordan is currently home to half a million Syrian refugees.

Iran
Iran has been Syria's main supporter in the region well before the current conflict and has also been extremely critical of any stance of a possible intervention. This has warned a top UN official visiting Tehran of “serious consequences” of any military action. Foreign ministry spokesman Abbas Araqchi also repeated claims that it was in fact rebels who used chemical weapons, AFP reports.

Iraq
Iraq has not been as critical of Syria as some other Arab countries and will also be concerned at the effect that any escalation in Syria could have on increasing sectarian violence, and they have made it clear that they want a mutual and peaceful solution to the conflict

“We have been against any military action, and we are hoping for a peaceful political solution to the crisis,” said Ali al-Musawi, media adviser to Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki.

Egypt
In June 2013 Egypt's former President Mohammed Morsi cut off relations with Syria and called for a no-fly zone. Nevertheless, after Mr. Morsi was removed from office by the army, the new authorities have taken an additional cautious stance. Egypt's short-term Foreign Minister Nabil Fahmy has said that “there is no military solution to the Syrian crisis, and the solution must be a political solution”.

11
Russia

On the topic of military intervention in Syria, Russian Foreign Minister, Sergei Lavrov said “A large contingent of Russian troops would not be necessary - rather a small detachment of observers would suffice.”

Lavrov suggested that Arab states and Turkey could be part of the monitoring mission.
In the same interview, Mr. Lavrov accused the US, Britain and France of being “blinded” by their objective of regime change in Syria.

He also mentioned that western countries were threatening to stop work on Syria's chemical nuclear disarmament deal unless Russia supported a UN resolution permitting military action against the government of President Bashar al-Assad.

Russia, which is a key ally of the Syrian government, has blocked previous similar resolutions in the Security Council.

Mr. Lavrov said the OPCW (Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons) was “about to make a decision” on Syria but the progression had been placed in danger by the “arrogant position of some Western partners.”

“Our American partners are beginning to blackmail us,” he said. The US, Britain and France should, he argued, be concentrated instead on the “unique opportunity” to solve the problem of Syria's chemical weapons.

Conclusion

Due to Syria’s war well into its third year, the number of Syrian children forced to flee their homeland as refugees has now reached one million. Children make up half of all refugees from the Syrian conflict, according to two agencies (UNHCR and UNICEF). Most have arrived in Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Iraq and Egypt. Increasingly, Syrians are fleeing to North Africa and Europe. Latest data show that more than 768,000 Syrian child refugees are under the age of 11. Though intensified efforts are needed to find a political and peaceful solution to the crisis in Syria, parties opposed against a solution to the conflict must stop targeting civilians and come
to an end of recruiting children. Children and their families must be safe to leave Syria and borders must remain open so they can cross to safety.

In conclusion due to constant bloodshed and disagreement between both groups Shia Muslims (Government) and Sunni Muslims (The people) as well as damaging alliances formed with the Syrian government, the US and its allies are considering military action against sites in Syria.
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Closure Of Guantanamo Bay

Introduction

Several states and international organisations have opined that both the fact of the detention and the conditions of detention are in breach of international humanitarian law and international criminal law. Not only did the U.S fail to recognise the prisoner of war (POW) status of the detainees, including former members of the armed forces of Afghanistan, but it has emerged that the detainees have been subject to cruel and inhumane treatment possibly amounting to torture. The Guantanamo Bay detention camp is a detainment and interrogation facility of the United States military, located within the Guantánamo Bay Naval Base in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba (Vogol).

The facility was established in January 2002 by the U.S Administration of George Bush to hold detainees determined to be connected with U.S opponents in the Global War against Terror, in Afghanistan, Iraq, parts of Africa and Southeast Asia. The Guantánamo Bay detention camp is operated by the Joint Task Force Guantánamo (JTF-GTMO) of the United States government. Acting on the advice of the United States Office of Legal Counsel- Department of Justice that the Guantánamo Bay detention camp could be considered outside United States legal jurisdiction, the Bush administration declared that the detainees were not entitled to any of the protections of the Geneva Conventions by classifying them as ‘enemy combatants’ rather than ‘prisoners of war’ and directed the military guards to take the first twenty captives to Guantánamo on the 11th of January, 2002. As a consequence of the attacks of September 11, 2001 on the Twin Towers and Pentagon in the United States of America, hundreds of people
detained by the U.S in the context of the ‘Global War on Terror’ declared by the U.S, have been incarcerated at the Guantanamo Bay Naval Station in Cuba since January of 2002. The possible indefinite detention without trial at a naval base not on the territory of, or within the jurisdiction of the US of both persons detained in the context of an armed conflict and alleged terrorists, has been the subject of controversy, not least because of the secrecy of which the situation is being handled, which has made monitoring of the conditions of the detainees extremely difficult.

**Legal Status of Guantanamo**

The US Supreme Court, in four important decisions—*Rasul v. Bush, Boumediene v. Bush, Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, and Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* (which declared that the Federal courts have jurisdiction and that detainees were entitled to the minimal protections listed under Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions), declared that international laws apply to Guantanamo detainees, they cannot be held indefinitely without trial, that constitutional habeas corpus—the right of a person to challenge the legality of his or her imprisonment before a court—protections apply to them, and that the combatant status review hearings were unconstitutional and violated the Geneva Conventions. Yet Congress and the executive branch have, through policy and legislation, actively avoided the implementation of these decisions.

The U.S. has also been chastised repeatedly by other states and the United Nations and its human rights organs that its interpretation of the laws of war concerning the detainees is wrong and against international consensus. Since 2002, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States has issued and re-extended
precautionary measures against the United States (equivalent of domestic law injunctive orders), requesting that the United States take urgent measures necessary to have the legal status of the detainees determined by a ‘competent tribunal’.

Criticisms/ US Plans and Response

Since the establishment of the detention camp, there has been harsh criticism worldwide including from human rights organization for the American practice of detaining prisoners without trial, allegations of torture, and none of the prisoners were allowed to meet with attorneys. Critics argued that due process is one of the great aspects of American democracy and these prisoners have a right to fair trials.

In late 2002, a campaign began in earnest to permanently shut down Guantanamo. The individual most responsible for launching this campaign was Michael Ratner, President of the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR). Other organizations followed the lead of Ratner and CCR in condemning the Guantanamo detention center. These critics objected to America’s use of an offshore prison, and to the unclear legal status of its detainees, who are classified as “illegal combatants” not entitled to Geneva Convention protections, rather than as prisoners-of-war or common criminals.

Critics of U.S. policy say the government has violated the Conventions in attempting to create a distinction between ‘prisoners of war’ and ‘illegal combatants’, while the supporters of the
detention argue that trial review of detentions has never been given to prisoners of war, and that it is reasonable for enemy combatants to be detained until hostilities end.

Prominent members of the Democratic Party have also been among the leading critics of Guantanamo. On June 14, 2005, Senator Richard Durbin went to the floor of the Senate and compared American interrogation techniques in Guantanamo to methods used by some of the most brutal oppressive regimes in history. After reading an account which claimed that detainees were being held in rooms that were either too cold or too hot, and where loud rap music was being played, Durbin said:

“If I read this to you and did not tell you that it was an FBI agent describing what Americans had done to prisoners in their control, you would most certainly believe this must have been done by Nazis, Soviets in their gulags, or some mad regime -- Pol Pot or others -- that had no concern for human beings. Sadly, that is not the case. This was the action of Americans in the treatment of their prisoners.”

On April 2007 Senator Hillary Clinton called for the closure of the detention center, stating:

“Guantanamo has become associated in the eyes of the world with a discredited administration policy of abuse, secrecy, and contempt for the rule of law. Rather than keeping us more secure, keeping Guantanamo open is harming our national interests.”

The issue is one that not only has legal implications but deals with Human Rights issues. The status of the detention camps is said to be unclear and may be against Human Rights and democratic ethics and laws.

Since the start of the “War against Terror” declared by the Bush administration following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States’ practices for combating terrorism have been subject to exhaustive moral, judicial and political debate. Especially, the Guantanamo Bay detention camp has raised further, vast human rights concerns. There have been allegations of torture, including sleep deprivation, the use of so-called truth drugs, beatings, locking in confined and cold cells, being forced to maintain uncomfortable postures, and the worst being waterboarding. Waterboarding is a form of torture in which water is poured over a cloth covering the face and breathing passages of an immobilized individual lying on an incline with the individuals feet elevated, this causes the individual to experience the sensation of drowning. Waterboarding can cause extreme pain, lung damage, brain damage from oxygen deprivation,
and other physical injuries including broken bones due to struggling against restraints, lasting psychological damage, and death.

Amnesty International and the UN have called the situation a ‘human rights scandal’ on a number of occasions and members of the European Union (EU), Organization of American States (OAS), and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) have protested the legal status and physical condition of the detainees, so much that on February 15, 2006 the UN called upon the U.S. to either release all suspected terrorists or to charge them to court.

European leaders are also not left out; they have expressed their feelings of opposition to the detention center on different occasion, and as was expected the European Parliament voted overwhelmingly in support of a motion urging the United States to close the camp in June 2006.

The Bush Administration had expressed their desire to eventually shut down Guantanamo but never did. On the 22nd of January, 2009, President Obama signed three executive orders, one of which states that the detention facility at Guantanamo “shall be closed as soon as practicable as and no later than one year from the date of this order.” The order also requires a review of all Guantanamo detentions and of conditions of detention and a halt to military commission proceedings. On the 21st of May of the same year, in a major speech on national security, President Obama restates his commitment to closing Guantanamo.
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**Genocides in Burma**

**Introduction**

Located in Southeast Asia, the sovereign state of Myanmar, formerly known as Burma, is the place of residence to over 48 million people (CIA Factbook, 2013), making it the 24th most populous country in the world. While a majority of the estimate may call Myanmar home, a surprising portion of this number can say the least. Myanmar’s post independence history has been marked by numerous struggles for ethnic autonomy. While 89% of Myanmar’s population identifies as practicing Buddhism, the country is ethno-religiously diverse, including groups of Christians (4%), Muslims (4%), Hindus (1%), and practitioners of traditional Chinese and indigenous religions (2%) (CIA Factbook, 2013), with significant correlation between ethnicity and religion. Persistent civil wars in the surrounding areas in the ethnically Burman central districts as the result of the internal ethno-religious conflict have been an occurrence in Myanmar since 1948. As a result, Myanmar’s long-lived ethno-religious conflict has been recognized as the world’s longest running civil war.

Prior to its recent transition to democracy in 2011 (BBC News, 2013), Burma was ruled by a highly authoritarian military regime implemented by General Ne Win in 1962. In a coup led by General Win, the civilian-elected government was overthrown and replaced with a repressive military government, controlled by the majority Burman ethnic group (United States Department of State, 2004). Despite the country’s ethno-religious diversity, the Burmese government has imposed restrictions on certain religious activities, and promoted Buddhism over other religions in some ethnic minority areas, most notably with the Rohingya Muslims of Burma.

Residing in Rakhine state, the Rohingyas live among the ethnic Rakhine Buddhist majority. The Rohingyas are a Muslim group of approximately 729,000 (United Nations, 2009) who are believed to have travelled and settled there more than 1,000 years ago. Despite this, under Myanmar's constitution the Rohingya are not classified as one of the 135 legally recognized ethnic minority groups that hold Myanmar citizenship, and are thus deemed as illegal immigrants from Bangladesh (BBC News, 2009).
Bangladesh however also does not recognize the Rohingya as their citizens, in effect making the Rohingyas legally stateless (Nawoyski, 2013). The United Nations have acknowledged the numerous human rights violations by the Myanmar Government and have called on the Burmese Government to “put an end to violations of international human rights and humanitarian law” (FIDH, 2009).

**Background**

**Burmese Independence**

Burma was granted conditional independence in 1948 by Britain, providing they guaranteed equal treatment to all ethnic nationalities as stated in the 1947 constitution, which contained a right to secession for the Shan and Karen states, unless otherwise stated, after 10 years of the country’s independence (Yawnghwe 2001).
**Rohingya Conflicts in Rakhine State**

Rakhine State (formerly known as Arkan State) is located on the west coast of Burma, bordered by Bangladesh to the North West. The initial conflict within Rakhine State commenced in 1947, with the onset of the Mujahideen Movements (1947 and 1961), intending to annex the Mayu frontier of Arakan to what is present day Bangladesh. However, due to failed negotiations between Burma and Pakistan, the Mujahedeen surrendered on two separate occasions in 1957, and 1961 respectively (Yegar, 2002).

**Coup D'Etat**

Following the instatement of General Win’s new regime, the constitutional agreement to allow the ethnic minorities to secede was nullified (Yawnghwe 2001). Since then, numerous secessionist movements have fought the Burmese Army, including those of Christian and Muslim origin.

**Rohingya Islamist Movement**

In 1978, General Win implemented a government campaign to check illegal immigrants residing in Burma in attempts to isolate Mujahid rebels in the area. As a result, approximately 200,000 to 250,000 Rohingyas crossed the border to Bangladesh as refugees (Lintner, 2001) and many were recruited by the *Rohingya Solidarity Organization* (RSO), a human rights political organization for the people of Rakhine State. In effect, the expansion led the Burmese government to launch a massive counter-offensive to clear up the Burma-Bangladesh border. In December 1991, Burmese troops crossed the border and attacked a Bangladeshi military outpost. This incident caused tension in Bangladesh-Burma relations, and by April 1992, more than 250,000 Rohingya civilians had been forced out of Rakhine State (Lintner, 2001).

**Current Situation**

Myanmar is currently in a period of democratic transition. In attempts to rebuild itself from the fifty years of military rule, the reduction in social controls has led to an increase in ethnic tensions, primarily between the Rakhine Buddhists and the Rohingya Muslims.
Buddhist-Muslim Tensions

Myanmar’s antidiscrimination laws do not apply to ethnic groups not formally recognized under their 1982 Citizenship Law, as is the case with the Rohingyas. The U.S. Burma 2012 International Religious Freedom Report stated that, there were reports of abuse and discrimination based on religious affiliation, belief, or practice. A driving force in the social tension between the Buddhist majority and the Christian and Muslim minorities is the government’s preferential treatment for Buddhists, as Muslims in Rakhine State continue to encounter severe forms of legal, economic, educational, and social discrimination (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, 2012). Religious freedom for Muslims is reduced. The Burmese government censors all publications (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, 2001), including those of religious text, thus undermining the free exchange of thoughts and ideas associated with religious activities.

2000-Present Day

Riots between Buddhist and Muslim Burmese have broken out on numerous accounts, including the 2001 Anti-Muslim Riots in Taungoo, in which Buddhist monks demanded that the Hantha Mosque in Taungoo be destroyed in retaliation for the destruction of the Buddhas of Bamiyan in Afghanistan, and the widely publicized 2012 Arakan State Riots; a series of conflicts involving the Rakhine Buddhists and Rohingya Muslims in northern Rakhine State, triggered by the rape and murder of a Buddhist woman by three Muslim men.
The Burmese Government declared a state of emergency on the town of Meiktila from March 2013 to July 2013 (Press TV, 2013), following an outbreak of communal violence among the Buddhist Rakhine, Muslim Rakhine, and Muslim Rohingya. As of January 2013, of those still residing in Myanmar, 430,400 Burmese claim to be internally displaced persons and 808,075 claim to be stateless persons while 415,343 refugees, 25,621 asylum seekers, and 430,400 IDPS are said to have originated from Myanmar (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2013).

**Human Rights Violations**

Despite the enforcement of democratic reforms over past last two years, the Myanmar majority continues to undertake ethnic wars on minority groups. According to the United Nations, the Rohingyas have become one of the most oppressed ethnic groups in the world. (Sutton, 2013). Because of their ongoing wars against minorities, Genocide Watch has kept Myanmar at a Stage 7, of the 8 stages of genocide. (Stanton, 1998)

**Issues of Citizenship**

Due to Myanmar’s Citizenship Law, implemented by General Ne Win in 1982, Rohingya civil rights are severely reprimanded. The Rohingya are denied civil rights in Myanmar without proper citizenship. Identification cards are refused to the Rohingya, cards that are necessary to travel, obtain passports, and enroll in higher education. They are denied land and property rights and ownership. The land on which they live can be taken away at any time. They are barred from government employment, and have marriage restrictions imposed on them – to a limit of two children per couple. Due to their dehumanization and persecution in Myanmar, many Rohingya attempt to flee to Bangladesh or Malaysia in boats, but are not accorded the rights of refugees in those countries.

Myanmar’s Citizenship Law is not compatible with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states in Article 15:

1. *Everyone has the right to a nationality.*
2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality (United Nations, 1948)

Rights of the Child

More than 40,000 Rohingya children in western Myanmar are deprived of rights to travel, to go to school, or to marry in the future, because their parents had an unauthorized marriage or exceeded the two-child limit the Myanmar government had imposed on the Rohingya. These children are refused birth registration, and so are not included in the family lists and must be hidden during the authorities' population checks. (Nawoyski, 2013)

The Citizenship Law also violates the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child, to which it is a signatory (United Nations Treaty Collection, 2013). Article 7 of this Convention states:

1. The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name, the right to acquire a nationality and, as far as possible, the right to know and be cared for by his or her parents.

2. States Parties shall ensure the implementation of these rights in accordance with their national law and their obligations under the relevant international instruments in this field, in particular where the child would otherwise be stateless (United Nations Human Rights, 1989).

UN Involvement

In June 2012, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) led the humanitarian response to the refugees from Rakhine State in four sectors: protection, shelter, camp coordination and camp management (CCCM) and non-food items (NFIs). UNHCR also plans to assist those without citizenship in other parts of Myanmar, with intentions to conduct the first national census in 31 years (to be implemented in 2014) that will serve as an important source of information.

As of 2013, UNHCR predicts a continuing need to assist approximately 800,000 residents of Rakhine State without citizenship (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2013).
The Office of the UNHCR said it is delivering aid to the more than 30,000 people that were affected by the violence (UN News Centre July 27, 2012).

Regarding the issue of Human Rights in Myanmar, Navi Pillay, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, is quoted as saying, “the Government has a responsibility to prevent and punish violent acts, irrespective of which ethnic or religious group is responsible, without discrimination and in accordance with the rule of law” (2013).
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