

**The Sociological Dynamics of Statelessness:
Case analysis of the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar**

Major Research Paper

Submitted to the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies
Master of Arts in Sociology

By Amina Haq

Presented to Professors José López and Philippe Couton

University of Ottawa

April 2018

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgments.....	4
Introduction.....	5 – 7
Context.....	7 – 12
What is statelessness?	13
What are the causes of statelessness?	14 – 15
The stateless Rohingyas.....	15 – 17
Impacts of statelessness for the Rohingyas.....	17 – 19
Literature Review.....	19
A historical, legal, and political overview of statelessness.....	20 – 23
Nationality and Citizenship.....	23 – 25
Loss of nationality due to deprivation on discriminatory grounds.....	25 – 30
Statement of the Problem.....	30
Theoretical Framework.....	31 – 36
Methodology.....	36 – 38
Findings.....	38 – 39
Discussion.....	39 – 57
Conclusion.....	57 – 58
Bibliography.....	59 – 67

Abstract:

The Rohingya Muslims, an ethnic minority from the Rakhine State of Myanmar have been subjected to countless human rights injustices. They are not considered citizens nor nationals of a State, and as a result have been rendered stateless. With the continuous violence in Myanmar, the Rohingyas have not only become victims of widespread discrimination and mistreatment, they are also gradually being annihilated. Using Christopher Powell's conceptualizations of the 'genos' and the idea of a barbaric civilization, a sociological approach to the contemporary statelessness of the Rohingyas is explored.

Acknowledgements:

First and foremost, I must extend my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. José López for the consistent support throughout this whole writing process. Without his expertise, patience and guidance, this would not have been possible.

Finally, I must express my profound gratitude to my family and friends for providing me with endless support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them.

Introduction:

There are many individuals and communities around the world that have been, and are, subjected to unwarranted conflicts that have resulted in forced migration and displacement causing statelessness. In most cases, the conflicts are state-induced violence due to ethnic-religious positions, which result in the stateless individuals becoming susceptible to human rights violations, socio-economic marginalization, exclusion, and even genocide. These individuals are forced to flee to neighbouring countries and live in abhorrent conditions without adequate access to healthcare, education, and face a future with little hope and uncertainty. And although recognition of nationality is vital to a host of other human rights, individuals without citizenship are vulnerable to exploitation and countless injustices. This is particularly true for the ethnic Rohingya Muslims who have been discriminated and persecuted against for decades and are now considered stateless.

The Rohingyas are a Muslim minority in the Buddhist majority country of Myanmar, which was previously known as Burma. When the Union of Burma became independent in 1948, it implemented an exclusionary definition of citizenship (Albert, 2017). The Government of Myanmar passed a Citizenship Act in 1982 which denied citizenship status to the Rohingyas (Albert, 2017). And although Myanmar has about 135 different legally recognized ethnicities, the Rohingyas have never been and still are not recognized as one of them (Albert, 2017). The government considers the Rohingyas illegal immigrants or “Bengali’s” even though they have lived in the country for generations (Gade & Gecker, 2015, p. 2). It is claimed that the Rohingyas either migrated illegally from Bangladesh or came as refugees during the 1971 Bangladesh war

on Independence (Jahan, 2014, p. 26). As a result, the government of Myanmar has been refusing to acknowledge the Muslim Rohingyas by denying them citizenship and depriving them of basic human rights, rendering them stateless.

With the prominent violence in Myanmar, the Rohingyas have become victims of widespread discrimination and mistreatment and are now gradually being annihilated. The purpose of this research paper is to conduct a sociological analysis that may be able shed some light on the issue of statelessness by examining the case of the Rohingya Muslims. Using Christopher Powell's sociological understandings and his contributions to the contemporary debates on genocide, this research paper will analyse news articles and historical events to draw the attention on some sociological insights into the situation of the Rohingyas.

To better understand the underpinnings of this study, this research paper will be divided into various subdivisions. To start, it will provide a synopsis of the Rohingya crisis and examine the concept of genocide by applying it to Gregory Stanton's list of the ten stages of genocide to illustrate how it relates to the mass extermination occurring in Myanmar. This will be followed by some brief sections to clarify the meaning of statelessness in relation to the objective of this research paper, the various causes of statelessness, and the impact that statelessness has on the Rohingyas. Next, the literature review will provide an overview of academic literature addressing the question of statelessness. This will be followed by an outline of the research question that will help identify the purpose of this particular research study. The theoretical framework section will illustrate how Christopher Powell's concerns with understanding what sociology can contribute to the contemporary debates on genocide will be examined using his idea of the "genos" and the concept of a barbaric civilization. This will be followed by the

methodology section that will describe the actions taken to investigate the research problem and depict the techniques used to identify, select, and analyze various credible newspaper articles and other academic sources. The findings section will present a summary of the results by exploring the methodologies used for the research study, while the discussion section will analyze the findings from the newspaper articles and academic sources using Christopher Powell's ideological framework. And finally, the conclusion will provide closing remarks.

Context:

According to the United Nations the Rohingyas are among “the most persecuted minorities in the world” (McLaughlin, n.d.). The Rohingyas are a Muslim minority in Myanmar who have endured countless dehumanizing acts against them. They have been “subject to persecution, discrimination, extortion, restriction of movement, land confiscation,” and denied legal human rights (Zawacki, 2012, p. 19). Myanmar's attempt to destroy the minority Muslim group have rendered the Rohingyas stateless, depriving them of nationality and citizenship. In addition, numerous scholars have described the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar as genocide, which is considered a crime under international law (Zarni & Cowley, 2014, p. 686). Raphaël Lemkin coined the term “genocide” in 1943 and advocated for a Genocide Convention. He stated:

By “genocide” we mean the destruction of a nation or of an ethnic group. Generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundation of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the

groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in the individual capacity, but as members of the national group (Lemkin in Powell, 2011, p. 316).

Shortly after, genocide was defined by Article 2 of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide as “any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group” (United Nations Human Rights: Office of the High Commissioner, 2018).

Additionally, the term genocide has been used in relation to the issue in Myanmar by Professor William Schabas, a member of the International Association of Genocide Scholars. In the documentary entitled “The Hidden Genocide” he states:

[I]n the case of the Rohingya we’re moving into a zone where the word can be used. When you see measures preventing births, trying to deny the identity of a people, hoping to see that they really are eventually –that they no longer exist –denying their

history, denying the legitimacy of their right to live where they live, these are all warning signs that mean that it's not frivolous to envisage the use of the term genocide (Schabas in Zawacki, 2012, p. 21).

It is important to acknowledge and understand the repercussions that genocides have in order to resolve conflicts and prevent future genocides from occurring. Gregory Stanton, the president of Genocide Watch created a list of the "Ten Stages of Genocide" which include: classification, symbolization, discrimination, dehumanization, organization, polarization, preparation, persecution, extermination, and denial (Stanton, 2013). The stages of genocide are clearly evident in the case of the Rohingya crisis. For instance, since the Rohingyas have been *classified* as "other" by the Genocide Watch metric as they have been marginalized due to their Muslim religion and their ethnicity in comparison to the dominant Burmese population in Myanmar (Genocide Watch, 2013). The individuals who are attempting to disparage the Rohingyas' identity often refer to them as "Bengalis," a *symbolic* word that the Rohingyas have rejected as the term is commonly used by Myanmar government officials to implicitly infer that the group are illegal immigrants (Nai, 2013). The Rohingyas have rejected registering as "Bengalis" and consequently, many have been detained. *Discrimination* against the Rohingyas is indisputable as they are not legally recognized as citizens and as a result their rights have been infringed upon. Benjamin Zawacki further highlights the issue of discrimination in his article, "Defining Myanmar's "Rohingya Problem" by stating that the violent events that have occurred in Myanmar can be attributed to the systematic discrimination against the Rohingya's through the "political, social, and economic system –manifested in law, policy, and practice –designated to discriminate against the ethnic and religious minority" (Zawacki, 2012, p. 18). In addition, he

states that “in Myanmar, a kind of circularity exists whereby systematic discrimination renders the Rohingyas stateless, while their status as a stateless population acts as validation for further discrimination and persecution by the state and its citizens” (Zawacki, 2012, p. 19).

The Rohingyas have also been *dehumanized* by being forced to live in “apartheid-like conditions” including ethnic enclaves with curfews and other restrictions on their freedom (Holtz, 2017, p. 1). The Myanmar government implemented policies and practices to restrict the Rohingyas’ freedom of movement making health care and education inaccessible to the vulnerable stateless individuals and enforcing legal restrictions on their right to marry and the number of children they can bear (Holtz, 2017, p. 1). As a result, it is evident that the Rohingyas have been treated as though they are an invasive species or an epidemic by the majority Burmese population in Myanmar (Ibrahim, 2017). Azeem Ibrahim from the Center for Global Policy and the author of “The Rohingyas: Inside Myanmar’s Hidden Genocide” states that “extremist Buddhist monks have been preaching that the Rohingya are reincarnated from snakes and insects and killing them would not be a crime against humanity, they say –it would be more like pest control” (Ibrahim, 2017). In addition, he states that “the Rohingya are supposed to be agents of a global Islamist conspiracy to take over the world and forcibly instate a global caliphate and the duty of any good Buddhist who wants to maintain the national and religious character of Myanmar is to prevent the Islamist takeover, and thus to help remove the threat posed by the “vermin,”” further adding to the notion of dehumanizing the Rohingyas (Ibrahim, 2017).

The Rohingyas have been subjected to violence that has been clearly *organized* by “Burmese officials, community leaders, and Buddhist monks that have been backed by state

security forces to conduct coordinated attacks on Muslim neighbourhoods and villages to terrorize and forcibly relocate the population” (Human Rights Watch, 2018). In the case of the Rohingyas, *polarization* is also evident as the violence against them has been heightened since the recent incident of a Rohingya being accused of raping a Buddhist woman in the Rakhine state (Gamez & van Waas, 2017, p. 14). This occurrence sparked ethnic hatred in Myanmar, and the government has essentially turned a blind eye to the wave of violence in the country. Additionally, it is claimed that “internal Myanmar government documents, and anti-Rohingya propaganda flyers produced by Rakhine monks and politicians” have further added to the intent of destroying the group as a whole (Lowenstein, 2015). In Myanmar, the *preparation* stage is in progress as Rohingyas are facing communal violence and human rights violations (Zawacki, 2012, p. 18). “The Myanmar army committed widespread killings and rapes of Rohingya civilians” which has resulted in the exodus of hundreds of thousands of Rohingyas to neighbouring countries (Zawacki, 2012, p. 18). The Rohingyas are now helpless as they lack necessary resources for survival and are “forced to live as undocumented migrants, vulnerable to ill health, exploitation, and abuse” (Robinson & Rahman, n.d., p. 17). The *persecution* against the Rohingyas is apparent as they are forced to flee their homes and are denied basic human rights. Furthermore, Amnesty International has stated that government security forces have been involved in the violence, which includes killings, rape and physical abuse against the Rohingyas (Robinson & Rahman, n.d., p. 16).

The *extermination* of the Rohingya civilians in Myanmar is undeniable as they have been forced to flee to neighbouring countries since being faced with “extrajudicial killings, rape, and other atrocities” (Holtz, 2017, p. 1). As *denial* is the final “stage” of genocide, it is interesting to

note that “a report by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights stated in 2016 that violations of the human rights of the Rohingya Muslims suggest “the possible commission of crimes against humanity, if established by a court of law” (Shivakoti, 2017, p. 1). In addition, to further validate the final stage of genocide, a critical report by the International State Crime Initiative concluded that “the Rohingya face the final stages of genocide” (Shivakoti, 2017, p. 1).

As a result of the Rohingyas enduring severe injustices, maltreatment and persecution, it is important to examine who is responsible for protecting the Rohingyas. The Responsibility to Protect doctrine was adopted by the UN member states at the 2005 UN World Summit which was triggered after the atrocities of the Rwandan Genocide (Robinson & Rahman, n.d., p. 17). The three guiding principles of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine include: “the State carries the primary responsibility for the protection of populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing; the international community has a responsibility to assist States in fulfilling this responsibility; the international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes. If a state fails to protect its populations or is in fact the perpetrator of crimes, the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council” (Robinson & Rahman, n.d., p. 18). However, despite the doctrine being adopted by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) member states, “it has not been welcomed in Asia, nor has its application been seriously considered” especially in the case of the case of the Rohingyas in Myanmar who have now become stateless (Robinson & Rahman, n.d., p. 18).

What is Statelessness?

With an estimated 11 – 15 million stateless individuals living worldwide, it is essential to understand the particulars of statelessness (Goris et al., 2009, p. 4). Not only is it difficult to document and collect reliable statistics on stateless individuals, it is also challenging to ascertain whom to include as stateless (Goris et al., 2009, p. 4). It has been argued that individuals who are *de jure* (legally) stateless based on Article 1 of the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons which defines a stateless person as “someone who is not considered as a national by any State under the operation of its law,” should be counted (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, n.d.). However, because there are millions of individuals who have not been formally denied or deprived of nationality but are unable to prove their nationality, they are left vulnerable and incapable of obtaining basic human rights such as the right to education, health care, employment, and equality before the law (Goris et al., 2009, p. 4). These particular individuals are considered “*de facto* stateless – that is, stateless in practice, if not in law – or cannot rely on the state of which they are citizens for protection” (Goris et al., 2009, p. 4). In addition, the two main principles for granting citizenship at the time of birth are *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis* (Goris et al., 2009, p. 4). *Jus soli* translates to the ‘law of the soil’ and means that individuals “born in the territory of a country have the right to citizenship of that country,” while *jus sanguinis* translates to the ‘law of the blood,’ which “confers citizenship on children whose parents are citizens of a given country” (Goris et al., 2009, p. 4). However, with that being said, in order to determine if an individual is considered a national by a state based on the operation of its law, an analysis of how a State employs, practices and interprets its nationality laws upon individuals must be acknowledged.

What are the causes of statelessness?

There are many circumstances that can cause an individual to become stateless. “States may simply cease to exist while individuals fail to get citizenship in their successor states; political considerations may dictate changes in the way that citizenship laws are applied; an ethnic minority may be persecuted by being denied citizenship; or a group may live in frontier areas and frequently cross borders, causing states on both sides of the border to deny them citizenship” (Goris et al., 2009, p. 5). Climate change can also cause statelessness. Small islands and poor countries with inadequate infrastructure may be absorbed by the sea and/or natural disasters may leave individuals and entire populations stateless (Goris et al., 2009, p. 5). In addition, statelessness can ensue due to legal differences between countries, individuals renouncing one nationality without acquiring another, and failing to or being unable to register a child’s birth (Goris et al., 2009, p. 5). Another cause of statelessness is discrimination. Statelessness can occur as a result of direct discrimination, by mistreating an individual based on one or more “protected characteristics” such as their gender, race, and/or ethnicity (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 56). Gender discrimination is evident in many countries due to the absence of gender-neutral citizenship laws. As a result, in some countries, women who marry foreigners lose their citizenship upon marriage and are unable to pass their citizenship to their children (Goris et al., 2009, p. 5). State succession is another cause of statelessness, and although it has been viewed as a ‘technical’ cause of statelessness, further analysis reveals that discrimination plays a significant role (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 56). However, despite all the difficult and unjust circumstances that cause statelessness, one of the main reasons people are denied or deprived of nationality and therefore left stateless, is due to racial and ethnic

discrimination as in the case of the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 57).

The Stateless Rohingyas

Despite having lived in the Buddhist majority Myanmar for generations, the Rohingyas have been considered “Bengali illegal immigrants” by their home country (Haque, 2017, p. 466).

From the beginning of Burmese independence in 1947, the Rohingyas were not formally recognized as one of the country’s official ethnic groups (Haque, 2017, p. 454). However, the 1962 military takeover in Myanmar fundamentally led to the Rohingyas facing human rights abuse and sufferings (Haque, 2017, p. 454). “The Rohingya exclusion policy started after General Ne Win seized power in a military staged coup d’état in 1962 and became head of state as Chairman of the Union Revolutionary Council and also Prime Minister” (Haque, 2017, p. 455). Soon thereafter, the 1982 Citizenship Law was created “in the name of indigenous ethnicity to deny nationality to the Rohingyas” and ultimately “institutionalized the Rohingyas statelessness” (Haque, 2017, p. 454). With that being said, it is believed that there were a few factors that contributed to the new citizenship law. First, it is claimed that the Burmese had a negative impression of the Chinese and South Asian origins since most administrative posts and business sectors were controlled by these individuals who originally immigrated to Arakan (now known as Rakhine State) during the British colonial period (Haque, 2017, p. 456). After 1962, the military regime provoked the ultra-nationalist policy which led to the confiscation of South Asian owned properties by the Ne Win government in the name of nationalization (Haque, 2017, p. 456). Second, Burmese officials and Rakhine leaders felt that the growth of the Muslim population posed an alarming threat to their country’s security (Haque, 2017, p. 456). In 1981,

before the enactment of the 1982 Citizenship Law, Union Home Minister Brigadier Sein Lwin expressed his frustration by stating that “Burma as a country would disappear and its original identity would become museum piece if immigration officials continued to let illegal immigrants into the country and to register them as citizens in lieu of a small bribe” (Haque, 2017, p. 456). With that being said, it is claimed that because of the Union Minister’s resentment, the Rohingya Muslims were excluded in the 1982 Citizenship Law (Haque, 2017, p. 456). Third, “after the operation Naga Min in 1978, and the first Rohingya refugee exodus, the Burmese government realized that the citizenship law had failed to manage citizenship and immigration issues” (Haque, 2017, p. 456). That said, it is claimed that the Myanmar government intentionally conducted a campaign undermining the Rohingyas’ existence in Burma (Haque, 2017, p. 456).

Furthermore, under the 1982 Citizenship law, there were three categories of citizenship which included, Full Citizenship– Pink Card Holders, Associate Citizenship– Blue Card Holders, and finally, Naturalized Citizenship– Green Card Holders (Haque, 2017, p. 456 - 457). The Council of State had the ability to dictate whether an ethnic group was considered a national or not (Haque, 2017, p. 457). Therefore in relation to Full Citizenship, the Rohingyas were not recognized nationals (Haque, 2017, p. 457). According to the category of Associate Citizenship, this classification was only “granted under certain conditions to those who applied for citizenship under the 1948 law and their children, whose application was ongoing at the time of promulgation” (Haque, 2017, p. 457). In addition, the “Associate Citizenship is virtually limited to those who applied under the 1948 Citizenship Election Act as a new settler in Burma (Haque, 2017, p. 457). Therefore because the ethnic Muslim minority Rohingyas did not fit the criteria

of this category, many individuals were not entitled to Associate Citizenship (Haque, 2017, p. 457). In terms of Naturalized Citizenship, Rohingya leaders rejected this option for their community and requested restoration of their Full Citizenship rights which they enjoyed before the enactment of the new law (Haque, 2017, p. 457). The Rohingya MP Shwe Maung alias Abdul Razak argues that:

...the above-mentioned article recognizes our citizenship before the enactment of the 1982 law, the Rohingya community enjoyed citizenship rights and joined the government. But in the name of indigenous ethnicity, the Rohingya are arbitrarily denied their right to nationality in Burma (Haque, 2017, p. 457).

That said, since the Rohingyas were excluded from both Full and Associate Citizenship, the 1982 Citizenship Law of Myanmar essentially legalized their statelessness, and as a result they have been denied basic human rights (Robinson & Rahman, n.d., p. 16).

Impacts of statelessness for the Rohingyas

Individuals who are considered stateless are some of the most vulnerable people in the world. Not only do the Rohingyas have no place to call home, they also face many burdens and challenges. The Rohingyas “lack access to identification papers to prove their citizenship, they are ineligible to vote and participate in political processes, unable to obtain travel documents and unable to access a range of government services” (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 56). In addition, the Rohingyas are subjected to discriminatory treatment and persecution impacting their livelihoods. They have limited access to health care, employment, shelter, and education (Green & Pierce, 2009, p. 34). They have issues with “water and sanitation, poor maternal,

child, and reproductive health; poor access to immunization; lack of access to the national AIDS programmes; and are at risk for tuberculosis” (Burki, 2017, p. 1385). With the constant fear of being deported or persecuted, stateless individuals are reluctant to seek medical attention. “If doctors and nurses are obliged to pass on details about people accessing services without identification documents, then there is a powerful incentive for stateless people to stay away” (Burki, 2017, p. 1385). Therefore, pregnant women may abstain from prenatal care and take the risk of giving birth at home. However, when a child is born outside formal structures of state health care, they are most likely not registered as citizens, resulting in perpetuating a cycle of statelessness (Burki, 2017, p. 1385). The Rohingyas are also vulnerable to labour exploitation, sexual exploitation, trafficking, arbitrary arrest and detention (Burki, 2017, p. 1385). Because the stateless Rohingyas have been subjected to mistreatment, discrimination and denied basic human rights, hundreds of thousands of Rohingyas have fled Myanmar to neighbouring countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand in dangerous and risky conditions as well as long journeys in search of security and a brighter future. Despite, their hopeful intentions, the aforementioned countries have not ratified the UN Refugee Convention and the Rohingyas are again treated as illegal immigrants (Burki, 2017, p. 1385).

To take an example, Tarik, who is a stateless Rohingya, fled Myanmar in 1989 and was trafficked into Malaysia in 1991 where he was in bonded labour for three months until he was able to pay off his debts (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 58). In Malaysia, Tarik suffers discrimination which affects his fundamental rights and various socio-economic rights (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 58). Under Malaysian law, Tarik is treated as an illegal immigrant, and

denied the ability to work. As a result, he was arrested for illegally working and deported into the hands of traffickers on numerous occasions. Tarik says:

Police can arrest us whenever they wish. We Rohingya do not have any security in this country. We do not have our own country. Everybody oppresses us. Life is very hard for us both in Malaysia and Burma... The place where I was born is now foreign to me. We cannot claim our birthplace as our own land... I am worried about the future of my children. They are neither Malaysian nor Burmese. I do not know what will happen to them (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 58).

The vulnerability and discrimination that Tarik faces as an undocumented stateless person has also been transferred over to his family who are currently living in poverty and in dangerous conditions. His children are unable to enroll into Malaysian schools without documentation or even gain access to any health care services due to the fear of deportation (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 58). Tarik also fears that his grandchildren will also be stateless and that they will face even more poverty with greater hardships and challenges as an effect of inherited statelessness (Chickera & Whiteman, 2014, p. 58).

Literature review:

The concept of statelessness can become quite convoluted for individuals all around the world including nations, states, but most predominantly for citizens who are deemed stateless. The literature on statelessness generally focuses on the historical, legal and political aspects of statelessness and seldom focuses on the complex sociological aspects. In the sections below, an overview of academic literature addressing the question of statelessness will be illustrated.

A Historical, Legal and Political Overview of Statelessness:

Historical literature demonstrates that a new group of individuals, the stateless, emerged from the calamity of war (Bernstein, 2005, p. 53). In Miriam Rürup's article "Lives in Limbo: Statelessness After Two World Wars," she states that there were three historical moments that clarified how statelessness emerged and evolved from its first mass appearance in 1918 over the course of the century (Rürup, 2011, p. 121). The first occurred in the aftermath of the First World War, when "the European map was redrawn following revolutions and the dissolution of empires" (Rürup, 2011, p. 121). The second moment was during the 1930's, when the "National Socialist regime in Germany enacted discriminatory citizenship laws against Jews and other presumed "enemies of the Reich," which rendered many people stateless" (Rürup, 2011, p. 122). And finally, the third moment was during the changes in the international political system that followed Germany's defeat in 1945 (Rürup, 2011, p. 122).

Richard Bernstein's article, entitled "Hannah Arendt on the Stateless," explains that to be a stateless person means that one is "unprotected by any specific law or political convention" (Bernstein, 2005, p. 51). Hannah Arendt, a German-born American political philosopher was forced to leave Germany in 1933 (Bernstein, 2005, p. 51). As a result, her "experience as a stateless Jew provided her with a sharp insight into the ominous paradoxes and instability that happens when masses of refugees and stateless persons are 'created' by political eruptions" (Bernstein, 2005, p. 51). Arendt claimed that the immediate development of "new stateless masses to be one of the most intractable problems of the twentieth century – a problem that outlasted totalitarian regimes" (Bernstein, 2005, p. 51). Rürup further adds to this

claim by stating that individuals who were displaced by flight, deportation or other means during the two world wars lost their formal state affiliation (Rürup, 2011, p. 113 - 114).

After the Second World War in 1949 the United Nations report entitled “A Study of Statelessness” construed statelessness as an “anomaly” (Robbins, 2004, p. 275). This was echoed in Hannah Arendt’s “The Origins of Totalitarianism” where she “criticized “civilized countries” for treating the stateless as criminals, since they did not fit into the normal framework of “state-citizen” or “state-foreign citizen” affairs” (Robbins, 2004, p. 275). This made stateless individuals vulnerable and susceptible to mistreatment despite the efforts taken by international law. The findings of the United Nation’s report prompted the need to include statelessness and as a result three instruments were established. The first was the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees that was adopted in 1951 and focused on the treatment of individuals who had been forced to flee their country due to fear of persecution and who may or may not have also been denationalised (Weissbrodt & Collins, 2006, p. 257). The second convention was the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons that was adopted in 1954. Its purpose was to “regulate and improve the status of stateless persons by an international agreement” (Weissbrodt & Collins, 2006, p. 248). Although the United Nations understood that it was important to ensure that stateless individuals were granted minimal standards of treatment, fundamentally the best alternative was to “reduce statelessness by international agreement” (Weissbrodt & Collins, 2006, p. 247). As a result, the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness was established to reiterate the efforts made by the League of Nations to assure statelessness could be prevented.

Furthermore, the most comprehensive studies on statelessness include Laura Van Waas' "Nationality Matters: Statelessness under International Law and a report by Katherine Southwick and Maureen Lynch on behalf of Refugees International, Nationality Rights for All: A Progress Report and Global Survey on Statelessness (Blitz, 2009, p. 38). Van Waas analyzed the two statelessness conventions and related instruments and also examined the legal provisions for stateless individuals (Blitz, 2009, p. 38). In addition, she suggested the need for reform in key areas including conflict laws, state succession, and arbitrary deprivation of nationality, birth registration and migration (Blitz, 2009, p. 38).

The majority of the literature pertaining to statelessness focuses on the political and humanitarian aspects. As Maureen Lynch explains:

Statelessness is a highly complex legal and often political issue ... It has serious humanitarian implications for those it affects, including no legal protection or the right to participate in political process, poor employment prospects and poverty, little opportunity to own property, travel restrictions, social exclusion, sexual and physical violence, and inadequate access to healthcare and education (Balaton-Chrimes, 2012, p. 30).

It is evident that stateless individuals do not have access to secure civil and political rights such as "recognition as a person before the law; equality before the law; liberty of movement and residence; birth registration and nationality, and the right and opportunity to take part in the conduct of public affairs" (Balaton-Chrimes, 2012, p. 8). Alec Paxton further depicts this in his article entitled "Finding a Country to Call Home: A Framework for Evaluating Legislation to

Reduce Statelessness in Southeast Asia” as he asserts that individuals who are stateless “lack a voice in a state’s political dialogue, which further marginalizes their position” (Paxton, 2012, p. 635). In addition he states that when individuals are stateless, without a citizenship, they are unable to benefit from their basic civil and political rights (Paxton, 2012, p. 635). With that being said, it is essential to understand the literature pertaining to citizenship and nationality and examine what scholars have brought forward with regards to statelessness. These will be briefly discussed below.

Nationality and Citizenship

Today, in International law, the terms citizenship and nationality are claimed to be used synonymously (Rürup, 2011, p. 113). However, there are still “differences between the two, both historically and in their qualitative essence: “Citizen” puts much more emphasis on an individual’s political status within a state and expresses more clearly the sense of belonging to a certain group and being able to participate actively in society” (Rürup, 2011, p. 113). While “nationality” emphasizes the more contractual agreement between an individual and a state” (Rürup, 2011, p. 113).

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed that “everyone has the right to a nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality, nor denied the right to change his nationality” (Rürup, 2011, p. 113). That said, the declaration aimed to “eliminate the stateless individual as a counterpart to the “national” since the link it makes between citizenship and human rights proves the rising influence of supranational institutions and discourses on national citizenship” (Rürup, 2011, p. 113). However, it is still concerning to some

scholars as human rights violations are still evident worldwide resulting in millions of individuals being denied the right to a nationality and therefore living as stateless individuals. In Carol Batchelor's article entitled "Statelessness and the Problem of Resolving Nationality Status" she exclaims that "nationality is perceived as involving the jurisdiction of the state as well as human rights issues" (Batchelor, 1998, p. 167). The majority of the literature acknowledges that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two subsequent human rights covenants are the most authoritative legal documentation pertaining to human rights as they outline civil, political, and social rights that are applicable to individuals all around the world regardless of their race, ethnicity, class, gender, or religious affiliation (Belton, 2005, p. 19). In addition, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) considers nationality to be a "fundamental right" as it gives individuals the "right to have rights" (Walker, 1981, p. 108). However, in Hannah Arendt's study on totalitarianism she examines the "close association between being a bearer of citizenship-as-status and basic rights in her study of the citizen-state relationship after World War II" (Belton, 2005, p. 2). Arendt explores the situation of individuals who were displaced and as a result lost their citizenship due to the conflict and notes that "not only did loss of national rights in all instances entail the loss of human rights, the restoration of human rights...has been achieved so far only through the restoration or the establishment of national rights" (Belton, 2005, p.1).

Some scholars find the term nationality to be problematic. In her article, "The Great Divide: Citizenship and Statelessness," Kristy Belton states that the terms "nationality" and "national" are problematic in the conventions of statelessness and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights due to the fact that "membership in a State is governed by domestic laws that

typically refer to members as citizens” and “once the discussion of citizenship leaves the domestic realm and enters the domain of international relations the terminology changes and citizens become nationals and citizenship becomes nationality” (Belton, 2005, p. 111). In addition, she claims that the “change in vocabulary is not particularly helpful when one considers that a “national” may refer to a person that is a member of a particular State or someone who belongs to a certain ethnic group” (Belton, 2005, p. 112). She says that the terms “nationality” and “national” should be replaced with “citizenship” and “citizen” in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as it would help resolve the misunderstanding that stateless individuals lack citizenship and not nationality (Belton, 2005, p. 112).

Loss of Nationality due to Deprivation on Discriminatory Grounds

As States have the power to create laws and regulations with regards to nationality, they are able to dictate which individuals can or cannot be nationals. Although there are many causes of statelessness, it is important to address the loss of nationality due to deprivation on discriminatory grounds since this is the main cause of statelessness that will be examined within this research paper. A report conducted by the Secretary General after being requested by the Human Rights Council examines the legislative and administrative situational measures that may lead to deprivation of nationality that ultimately may leave individuals stateless (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). The report gathered information from 33 States, 22 United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations and discusses the loss or deprivation of nationality with regards to domestic laws and examines the international norms and standards that limit the discretion of States to retract an individual’s nationality (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). It reiterates the importance of establishing various forms of

protection so that statelessness is prevented (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). In addition, the report also indicates that although almost “all States stipulate in their laws the conditions under which a person would cease to be a national thereof, the terminology used varies” (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). However, while the terms “loss” and “deprivation” cover two different aspects, the overall consequence results in individuals no longer being considered a national by the State and eventually leading to statelessness (United Nations General Assembly, 2013).

The report outlines the various grounds for loss or deprivation of nationality which include: voluntary acquisition of another nationality, fraud, acts seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State, services to a foreign government or military, change in civil status; absence (when a national has been absent from his or her country of nationality for an extended period of time), serious criminal offence; and discrimination (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). With regards to discrimination, “relevant international standards prohibiting the arbitrary deprivation of nationality and prohibiting discrimination on any ground, very few domestic laws provide for deprivation of nationality on any ground, very few domestic laws provide for deprivation of nationality on grounds such as race, religion, political opinion or disability” (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). The report also states that there are still many States that explicitly prohibit arbitrary or discriminatory deprivation of nationality in their domestic law, however, there are new cases of large-scale and discriminatory deprivation of nationality being reported (United Nations General Assembly, 2013). Overall, this report illustrates the key roles that due process plays in preventing arbitrary deprivation of nationality

and advises States of the importance of providing adequate remedies with regards to decisions on nationality (United Nations General Assembly, 2013).

Many other literatures illustrate similar ideas and recognize that loss of nationality due to deprivation on discriminatory grounds is a gross injustice. In Michelle Foster and H el ene Lambert’s article entitled “Statelessness as a Human Rights Issue: A concept Whose Time Has Come,” similar ideas are discussed in relation to the protection of stateless individuals. In their research, they indicate that Guy Goodwin- Gill argued for a “refocus of international attention and effort on the plight, predicament, and protection needs of stateless persons” as he perceived statelessness to be a ‘technical problem’ which commonly occurs due to arbitrary deprivation of nationality, including on the basis of racial and gender discrimination (Foster & Lambert, 2016, p. 564). In addition, the authors signify the Global Action Plan to end statelessness by 2024 that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees launched in order to eradicate statelessness by “resolving existing situations and preventing the emergence of new cases of statelessness” (Foster & Lambert, 2016, p. 571). Furthermore, the authors stipulate how the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination outline laws in relation to nationality, citizenship, or naturalization and how they must “not discriminate against any particular nationality” (Foster & Lambert, 2016, p. 573). They also emphasize that regardless of an individual’s citizenship status, “all those within a State’s territory or jurisdiction are entitled to a certain standard of treatment” as “ratified human rights treaties prohibit discrimination on grounds relevant to stateless persons, including ‘national, ethnic or social origin ... birth or other status’”(Foster & Lambert, 2016, p. 574). Additionally, they note that under situations “where deprivation of nationality takes place

on the basis of race, colour, sex, descent, national or ethnic origin, and so forth, it becomes both arbitrary and a breach of the principle of non-discrimination in the enjoyment of the right to nationality” and therefore the “the principles of equality and non-discrimination are fundamental elements of international human rights law’ the linkage between statelessness and discrimination is very strong” (Foster & Lambert, 2016, p. 579).

The ideas and conceptions surrounding loss of nationality due to deprivation on discriminatory grounds is also emphasized in H el ene Lambert’s article “Comparative Perspectives on Arbitrary Deprivation of Nationality and Refugee Status as she points out the Human Rights Council’s Resolution 20/5 that “reaffirms that the arbitrary deprivation of nationality, especially on discriminatory grounds such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, is a violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms” despite the fact that stateless individuals are already vulnerable to discrimination (Lambert, 2015, p. 36). Lambert also indicates that there are many human rights that are especially affected in situations of arbitrary deprivation of nationality which includes discrimination such as “political rights resulting in the inability to participate politically, the right to freedom of movement resulting in the inability to travel, to return and be readmitted in a country of habitual residence, but also in the inability to access health and educational services, the right to liberty resulting in arbitrary arrest or detention, the right to an effective remedy resulting in the inability to challenge administrative or judicial decisions or actions of racial discrimination, and the right to family life due to limitations to the right to enter or reside in a territory” (Lambert, 2015, p. 12). In addition, Lambert states that although combatting discrimination is fundamental based on the 1951 Refugee Convention, the

main issue is the measures in which persecution is a fundamental violation of human dignity in cases involving “ethnic and racial discrimination of Faili Kurds, Roma, Rohingya of Myanmar, refugees from Bhutan, the Bidoons in the Gulf States, and Dominicans of Haitian descent in the Dominican Republic” (Lambert, 2015, p. 13). Lambert further details that “in international refugee law, discrimination is often used to support the individualized or targeted character of persecutory acts, in contrast with the indiscriminate character of generalized violence” (Lambert, 2015, p. 25). She also states that “discrimination is often used to indicate a form of harm that is less serious in terms of its intensity or gravity than persecution, on par with harassment” and argues that the idea that there are degrees of severity when it comes to discrimination is unique to refugee law (Lambert, 2015, p. 25). She details the importance of protecting, providing assistance and fulfilling human rights for stateless individuals.

Although much of the literature with regards to statelessness focuses more on the historical, legal and political aspects, there are a few who examines the socio-economic elements as well. For instance, Alec Paxton states that “statelessness undermines individuals’ social and economic rights” (Paxton, 2012, p. 634). He explains that the social costs of statelessness are relentless in that individuals who are stateless find it very difficult to obtain an education. In addition, he says that stateless individuals are unable to access or unable to afford basic health care services (Paxton, 2012, p. 634). Paxton also examines how stateless individuals also face harsh economic instability in that many are “precluded from seeking traditional employment or even owning property” (Paxton, 2012, p. 634). He also states that when stateless individuals are able to obtain employment opportunities, they are often under “poor working conditions, including difficult, dangerous, and dirty jobs; verbal abuse; violence;

racism; discriminatory attitudes; cramped living conditions; intimidating workplace environments and low salaries” (Paxton, 2012, p. 635). This is further emphasised in Nicole Green and Todd Pierce’s work on statelessness through a governmental perspective. The author asserts that “statelessness or the absence of citizenship typically denies individuals the ability to exercise their human rights, poses obstacles to meeting their basic needs and prevents their full participation in society” (Green & Pierce, 2009, p. 34).

Statement of the problem:

As the literature review highlights, in principle, statelessness is prohibited by international law, and there are a number of international instruments devised to prevent statelessness. Indeed, many countries in their own domestic law do not envision the possibility of creating individuals stateless. However, statelessness is still a contemporary reality, especially for the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar who have been deemed stateless. Political, legal, and philosophical analyses tell us that statelessness is wrong, and that it should not happen. Given that statelessness can lead to genocide, can work on the sociology of genocide shed some light on the sociological dynamics associated statelessness? Equally, international law on statelessness tends to focus on individuals, however in the case of the Rohingya it is an entire group that is made stateless. How can one sociologically grasp this process?

Theoretical Framework:

Christopher Powell has been concerned with understanding what sociology can contribute to the contemporary debates on genocide and has argued that Elias' figural sociology can be valuable. Powell discusses two major components: the first is the idea of a "genos," which he distinguishes from a tribe, race, and nation, and secondly, the idea of a barbaric civilization.

For Powell, statelessness is a component of processes that can lead to genocide. Therefore, the types of dynamics that he describes in the context of genocide can be used to understand statelessness. The advantage of looking at statelessness in this particular way, is that it does not focus abstractly and generally on the presence or absence of international law, or the explicit decision to revoke citizenship or legislate a particular group out of its citizenship. Instead Powell shows how statelessness is a dual process where a particular genos is isolated from the space of a nation by showing that the genos is not compatible with that of the nation, making it justifiable to interrupt the social figurations sustaining the genos. This draws attention to the fact that statelessness, rather than an individual juridical matter or the condition of a situation is frequently about a social identity. Consequently, barbaric civilization, as understood by Powell, is not so much then about killing people, but of killing social identities, which is an important dimension of being stateless. That being said, both of Powell's ideas can provide some insight into how to sociologically approach the contemporary statelessness of the Rohingyas using concrete examples from various news articles.

Norbert Elias uses the term figuration as opposed to structure and Christopher Powell argues that this can be important for understanding how populations are made stateless and

how this can eventuate, in some cases, into genocide. Powell focuses on Elias's theory on relational sociology to deconstruct the Others. Elias's relational structure focuses on individuals and the complex social relations that exist amongst them. This is because individuals cannot exist independently of one another. In order to survive, people require each other's presence to ensure the basic necessities of life (Powell, 2007, p. 533). The ways in which people interact with each other can shape and change the lives of an individual or a group. In all communities around the world the strength of a community is often seen when there is interaction amongst the people because each individual is able to help one another to maintain and establish their social wellbeing. These societies are dependent on individuals and individuals are dependent on society because there is a level of protection that can be achieved through the networks in society that cannot be achieved without them. Although there is a tendency to see individuals as isolated units, there are many social relations that influence the social world and as a result have an impact on individuals (Powell, 2007, p. 537).

The notion of the *genos*, which Powell takes from Lemkin, is understood as a figuration, a network of practices and people that is ongoing (Powell, 2007, p. 538). This means that genocide refers to the interruptions of the processes that enable the reproduction of the *genos*, this can mean killing people, but it can also mean geographically displacing them, preventing them from practicing their language, religion, or carrying on their customs. Genocide is about killing a particular "social identity." Powell breaks down the term *genos* into three components of the conception of genocide. First, genocides are the results of breaking down social relations and the destructions of figurations. In Myanmar the government has indicated that the Rohingyas are considered to be illegal inhabitants who do not share the same language and

culture of the country. In this case the government has created barriers between the institutions of the country and that of the Rohingya communities because the government is trying to establish an Us versus Them dichotomy that will legitimize the difference between the two. Statelessness is produced by isolating a specific social identity from the national identity and framing the social identity as being threatening. This legitimates the destruction of the networks of practices that reproduce those practices, for example banning a language and/or religion.

Once a social identity is identified as being dangerous and its networks of practices are interrupted or destroyed, it becomes acceptable to engage in the violent massacre of the populations in order to prevent future generations from progressing. This has been evident in the Rakhine state where the Myanmar government and military targeted the Rohingya's which forced them to flee to Bangladesh. And third, the separation of a social identity from a national identity leading to attempts to extinguish the identity, and the people that carry or are attributed the identity, leads to the retrenchment of propaganda and stereotypes that "dehumanize their victims" and remove the moral attachment that is seen on a particular group or individual (Powell, 2007, p. 539). The use of propaganda and stereotypes reinforces the idea of the Other because this form of branding and representation persuades citizens to believe that these individuals do not belong within the state.

Powell argues that targeting a particular group breaks down the human perspective of these individuals and groups to depict them as stereotypes that have been promoted to cause hate towards the Other. As a result, the human aspect of the individual is diminished and the negative connotations of these individuals are enhanced. This essentially enables the barbarism

of civilizations between the “Self” against “Other” and, in some instances, the ultimate destruction of the Other. “Self and Other are not separate or separable, but exist in relation to each other, even where the relation is one of the opposite” (Powell, 2007, p. 541). Here, Powell is suggesting that the ‘Others’ are those who are marginalized in society and therefore cannot be separated from the ‘self’ and the rest of society because they are seen as coexisting units. The ‘self’ and the ‘other’ can be seen in parallel with each other but often times are at odds with one another. For example, the ‘Others’ or in this case, the Rohingyas are continuously blamed for many social issues and the ‘self’ or the rest society like Myanmar and top officials are willing to pass that blame onto the Rohingyas to ease the tensions within society and to control the narrative of the actual societal problems.

In genocides, the causality for the Others often results in the extermination of entire cultures, languages, religions, traditions and so on, because the perpetrators seek to eradicate generations of people in the hopes that they can get rid of the segments of the population that is considered to be the cause of the social unrest. Consequently, countries and their military are attempting to normalize and subdue the intensity of the overall situation so the majority of the population who are not a part of the Other do not see the effects of the breakdown of the social structure within other communities. This is because, communities that are targeted are often isolated from the rest of society, and their struggles and hardships are lessened so that the rest of society cannot sympathize with the affected communities. In the case of the Rohingyas the government will often misinform the general public about the intensity of the situation and try to control the narrative to portray the Rohingyas in a negative manner.

The second idea, which is developed in Powell's book is the idea of a barbaric civilization. Powell argues that there is a tendency to understand genocide as the other of civilization. That is to say, as something that happens when civilization breaks down, or when polities do not achieve "civilization." He does not think that this is useful. In addition, he argues that conceptualizing genocide as pure evil is not very productive either. Instead he suggests that the potential for genocide is inherent in the civilizing process (Powell, 2007, p. 534). Drawing on Elias, he claims that civilization, in figurational terms, describes the historical and social processes that have led to the pacification of social space. In other words, civilization means that violence is monopolized by the state, and cannot be engaged in without impunity. However, Powell argues that violence does not disappear with civilization, in fact, he maintains, it creates the possibility for violence to be exercised at a much larger scale as a result of its monopolisation by the state and its associated resources. Also, because violence is no longer acceptable within the space of the nation state, then the potential for violence is trained on those that are different, both inside or outside the space of the nation state.

If genocide is understood as the ability to interrupt the process that allows a particular genos to reproduce itself, and if that genos is found within the confines of a nation state, then the first step towards genocide is to make the social identity, rather than the individual stateless. According to Powell, there are three dynamics that move a particular genos towards statelessness: "Identify/difference: who is included and who is excluded from moral obligation; Impunity/interdependence: the power relation between the targeted genos and the broader society so that violence can be engaged in at low cost; and Interest/indifference: what can be gained or lost as a result of the violence" (Powell, 2011, p. 12). He argues that "a network of

actors joined together by common identity will pursue genocide across the boundary of difference if sufficient interests exist to mobilize such a large-scale action and if the actors have the impunity to do so” (Powell, 2011, p. 12).

Methodology:

This research paper will employ a documentary analysis approach using news articles published by major news sources but will also draw on information and reports from various credible human rights organizations, international governmental organizations, and secondary academic sources. As the conflict against the Rohingyas in Myanmar is fairly recent and can easily jeopardize the lives of researchers and reporters because of the violent acts that are unfolding, for this research study it will be crucial to rely on and examine newspaper articles that discuss the mistreatment of the Rohingyas who are now stateless to explore the utility of the framework proposed by Christopher Powell.

The stories will be drawn from news articles based on an incident that erupted in 2012, which ultimately lead to escalating conflicts and tension in Myanmar until present day. According to Human Rights Watch, in June 2012 “the sectarian violence was sparked by the rape and murder of a 28-year-old woman by three Muslim men. In retaliation, Buddhist villagers beat and killed ten Muslims, and violence between the Buddhist and the Rohingyas intensified, with both sides committing killings and arson” (Human Rights Watch, 2018). It is claimed that “security forces initially witnessed the attacks and remained idle, but then later joined in to burn the neighbourhoods and villages of the Rohingya Muslims” (Human Rights Watch, 2018). Therefore, for this research study, a total of 15 credible news articles will be

examined that range from the 2012 incident to March 2018 when Bob Rae, Canada's special envoy to Myanmar released his report on the Rohingya crisis. These news articles include: The Wall Street Journal, The Guardian, CNN, The New York Times, Al Jazeera, The Financial Express, Times, and Daily, BBC news, Gulf news, NPR News and The Globe and Mail. All these newspapers have a reputation for professional, impartial journalism and producing original content that is portrayed in the news industry. Although the chosen newspapers do not originate from all parts of the world to give a diversified and more globalized coverage, the chosen sources are credible and highly reputable as they will have differing perspectives from various international platforms.

The abovementioned articles were chosen particularly because they addressed the current situation on the Rohingyas. These articles also provide historical information about the processes that are taking place in Myanmar and why there has been a recent surge in the violence against the Rohingyas. In order to determine which articles would be relevant to my discussion, it was essential to look for key words such as the following: rape, mass killings, genocide against Rohingyas, United Nations response to the Myanmar conflict, international assistance for Rohingyas, history of Rohingya conflict, and the current situation of the Rohingya violence.

In comparing the selected news articles with one another, it was important to examine which articles had conflicting information and duplicate information. Conflicting information was considered to be not consistent with the majority of the articles as it had an obvious bias or was heavily opinionated. For example, almost all the articles that were reviewed mentioned that the government of Myanmar was aware of the genocide taking place, yet there were some

articles that mentioned that the government did not have a part in the overall conflict or was unaware of the extent of the issue. As a result, these articles were not examined and removed from the overall discussion because it was very evident that the Myanmar government was aware of the scope of the issue based on the majority of credible news sources. That being said, it was important to acknowledge in the discussion section of this research paper that the Myanmar government often portrayed the issues as less dire than what it was. For articles that had the same or similar information, the source that was the most recent was utilized because it was more up to date and provided a more accurate depiction of the situation against the Rohingyas.

Findings:

Based on the initial review of the articles there was a lot of information that was useful to the discussion of the alleged Rohingya genocide and the concept of the Other that Powell refers to in his book "Barbaric Civilization: A Critical Sociology of Genocide." Within the articles there was information on the history of the conflict within Myanmar and the Rohingyas, and there was also informative segments that traced back generations of ancestors who have lived in Myanmar for centuries. The articles also provided additional information regarding why the current conflict has escalated and what the Rohingyas have been facing for decades. Many of the articles also had common themes such as topics on the international community and their role in helping to prevent genocides and facts and statistics on how many people have been affected by the violence, such as the number of people presumed to have died or have been injured as well as the number of displaced people in refugee camps in neighbouring counties.

There was also information about the treatment of the government towards the Rohingyas and how they have been marginalized and discriminated against over time.

After further critically analyzing the chosen news articles, the most common stories illustrated throughout include the evidence of genocide occurring within Myanmar; the lack of response from Aung San Suu Kyi, human rights abuses against the Rohingyas; ethnic tensions in Myanmar; and the result of Rohingyas fleeing Myanmar and becoming refugees in neighbouring countries such as Bangladesh, Malaysia and Thailand. The Rohingyas are depicted throughout the news articles as the world's largest stateless ethnic group who are poor, vulnerable, and susceptible to all kinds of abuses. The Rohingyas were also visually represented throughout some of the news articles with pictures to illustrate their situation. The pictures that were portrayed included innocent women and children crying in refugee camps, reaching out their arms and begging for food; men, women and children sitting on unstable wooden boats in an attempt to flee Myanmar looking distressed, and malnourished men without shoes carrying the elderly in makeshift slings. The focus of the chosen articles consists of ethnic persecution, violence in Myanmar, mass exterminations including genocide, and denial of basic human rights. Overall, in all of the 15 articles that were examined, the Rohingyas were represented as the ethnic Muslim minority group that have been heavily marginalized.

Discussion:

The Rohingyas are a minority Muslim group in Myanmar who have been continuously persecuted for many decades by the Myanmar government and military forces. The actions of the government have blatantly been seen as a method to illustrate how they are working to

deny the Rohingyas rights and deny their existence as citizens of Myanmar. The Financial Express mentioned that the violence and persecutions against the Rohingyas were “triggered by an alleged rape and murder of a Rakhine Buddhist woman by two Rohingya Muslim men” (Financial Express, 2017, p. 1-2). As usual, the regime failed to provide any concrete evidence providing that such a crime was committed by the alleged rapist. Within the concept of the genos, Powell suggests that there is a network behind the practices to create the concept of Others. This network is often established by the government to marginalize groups from being part of a larger social structure in society (Powell, 2011, p. 533). There have been significant efforts by the Myanmar government to prevent Rohingyas from taking part in the figuration of Myanmar society and rendering them stateless.

The Myanmar government has taken drastic measures to ensure the Rohingya population will cease to grow. In the news article “Burma’s Ethnic Persecution is State Policy; Official Abuse Threatens both the Rohingya Muslims and the Country’s Opening to the West” published by the Wall Street Journal, the author illustrates that the Myanmar government has been using tactics to promote statelessness amongst the Rohingyas. For example, the government has engaged in “abusive population control measures against the Rohingya Muslims” (Smith, 2014, p. 1). The article also illustrates the abusive population control measures, and “other evidence demonstrates that the state and central government authorities are responsible for denying Rohingya fundamental human rights by limiting their freedom of movement, marriage and childbirth, among other aspects of daily life in the northern Rakhine State” by further perpetuating statelessness (Smith, 2014, p. 1). While deconstructing the concept of the genos, the policies that are in place are in fact a measure used by the

government to control and alienate the Rohingya from establishing social relations both within the Rohingya genos and across to the broader figurations underpinning the society in Myanmar. These tactics are used by government officials as a ploy to isolate the Rohingyas so that they cannot be a part of society. In the New York Times, author Nicholas Kristof says, “these tactics are rights out of the genocidaires’ playbook” (Kristof, 2018, p.2). In addition, Kristof states that systematically weakening a population has been characteristics of other genocides” (Kristof, 2018, p.2). The regulations imposed are then crucial to statelessness because the Rohingyas become vulnerable to the demands of the state. These limitations are also preventing the Rohingyas from being seen as equals to Myanmar nationals because they do not have the same fundamental rights as the rest of Myanmar. Therefore, it is evident that these stateless Rohingyas are experiencing a series of social processes where a particular social figuration, a genos is being excluded from the nation, and the processes that reproduce that genos are being targeted, and ultimately causing havoc in Myanmar against the Rohingyas.

Statelessness is then not produced by international laws not being applied, but by the types of policies that target or interrupt the Rohingya genos. In other words, policies that are used to regulate Rohingya lifestyles and movement are contributing to the indirect extinction of the Rohingya and the evidential genocide of the group. These policies that have been imposed upon them strictly monitor the movement and the number of individuals who are allowed to live within the state. The Wall Street Journal states that the Myanmar government has “imposed a strict two-child limit...,” and that Rohingyas require “permission to marry,” and “restricting freedom of movement between village tracts, townships and beyond,” the Rohingyas have lost their agency to form social figurations and social dependencies since their

social interactions and networks are limited (Smith, 2014, p. 1-2). These laws and regulations that are imposed upon the Rohingyas are overtly discriminatory which legitimizes the mistreatment of these groups as well as their social identities. Discriminatory regulations are a method to ensuring statelessness because the regulations make the Rohingyas vulnerable to exploitation by the government. The Rohingyas social configurations are therefore disrupted as a result of the actions taken by the Myanmar government. In addition, Powell suggests individuals cannot exist independently of one another (Powell, 2011, p. 533). With that being said, in order to survive, people require each other's presence to ensure the basic necessities of life (Powell, 2007, p. 533). The ways in which people interact with each other can shape and change the lives of an individual or group. Consequently, policies that produce statelessness do not necessarily target individuals as such, but the types of configurations that underpin individuals' lives. Therefore, limiting the freedom of movement and strictly monitoring the actions of the Rohingyas prevents them from seeking protections and jeopardizes their social wellbeing because each community or village is isolated from the other, but also isolated from the rest of the nation. This practice prevents communities from supporting each other in social, economic and cultural aspects because there is heavy dominance of the state and government regulations for basic necessities of life. This also shows that gaining state recognition would be difficult because the government is working against the Rohingyas to strip them of their social identities. Therefore, social identity can be related to an individual's social community since the construction of identity is based on ethnicity, culture, religion, and nationality. Although these can be socially constructed, they also share a common concept of belongingness. The

Rohingyas social identity can be associated with their religious belief as Muslims, but also now with their social standing as stateless individuals.

Throughout history there have been numerous examples of the breakdown of social identities that produces statelessness, genocides and the destruction of the genos. Powell uses the example of the Ottoman Empire and the genocide of the Armenians to illustrate the barbaric, yet civilized, nature of genocides and how they are further amplified through nationalism. Through his example, Elias is able to show the extent to which nations and groups in nations are willing to go in order to exterminate the Other, in doing so he illustrates that there were barbaric Armenian people who became vulnerable to the state powers which also resulted in statelessness for the Armenians. "In figurational terms, military weakness translated into ongoing symbolic violence in which Turkish Ottomans identifying with the sovereign state to which they were subject, experienced diplomatic losses as personal humiliations.

Discrepancy between reforms on paper and practice on the ground meant that "short term stability was purchased at the expense of storing up grievances among the minorities...and of grievances amongst Ottoman elites..." (Powell, 2011, p. 255). This is because the Ottoman Empire wanted the Armenian nationals to conform to their regulations which evidently meant the imposition of harsh laws, regulations and practices towards them. Consequently, their social identities were compromised because they were required to conform to the regulations and in doing so they had to give up their own identities, ethnicity, culture, religion and traditions to be accepted within the Ottoman Empire. Their compliance was expected in return of state protection while non-compliance resulted in the violence, humiliation and death for hundreds and thousands of people. As the Armenians were considered the Other within the

nation, the relationship was only seen as a method of controlling the Other while progressing their own state policy which was used as a guise to show state unity and nationalism.

Nonetheless, the Armenians lost much of their identities and were not considered to be nationals because of the vast difference that continued to exist between the Ottoman Empire and the Armenians.

This example of the Ottoman Empire also illustrates the idea of civilizing process that essentially lead to the barbaric destruction of the Armenians but also the realization of being stateless. The Ottoman Empire wanted to become more “civilized,” in doing so, the Empire established social networks of interdependency which resulted in more violence (Powell, 2011, p. 265). “Religious-ethnic nationalism provided a resolution of sorts to this instability by establishing singular identities strongly identified with the sovereign, allowing violence to circulate downwards and outwards to abject or foreign Others” (Powell, 2011, p. 266). Eliminating the Other allowed the Ottoman Empire to resolve many social, political and economic issues that were the result of the Armenian nationalism. With the Empire being highly persuasive, citizens willfully engaged in the barbaric acts that took place against the Armenians and as a result the Empire was able to successfully promote their political agenda. “Genocide realized this unity, enabling Turks to share the active negation of Armenian identity, defining their collective selfhood through vigorous expression of what selfhood could not include” (Powell, 2011, p. 267). The effect of the nation state is highly influential on its citizens as governments are able to shape the way in which the Other is perceived and how the other is treated. This is mainly because governments are able to control the resources that are allocated to the Others and ensure that their resources are limited so that there is a degree of

compliance by the Others towards the government, since non-compliance would result in further limitations of resources and access to services. These discriminatory actions also resulted in the realization of statelessness because it was evident that the Armenians would never be considered nationals within the state. Their presence in the state was solely for the benefit of the Empire to manipulate and control the Armenians as they were highly vulnerable. In this case the genos was marginalized and discriminated against in order to justify the breakdown of the social figuration. The genos became the Other in society so that governments could control the genos for their own benefits and therefore further build on the complexities of the genos.

The example of the Ottoman Empire has many similarities to the situation genocide that is currently occurring in Myanmar. The Ottoman empire focused on the destruction of the social identities of the Armenian people which can also be seen amongst the Rohingyas. The Myanmar government and military are attempting to control the lives of the Rohingyas by imposing strict rules on the freedom of movement, marriage and children, rescinding citizenship or lack of providing citizenship, implementing harsh regulations on jobs and work and so on. These rules are essentially limiting and breaking down the social identities of the Rohingyas. These laws and regulations are similar to those imposed by the Ottoman Empire because there is an overall destruction of the social figuration of the genos as these individual must abide by state regulation in order to live within the state with minimal persecution. However, non-compliance with the laws and regulations would mean violence and abuse, which is the unfortunate reality. As more laws and regulations are formed to monitor and control populations there is a loss of agency amongst those who are affected. Those who are

affected can see the loss of value in their identities and the breakdown of their social relations because these individuals are no longer seen as humans but rather a burden to society and precursors to becoming and achieving statelessness. As a result, government and military are able to shift the blame of social issues to those that are considered to be the others and therefore legitimizing the use of harsh laws which was evident in the example of the Armenian genocide and now in the Rohingya crisis. With the imposition and legitimization of strict regulations against the Rohingya and the Armenians there is an indication that that the concept of the Other has been encouraged throughout society. This is evident in the actions and the language that is used to portray the Rohingyas and the Armenians by the rest of society. In Myanmar, monks and high-ranking officials would openly discriminate against the Rohingyas calling them names and dehumanizing their presence within the state. Consequently, this discourse legitimized the notion of the Other and the mistreatment of an entire population as well as the denial of their existences as citizens or nationals of the state. The social figuration demonstrates the complexities of the genos because there are many dimensions that can shape the genos such as the imposition of regulations on personal lives.

As genocide is about destroying a specific collective “social identity,” Powell divides the term genos into three components of the conception of genocide. First, he states that genocides are the results of breaking down social relations and the destructions of figurations and that statelessness is a dual process in state conflicts. Because the Rohingyas are considered to be illegal inhabitants by the government, they do not share the same language and culture with the rest of the country. Therefore, the genos is not compatible with the nation and as a result, the government created strict boundaries between the institutions of the country and

the Rohingya communities in an attempt to create an Us versus Them division. Statelessness is produced by disengaging a particular social identity from the national identity and fabricating the social identity as being threatening. This inadvertently authorizes the destruction of the networks of practices that reproduce those practices, for example by prohibiting the use of a language or religion. This also relates to the notion of statelessness because there is an overall breakdown of the social identities of these groups. This is done through manipulation of groups to conform to state regulations that impede and obstruct the practice of traditions, cultures, and religions of the Others. This is because the group does not fit into the mold of society established by governments, the group falls outside the normal social constructions of society and become segregated and withdraw from social interactions. This is depicted in a news article published by the Financial Daily that states “the Rohingya are portrayed as illegal immigrants and terrorists, and they face campaigns of race and religious hatred from nationalists in Rakhine State” (The Financial Daily, 2016, p. 2).

With the implementation of these policies the Other is established because the government has indicated that there is a need to regulate the lives of the Rohingyas since they are considered to be illegal inhabitants. As opposed to seeing them as humans the government is willingly portraying these people as criminals and groups of people who are the cause of social and economic strife within the nation. The policies that have been created further to promote the construction of the Other because governments are able to successfully provide non-Rohingya citizens with theories and rhetoric to explain the harsh rules that are needed to ensure the safety of the rest of the nation. As a result, the governments have a significant role in the creation of the Other as the propaganda that is used to create the Other is legitimized

through the discourse that has been developed throughout history and through the information that has been given to the rest of the population by the government and military. This is a primary example of how the social configuration does not justify the genos because of the continual conflict that is inflicted to prevent the genos to be compatible with the state.

Powell argues that targeting a particular genos breaks down the human perspective of these individuals and groups to depict them as stereotypes that have been promoted to cause hate towards the Other. As a result, the human aspect of the individual is diminished and the negative connotations of these individuals are enhanced. This essentially enables the barbarism of civilizations between the “Self” against “Other” and the ultimate destruction of the Other. “Self and Other are not separate or separable, but exist in relation to each other, even where the relation is one of the opposite” (Powell, 2007, p. 541). In genocides, the causality for the Others often results in the extermination of entire cultures, languages, religions, and traditions since the perpetrators seek to eradicate generations of people in the hopes that they can get rid of the segments of the population that is considered to be the cause of the social unrest. This is a dimension of the complex social configurations that sustain the genos. However, further break down of the social configurations prevent the establishment of the genos outside normal social conditions.

The rhetoric used by the government to portray the Rohingyas as the Other has been successful throughout Myanmar. This is evident through the actions and the first-hand accounts seen in many articles that illustrate how the Rohingyas are perceived. In almost all of the news reports there was a negative representation of the Rohingyas, specifically in an article published by the Gulf News where “revered Buddhist monks openly called them insects and

snakes” (Gulf News; Dubai, 2017, p. 3). There have also been many references to the Rohingyas as illegal inhabitants even though the Rohingyas have been settled in Myanmar for centuries (Dewan, 2017, p. 4). The discourse that has been used throughout the nation even by government has approved the conception of the Other because these groups are not considered to be citizens of the state. As a result, an article published by the Financial Express states, the Rohingya’s are not given passports and are issued “temporary scrutiny cards” which clearly mentioned they “were not entitled to citizenship” (Financial Express, 2017, p. 1). When the government denies the right to citizenship, this demonstrates a violation of human rights. The rhetoric that is disseminated throughout the country is used as a divisive measure to disengage the national identity of the Rohingyas and therefore legitimizing the idea that the genos cannot be associated with the national identity of Myanmar.

This discourse has legitimized the use of violence and hate against the Rohingyas because national campaigns have been used to dehumanize the Rohingya to be seen as criminals and murderers (Pitsuwan, 2016, p. 2). Consequently, violence that is directed towards the Rohingyas are overtly ignored by the government and citizens because the narrative within Myanmar is to get rid of the Rohingyas (Mahmood, 2017, p. 2). For this reason, there has been little done by anyone to prevent the attacks from happening against the Rohingyas. “Amnesty International detailed evident of mass killings, torture, rape, and forcible transfers of the Rohingya” (Pirani, 2018, p. 2). The actions of the military and the inaction of the government has led to hundreds of thousands of Rohingyas fleeing to neighbouring countries like Bangladesh, Malaysia and Thailand for their safety. Many other news articles have also said that “there is an increasing amount of credible satellite images, which indicates that whole

villages that were once homes to Rohingya have been bulldozed to the ground” (Wilkinson, 2018, p. 3). There have also been many accounts by the media that the satellite imagery also illustrates that “360 Rohingya villages had been partially or completely destroyed” (Al Jazeera, 2018, p.3).

According to Powell’s breakdown of the genos, the second component is about a social identity and how it is identified as being dangerous. Its networks of practices are interrupted or destroyed, creating violent massacre of populations in order to prevent future generations from progressing (Powell, 2011, p. 538). This was evident in the Rakhine region where the Myanmar government and military targeted the Rohingyas which forced them to flee to surrounding countries. There have been numerous new articles that have illustrated the atrocious acts that the military has engaged in and quoted international organizations such as the United Nations (UN) indicating that the actions of Myanmar can be comparable to the genocide seen in Rwanda (The Financial Daily; Karachi, 2016, p. 1-2). “Monks and protestors shout during a march to denounce foreign criticism of the country’s treatment of stateless Rohingya Muslims, in Yangon, Myanmar” (The Financial Daily; Karachi, 2016, p. 2). Penny Green, a professor at Queen Mary University says “it’s not a stretch to make a comparison between Myanmar and Nazi Germany in the 1930s, or Rwanda in the early 1990s, when 800,000 people, most Tutsi were killed in a matter of weeks. She [Green] added that “the apartheid system in Myanmar is worse than that in South Africa” in the 20th century” (The Financial Daily; Karachi, 2016, p. 2).

Throughout the Rwandan genocide it is evident that the civilization process was a figuration of the monopolization of violence by the state. The conflict between the Hutus and

the Tutsis were essentially developed by the state actors in order to categorize individuals into classes. This identification process essentially resulted in the civil unrest and the genocide between the Tutsis and the Hutus which resulted in the isolation of the genos. Mahmood Mamdani says that “instrumentalism, which explains genocide as an outcome of rational actors pursuing their self-interests by unethical means. Instrumentalism takes for granted the boundaries of identity and the nature of difference – in effect, essentializing the identity-difference relation” (Powell, 2011, p. 276). Leaders in Rwanda who identified as Tutsi’s monopolized the political platform to further their own agendas and ensure that their status but also ensure that there was a known difference between the two classes. This resulted in the hinderance of the genos from the social identity of the state because there was a clear segregation of identities between the genos. These distinctions essentially resulted in the barbaric treatment of the Hutus as they were continuously treated as the inferior race in society or the Others and the marginalization of the genos. The civilization process also limited the resources that Others received, furthering the Hutu’s dependency on the government for additional resource allocation. The Hutus were the farmers who were physiologically thin built while Tutsis were considered to be leaders or Chiefs. The dichotomy of the Hutus and the Tutsis resulted in the polarization of the two which also lead to hatred. This civilization process used the identities of the citizens to further monopolize the way in which people were perceived and treated. As a result, the government and the political system encourage these differences to make one group more superior to the other by giving the status of wealth to the minority group in the country, the Tutsis (Powell, 2011, p. 281).

Eventually this led to the introduction of identity cards for all Rwandans which further segregated and stigmatized the differences between the Hutus and Tutsis. The identification cards gave Tutsis greater powers over their fellow neighbours and gave the Tutsis the legitimization of their brutality towards the Hutus. However, after the independence of Rwanda there was a shift in violence as the Tutsis were actively persecuted. As a result of the continuous violence between the Hutus and Tutsis there was significant economic crisis, the governments and elites used any means necessary to try to create a solution. "...The highly civilized-barbarized quality of the Rwanda state enabled its dominant elite to extemporaneously choose genocide as strategic response to crisis" (Powell, 2011, p. 277). The government also gave the citizens weapons to encourage the genocide and used propaganda that promoted the hatred of the Tutsis while ensuring that there were mass casualties. "The civilizing process in Rwanda produced both social interdependence and impunity. When faced with the loss of their political dominance, a social elite commanding the institutional and material means to ignite the holocaust perceived that they had more to gain than they had to lose from their severing the last, weak ties of moral reciprocity that connected them to their Others" (Powell, 2011, p. 277). This also enables the breakdown of the social identities of the Tutsis because they were no longer seen as nationals but rather enemies of the Hutus. The barbaric civilization process resulted in the monopolization of nation states to promote violence and encourage their politics. Governments have a significant role in promoting genocides as they are able to condition how individuals think about the Others. Once the perception has been legitimized through examples that are endorsed through state action such as arming civilians and legitimizing the use of violence against the Others. As Durkheim said, "the state is

the very organ of social thought” and therefore a very influential institution within the state (Powell, 2011, p. 274).

When comparing the Rohingya genocide to the Rwandan genocide there are many parallels that illustrate how the actions of the Myanmar government and military has resulted in significant barbarism. Powell’s argument of the second component of the genos clearly illustrates that the actions taken towards the Rohingya can be considered a genocide and a form of ethnic cleansing but also the impediment of the social figuration. While analyzing over a dozen different news articles, there was clear mention of the violence that was directed towards the Rohingyas. The parallels between the Rwandan Genocide and the genocide in Myanmar are that there is little to no action by the international community. Although there is a lot of evidence about what is taking place in Myanmar, there has been an overall failure to acknowledge that there is a genocide occurring in Myanmar. An article published by the Guardian states that “the lack of political will is only one reason why the international community appears powerless to halt mass killings” (Tisdall, 2018, p. 3). However, the United Nations has called the violence “a textbook example of ethnic cleansing” but stopped short of the word “genocide,” a legal definition that would require global leaders to take action under the Genocide Convention” (McPherson, 2017, p. 2). Consequently, the international community’s efforts seem to have failed because there have been no further consequences relayed to the Myanmar government and military for the mass exodus of Rohingyas. This is mainly because the genos has been isolated from the social identity of the state, the genos no longer possesses any form of association within social, political and economic platforms.

Therefore, the genos has been forcefully removed from the social identity of the nation to legitimize the use of violence against the Rohingyas.

Although, the government has claimed that they are not involved in the genocides of the Rohingya, the government can be seen as an accessory to the overall genocide because of their refusal to acknowledge the scope of the issue and their refusal to take action. News articles, such as The New York Times have provided primary sources from Rohingya refugees on their experiences, an interviewee told the reporter “how soldiers had executed the men and boys in her village, had made a bonfire of their bodies and had then taken the women to a hut to be raped” (Kristof, 2018, p. 3). Many people in the villages were also attacked with machetes that were openly fired upon. Even though, the military admitted to the involvement of killing Rohingyas and burying them in mass graves, there has been almost no action taken by the government because any sympathy taken by the government would harm the rhetoric of the Others. Consequently, the genos has become an obsolete social figuration because the nation has become immune to the action that take place to disrupt social identities.

Furthermore, since the Rohingyas have been dehumanized and not regarded as nationals of Myanmar, they have become stateless and subjected to annihilation. David Livingstone Smith, the author of “Less Than Human,” argued that “it is important to define and describe dehumanization, because it’s what opens the door for cruelty and genocide” (NPR News, 2011). “Smith also believes that the process of dehumanization, of treating other human beings like game animals or predators, has occurred throughout history. And when people dehumanize others, they actually conceive of them as subhuman creatures” (NPR News, 2011). In addition, he states that dehumanization strips an individual from their identity as humans

and relegates them to the status of a non-human animal (NPR News, 2011). Therefore, in the case of the Rohingyas, their social status and social identity remain stateless since they are considered a nuisance and not Myanmar's issue to deal with.

There are numerous articles such as the BBC online article that have indicated that there has been international outrage towards Aung San Suu Kyi, the State Counsellor of Myanmar, and the recipient of the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize ... as "her failure to defend the Rohingya is extremely disappointing" (Ponniah, 2017, p. 5). As a result, many news articles have also pointed to the fact that Ms. Suu Kyi's silence is a method of covering up the actual atrocities that are taking place within the state as she claims that the number of individuals affected are vastly exaggerated. "A special Myanmar government committee appointed to investigate the ongoing violence in Rakhine state said in an interim report early January that it has so far found no evidence to support claims of genocide against the Rohingya, nor to back up widespread rape allegations. The report made no mention of claims that security forces had been killing civilians" (Ponniah, 2017, p. 5). However, given the number of individuals who have fled to Bangladesh with their first-hand account, it is evident that information that the Myanmar government is providing is a disproportionate representation of the actual facts. News articles such as Al Jazeera, have cited that more than 650,000 Rohingyas have fled to neighbouring countries since August 2017 (Al Jazeera, 2018, p. 3). "Many villages have been locations for mass burials and atrocities, however the international community has been prevented from visiting the villages to see the scope of the issues and there has been evident that the Myanmar government and military bulldozed 55 villages to remove all traces of habitation and the removal of evidence" (Al Jazeera, 2018, p. 3). In addition, an article published by the Globe and

Mail states that Prime Minister Justin Trudeau recently sent a special envoy, Bob Rae to Myanmar a report on the Rohingya crisis was released. In his report he “urges the federal government to lead an international effort to investigate “clear evidence” that crimes against humanity were committed against the Rohingya –a crisis he says bears the hallmarks of genocide” (Zilio, 2018, p.1).

Since “individuals form their social subjectivity through relations with others in a definite context, and identification with others is a crucial part of the process” (Powell, 2007, p. 542). Social structures are established through the connections and interactions between humans in order to satisfy survival needs and sustain social figurations. Powell states that “genocide is the process of violent destruction of that type of figuration (a self-reproducing dynamic network of practical social relations) whose organizing principle is a collective identification” (Powell, 2007, p. 542). This can be related to the Rohingyas genocide and mass extermination, although the Myanmar government and military espoused to get rid of the Rohingya’s, a large population of the region was able to escape to neighboring Bangladesh. Therefore, the Rohingya’s are able to reconstruct their identity and social relations void their home state. This is because these individuals are able to extend beyond their social relations and build on their social facts. “Durkheim defines social facts as a way of acting that individuals confront as external to themselves, capable of constraining their action, and that exist independently of any one of their individual manifestations” (Powell, 2007, p. 536). Individuals and groups are able to reestablish and reproduce their identity through common understandings of their social experiences. These experiences can bring together communities

to assist in the reconstruction of the identity of the individual while enabling the social structures to maintain their functionality.

In analyzing the aforementioned articles, it is evident that Powell's idea of the genos and his concept of the barbaric civilization can be illustrated throughout various published news articles.

Conclusion:

Many privileged people around the world normally do not think about their citizenship on a daily basis. They are able to enjoy basic human rights such as participating and exercising in political activities, gaining access to health care, education and other important government services. However, this is not the case for the millions of stateless people around the world like the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar. The absence of citizenship for these Rohingyas makes them susceptible to various forms of mistreatment and discrimination. They are susceptible to labour exploitation, trafficking, arbitrary detention and countless other human rights abuses. Despite all the obstacles the stateless Rohingyas endure, the most appalling is the fact that they are slowly being annihilated. By examining numerous credible news articles, it is evident that Christopher Powell's idea of the genos and the concept of barbaric civilizations can be used to sociologically account for the Rohingyas' statelessness. Although the Rohingya crisis has actively been portrayed in the media, not enough is being done to place a standstill on the eradication of the Rohingyas who are jeopardizing their livelihoods in an attempt to escape from the horrors of their so-called home country.

The International community has been encouraged to intervene and take action to help rectify the crisis in Myanmar and make the individuals who are responsible for orchestrating the attacks against the Rohingyas accountable for their actions. However, based on the analysis of Powell's sociological contributions, international and local communities need to be further advised and aware that despite the fact that statelessness is a component of processes that can lead to genocide, it can also kill off social identities which perpetuate the dimensions of stateless individuals by eliminating their culture, ethnicity, religion and nationality. Although the Rohingyas themselves need to determine how best to repair and restore their identities that have been destroyed and reconstruct their social relations, both Myanmar and the international community need to provide support to the Rohingyas in order to help rebuild and stabilize their lives through various programs and initiatives that aim to gather small support groups which will allow them to reconstruct their social identities. In addition, it is essential that there be sanctions instilled to impose pressure on the Myanmar government to adopt practices that protect the human rights of stateless civilians in their home country regardless of their citizenship and/or nationality. There also needs to be more direction from the international community to create avenues for stateless individuals to gain citizenship or create alternative measures that allow individuals like the Rohingyas to obtain socio-economic opportunities and the ability to gain basic human rights and not be treated as marginalized stateless individuals making them further vulnerable to social isolation, displacement, and/or even death.

Bibliography:

Al Jazeera. (2018, March 9). UN: Myanmar should be investigated for crimes against Rohingya.

Al Jazeera, pp. 1–3. Retrieved from

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/03/myanmar-investigated-crimes-rohingya-180309105233347.html>

Albert, E. (2017, October 4). What Forces Are Fueling Myanmar’s Rohingya Crisis? Retrieved

October 12, 2017, from <https://www.cfr.org/background/rohingya-crisis>

Balaton-Chrimes, S. (2012). Statelessness in a World of Nation-States. *Web: Http://Artsonline.*

Monash. Edu. Au/Mai/Files/2012/07/Sbalatonchrimes. Pdf, Erişim, 23, 2013.

Batchelor, C. A. (1998). Statelessness and the problem of resolving nationality status.

International Journal of Refugee Law, 10(1–2), 156–182.

Belton, K. (2005, January 1). *The great divide: Citizenship and statelessness*. ProQuest

Dissertations Publishing. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/305363009/>

Bernstein, R. J. (2005). Hannah Arendt on the Stateless. *Parallax, 11(1), 46–60.*

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1353464052000321092>

Blitz, B. K. (2009). Statelessness, Protection and Equality. *Refworld*. Retrieved from

<http://www.refworld.org/docid/4e5f3d572.html>

Burki, T. (2017). Life in limbo for millions of stateless people worldwide. *The Lancet,*

389(10077), 1384–1385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)30942-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30942-X)

- Chickera, A., & Whiteman, J. (2014). Discrimination and the human security of stateless people. *Forced Migration Review; Oxford*, (46), 56–59. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1533427645/abstract/AF67A7ACAE2A42FAPQ/1>
- Dewan, A. (2017, September 13). Who are the Rohingya and why are they fleeing? - CNN. *CNN*, pp. 1–8. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2017/09/05/asia/rohingya-myanmar-explainer/index.html>
- Financial Express. (2017, September 12). Who are Rohingya Muslims and what is the conflict in Rakhine state of Myanmar? *Financial Express; New Delhi*, pp. 1–3. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1937791338/citation/8707D247AB314543PQ/7>
- Foster, M., & Lambert, H. (2016). Statelessness as a Human Rights Issue: A Concept Whose Time Has Come. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 28(4), 564–584. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eew044>
- Gade, F., & Gecker, J. (2015, May 16). 1,000 migrants make landfall after near-starvation at sea. *Telegraph-Journal; Saint John, N.B.*, p. A.10. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/canadiannewsmajor/docview/1681071310/abstract/84D6EC1023EC4791PQ/1>
- Gamez, K. R., & van Waas, L. E. (2017). Examining the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR): The Case Study of the Rohingya Crisis.
- Genocide Watch. (2013, November 20). The International Alliance to End Genocide. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from <http://www.genocidewatch.org/myanmar.html>

Goris, I., Harrington, J., & Köhn, S. (2009). Statelessness: what it is and why it matters. *Forced Migration Review; Oxford*, (32), 4–6. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/236441361/abstract/7E3058BFD9904841PQ/1>

Green, N., & Pierce, T. (2009). Combatting statelessness: a government perspective. *Forced Migration Review; Oxford*, (32), 34–35. Retrieved from [https://search-proquest-](https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/236501546/abstract/D4EFF23F4EF9401BPQ/1)

[com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/236501546/abstract/D4EFF23F4EF9401BPQ/1](https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/236501546/abstract/D4EFF23F4EF9401BPQ/1)

Gulf News; Dubai. (2017, November 4). Fate of stateless Rohingya Muslims is in antagonistic hands. *Gulf News; Dubai*, pp. 1–4. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1959580339/citation/7ABA1AA9F0984E93PQ/1>

Haque, M. M. (2017). Rohingya Ethnic Muslim Minority and the 1982 Citizenship Law in Burma.

Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 37(4), 454–469.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13602004.2017.1399600>

Holtz, M. (2017, September 15). Who are the Rohingya? What you should know about

Myanmar's deepening crisis. *The Christian Science Monitor; Boston, Mass.* Retrieved from [https://search-proquest-](https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/1939054731/abstract/8F9039728EFD43B3PQ/1)

[com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/1939054731/abstract/8F9039728EFD43B3PQ/1](https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/1939054731/abstract/8F9039728EFD43B3PQ/1)

Human Rights Watch. (2018). Burma: End 'Ethnic Cleansing' of Rohingya Muslims. Retrieved

March 20, 2018, from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2013/04/22/burma-end-ethnic-cleansing-rohingya-muslims>

Ibrahim, A. (2017, October 23). There's only one conclusion on the Rohingya in Myanmar: It's genocide. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from

<https://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/opinions/myanmar-rohingya-genocide/index.html>

Jahan, I. (2014a). *Nationality crisis and rights of Rohingya refugee children: A sociological analysis of children's rights in Bangladesh*. Retrieved from

<http://repository.library.du.ac.bd/xmlui/handle/123456789/386>

Jahan, I. (2014b). *Nationality crisis and rights of Rohingya refugee children: A sociological analysis of children's rights in Bangladesh* (PhD Thesis).

Kristof, N. (2018, March 2). I Saw a Genocide in Slow Motion. *The New York Times*, pp. 1–7.

Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/02/opinion/i-saw-a-genocide-in-slow-motion.html>

Lambert, H. (2015). Comparative Perspectives on Arbitrary Deprivation of Nationality and Refugee Status. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 64(01), 1–37.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589314000475>

League of Nations: Treaty Series. (n.d.). Retrieved February 13, 2018, from

https://treaties.un.org/pages/LONViewDetails.aspx?src=LON&id=516&chapter=30&clang=_en

Lowenstein, A., K. (2015). Is Genocide Occuring In Myanmar's Rakhine State?, 78.

- Mahmood, M. (2017, December 18). The Rohingyas: A struggle for identity. *The Financial Express; Dhaka*, pp. 1–4. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1977732968/citation/18A99ED12FBA46FDPO/1>
- McLaughlin, T. (n.d.). Origin of ‘most persecuted minority’ statement unclear. Retrieved March 19, 2018, from <https://www.mmtimes.com/national-news/7376-origin-of-most-persecuted-minority-statement-unclear.html>
- McPherson, P. (2017, November 14). US Holocaust Museum says evidence of genocide against Rohingya in Myanmar | World news | The Guardian. *The Guardian*, pp. 1–3. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/nov/15/us-holocaust-museum-evidence-genocide-rohingya-myanmar>
- Nai, A. (2013, May 22). Rohingyas face riot charges for refusing to register as “Bengali.” Retrieved March 19, 2018, from <http://www.dvb.no/news/rohingyas-face-riot-charges-for-refusing-to-register-as-bengali/28370>
- NPR News. (2011, March 29). “Less Than Human”: The Psychology Of Cruelty. Retrieved April 27, 2018, from <https://www.npr.org/2011/03/29/134956180/criminals-see-their-victims-as-less-than-human>
- Paxton, A. (2012). Finding a Country to Call Home: A Framework for Evaluating Legislation to Reduce Statelessness in Southeast Asia. *Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal; Seattle*, 21(3), 623–653. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/1470087399/citation/775F80FBB1CF47DEPO/1>

- Pirani, F. (2018, March 13). Who are the Rohingya Muslims? 7 things to know about the “world’s most persecuted minority.” *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, pp. 1–12. Retrieved from <https://www.ajc.com/news/world/who-are-the-rohingya-muslims-things-know-about-the-world-most-persecuted-minority/MzQM06SjX8k0hGKz0t9cnM/>
- Pitsuwan, S. (2016, December 7). Asia’s Moral Duty to the Rohingya; Being denied their basic human rights has left them stateless and suffering--and prone to radicalization. *Wall Street Journal (Online); New York, N.Y.*, p. n/a. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1846453132/abstract/EC90ED681E1D4091PQ/1>
- Ponniah, K. (2017, January 10). Who will help Myanmar’s Rohingya? *BBC News*, pp. 1–17. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-38168917>
- Powell, C. J. (2011). *Barbaric civilization: a critical sociology of genocide*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Powell, C. (2007). What do genocides kill? A relational conception of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 9(4), 527–547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520701643285>
- Robbins, M. (2004). Powerful States, Customary Law and the Erosion of Human Rights Through Regional Enforcement. *Cal. W. Int’l LJ*, 35, 275.
- Robinson, I. G., & Rahman, I. S. (n.d.). The Unknown Fate of the Stateless Rohingya, 2(2), 6. Retrieved from <http://oxmofm.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Robinson-and-Rahman-FINAL.pdf>
- Rürup, M. (2011). Lives in Limbo: Statelessness After Two World Wars. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(2), 189–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014198700329024>

- Shivakoti, R. (2017). ASEAN's role in the Rohingya refugee crisis. *Forced Migration Review*, (56), 75–77. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=125667270&site=ehost-live>
- Smith, M. (2014, March 13). Burma's Ethnic Persecution is State Policy; Official abuse threatens both the Rohingya Muslims and the country's opening to the West. *Wall Street Journal (Online); New York, N.Y.*, pp. 1–4. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1506899396/abstract/76A751A7AC394A8BPQ/1>
- Stanton, G. H. (2013). The Ten Stages of Genocide. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from <http://genocidewatch.org/genocide/tenstagesofgenocide.html>
- The Financial Daily; Karachi. (2016, December 21). Rohingyas face "mass annihilation." *The Financial Daily; Karachi*, pp. 1–3. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1850748459/abstract/A2E87BE1335E4AD8PQ/1>
- Tisdall, S. (2018, January 3). World's awkward silence over Rohingya genocide warnings | The Guardian. *The Guardian*, pp. 1–5. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jan/03/worlds-awkward-silence-over-rohingya-genocide-warnings>
- Tribune Content Agency. (2017, September 12). Myanmar: Who are the Rohingya? *TCA Regional News; Chicago*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1937733652/citation/DE3232EDEB9C463EPQ/1>

- United Nations General Assembly. (2013, December 19). Human Rights and Arbitrary Deprivation of Nationality - OHCHR. Retrieved March 5, 2018, from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/RegularSessions/Session25/Documents/A-HRC-25-28_en.doc
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (n.d.). Statelessness Around the World. Retrieved January 22, 2018, from <http://www.unhcr.org/statelessness-around-the-world.html>
- United Nations Human Rights: Office of the High Commissioner. (2018). OHCHR | Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CrimeOfGenocide.aspx>
- Walker, D. J. (1981). Statelessness: Violation or Conduit for Violation of Human Rights? *Human Rights Quarterly*, 3(1), 106. <https://doi.org/10.2307/762070>
- Weissbrodt, D. S., & Collins, C. (2006). The human rights of stateless persons. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 28(1), 245–276.
- Wilkinson, B. (2018, March 12). UN official convinced of Myanmar Rohingya “genocide” - CNN. *CNN*, pp. 1–4. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2018/03/12/asia/myanmar-rohingya-un-violence-genocide-intl/index.html>
- Zarni, M., & Cowley, A. (2014). The Slow-Burning Genocide of Myanmar’s Rohingya. *Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal*, 23(3), 683–754. Retrieved from

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=97181422&site=ehost-live>

Zawacki, B. (2012). Defining Myanmar's "Rohingya Problem." Retrieved from

<http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1873&context=hrbrief>

Zilio, M. (2018, April 3). Canada must lead effort to investigate Rohingya crisis, Bob Rae says.

The Globe and Mail, pp. 1–5. Retrieved from

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/politics/article-canada-must-continue-to-target-myanmars-human-rights-abusers-bob-rae/>