

STATELESSNESS IS A VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS -WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON ROHINGYAS

Mounika Chelamkuri*

ABSTRACT

Statelessness is a global problem that is getting worse and affects millions of people. Article 1 of the Convention on the Status of Stateless Persons, 1954 states that a stateless person is "not considered as national by any State under the operation of its law". It only talks about de jure stateless people, who have a nationality but are not protected by any government and leaves out de facto stateless people, who have a nationality but are not protected by any government. People have found it helpful to use the term "statelessness" to describe all people who do not have an "effective nationality." An individual may lose his/her citizenship due to different reasons. This paper deals with a broad view of those individuals who have no home country with an outlook on statelessness from a legal, theoretical, and practical point of view. The article explains the rights of stateless people as stated in different human rights instruments. It also explains how and why people become stateless. It shows the struggles of stateless people by focusing on the plights of different stateless groups. It looks at how the problem of statelessness is being dealt with and how complex political and regional forces affect policies toward stateless people. Not only does statelessness cause problems within a state, but these problems often spread across borders. This paper talks about the Rohingya refugee crisis, which has led to a large number of people being forced to move to neighbour Bangladesh. The problem of people without citizenship eventually spread across borders, forcing the Rohingyas to move against their will.

Keywords: Nationality, Statelessness, Refugees, Rohingyas, Citizenship, International Court of Justice.

INTRODUCTION

A stateless person is a person who is not recognized as a national of any country under international law. Nationality is typically an issue of domestic jurisdiction within a country. International human rights law affirms everyone's right to nationality, which means that each

*BA LLB, DAMODARAM SANJIVAYYA NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY, VISAKHAPATNAM.

person should be entitled to acquire, renounce, or preserve his or her nationality. The loss of nationality places an individual in a precarious position. Eighty percent of refugees are seeking shelter in neighbouring nations. Refugees face the hardships of war and persecution. Their fundamental rights and even their lives are in jeopardy. The Rohingya Refugees are an ethnic minority tribe, who are Muslims and had been residing in Myanmar for generations. The estimated Rohingya population in the country is approximately 1.1 million. This is a classic migrant crisis; it has affected a large number of people, which is currently escalating the problem. The Rohingya face starvation, housing shortages, and ethnic cleansing, but they lack the necessary rights because no country recognizes their citizenship. The human rights of these people are gravely violated, and they confront a multitude of consequences and difficulties.

STATELESSNESS

The term 'stateless person' is defined in the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons (1954 Convention) as an individual who is not considered a national by any state under the operation of its law.¹ The UN estimates that at present there are at least 10 million stateless people globally. While instances of statelessness occur throughout the world, the problem is particularly acute in the Middle East and Asia; more than 40% of the world's known stateless people live in Southeast Asia. Numerous factors contribute to statelessness, including complexities or conflicts in nationality laws, state succession, forced displacement, historic migration, and difficulties in registering the birth of children. Due to the correlation with displacement, many stateless individuals are refugees. Among the displaced stateless populations are the Rohingya, the Syrian and Iraqi Kurds, and the Palestinians. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is working with authorities in asylum countries to ensure that civil registration is available to refugees, for example by conducting civil registration in the refugee camps in Jordan. It was mentioned that the UNHCR now considers nationality acquisition, reacquisition, or confirmation to be necessary for long-term solutions, such as voluntary repatriation of stateless refugees. Statelessness has serious consequences because it deprives people of the rights afforded to those who are recognised as citizens of a state. Many civil, political, economic, and social rights, such as the right to a decent education, access to healthcare, the right to vote, and the right to work, are guaranteed by this guarantee. It was emphasised that stateless people are extremely marginalised and at

¹ Article 1(1) Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons (1954) 360 United Nations <<http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3840.html>> accessed 12 June 2023.

risk.²The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was the first UN instrument to address the issue of statelessness, stating that ‘everyone has the right to a nationality’ and that ‘no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality’.³Two subsequent United Nations conventions exclusively address statelessness: the 1954 Convention on the Protection of Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, which aims to eliminate statelessness.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK TO ADDRESS STATELESSNESS

The later effect of both World Wars has been so drastic, millions of people fled their homes in search of safety. The United Nations has been addressing war and conflict since its inception after World War II. In an effort to address the issue of statelessness, the international community has come to a number of agreements. The right to nationality was first recognised as a fundamental right with the adoption of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 15 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides:

- 1) Everyone has the right to a nationality;
- 2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality or denied the right to change his nationality.

Three conventions were ratified to safeguard against people being rendered stateless. And those things are:

- 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees;
- 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons;
- 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

1951 CONVENTION RELATING TO THE STATUS OF REFUGEES

United Nations multilateral treaty for the protection of refugees also known as the Refugee Convention. It lays out who is considered a refugee, their rights, and the responsibility of states to protect them. The convention stresses that refugees should not be returned to

²“Statelessness” *Social Service Review* (1951) 25 (1) *JSTOR* <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30018580>> accessed 12 June 2023.

³ Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948.

countries where they fear persecution or danger to life, with the exception of war convicts and those deemed dangerous to the security of the country.

In addition, refugees are also required to abide by the laws of the country in which they are residing and maintain public order. Some provisions of this convention include:

- Article 21 – the right to have a house.
- Article 26 – the right to freely move within the territory.
- Article 31 – the right not to be punished for illegal entry while in the territory of the contracting state.

1954 CONVENTION RELATING TO THE STATUS OF STATELESS PERSONS

This Convention sets forth criteria for identifying a stateless person, grants them certain rights, and seeks to address the day-to-day challenges they face. The person without nationality must obey the rules and regulations of the country in which he is temporarily residing and contribute to the preservation of public safety. Certain provisions of this convention are:

Article 5 – the right to freedom of religion.

Article 22 – The right to education.

Article 27 – A stateless person not having a travel document to be issued with identity papers by the contracting state.

The de jure stateless persons were intended to be regulated by the 1954 Convention. Thus Convention guarantees various rights, such as identity, travel documents, and administrative assistance, to stateless people and establishes minimum standards of treatment for them in these areas.

1961 CONVENTION ON THE REDUCTION OF STATELESSNESS

This Convention was brought with the aim to eradicate statelessness dealing with the conferral of citizenship giving effect to Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – the right to nationality for all. Some important provisions of the Convention:

Article 1 – Subject to certain conditions, granting nationality to all stateless children born in their state, automatically or upon application.

Article 2 – granting nationality to those children who are found abandoned in their state.

The 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness would reduce the number of people who became stateless.

International bodies such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) guarantee the protection of civil and political rights at the regional level to supplement the international conventions on statelessness. In regard to nationality, however, the discretion of states is constrained by the obligations imposed by international treaties to which they are parties. The majority of nations where large numbers of people have been rendered stateless are not signatories to international conventions pertaining to the protection of stateless individuals.

RESPONSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO STATELESSNESS

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) was adopted in 1948 with the purpose of guaranteeing fundamental human rights to all people and promoting international peace. It contains provisions regarding the right to life and liberty, the abolition of slavery, and the prevention of inhumane, torturous, and degrading treatment, among others. Since the adoption of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, every subsequent universal and regional human rights treaty has reaffirmed the right to nationality. However, there are still thousands of people in the world who lack the security and protection available to citizens.⁴

⁴Weissbrodt, David, and Clay Collins, The Human Rights of Stateless Persons, *Human Rights Quarterly*, (2006) 28 (1) *JSTOR* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20072730> accessed 13June 2023.

UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is a United Nations institution that focuses on the subject of statelessness. It strives to provide food, water, and shelter, as well as protect human rights and provide long-term solutions to refugee issues. Currently, UNHCR is active in 134 countries and employs more than 16,000 people. The UNHCR Statistic Database provides field operations with statistics, reports, etc. that are vital for field operations. The UNHCR started #IBelong, a ten-year global movement to abolish statelessness by 2024, in 2014. UNHCR believes that the issue of statelessness can be handled with political and popular support and the appropriate help.

Measures recommended by the UNHCR to end statelessness

- By ensuring that no child is brought into the world stateless.
- Resolving the current statelessness situation.
- Elimination of gender discrimination law.
- Preventing statelessness in the event of state succession.
- Facilitate naturalization of stateless migrants.
- By ensuring birth registration.
- To accede to the UN Convention relating to statelessness.

In 1995, the UN General Assembly authorised the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to identify and protect stateless people, as well as to prevent and eliminate statelessness. Prior to that, the rate of ratification of the two statelessness conventions of 1954 and 1961 was low, and statelessness was a minor concern for the international community. During the Cold War, international societies neglected to devote considerable attention to the issue of statelessness. Due to the rise of consciousness, the increase in communal conflicts, the dissolution of several federal policies such as the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, and the fear of mass exodus, the issue of statelessness was added to the international humanitarian and security agenda by the end of the 1980s. UNHCR serves as a coordinating partner in implementing nationality law or policy reforms to eliminate statelessness through the automatic acquisition of nationality⁵. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals strives to foster peaceful and inclusive

⁵ROE DILYS, Conservation and Human Rights: The Need for International Standards. International Institute for Environment and Development (2010) JSTOR <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep01438> accessed 13 June 2023.

societies for sustainable development, offer access to justice for all, and establish institutions at all levels that are effective, responsible, and inclusive. Alongside this objective, if other targets such as the eradication of gender discrimination and ensuring legal identification for all, including birth registration are efficiently fulfilled, statelessness may be reduced.

ROHINGYA CRISIS

The Rohingya people who live in Rakhine State were an ethnic minority in Myanmar. They were subjected to persecution, brutality, apartheid, and violations of basic liberties because of Myanmar's public military. This violence, which has been described as ethnic cleansing and decimation, has forced many families to flee to Bangladesh, which is currently overwhelmed by the massive influx of displaced people. "The world's largest exile camp is located in Bangladesh's Cox's Bazar district, where a sympathetic guide is essential in helping the weak outcast local area. The UN has declared the Rohingya people to be the most oppressed people in the world,⁶ but very less has been done by the international community to alleviate this repression and racial tensions in Burma. For more than 17 years, the Rohingya people have been fighting for their right to citizenship in Burma. The Rohingya are a different race than the majority of people who follow Islam, and hail from Rakhine, formerly known as Arakan. They are not considered Burmese because they speak a different language, have a different history, and have a different historical context. This organisation dates back to the 15th century and represents Myanmar's first Muslim group. Despite having lived in Rakhine for generations, "they are described by the Burmese state as Bangladeshi nationals with no right to the privileges of Burmese citizenship, leading to a mass exodus of more than 250,000 Rohingya refugees who fled persecution in Myanmar and arrived in Bangladesh, living in makeshift camps and completely reliant on UN assistance. There is evidence of cultural genocide in Burma, which resulted in mass migration to Bangladesh, a neighbouring country. It is clear that the condition of Rohingya Muslims in Burma is much worse than in Bangladesh. In either situation, the Bangladeshi government has engaged in indefensible actions in relation to the Rohingya."⁷ In this way, while the Burmese government treats these stateless people with ruthlessness, the Bangladeshi government treats them in a similar fashion, but with a difference in political thought processes. As a result, the regime, by enacting legislation to exterminate a segment of the population, will exploit this group even

⁶ UNHCR, <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e4877d6.html> (13/06/2023).

⁷ Penny Green, "Islamophobia: Burma's racist fault-line" (2013) 55 (2)Sage journals <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0306396813497884> accessed 13June2023.

more than the express into which stateless citizens will be forced due to denials of fundamental freedoms.

The Rohingya people face regulated separation and mistreatment in their homeland of Myanmar, which has exacerbated the humanitarian crisis. This emergency is directly linked to a variety of global structures and key factors, including environmental change impacts, social and political stresses, ecological weakness, and state delicacy. Nonetheless, Myanmar's ongoing popular struggle is rooted in the country's history as a British colony, and it has caused the legitimacy of the government to be repeatedly questioned and checked. As a result, the Myanmar government lacks the capacity to maintain control, ensure ordinary citizens, and run a different nation.

The military's repeated violations of common liberties have resulted in the mass resettlement of Rohingya as they flee the obliteration of their homes and property. As Myanmar's growth continues to overwhelm a state with limited assets and borders, this has a significant impact on neighbouring countries, especially Bangladesh. A global helpful guide is needed to assist Rohingya exiles, reduce the monetary and authoritative burden placed on Bangladesh's government, and ensure the stability, safety, and well-being of a large number of evacuees. Limitations imposed by Bangladesh's public authority on exiles' growth and rights, as well as NGOs' practises, have encouraged an unfair approach to dealing with helpful guides, resulting in a focus on foreign assistance rather than empowering displaced people by increasing their resilience, sovereignty, dignity, and prospects for expanding independence. As a result, assistance has been concentrated on funding exiles' forgotten immediate needs, rather than addressing the evacuees' primary problems. Furthermore, the restrictions on interests in the system for exiles hinder the ability of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to assist and accommodate evacuees in a cost-effective and long-term manner.

Bangladesh and the international community must see the safe and only return of Rohingya evacuees to Myanmar. Bringing home, on the other hand, is likely to be a long-term goal since it faces many challenges and is unlikely to happen quickly. Apart from refusing to acknowledge the public military's ethnic cleansing and violations of fundamental rights, the Myanmar civilian government is unable to ensure the Rohingya population's safety and protection within its borders. Meanwhile, the Rohingya populations in Myanmar's IDP camps, as well as Bangladesh's outcast camps, remain powerless.

MYANMAR'S ROHINGYA: FROM BURMA PEOPLE TO GLOBAL STATELESSNESS

The Rohingya population in the country is assessed to be about 1.1 million. Regardless of this, they have not been perceived as one of Myanmar's authority ethnic gatherings and have been denied citizenship since 1982. Practically the entirety of Myanmar's Rohingya individuals lives in Rakhine, one of the country's most unfortunate areas, with ghetto-like camps and a shortage of social offices and openings.

The Union Citizenship Act was passed shortly after Myanmar's independence in 1948, defining the names that were eligible for citizenship. About the fact that the Rohingya were exempt from the protest, it allowed those whose families had lived in Myanmar for at least two generations to apply for identity cards. In either event, in the 1962 military upheaval, Army Chief of Staff Ne Win became President of the Republic as Chairman of the Revolutionary Council, suspending the constitution and dissolving the legislative body, signalling the beginning of the military's hegemony in nearly all areas of the region, which continues to this day. This takeover dramatically changed things for the Rohingya, as citizens were required to obtain public enrolment cards. However, the Rohingya were only issued unfamiliar character cards, implying that any job and educational opportunities they might pursue were completely restricted. Another regional law was passed in 1982, declaring the Rohingya to be stateless because they were not considered one of the country's 135 ethnic groups. This rule stipulated that in order to obtain the highest level of citizenship, an individual's family must have resided in Myanmar prior to 1948, as well as knowledge of one of the public dialects. Many Rohingyas needed administrative assistance, which was either unavailable or denied to them. As a result, their ability to work, fly, follow their faith, and access healthcare services has been and continues to be limited. They are unable to vote, and there is a limit on the number of people who can practise medication, law, or pursue a position.⁸

Various attacks on the Rohingya in Rakhine State have forced several thousand to flee to neighbouring states such as Bangladesh, Malaysia, Thailand, and other Southeast Asian countries since the 1970s. Exiles have detailed instances of Myanmar security forces

⁸Md JobairAlam, *The Rohingya Minority of Myanmar: Surveying Their Status and Protection in International Law* (2018) 25 (2) JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26557890> accessed 13June 2023.

assaulting, torturing, torching, and murdering Rohingya candidates, the most recent of which occurred in late August, when Rohingya candidates assaulted police posts, inciting a military crackdown, which has prompted international condemnation for their plainly unbalanced and disregard for fundamental standards of worldwide law.

Impact of Myanmar Citizenship Law of 1982

The Burmese government and military regime have been known to engage in acts of violence in fear of psychological oppression from Muslim extremists. Another theory behind this statelessness stems from the Burmese government's claim of 'racial purification.' The Rohingya race is not regarded as a distinct ethnic group in Myanmar, as stated in the recently updated constitution's 1982 Citizenship Law: 'First, there were people from Burmese ethnic groups, and then there were people who were "partners" or "naturalised" civilians.'⁹This is in violation of Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that "everyone has the right to an identity" and that "no one will be self-assuredly refused his identity or denied the opportunity to change his nationality." "As many Rohingyas had been taught the Chittagong language and had received no education in the public language, this effectively neutralised them. Another point worth mentioning is that the actual legislation states that the Council of State can choose whether or not any ethnic gathering in public." The province of Burma had ignored Rohingya as an ethnic group, implying that they would not be classified as citizens if they bombed the models classified. As a result, for the majority of Burmese people, there was a fair distinction of prejudice.

People face a variety of consequences if they are refused citizenship within their own country. The Rohingya are barred from participating in elective government, entering the army, and engaging in some financial activities as a result of their lack of citizenship. The UN Declaration states in Article 21 that "each has the right to participate in the public authority of his government, directly or by unreservedly chosen delegates."¹⁰ As a result, the Rohingya are being held accountable for their ethnicity. There is also a commitment to obtain funds in order to travel around the world to operate in different areas, which is all very

⁹ Grundy-Warr, Carl, and Elaine Wong. "Sanctuary Under a Plastic Sheet—The Unresolved Problem of Rohingya Refugees." (1997) 84 IBRU <https://www.dur.ac.uk/ibru/publications/view/?id=116> accessed 13 June 2023.

¹⁰ Mary Ann Glendon, "A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights" (New York: Random House, 2001) 354.

expensive. There is a barrier to growth in the absence of citizenship, which could significantly stymie financial development.

LIFE IN AND OUT OF THE REFUGEE CAMPS

Article 26 of the Declaration of Human Rights states that everybody has the choice of attending school in every jurisdiction. This has not been the case for the Rohingya people of Bangladesh. The Bangladeshi government had not allowed any exiles to be educated in UN evacuee camps for the “first five years of the flood of Rohingya refugees.”¹¹ The reason for this is that free training may encourage more exiles to join Bangladesh, preventing the progress of taking them home. Indeed, even now, the most important standard of teaching in the camps is at the primary school level, and any single person instructing is unpaid and doing so on purpose. There is a financial impediment to anyone who attends these camps by not allowing training to take place. The lack of training will obstruct each child, man, and woman's ability to do business, and by intentionally prohibiting each Rohingya from entering these camps, there is a sense of disregard for basic freedoms, which adds to the feeling of inequality. Another major deprivation of fundamental liberty perpetrated against the Rohingya in Bangladesh is their refusal to leave evacuee camps, and if they do leave, they face immediate prosecution to end their stay in Bangladesh. In 2011, Bangladeshi authorities decided to demolish all improvised camps and deport all exiles living in filthy conditions through 'Activity Clean Core.' This resulted in approximately 6000 people being homeless, as well as a failure to allow any organizations to assist the Rohingyas. They were not allowed to receive guidance, medical care, or even know how much food to eat. The Bangladeshi government has made it clear that it will not assist the Rohingya by completely restricting growth and being unable to allow basic ways of life. The difference in the current situation is that the Rohingyas are essentially Bengali in origin, speaking in common dialects, practicing a similar religion, and even seeming to have similar ancestors.

From a pragmatist perspective, the public authority admits immovably to ‘self-interest’ and will face severe scrutiny for improving the Rohingya's lives when the public's living conditions are too dire. The fact that fundamental freedoms have been denied in Bangladesh, there is a stronger sense that all is well in the world for the Rohingyas and the possibility of racial and strict pressure. Since Bangladesh is a mainstream country with a large Muslim

¹¹Frontieres-Holland, Médecins Sans. "10 years for the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh: Past, present and future." (MSF-Holland, 2002).

community, the Islamic faith is respected. Mosques, Friday supplications, and Halal meat are fair with the Sunni faith accounting for the lion's share. This alleviates the Rohingya's fear of the government clamping down on social differences. Bangladesh has a similar language, making it easier for displaced people to find jobs and get acquainted with it.

ICJ RULING ON ROHINGYA CRISIS

The International Court of Justice's decision on Rohingya, which was a memorable one, would most certainly lift certain expectations among exploited Rohingyas. The decision has compelled the Myanmar government to fulfill its legal obligations in the aftermath of the Myanmar military's indiscriminate protests against Rohingyas in 2017. Furthermore, the United Nations' top court adopted a course of action in response to the 1948 Genocide Convention, asking Myanmar to take four interim steps to prevent acts of genocide against the Rohingya minority population and to stop erasing evidence of alleged devastation. Myanmar was also a source of disappointment for the ICJ. The ICJ ruling is being hailed as a victory for those who have worked tirelessly to safeguard the Rohingya's rights and protect them from mistreatment by members of the Myanmar military and other fearful elements. The Gambia, which followed up with the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), deserves special praise for defying the International Court of Justice. The decision made a week ago is necessary to create some friction in Myanmar. The nation should now feel compelled to provide assurance to the Rohingya people. However, the decision excludes any meaningful action on Bangladesh's top concern: the repatriation of nearly 0.75 million Rohingya refugees who sought shelter in Bangladesh in 2017 to escape extreme violence. From the beginning, there have been divergent viewpoints on Bangladesh's treatment of the Rohingyas. However, through international support, it is creating some intense memories of providing food and shelter to a particularly large number of displaced persons. The Rohingya population's influx has also resulted in a slew of social and environmental problems. The Rohingya evacuees must be returned to Bangladesh as soon as possible. It was, however, equally concerned about the health and welfare of these people who had seen the most dreadful in their own country. Bangladesh has made a number of fruitless attempts to persuade Myanmar to return the Rohingya refugees. The latter isn't sincere about the matter, as it has repeatedly broken its promises made at different gatherings. The Rohingya problem has put a strain on Myanmar's rebel organisation. In either case, such a pressing consideration yielded no certain outcome as a result of overt yet ludicrous encouragement from a couple of

awesome nations. The fact remains that Bangladesh enjoys excellent relations with each of these countries. However, their political and financial interests in Myanmar were more important to them than anything else. This time, though, there could be an emotional change as a result of the ICJ's decision, which has much more significant consequences. The Rohingya problem is no longer only discussed in global and regional meetings. The problem now has the truly requisite legal backing of the world's most powerful court, as a result of Thursday's ruling. If Myanmar tells the ICJ about the conduct taken in accordance with its January 23 ruling, the case will be investigated again in four months. Bangladesh should play its cards wisely with the sole goal of returning the Rohingyas to their homeland in a safe environment. With this goal in mind, Dhaka must mount a discretionary hostility in a situation that is considered to be better than before.¹²

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that statelessness has been given little attention by policymakers so far, it has the potential to spark unrest on a national or even a global scale if left unchecked. States that have a high rate of population rendered stateless due to discriminatory nationality policy are often not signatories to international conventions addressing the issue. The refusal to accept these conventions presents a significant barrier to ending statelessness and providing humanitarian aid to those without nationality. Most importantly, statelessness is a major barrier to achieving sustainable development goals when certain populations are denied access to essential resources. In order to make progress on the Sustainable Development Agenda, a goal of a more equitable and inclusive world, the problem of statelessness must be properly addressed. The Rohingya crisis is a major international issue, as has become abundantly clear. It is suggested that countries in the region increase their cooperation and work together to solve the problem, while each country also takes personal responsibility. Equal treatment of all people without discrimination and safety for all are fundamental human rights and humanitarian principles upon which any regional approach must be built. It's safe to say that the refugees' myriad problems, which prevent them from leading normal life, have not been resolved. The government of the countries that have taken in refugees has an obligation to improve the living conditions there. Finally, the ICJ ordered Myanmar to take "all measures within its power to prevent genocide" in the Rohingya population.

¹²ICJ ruling on Rohingya crisis' The Financial Express (27 January 2020)
<<https://thefinancialexpress.com.bd/editorial/icj-ruling-on-rohingya-crisis-1579969104>>
accessed 14 June 2023.

According to the decision, which has been called a "restraining order," the government of Myanmar must take additional steps to ensure that its armed forces do not attempt to commit genocide or conspire to commit genocide.

