

BBIMUN'25

International Organisation for Migration (IOM)

Be Honest, Be Brave

BBIMUN'25

Agenda: Formulating Strategies to Combat Mass
Migration due to Ethnic Conflict with Reference to
Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar

Table of Contents

Letter from the Executive Board	2
Introduction to the Committee (IOM)	3
Mandate and Scope of the IOM	4
Understanding Mass Migration due to Ethnic Conflict	5
Case Study: The Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar	7
Regional & International Response to the Crisis	10
Broader Solutions for Delegates to Consider	12
Challenges in Managing Rohingya Displacement	13
Framework and Strategic Approaches	14
References	15

Letter from the Executive Board

Greetings Delegates!

It is our pleasure to welcome you to the academic stimulation of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) of the BBI Model United Nations, 2025. In this committee, we shall be analyzing a very challenging and common subject in today's time which is "Formulating Strategies to Combat Mass Migration due to Ethnic Conflict with Reference to Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar". Please note that this background guide is in no way meant to be an exhaustive guide on the subject, but merely a stepping stone for the rest of your research, which you are expected to undertake independently. Also, not under any circumstances can the background guide be quoted or used as substantial proof in committee sessions. The more information and understanding you acquire on the agenda, the more you will be able to influence the discussion in committee. With that said, you have to understand your research and be able to use it. Try not to quote things from documents without really understanding what they mean. Instead, understand the content in the documents and form your own arguments based on your understanding and analysis of this content.

We understand that MUN conferences can be an overwhelming experience for delegates but we don't expect you to be perfect. We want to see how you can respect disparities and differences of opinion, work around them, while extending your own foreign policy so that it includes more comprehensive solutions without compromising your own stand and initiate consensus building. New ideas are by their very nature disruptive, but far less disruptive than a world set against the backdrop of stereotypes and regional instability due to which reform is essential in policy making and conflict resolution. Thus, we welcome fresh perspectives for intelligent management of human capital which shall shape the direction of this world. We are looking forward to meeting you all at the campus. Don't be afraid to speak up and be heard.

Regards,

Lavisha Bageja (Chairperson)



Manya Arora (Vice Chairperson) manya.arora2404@gmail.com

Vedika Arora (Substantive Director) vedikaroraa@gmail.com

Introduction to the Committee (IOM)

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) was founded in 1951 in the aftermath of World War II, when the devastation of Europe had displaced millions of people and created an urgent need for coordinated resettlement and humanitarian action. Originally called the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, the body evolved into what is today a global leader in migration governance. With over 175 member states and offices in more than 100 countries, the IOM is a unique platform where humanitarian needs, state sovereignty, and international cooperation intersect.

The committee's work is rooted in the recognition that migration is not merely a demographic or logistical challenge, but a complex socio-political reality that directly impacts human security, development, and human rights. In this sense, IOM does not view migration as a problem to be "solved," but as a phenomenon to be managed, with equal attention to migrants' dignity and states' security concerns.

Its functions span three main domains. The first, **migration management and governance**, focuses on ensuring that migration takes place through regulated frameworks that protect migrants' rights while allowing states to set lawful entry and residence criteria. The second, **humanitarian assistance**, reflects IOM's role in responding to crisis situations, such as conflicts, natural disasters, and sudden mass displacements, where it delivers emergency shelter, health care, and logistical support. The third, **return and reintegration**, addresses long-term solutions by helping displaced populations either return to their countries of origin under voluntary and safe conditions or integrate into host communities with social and economic support. By addressing both immediate humanitarian needs and long-term governance challenges, IOM provides delegates in this committee with a dynamic space to explore not only the technical aspects of migration but also the ethical and political considerations underlying it.

Mandate and Scope of the IOM

The IOM's mandate is guided by the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits both migrants and societies. Its scope has broadened significantly since 2016, when the organization formally became a related agency of the United Nations. This development brought migration firmly into the UN system, recognizing its centrality to global peace, development, and human rights.

The IOM's mandate is multifaceted. It works to facilitate **international cooperation on migration issues**, bringing together states to develop common strategies and share best practices. It also provides **direct services to migrants**, including medical screenings, vocational training, legal advice, and resettlement operations. Another critical element of its mandate is to assist states in **policy formulation and capacity building**, ensuring that governments are equipped to handle migration flows while adhering to international human rights standards.

Importantly, the IOM's scope extends beyond administrative or technical assistance. It is also tasked with addressing the **root causes of migration**, which may include poverty, inequality, conflict, or environmental



degradation. In this sense, the organization operates not only as a humanitarian actor but also as a development partner, working to integrate migration into national and regional development agendas.

The IOM occupies a delicate position, balancing the humanitarian imperative to protect vulnerable populations with the sovereign right of states to regulate entry and residence. This duality often places the organization at the heart of difficult negotiations, where political, legal, and humanitarian considerations must be weighed against one another. For delegates, understanding this tension is critical, as it reflects the very challenges they will face when drafting resolutions which is how to uphold the rights and dignity of migrants while accommodating states' legitimate concerns over security, resources, and social cohesion.

Understanding Mass Migration due to Ethnic Conflict

Mass migration arising from ethnic conflict represents one of the most severe humanitarian challenges in the international system. It is often the result of deep-rooted structural discrimination, political exclusion, and deliberate acts of violence that target communities on the basis of their ethnicity, religion, or cultural identity. Such migration is rarely voluntary; rather, it is overwhelmingly the product of survival imperatives in the face of persecution and violence.

Ethnic persecution is frequently at the core of these movements. States or dominant groups may systematically marginalize ethnic minorities, denying them access to citizenship, property rights, education, or political representation. Over time, such exclusion creates conditions where these groups are stripped not only of legal recognition but also of their social and cultural identity. Persecution in this form often escalates into widespread displacement when discriminatory policies are coupled with violence or state-led crackdowns.

The result is often **forced displacement**, where individuals and families flee across borders or within their own country to escape persecution. Unlike voluntary migration, where movement may be motivated by opportunities, forced displacement occurs under duress, with migrants often leaving behind homes, livelihoods, and communities in search of basic safety. These displaced populations face precarious conditions, with limited legal protections and heightened vulnerabilities.

A recurring consequence of such displacement is **statelessness**, wherein individuals are not recognized as nationals of any state. Stateless populations exist in a legal vacuum, lacking access to basic rights such as healthcare, education, and freedom of movement. The Rohingya, for example, have long been denied citizenship by Myanmar, rendering them stateless even before their mass exodus in 2017. Statelessness magnifies vulnerability by leaving affected populations without recourse to state protection, effectively cutting them off from the guarantees of sovereignty.

Ethnic conflicts often unfold in the context of **armed conflict and targeted violence**. Civil wars, insurgencies, or military campaigns frequently intersect with ethnic divisions, leading to attacks that disproportionately affect minority communities. These can take the form of massacres, sexual violence, or destruction of villages, all aimed at either punishing or removing targeted groups. The deliberate and systematic nature of such acts constitutes not only crimes against humanity but, in some cases, genocide.

This gives rise to the phenomenon of **population cleansing**, where violence and intimidation are deployed to create ethnically homogenous regions. Such cleansing campaigns often involve mass



killings, forced evictions, and destruction of cultural symbols. Beyond the immediate human toll, they alter demographic realities, create permanent refugee flows, and destabilize entire regions.

In this context, the distinction between a **refugee** and a **migrant** becomes crucial. Refugees, as defined by the 1951 Refugee Convention, are individuals who cross borders due to a well-founded fear of persecution and are entitled to international protection. Migrants, by contrast, are generally understood as individuals who move voluntarily, often for economic or educational opportunities, and may not enjoy the same level of legal safeguards. In practice, however, this distinction is often blurred, particularly when states attempt to deny refugee status to those fleeing ethnic persecution, framing them instead as “illegal migrants.” Delegates should remain mindful of how this definitional debate has significant consequences for international protection obligations.

Finally, understanding the **root causes of migration** is essential. Ethnic conflict-driven migration rarely occurs in isolation. It is tied to broader issues such as poverty, weak governance, systemic discrimination, historical grievances, and political manipulation of ethnic identities. Climate change and resource scarcity increasingly exacerbate these tensions, as marginalized communities are often the most vulnerable to environmental degradation. Thus, ethnic persecution becomes both a direct cause and an amplifier of pre-existing vulnerabilities, pushing communities into cycles of displacement and instability.

In sum, mass migration due to ethnic conflict is not merely the movement of people but a reflection of deep structural injustices. It raises critical questions about sovereignty, international protection, and the responsibility of the global community. For delegates, engaging with this issue means not only examining the immediate humanitarian crises but also addressing the systemic roots that drive populations from their homes.

Case Study: The Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar

The Rohingya crisis is widely regarded as one of the most pressing humanitarian emergencies of the 21st century, marked by mass displacement, statelessness, and allegations of genocide. The Rohingya are a predominantly Muslim ethnic minority residing primarily in Myanmar’s Rakhine State, where they have lived for generations. Despite their historical presence, the Myanmar government has consistently denied them recognition as one of the country’s official ethnic groups. Under the 1982 Citizenship Law, most Rohingya were rendered stateless, stripped of nationality, and excluded from basic political and civil rights. This long-standing marginalization created fertile ground for systemic discrimination, social alienation, and eventual mass violence.

The **2017 exodus** was a defining moment in this crisis. Following attacks by the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA) on security posts, the Myanmar military, known as the Tatmadaw, launched sweeping operations in Rakhine State. What the government framed as “counter-terrorism” efforts quickly escalated into widespread atrocities, including extrajudicial killings, sexual violence, and the destruction of entire villages. Within weeks, over 740,000 Rohingya fled across the border into Bangladesh, joining earlier displaced communities. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights described the crackdown as a “textbook example of ethnic cleansing,” while several international bodies and NGOs have gone further, categorizing it as genocide.

The **Tatmadaw’s role** in this crisis cannot be overstated. For decades, the military has wielded significant political and economic influence in Myanmar, often above civilian control. Its operations in Rakhine revealed not only systematic brutality but also the

use of advanced military tactics and psychological warfare against civilians. The Tatmadaw deliberately destroyed food sources, razed villages, and weaponized sexual violence to dismantle entire communities. These actions were not isolated incidents of military excess but part of a coordinated strategy to erase Rohingya identity and force displacement.

Efforts toward **repatriation** have proven deeply problematic. While Myanmar and Bangladesh have entered into bilateral agreements to facilitate the return of refugees, the absence of guarantees for safety, citizenship, and basic rights has made these plans untenable. Most Rohingya fear returning to a state that continues to deny their identity and protection. International organizations have stressed that repatriation can only be viable if it is voluntary, safe, and dignified, conditions that Myanmar has thus far failed to meet. As a result, millions of Rohingya remain in protracted displacement, largely in overcrowded camps in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh.

Beyond the conventional challenges of displacement, the Rohingya crisis presents **unique, non-traditional problems** that complicate solutions and demand innovative thinking:

- **Identity and Recognition:** Unlike many refugee groups, the Rohingya suffer from both physical displacement and existential erasure. Myanmar does not recognize them as citizens, and even their name “Rohingya” is contested. This lack of recognition undermines not only legal protections but also cultural survival. Any solution must grapple with the restoration of identity, not merely physical resettlement.
- **Digital Persecution and Hate Speech:** Social media, particularly Facebook, played a significant role in spreading hate speech and incitement against the Rohingya prior to and during the 2017 violence. This digital dimension represents a modern, unconventional driver of ethnic cleansing, raising the question of how international law and migration governance should respond to online hate as a precursor to physical violence.
- **Climate Vulnerability in Refugee Camps:** The Rohingya refugee settlements in Bangladesh's Cox's Bazar are among the most densely populated in the world, situated in areas highly prone to cyclones, monsoon flooding, and landslides. Unlike traditional refugee crises, where security and resource constraints dominate, here environmental fragility poses an equally existential threat. This intersection of displacement and climate risk is relatively new in migration governance and requires forward-looking adaptation strategies.
- **Generational Limbo:** A significant portion of the Rohingya population in exile is children, many of whom have been born in camps. These youth are growing up stateless, without access to formal education or economic opportunity. The risk is not merely a “lost generation,” but a community trapped in perpetual dependency and vulnerability. Delegates must consider how to address education, vocational training, and long-term human capital development alongside immediate humanitarian relief.
- **Regional Geopolitical Sensitivities:** The Rohingya crisis is not contained within Myanmar and Bangladesh alone. India, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia have also faced irregular arrivals of Rohingya migrants. However, responses have varied, with many states reluctant to assume long-term responsibility. The situation is further complicated by geopolitical rivalries, such as China's support for Myanmar at the United Nations, limiting international pressure. This geopolitical complexity prevents conventional solutions like regional burden-sharing from being straightforwardly applied.



In examining the Rohingya case, delegates should recognize that it is not merely an instance of displacement but a multi-layered crisis at the crossroads of ethnic identity, geopolitics, human rights, digital governance, and environmental sustainability. Conventional solutions such as repatriation or third-country resettlement cannot by themselves resolve the unique dimensions of this crisis. Delegates are thus encouraged to explore creative, multi-disciplinary approaches that not only respond to the immediate humanitarian emergency but also reimagine the frameworks of protection and identity recognition for displaced peoples in the 21st century.

Regional & International Response to the Crisis

The Rohingya crisis has drawn both regional and international attention, yet responses have often been fragmented, inconsistent, or constrained by political considerations. The plight of the Rohingya has tested the capacity of regional organizations like ASEAN and SAARC, while also engaging broader global mechanisms such as the United Nations, the International Criminal Court (ICC), and international humanitarian agencies.

ASEAN's Response

ASEAN, as the primary regional body in Southeast Asia, has been at the forefront of regional engagement with the Rohingya crisis. However, its principle of *non-interference* in the internal affairs of member states has sharply limited the scope of collective action. For much of the early years, ASEAN refrained from even naming the Rohingya in its official communiqués, framing the situation instead as a “humanitarian crisis in Rakhine State.”

Nevertheless, there have been notable initiatives. In 2017, the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA Centre) was tasked with delivering humanitarian relief to affected populations in Rakhine State. This was one of the few instances where ASEAN took a direct role in humanitarian operations. In 2019, ASEAN conducted a preliminary needs assessment in Rakhine, aimed at preparing for potential repatriation of Rohingya from Bangladesh. Yet, this effort was criticized as superficial and overly reliant on Myanmar's cooperation, raising concerns that ASEAN was inadvertently legitimizing Myanmar's narrative rather than ensuring accountability.

Beyond institutional action, individual ASEAN member states have adopted varying stances. Malaysia, for example, has been vocal in international forums, with former Prime Minister Najib Razak condemning Myanmar's actions as “genocide” in 2016. Indonesia has pursued quiet diplomacy, facilitating dialogues between Myanmar and Bangladesh and providing humanitarian aid. Conversely, Thailand has often taken a more security-centric approach, pushing back boats carrying Rohingya refugees. This divergence among ASEAN members reflects the difficulty of forging a unified regional response.

SAARC's Response

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), by contrast, has remained largely inactive in addressing the Rohingya crisis. Structural weaknesses within SAARC, most notably the long-standing rivalry between India and Pakistan have limited its ability to act as a cohesive regional forum. Although Bangladesh, as a SAARC member, has repeatedly raised the issue of Rohingya displacement and called for burden-sharing, the bloc has not developed any coordinated strategy.

That said, individual South Asian states have played significant roles. Bangladesh has shouldered the overwhelming humanitarian burden, hosting nearly one million Rohingya refugees in Cox's Bazar, despite severe resource constraints. India's response has been ambivalent: while providing some humanitarian aid, it has simultaneously sought to deport



Rohingya on national security grounds. Nepal and Sri Lanka have kept largely silent, while Pakistan has occasionally raised the issue in multilateral forums, framing it within a broader Muslim solidarity narrative. SAARC as an institution, however, has not leveraged its mechanisms to address the crisis in any meaningful way, highlighting its limitations as a regional organization.

Broader International Response

The international community has responded through a combination of humanitarian, legal, and diplomatic measures. The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) and UNHCR have condemned the violence and coordinated relief efforts in refugee camps. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is currently hearing the case brought by The Gambia against Myanmar, accusing it of violating the Genocide Convention. Simultaneously, the International Criminal Court (ICC) has opened an investigation into crimes against humanity relating to the forced deportation of Rohingya into Bangladesh, which is an ICC member state.

Humanitarian organizations such as the World Food Programme (WFP), Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), and IOM have been crucial in providing food, medical care, and logistical support in camps. However, donor fatigue and competing global crises have led to chronic funding shortfalls, threatening the sustainability of these efforts.

Broader Solutions for Delegates to Consider

The uneven response to the Rohingya crisis highlights the need for stronger regional and international frameworks. Broader solutions could include:

- Strengthening ASEAN's humanitarian mechanisms, moving beyond short-term aid delivery toward advocating for accountability, safe repatriation, and legal recognition of the Rohingya.
- Encouraging SAARC to develop a migration and displacement framework, which could enable coordinated responses to refugee inflows, resource-sharing, and burden-sharing in South Asia.
- Promoting regional burden-sharing agreements, where states collectively host refugees, even temporarily, to ease the disproportionate strain on Bangladesh.
- Expanding the use of international justice mechanisms, such as ensuring compliance with ICJ rulings or supporting ICC investigations, to hold perpetrators accountable and deter future atrocities.
- Leveraging development-oriented aid, whereby donor states and agencies invest not only in short-term relief but also in education, skills training, and livelihood opportunities for displaced populations, reducing long-term dependency.
- Engaging non-traditional actors, such as private sector companies and digital platforms, particularly in combating online hate speech that has fueled persecution, or investing in refugee-driven entrepreneurship and climate resilience programs in camps.

In essence, while ASEAN and SAARC have been constrained by political and structural limitations, their proximity to the crisis makes their involvement indispensable. A combination of stronger regional leadership, international accountability, and innovative burden-sharing mechanisms is critical to moving beyond piecemeal humanitarianism toward durable solutions for the Rohingya people.

Challenges in Managing Rohingya Displacement

The management of Rohingya displacement continues to face severe challenges, both at the humanitarian and security levels, which demand careful consideration by the international community. One of the most pressing concerns is the risk of radicalization within refugee camps. The protracted displacement of the Rohingya community, coupled with statelessness, lack of access to education, and minimal livelihood opportunities, creates fertile ground for extremist groups to exploit vulnerabilities. Camps in Bangladesh, particularly in Cox's Bazar, are overcrowded and resource-starved, which heightens frustration among refugees and increases the potential for recruitment into illicit networks, including armed militias and transnational terror groups. This risk has further security implications for South Asia, as porous borders and weak surveillance mechanisms may allow radicalized elements to destabilize the region.

Another major obstacle lies in funding shortfalls, which severely constrain humanitarian response mechanisms. International donor fatigue has been growing, with global crises such as the wars in Ukraine and Gaza diverting attention and financial commitments. The United Nations and its agencies have consistently reported a shortfall of more than 50% in required funds to sustain basic relief measures for Rohingya refugees. This underfunding affects critical areas such as food distribution, medical care, education, and shelter facilities, further compounding the vulnerability of displaced populations. Additionally, reduced funding undermines long-term rehabilitation and skill-development initiatives, thereby perpetuating dependence on aid rather than fostering resilience and self-sufficiency.

Host countries like Bangladesh, already under immense socio-economic strain, face internal political pressures as local communities grow resentful of the prolonged refugee presence. Environmental degradation caused by massive camp settlements, particularly deforestation and strain on water resources, exacerbates tensions between refugees and host populations. The absence of legal recognition and pathways to citizenship for the Rohingya means that statelessness continues to hinder durable solutions, leaving them caught between unsafe repatriation and uncertain resettlement prospects. Furthermore, the lack of cohesive international coordination has resulted in fragmented approaches, with ASEAN, SAARC, and the UN often adopting divergent strategies rather than a unified stance.

Delegates addressing these issues must therefore focus not only on humanitarian aid but also on sustainable, innovative solutions. This includes ensuring adequate and predictable funding

mechanisms, developing education and livelihood programs to reduce susceptibility to radicalization, and fostering regional cooperation to share responsibility equitably. Only by addressing these multi-faceted



challenges in tandem can the Rohingya displacement crisis be managed in a way that ensures security, dignity, and long-term stability.

Framework and Strategic Approaches

A meaningful way forward in addressing the Rohingya crisis requires delegates to focus on the development of sustainable frameworks and strategic approaches that go beyond short-term humanitarian relief. Delegates must recognize that existing international mechanisms, such as the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol, although pivotal, have limitations in applicability since Myanmar is not a signatory and regional bodies like ASEAN and SAARC lack binding refugee protection frameworks. Thus, the committee should consider hybrid solutions including balancing humanitarian aid, regional cooperation, and political dialogue to create a robust framework that can be implemented in practice.

The strategic approach should be multi-layered. At the immediate humanitarian level, emphasis should be placed on ensuring adequate funding for refugee camps, preventing radicalization within displaced communities, and guaranteeing access to education, healthcare, and livelihood opportunities for Rohingya refugees to mitigate long-term dependency and vulnerability. At the regional cooperation level, delegates should explore whether ASEAN or SAARC could operationalize a regional compact on forced migration, modeled on frameworks like the EU-Turkey deal or the Global Compact for Refugees. Such a compact could distribute responsibilities equitably among states while securing international donor commitments.

On the political and security front, the delegates should deliberate whether a safe repatriation mechanism could be devised under international supervision perhaps with UNHCR monitoring, regional peacekeeping deployment, or third-party verification to ensure voluntariness and dignity of return. At the same time, the committee should weigh in on the non-conventional challenges such as cyber radicalization of refugee youth, cross-border human trafficking networks, and the geopolitical deadlock created by Myanmar's military junta and its international backers which require out-of-the-box solutions. Delegates should also assess the feasibility of employing strategic litigation mechanisms, such as the ongoing ICJ proceedings against Myanmar for genocide, as leverage to push accountability and facilitate future transitional justice.

Ultimately, the way forward must balance realism and innovation. Delegates should avoid purely rhetorical condemnations and instead focus on actionable strategies such as regional resource pooling, burden-sharing agreements, innovative funding models like refugee bonds, or partnerships with non-state actors (NGOs, tech companies, civil society) to mitigate radicalization and provide sustainable livelihoods. By grounding proposals in both legal frameworks and pragmatic regional diplomacy, delegates can craft resolutions that not only alleviate immediate humanitarian suffering but also set the foundation for durable peace, security, and stability in the region.

References

1. UNHCR – Rohingya Emergency:



<https://www.unhcr.org/us/emergencies/rohingya-emergency>

2. UNICEF – Rohingya Crisis: <https://www.unicef.org/emergencies/rohingya-crisis>
3. UNHCR USA – Rohingya Refugee Crisis Explained:
<https://www.unrefugees.org/news/rohingya-refugee-crisis-explained/>
4. UN Press Release – Myanmar: <https://press.un.org/en/myanmar>
5. UN Press Release – Security Council (SC/15652):
<https://press.un.org/en/2024/sc15652.doc.htm>
6. UN Security Council Resolution 2669 (2022):
<https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/2669%282022%29>
7. UN General Assembly Resolution 77/227: <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/77/227>
8. UN General Assembly Resolution 79/278: <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/79/278>
9. Kofi Annan Foundation – Final Report (2017):
https://www.kofiannanfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/FinalReport_Eng.pdf
10. Cambridge University Press – *Who and What is IOM For?*:
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/iom-unbound/who-and-what-is-iom-for-the-evolutio-n-of-ioms-mandate-policies-and-obligations/76CAB60E8A00F27E23366D3407281360>
11. Amnesty International – Myanmar: Rohingya Exodus (2017): <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2017/09/myanmar-rohingya-exodus-exposes-aject-failure-of-world-leaders-at-un-to-deliver-solution-to-refugee-crisis/>
12. Reuters – Rohingya Exodus & ICC Prosecutors (2024): <https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/rohingya-exodus-icc-prosecutors-pursuit-myannma rs-top-general-2024-11-27/>
13. Reuters – Bangladesh Runs Out of Resources for Refugees (2025):
<https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/bangladesh-runs-out-resources-rohingya-refugees -2025-08-25/>
14. TIME – Myanmar Military Campaign Against Rohingya (2017):
<https://time.com/4979083/myanmar-rohingya-military-campaign-un/>

