

Research Article

ASEAN's Role in the Rohingya Crisis: A Critical Analysis from the Perspective of Bangladesh

Parimal Kumar Roy^{1*}, Md. Elias², Md. Moshir Rahman¹, Md. Shakhawat Hossain Sojib³

¹Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre, Savar-1343, Bangladesh.

²Department of Social Administration and Justice, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia.

³CBT- Research, Savar-1340, Bangladesh.

*Email: parimal_anp@yahoo.com

Citation: Roy, P. K., Elias, M., Rahman, M. M., & Sojib, M. S. H. (2025). ASEAN's Role in the Rohingya Crisis: A Critical Analysis from the Perspective of Bangladesh. *International Social Research Nexus (ISRN)*, 1(2), 1-9.
<https://doi.org/10.63539/isrn.2025013>

Received: June 28, 2025

Accepted: August 13, 2025

Published: August 17, 2025

Copyright © 2025 The Author (s).
Published by Scholar Cave.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



Abstract

This study explores ASEAN's role in the Rohingya Crisis as a regional organization in Southeast Asia. Myanmar is one of the member countries of this Organization, but ASEAN's collective initiatives on the Rohingya issue are not notable. Instead, it asserts that it has treated the Rohingya crisis as a domestic concern and thus left the matter within Myanmar's jurisdiction. Consequently, as the findings suggest, few reactions adequately illustrate ASEAN's regimes protecting their populations. These reactions are understood within the framework of its traditional norms and the ASEAN way, but this approach has not been applied in Myanmar. Instead of invoking the responsibilities to protect, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia prefer a 'quiet diplomacy approach' towards the Rohingya crisis. ASEAN allowed for an open consultation, but Myanmar did not pay attention. In turn, Myanmar regarded ASEAN as a trusted interlocutor since Myanmar agreed to discuss and update ASEAN on the Rohingya crisis. Typically, these dialogues were unofficial and low-key. Myanmar's openness towards ASEAN contrasts with its reluctance to talk with Western governments, which used methods of naming and shaming that ran counter to ASEAN's approach. Methodologically, the study involved secondary sources and a qualitative research design with a critical analysis of the Rohingya influx from 2012 to 2018 in Bangladesh. The study recommends motivating peaceful repatriation to their land, Rakhine, by recognizing them as a means of solving these burning issues. Although time is a factor, the authors see it as a sustainable pathway.

Keywords

Rohingya, ASEAN, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Humanity, Sustainable Pathways.

1. Introduction

The Rohingya crisis is a burning issue in South and Southeast Asia in the humanitarian context. However, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) remains inactive in resolving this issue due to weak diplomacy, its country interests, and a lack of credibility among its member states. As a result, the issue is not getting solved, and Bangladesh is being treated under security concerns, social and political tensions, environmental degradation, and frustrated non-refoulement deportation in Myanmar (Barany, 2022). It is a reality that the Rohingya people in the 34 camps (33 in Cox's Bazar and one in Bhasan Char) are living with cascading catastrophes in the Rohingya camps in Cox's Bazar of Bangladesh (Roy et al., 2024). Indeed, Bangladesh is a small country with 170 million people (BBS, 2022), and the government faces challenges in meeting its needs. In this context, 1.3 million Rohingya people, of course, are a burden in ensuring social justice in terms of humanity, decent work, dignity, and equity. It is alarming that the amount of foreign aid is decreasing for their livelihood. On the other hand, the USA stopped its USAID-funded projects, leading to their dismantlement. This

disassembled the employment scenarios and affected the Rohingya camps to reduce their quality of life in terms of monitoring, implementation, and supervision. It is unfortunate but true that the Myanmar military government forced them to move forward either to Bangladesh or other South East Asian countries like Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia. The host countries; Bangladesh, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia did not welcome them; rather lack of signatories to the Protocol 1967 and the Convention 1951, they pushed them to be confined in a camp or place. The protracted life is congested, and insufficient facilities, health access, and education facilities are limited. As a result, the people always seek a way to escape camp life, try to go to another country, or out of camps to get a better life. This type of uncertain life or journey, often undertaken barefoot, has led to Rohingya people dying in the deep sea, or upon reaching their destination, living their lives with threats or mental sickness.

The ASEAN was established in 1967 with five countries, at the beginning, to protect humanity and peace with regional connectivity, but its number is now ten, and its voice is low against the Rohingya issues. The Myanmar government has created such like situation and caused forced displacement, even genocide, in the Rakhain state in Myanmar. Against this backdrop, why ASEAN is not playing an important role in saving the Rohingya people and keeping peace against the crime of humanity? And what is the alternative way that has been explored here in the lens of Bangladesh?

2. Literature Review

According to Quint and Pareja-Alcaraz (2023), ASEAN's leaders have stated that they will consider the Rohingya crisis a domestic issue and leave it within Myanmar's jurisdiction. The study argues that these reactions demonstrate how ASEAN's regimes prioritize protecting their own populations, which can be understood within the context of the organization's traditional norms and the ASEAN way. Rather than invoking the Right to Protection, Indonesia has chosen a 'quiet diplomacy' approach to the Rohingya crisis (Barany, 2022).

It examines ASEAN's role, critically, in protecting human rights during the Rohingya crisis. The study assumes that no established, robust system for responding to atrocities exists. As a result, the international community has failed to respond to mass killings, such as those of the Rohingya in Myanmar, over the past four decades. It was formed as a regional group of ten states to address security concerns among its members. The primary focus was on promoting stability within the region and building national resilience among its members. In addition to these goals, the organization also prioritized economic growth, social progress, cultural development, and regional peace and stability. This study aligns with ASEAN's objectives and explores the Rohingya issue to understand why the organization has remained silent on the crisis. It is also based on ASEAN's shared values of respect, peace, economic growth, prosperity, and social progress. However, due to national sovereignty and non-interference in international affairs, ASEAN's member states cannot interfere in each other's affairs or support political uprisings, security, or economic issues. Despite these, ASEAN has proven to be a successful regional organization?

Another study (Shukri, 2021) delineated the Rohingya refugee crisis in Southeast Asia. The author depicted ASEAN's role and way forward by clarifying the Rohingya crisis in Malaysia, but ASEAN did not take any effective intervention in Myanmar that we can refer to in a loud voice. The author's analysis covers the efforts and mechanisms used by ASEAN member states to address the Rohingya refugee situation, but ineffective in stopping either genocide or force displacement. Initially, the study looks at how key ASEAN actors, including Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand, have responded to the crisis. These countries have been proactive in helping Myanmar, using both bilateral diplomatic channels and ASEAN's institutional framework. In contrast, many other member states have been more cautious. The analysis then explores the complex challenges ASEAN faces in finding a lasting and effective solution to the ongoing refugee issues.

This study examines ASEAN's key steps to tackle the Rohingya refugee crisis. Its ability to take effective regional action is tested. While member states have responded differently at the national level, their varied approaches test whether ASEAN's approaches can still lead to stronger regional cooperation on this crisis. The main obstacle, however, is the evident lack of unity in resolving the situation, which needs immediate attention to improve coordination and cooperation between Myanmar and ASEAN member states for better results.

The Study (Davies, 2008) on "Legitimizing rejection: International refugee law in Southeast Asia", here, portrays ASEAN as having shown no collective interest in establishing a regional refugee instrument that would provide all members with a common legal or political framework for addressing refugee crises in the region. Against this backdrop, the need for either a unified ASEAN response to the refugee situation or more states joining the international refugee law instrument has been acknowledged.

This study (Sholeh, 2019) on “Indonesia and ASEAN Responses to Rohingya Refugees regarding the Rohingya issue” has put the ASEAN role under strain, or ASEAN is in trouble when the Rohingya are at the center of a catastrophic situation in Rakhain state or even in Bangladesh's border region. In this context, the author views the situation from a different, unconventional perspective, not through the lens of ASEAN, but from the perspective of the Rohingya, as the organization has failed to adequately protect them as a vulnerable community in Myanmar, Indonesia, Malaysia, or Bangladesh.

The author mainly highlighted the Indonesian Policy aligned with ASEAN's inability to protect the people of Rohingya, where human rights are the main issue. So, the author says, “Rohingya refugee issues tested the commitment of ASEAN on how non-interference policy deals with human rights” (Sholeh, 2019, p. 1892).

After summarizing, we can briefly suggest three policies. i. ASEAN states should be signatories of the 1951 Refugee Convention ii. ASEAN states should have a common legal framework to deal with refugees iii. Pressure on Myanmar to accommodate Rohingya Refugees. The study says the Rohingya people faces different discrimination including forced labour, denial of residency, mass burning, rape, child labour, restriction of movement but the ASEAN did not do against this per se the common objectives of it's as a regional organization. The authors (Roy et al., 2024) clarified the Rohingya issues regarding ASEAN, which has to stand firmly against Myanmar's gross violation of human rights. At the same time, ASEAN must deal with the statelessness crisis by formulating a workable regional framework. However, this chapter addresses the underlying Human Rights protection paradigm in Rohingya issues: how to reconcile State sovereignty vis-à-vis responsibility and how to ensure the protection of both human rights and State security (Roy et al., 2024).

3. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This study adopts Conflict Transformation Theory (Lederach, 1996) to critically analyze ASEAN's role in the Rohingya crisis. Conflict Transformation Theory emphasizes addressing the root causes of conflict rather than merely resolving the symptoms. In the context of the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar and Bangladesh, the theory suggests that lasting peace can only be achieved through deep structural changes that dismantle ethnic and religious discrimination as well as through long-term socio-political and economic reforms. The key concepts include Conflict Transformation, which seeks to address the underlying causes of displacement and statelessness, relational change, focusing on the evolution of relationships between Rohingya people, host communities (Bangladesh), and Myanmar state actors, and bottom-up peacebuilding, which advocates for grassroots-level peace initiatives. This framework allows for an exploration of ASEAN's limited involvement and posits that sustainable peace can be realized by fostering local dialogue, empathy-building, and collaborative community-driven solutions, involving both refugees and host nations like Bangladesh.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1. Asean's Country Role in the Rohingya Community

The ASEAN was established on August 8, 1967, in Bangkok, Thailand, when the founding members—Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand—signed the ASEAN Declaration, sometimes referred to as the Bangkok Declaration. Vietnam joined in July 1995, Laos and Myanmar joined in July 1997, Cambodia joined in April 1999, and Brunei Darussalam joined in January 1984. There are currently 10 ASEAN member States. We discussed the 4 countries' role in the Rohingya issues in the following—

4.1.1. Myanmar

Whatever happened against the Rohingya in Myanmar is called genocide. However, the author (Uddin, 2012) emphasizes it as ethnocide. Finally, to the solution to avoid this cleansing, like “Global solidarity is needed now more than ever, and the international community must support accountability mechanisms for perpetrators of violence against civilian.” (Parmar et al., 2022, p.794). According to (Parmar et al., 2022), global solidarity is more crucial than ever, and the international community must back accountability mechanisms for those who commit violence against civilians. We can refer that “The Refugees' horrible tales of torture and persecution, of family members being killed before their very eyes and baby thrown into fires in front of mothers, of mass rapes of Rohingya women and girls.....” (Bari, 2018, p.39). Furthermore, one of the studies informed us what happened either genocide or cruelty by the Buddhism is not acceptable—“Myanmar's monks, (referred to collectively as the Sangha) have been central to the stigmatization and violent harassment stages of the genocide, not least because they hold an especially revered position in Myanmar society” (Macmanus et al., 2015, p. 59).

Based on the literature, we can say that without State interventions, genocide was impossible in 8-12 June 2012, and later what happened in Rakhain state of Myanmar. The government instigated to do so instead of encountering the conflict

and showed no interest in coordinating among the forces. Apart from these, the military government also gave exemptions to Buddhists from genocide liabilities (Macmanus, T., Green, P., & De la Cour Venning, A., 2015). We can say that the infrastructure and ideological base for mass killings exist in Myanmar, and that the elimination of the Rohingya, though not always visible, is well under way. Myanmar's Rohingya are being slowly annihilated through sporadic massacres, mass flight, systematic weakening and denial of identity.

Finally, we can refer to the International Community claims that whatever happened in Myanmar with the Rohingya is genocide, but the Myanmar government and Nobel Laureate Suu Kyi firmly claim that nothing happened like that [genocide] (Ahmed et al., 2018).



Figure-1: Map of ASEAN; Source: website of ASEAN

4.1.2. Malaysia

According to a May 2015 report by the IOM, up to 8,000 Rohingya were stranded at sea for Malaysia. These refugees were forced to between Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia, as each country refused to let their boats dock. Eventually, Indonesian fishermen rescued them and brought them ashore in Aceh. From 2012 to 2015, around 1,25,000 Rohingya took the treacherous and grueling journey from Burma to Malaysia in overcrowded, unseaworthy boats. Ironically, Malaysia did not ratify the 1951 Convention and Protocol 1967; the Malaysia government considers them as illegal. So, they are not getting the Refugee status in Malaysia.

Malaysia has a long history of refugees, dating back to the 1970s following the Vietnam War. The country has seen both registered and unregistered refugees. Since the 1970s, researchers have evaluated Malaysia's perspective on refugees, including the Rohingya. In response to the growing issue, the Malaysian government has implemented policies and acts to control refugees and illegal migrants, aiming to prevent social violence.

In Myanmar, the 1982 citizenship law denied the Rohingya recognition as one of the country's 135 original ethnic groups, leaving them stateless. As a result, many Rohingya fled to Bangladesh or Malaysia, a predominantly Muslim country, seeking refuge from persecution. Malaysia is a multicultural and religiously diverse nation, offering job opportunities for low-skilled workers, making it an attractive destination. In this context, the Malaysian government introduced National Security Directive No. 23 in 2009, followed by the Equal Rights Trust in 2014, Fortify Rights in 2014, and the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia in 2019. Today, the Malaysian government is taking a stricter stance, prioritizing the protection of human rights, even as it provides privileges to Rohingya refugees (Kanney & Azman, 2025). Perspectives of rohingya on the positive and negative aspects of life in Malaysia, Kajian Malaysia.

4.1.3. Indonesia

The Rohingya issue requires an empathetic and rights-based approach, but the destiny of this outcome remains uncertain. The Rohingya have been explained with evidence that displaced and stateless Rohingya are creating problems not

only in Bangladesh, Malaysia, Thailand, India, Indonesia, but also in Saudi Arabia. Against this backdrop, Indonesia did not welcome them; rather, they blocked all borders, even the sea, to prevent their entering (Zawacki, 2013). We see how ASEAN's leaders assert that they will treat the Rohingya crisis as a domestic concern and thus leave the matter within Myanmar's jurisdiction. Furthermore, the study thinks these reactions best illustrate ASEAN's regimes protecting their populations, which must be understood within the framework of its traditional norms and the ASEAN way. Instead of invoking the Right to protection, Indonesia prefers a 'quiet diplomacy approach' towards the Rohingya crisis (Quint, 2023). But the author (Shukri, 2021) claims that Malaysia and Indonesia, among others, have been the most vocal in condemning the atrocities against the Rohingya minority and have called for a more holistic approach by the ASEAN members.

Although individual countries have made efforts, Malaysia and Indonesia have pushed for stronger collective action and urged the organization to do so. ASEAN is viewed as a regional organization without a comprehensive framework to address one of the world's largest refugee crises. Despite numerous attempts by members to discuss the issue, ASEAN still lacks a shared consensus and a robust mechanism to handle the Rohingya crisis. Even tackle the crisis, the organization holds a ministerial meeting, attended by all 10 ASEAN foreign ministers, to discuss various issues related to regional political and security cooperation, including violence against the Rohingya minority.

4.1.4. Thailand

Thailand has been an ASEAN country since 1967, alongside Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore, which are founding members. Thailand is adjacent to Myanmar and has become a strategic country for the Rohingya in transit to Malaysia to seek asylum. Thailand supports the words like 'ethnic cleansing and clearance operation' that have happened in the Rakhain state in Myanmar during 2012 to 2017 (Kaewkuekoonkit & Chantavanich, 2018). Despite that, Thailand did not play an essential role in ASEAN in stopping these or against these anti-humanist activities.

However, we can present the interventions of the Thai government to manage the Rohingya who have fled here to save their lives. "The status of Rohingya in Thailand is fluid and complicated" (Kaewkuekoonkit & Chantavanich, 2018, p.10). It indicates that the Rohingya issue is a burden to them, and it is making a complex scenario that is not easy to solve without the effective collaboration of all parties.

Understanding the scenarios, the Rohingyas are categorized into four types, like i. the early arrival: Old Rohingya, ii. The late comers: New Rohingya, iii. Rohingya victims of human trafficking, and iv. Rohingya applying for displacement person (refugee) status in a temporary shelter.

Against this backdrop, the government has taken four initiatives or measures: promotional, preventive, transformative, and protective measures (Kaewkuekoonkit & Chantavanich, 2018). However, in the context of global or regional solidarity, Thailand did not show a proactive intervention at the ASEAN table, as we can portray Thailand as worried about Genocide / Ethnic Cleansing in Myanmar, but Thailand is in tension because its own country is under pressure. The Rohingya have faced persecution in Myanmar for decades. More than one million Rohingya have fled Myanmar to Bangladesh, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand since the 1970s after being attacked by the military and subjected to killings, rape, and the burning of villages.

Myanmar Government in the beginning, was not so hard now they are running upon them, there is a long history of violent executions by the Myanmar security forces. In the 1970s, and again in 1990s the Myanmar government launched military crackdowns on illegal immigration code-named Operation 'Nagamin' and Operation Pyi Thaya- as of result, the Rohingya population fled the country and took shelter in Bangladesh or Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia (Roy et al., 2024). Above mentioned role of the four countries has been described briefly in the following table to understand the perspective to the Rohingya people.

Table 1: Country's Role towards the Rohingya People

Country	Legal Position	Refugee Position	Response towards Rohingya	References
Myanmar	Referred to the Table 3	Excluded them from out of 135 races	Genocide, Ethnic Cleansing	Uddin, 2012; Parmar et al., 2022; Bari, 2018
Malaysia		Almost 2 lakhs sheltered	Counting them as Illegal	Kaney & Azman, 2025; Roy et al., 2024
Indonesia		Quiet Diplomacy	Not welcome them	Quint, 2023; Shukri, 2021; Zawacki, 2013

Thailand		Support the state- ment of ethnic cleansing	Think them as Burden	Kaewkuekoonkit & Chan- tavanich, 2018; Roy et al., 2024
----------	--	---	----------------------	---

4.2. Rohingya Issues in Bangladesh

The Rohingya issue in Bangladesh began after the 1970s when the people entered by crossing the Naf River. The following table shows the evolution and brief history of the Rohingya influx to Bangladesh. As an over-crowded country, Bangladesh considers them a burden not only for the economy but also in security terms. In the beginning, the fund flow was manageable, but over time, the allocated budget per person has been reduced, and it is now insufficient to maintain a good quality of life (Roy et al., 2024). Politically, whether to allow Rohingyas more freedom of movement or not is now a debatable agenda with the Interim government and other political parties in Bangladesh.

Table 2: Influx Wave in Bangladesh (1978-2017)

Year/Period	Brief Narrative	FDMN/ Number
1978	Myanmar Military government deployed Dragon King Operation. Most Rohingya Muslims fled to Bangladesh	2,00,000
1991-1992	Military Government forced power to evacuee them against Rohingya people in Rakhain state to construc-tion military camp and highways.	2,50,000
2012	Communal Conflict between Buddhist and Rakhain community.	1,40,000
2017	Military and police massacres perpetrated in the Rakhain state.	7,00,000

Source: Roy et al., 2024

Most Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh fled directly from Myanmar's Rakhine State in 2015 and 2017 due to persecution and violence, primarily crossing the Naf River into Cox's Bazar. While some Rohingya also seek refuge in other ASEAN countries, reaching Bangladesh from those locations is not their main or easiest route. Bangladesh's direct border with Rakhine State via the Naf River makes it the most accessible and often only viable escape route when immediate flight from violence is necessary.

While Bangladesh's Muslim-majority identity can offer Rohingya refugees a sense of shared faith and potentially a more welcoming initial reception, especially as they're fleeing religious persecution, it doesn't change the dire circumstances they face. The Bangladeshi government sees them as temporary guests or stateless persons, denying them full refugee status, social status, citizenship, or significant rights to work or integrate. This leads to overcrowded camps, stretched resources, and severely limited opportunities.

Ultimately, Rohingya refugees come to Bangladesh because they are fleeing for their lives from extreme persecution in Myanmar, making Bangladesh the closest and most accessible place for safety. The shared Muslim faith, while offering some cultural familiarity, is a secondary factor that doesn't outweigh the severe practical challenges and harsh realities of refugee life.

In 2017, Bangladesh established large refugee camps in Cox's Bazar to offer temporary humanitarian shelter to Rohingya fleeing Myanmar's military crackdown. The government and international aid organizations provided essential services like food, shelter, and medical care. This initial response was widely praised internationally, even though Bangladesh is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention or its 1967 Protocol, and its domestic law does not specifically grant refugees legal status or rights.

The primary long-term solution for Bangladesh is the voluntary, safe, and dignified repatriation of the Rohingya back to Myanmar. They have repeatedly engaged in bilateral talks with Myanmar to facilitate this, though these efforts have largely stalled due to Myanmar's lack of cooperation and the unsafe conditions in Rakhine State. Bangladesh has rejected proposals for integrating the Rohingya into Bangladeshi society, fearing it would encourage more Rohingya to come and create a permanent burden on their already densely populated and resource-stretched country. They have explicitly re-fused World Bank proposals that suggested integration measures like freedom of movement, right to work, and access to formal education in Bangla.

4.3. ASEAN Role in the International Treaty

Table 2 shows that four ASEAN countries have ratified or not the international documents to protect their rights and humanity. The four ASEAN countries did not intervene to put their signatures on the international documents.

Table 3: Signature Status of Four ASEAN Countries Along with Bangladesh

International Legal Instruments	Year of Ratification				
	Myanmar	Indonesia	Bangladesh	Thailand	Malaysia
1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights	2015	1966 Accession in 2006	1998	1966 Forced in 1997	No
1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	No	2006	2000	1996 Forced in 1997	No
1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees	No	No	No	No	No
1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees	No	No	No	No	No
1969 Organization of African Unity Convention Governing Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa	No	No	No	No	No
1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugees	No	No	No	No	No
1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons	No	No	No	No	No
1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness	No	No	No	No	No
1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhumane or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	No	1998	1998	1988	No
1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child	1991	1990	1990	1992	1995
1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	1997	1984	1984	1985	1979 Accession in 1995
1966 Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination	No	1999	1979	2003	No
2000 United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime	2004	2009	2011	2000	2004
2009 African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Roy et al., 2024 and Authors' Compilation

Like Bangladesh, Myanmar, Indonesia, Thailand, and Malaysia, none of these countries signed the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Table 2 also showed that not all countries ratified the two international documents, like the 1954 Convention on the Status of Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. Consequently, these countries are not compelled to show any respect

or take any responsibility for the Rohingya community. However, if any country chose to act, it would be from humanitarian perspective. Bangladesh is showing, and the other country is also. It is also debatable that other country thinks Bangladesh is doing for them with foreign aid.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Within Bangladesh, the Rohingya people are receiving less attention from development agencies, and decreasing budget allocation is a prime example of this. Beyond these challenges, Rohingya people are now being implicated in devastating activities such as killing, drug, and anti-state activities. Political entities are now targeting the Rohingya community, possibly due to international pressure groups.

Understanding this, ASEAN is currently behind on and unaware of this burning issue; rather, they are focused on strengthening their economic stability for their countries' interests. Regarding the oppression or genocide of the Rohingya, whatever term you may use, they dismiss it as an internal matter. However, when the issue becomes anti-humanitarian and involves multiple states, it is no longer internal but a regional security concern.

Regional leaders have already been informed about the root cause, but they haven't made human rights a priority for a lasting solution, such as granting citizenship and other rights to the Rohingya through strengthened regional cooperation and dialogue. We recommend implementing all interventions through a strong partnership of the Rohingya issue.

Declarations

Author Contributions

PKR: Idea generation and first draft with field experiences in the Rohingya camps of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, **ME:** Theoretical conceptual framework and field expertise shared in the Rohingya camps of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. **MMR:** Literature review and review the document. **MSHS:** Systematic literature review and rewrite with field experiences shared in the Rohingya camps of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh.

Funding

No funding was received for this research.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback and Scholar Cave for presenting it at the international conference.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this study.

References

- Ahmed, M. U., Tiwana, D. S., & Begum, R. (2018). *THE GENOCIDE, Restless Beings* 90C Mile End Road London E1 4UN. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/58511393/RB_Report_2018_compressed1bre.pdf?1551299934=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DThe_Genocide_Of_The_Ignored_Rohingya.pdf
- Barany, Z. (2022). *The Rohingya Predicament.: Why Myanmar's Army Gets Away with Ethnic Cleansing*. Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). ISBN 978-88-9368-099-8
- Bari, M. A. (2018). *The Rohingya crisis: A people facing extinction*. Kube Publishing Ltd. ISBN13: 9781847741240
- BBS(2022). National Census, the Government of Bangladesh https://bbs.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/bbs.portal.gov.bd/page/dd1bac37_743a_465b_bd6f_76fe47c436d5/2024-11-07-09-29-44a9f41ef3fd5e87b07cf7d02784f820.pdf
- Davies, S. E. (2008). *Legitimizing rejection: International refugee law in Southeast Asia* (Vol. 13). Brill. ISBN: 978-90-04-16351-5
- Kaewkuekoonkit, A., & Chantavanich, S. (2018) Rohingya in Thailand: Existing social protection in dynamic circumstances. *Asian Review*, 31(1), 5-22). DOI: 10.58837/CHULA.ARV.31.1.1

Available at: <https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/arv/vol31/iss1/2>

- Kaney, A. D., & Azman, A. (2025). Perspectives of Rohingya on the positive and negative aspects of life in Malaysia. *Kajian Malaysia: Journal of Malaysian Studies*, 43(1). http://web.usm.my/km/earlyView/117_KM-OA-10-23-0152.R2.pdf
- Lederach, J. P. (1996). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. Syracuse University Press. ISBN: 0-8156-2656-8
- Macmanus, T., Green, P., & De la Cour Venning, A. (2015). *Countdown to annihilation: Genocide in Myanmar*. International State Crime Initiative). ISBN: 978-0-9934574-0-1 (Paperback) and 978-0-9934574-1-8 (eBook-PDF)
- Parmar, P., Mon, S. H. H., & Beyrer, C. (2022). The Rohingya genocide and lessons learned from Myanmar's Spring Revolution. *The Lancet*, 400(10355), 793-795. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(22\)01651-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01651-8)
- Quint, K., & Pareja-Alcaraz, P. (2023). ASEAN's Approach to the Responsibility to Protect: Case Analysis of the Rohingya in Myanmar. https://www.google.com/search?client=sfari&rls=en&q=IHL410_SuSe2023_Quint_Master+Thesis&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8
- Roy, P. K., Das, P. K., & Das, C. (2024). A Critical Review on the Current Status of Human Rights in the Shed of International Law: A Case from Rohingya's in Bangladesh. *Media Representation of Migrants and Refugees*, 15-31. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3459-1.ch002>
- Sholeh, B. (2019). Indonesia and ASEAN Responses on Rohingya Refugees. In: Ratuva, S. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Ethnicity*. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2898-5_170
- Shukri, S. (2021). The Rohingya refugee crisis in Southeast Asia: ASEAN's role and way forward. *Journal of International Studies*, 17, 239-263. <https://doi.org/10.32890/jis2021.17.10>
- Uddin, N. (2022). *Voices of the Rohingya People: A Case of Genocide, Ethnocide and 'Subhuman' Life*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-90816-4>
- Zawacki, B. (2013). Defining Myanmar's "Rohingya Problem". *Human Rights Brief* 20, no. 3 (2013):18-25 https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/hrbrief?utm_source=digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu%2Fhr-brief%2Fvol20%2Fiss3%2F2&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages