

# ROHINGYA PRESS

COVERING THE ROHINGYA STORY – AS IT HAPPENS [WWW.ROHINGYAPRESS.COM](http://WWW.ROHINGYAPRESS.COM)

## ROHINGYA CRISIS: DISINFORMATION, ANTI-IMMIGRANT DISCOURSE IN INDIA



This not new that misinformation targeting Rohingya refugees often originates in Myanmar and Bangladesh, transcends borders and evolves into a transnational narrative that shapes public perceptions across South Asia. Images and videos drawn from Bangladeshi refugee camps and Myanmar conflict zones are repurposed in anti-immigrant and state propaganda to lend false authenticity, evoke fear and

reinforce existing prejudices against stateless Muslim refugees.

A recent study traces how anti-migrant narratives targeting the Rohingyas migrate across borders – from Myanmar to Bangladesh, India and beyond – transforming humanitarian sufferings into socio-political fiction.

Most significantly, the study classifies more than 20 fact-checked reports on

anti-immigrant misinformation that have circulated widely on Indian social media and even in some news outlets.

The fact checks from 2017 to 2025 highlight how the ‘Bangladeshi Rohingya’ framing has become a central weapon in anti-immigrant narratives through systematic disinformation campaigns.

This narrative conflates anti-migrant sentiment, anti-Muslim rhetoric and hate speech targeting Bangladeshis into a unified exclusionary discourse.

### IDENTITY MERGER AND CONSEQUENCES

THE findings show 75 per cent of fact-checked reports involved old visuals, 12 out of 16 reports, demonstrating the deliberate strategy of reusing authentic imagery with false contexts.

■ Source: newagebd.net

### More News:

■ Rohingya, polls, global peace top Bangladesh's agenda at UNGA | The Financial Express



SCAN THIS QR CODE  
TO READ FULL NEWS  
ARTICLES, REPORTS  
ETC. IN DETAILS.





# TRUMP ADMINISTRATION SEEKS TO REWRITE GLOBAL REFUGEE RULES

The US government is inviting government delegations to a high-level meeting on the margins of the United Nations General Assembly in what looks like the first step in a bid to tear down the global refugee system. A US State Department “concept note” for the event outlines an approach that seems determined to run roughshod over the rights of refugees.

This is happening parallel to an executive order that requires a national-interests review of all conventions and treaties the United States has joined.

Alarmingly, the US State Department’s list of the “core principles” in its concept note fails to include the principle of nonrefoulement, which holds that refugees cannot be returned to places where they would likely be persecuted, the foundation of the global refugee system.

The note asserts that “every nation has the absolute right to control its borders.” While international law is highly deferential to states in controlling their borders, the principle of nonrefoulement maintains that states don’t have unfettered discretion to



A Libyan coastguard boat carrying migrants arrive at the port in the city of Misrata on May 3, 2015, after the coastguard intercepted five boats carrying around 500 people trying to reach Europe. © 2015 Mahmud Turkia/AFP via Getty Images

push people away. Everyone’s right “to seek and enjoy asylum in other countries from persecution” is the flip side of nonrefoulement. If countries are prohibited from sending someone to a place where they would be tortured or persecuted, they need to afford them a way to secure protection.

The US concept note contends that “asylum is a temporary, not permanent, status, and that asylees should ultimately return home.” But in reality, that depends on the home country situation. If the threats and harm that caused someone to

flee their country are unchanged, or get worse, sending them back is not an option.

The note also asserts that “sovereign states, not transnational bodies, make the determination whether conditions in a country of origin permit return.” True, but in making refugee determinations in good faith, states should respect assessments by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, whose determinations are guided by its mandate, whereas states often have conflicting interests.

■ Source: hrw.org