

# HOLLOW 'ROHINGYA' CLAIMS: Irrational, Impossible, and Irritating

The pro-Rohingya groups will make these claims and others:

---

## Claim 1 –The Rohingya are Actually Indigenous to Arakan.

- **Arakan** has had a Buddhist identity (before that - Hindu), verified by archaeology (royal capital cities, inscriptions on stone which lists kings and royal dynasties), books, and manuscripts, and these go back over 1000 years before Islam even existed.
  - There is no archeological evidence of major Muslim cities, palaces, or large population.
- 

## Claim 2 – The Rohingya came from Muslim Persian, Turkish, and Bengali Traders, Shipwrecked in the **7th century**, on the Shores of Arakan.

- It was in the **13th century** that the Bengal area and the Turkish lands even started to become Muslim. Bengal was mostly Buddhist for nearly 2000 years. Its last Buddhist dynasty - starting in the 8th century and known as the Pala Empire - weakened after the destruction of the famous ancient Buddhist university of Nalanda by Muslim invaders in the late **12th century** and succumbed to the Muslim conquest in the **13th century**, with large scale conversions starting, and continuing for centuries. Turkey started changing to Islam in the **13th century**, and its Roman Empire capital of Constantinople (now Istanbul) fell to the Muslim armies in the **15th century**.
- Persia was defeated and occupied by the Muslim Arab armies in the **7th century**, but, only an estimated 10% of the Persian population became Muslim at that time. The conversion to Islam was very gradual in Persia, and took a couple of centuries - during in which time non-muslims were required to pay a 'jizya' (tax) in order to remain non-Muslim. For a couple of centuries the majority of Persians were not Muslim, though they were ruled by the Arab Muslims.
- Thus, it is abundantly clear that such statements as we have today, about Muslims arriving in Arakan in the 7th century, are undisputedly false, and impossible to be true. And, it verifies, again, the fact that the rohingya and supporters are putting out so much false media.
- It is in the **7th century** that Mohammed lived and Islam began - and Arakan was 5000 long miles away. The shipwreck stories are just that - stories. There is no evidence or correlating material. Around the world there are stories of shipwrecks and ship journeys - including the story of Noah's Ark.
- It can even be said that if, indeed, sailors from those areas actually landed in Arakan, then they most certainly most certainly were not Muslim!

---

### Claim 3 – The word ‘Rohingya’ originated and existed long ago.

- The only old reference to ‘Rohingya’ is in a book printed in 1801 - A Comparative Vocabulary of Some of the Languages Spoken in the Burma Empire - by Francis Buchanan. After talking about the main languages of the Burma area he mentions three small dialects, derived from the languages of the Hindu Nation (India), one of which he called ‘Rooinga’ which is spoken by Muslims who live in Arakan. He also makes it clear that the Muslims, and also the Hindus, are not the native people, nor the main or dominant people. However, beyond this mention of ‘Rooinga’ there is no appearance of the word anywhere.
- The British were very good at writing reports and research - they never heard it. The Dutch, the Portuguese, the Chinese, the Indians - all never heard it. The Muslims didn't seem to use it, it obviously was not an important word for them, they forgot about it, it was not used by the Bengal Muslims, not used by the Chittagong Muslims, not used by the Bengali V-force, not used by the Mujahid Party in 1948 when they gave an ultimatum to the government, and not used by U Nu.
- So when 'Rohingya' started to be used, it was a new word for everybody - and it had a purpose - to turn attention away from the terms ‘Bengali Muslims’, or ‘Chittagong Muslims’, which clearly show the origins of the person in question. If the word Rohingya existed long ago to describe those people why did they never use it?

---

### Claim 4 – Many Arakan Kings Were Muslim.

- It is rather absurd to claim that some Arakan Kings were actually Muslim. Some point to coins of a certain time that had a Persian script on them. But that does not prove the Kingdoms were Muslim at all. For some time the Arakan Kingdom included parts of Bengal (including the Chitaggong area) which had become majority Muslim after a nearly 2000 year Buddhist history. Having the Persian script on the coins gave the Buddhists more legitimate rule over the Muslims.
- Also, concerning the coins - consider that U.S. one dollar bills have Latin phrases, Roman numerals, an Egyptian pyramid and the ‘Eye of Horus’ on them. Chinese money has five languages on them: Chinese Mandarin, Tibetan, Mongolian, Zhuang, and the Muslim minority Uigher language - and, in addition, has Western numbers - and China clearly is not beholden to any one of those cultures. Hilltribe people in many areas of Southeast Asia still have and value old British Indian Rupees. Even North Korean and Iranian money has some English and western numbers. So, the appearance of other languages on a country’s currency does not necessarily show power or influence of those other entities.

Rick Heizman  
San Francisco  
March 20, 2013