

Human Rights Watch and United Nations Agencies

- allowing massive misinformation and blatant lies to spread

Human Rights Watch: Impossible History

Defying all logic, fairness, and morality, **Human Rights Watch** and many of the main organizations - that usually do well-needed humanitarian, human rights, and research about many issues in the world - have allowed massive misinformation, blatant fraud, and manipulative lies in their reports, timelines, 'country facts and history' documents and analysis of the issues in Arakan.

Totally false, manipulative, and incorrect is this ludicrous 'history' in HRW (Human Rights Watch) reports:

1) *“The Rohingya have been present for several centuries in Arakan, where they settled in three successive waves. The first Muslim sailors (originating from Persia, Arabia, Turkey, Bengal...) settled the region in the seventh century, and integrated with no difficulty”.*

- A bit of basic History easily exposes this outright lie. And, all the more incredulous is the fact that HRW and other organizations that use this quote - without question - cannot even recognize the impossibility of this claim. 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**.
- However, HRW says the first Muslim sailors settled in the region in the 7th century! It is impossible.
- 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.
- 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!

- Thus, it is abundantly clear that such statements as in the HRW report are undisputedly and flagrantly false.
- The statement above concluded with “*and integrated with no difficulty*”.
How can HRW conclude that? Based on what? That does bring up the point that: the Arakanese Buddhists have always lived harmoniously with other people and faiths - with the exception of the Bengali Muslims.

2) HRW describes the Mujahid rebellion as inconsequential and “short-lived” in this quote:

“While some Rohingya have taken up arms, they have never posed a serious threat to Burma’s territorial integrity. A short-lived Mujahid rebellion in the early 1950s in Arakan failed to attract twidespread Rohingya support.”

- The truth is that the Mujahid was a strong threat to the nation of Burma, by virtue of receiving funding, training and weapons from various other Muslim countries, and by a constant agenda and demands for their own Muslim territory.

The prestigious newspaper of India - The Hindustan Standard - reported the following, on May 18, 1949:
 “A dangerous aspect of this fighting is its international aspect: the Moslem insurgents have been carrying the Pakistani flag, and many of them clamor for the incorporation of this end of Arakan with Pakistan. It was suspected that they drew arms from across the border; the Government, however, is now satisfied that their rifles and ammunition are old stocks, left behind by the Japanese and British.... The great majority of Arakan Moslems are said to be really Pakistanis from Chittagong, even if they have been settled here for a generation. Out of the 130,000 here, 80,000 are still Pakistani citizens.”

- In actuality the Mujahid continued from it’s beginnings in the mid 1940s, and continued through the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and on to the present. At times it was strong and active, and also it had times when it was weakened and on the defensive. There were major Burmese army campaigns against the Mujahid insurgents in 1950, 1952, and 1954. In the 1960s, the Mujahid forces were greatly weakened and inactive, but in the aftermath of the 1971 independence war which resulted in the Liberation of Bangladesh from Pakistan, the Mujahid insurgents had opportunity to collect many weapons left-over from the neighboring war. New groups were formed - the Rohingya Liberation Party (RLP) and the Rohingya Patriotic Front (RPF) - and the insurgency swelled.
- In 1978, General Ne Win launched Operation King Dragon (Nagamin) against the rebels. After their temporary defeat new groups and alliances were made, in particular the Rohingya Solidarity Organization (RSO) which became the main and most militant faction, and was strongly based on rigid Islamic grounds, which enabled it to get more support from other militant groups of the Muslim world.

- These included Jamaat-e-Islami (JeI) in Bangladesh and Pakistan, Hizb-e-Islami (HeI) in Afghanistan, Hizb-ul-Mujahideen (HM) in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, Angkatan Belia Islam sa-Malaysia (ABIM), and the Islamic Youth Organization of Malaysia. In 1991, another Burmese Military operation was launched against the insurgents, and that riled the commander of the Saudi Arabian Military who then recommended military action against Burma by a coalition of Muslim countries.

3) Finally, HRW states that “There has never been a Muslim-connected terrorist incident in Burma.”

- That is disingenuous and misleading to the highest degree. This report, and the included interviews are full of accounts of terror, violence, and hatred, and it is rooted in the rigid Islamic faith of the ‘Rohingya’ resulting in their fierce intolerance and contempt for all non-Muslims. Add to that these terrorist acts:
 - 1) In November 2012, a group of unarmed military engineers, building the Burma-Bangladesh Friendly Road were ambushed. One was killed, and 3 were kidnapped by the RSO.
 - 2) On May 13, 1988, about 50,000 ‘Rohingya’ gathered and attempted to storm into Maungdaw, with the intention of exterminating the remaining Buddhist of the town. They first destroyed a big Buddhist Monastery and then began to burn all the wards where Rakhine lived, and planned to kill ALL Rakhine people in this area, but, their genocidal plan was stopped by the local army reinforced police force. This day was the anniversary of the 1942 massacre of 30,000 Rakhine Buddhists by the Muslim Bengali V-Force militia, which takes distinction as the largest single slaughter in contemporary Burmese history.
 - 3) In April 1994, about 120 RSO (Rohingya Solidarity Organization) terrorists entered Maungdaw Township from the sea. At midnight on April 28, 1994, nine out of 12 time bombs, planted by these terrorists, in 12 locations in Maungdaw Township exploded. The remaining three unexploded time bombs were confiscated by the authorities. On the same night, a RSO terrorist group comprising about 80 members entered Maungdaw from another direction, while another group of 40 members entered the northern part of Maungdaw.

The southern terrorist group burned down houses in Kyaukpandu Village. Ten civilian houses were destroyed in the fire. The same group attacked Zeyawaddy Village with small arms and burned down more houses on May 2. Two houses belonged to the village workers and 14 civilian houses were destroyed, while one civilian was killed and a 17-year-old girl was injured in the incident.

The terrorists who entered the northern part of Maungdaw burned down 13 houses in Shwetaung Village and, two civilians were seriously injured when they stepped on a mine planted by those terrorists.

The Burmese military, members of the Border Enforcement, local Police, and local residents - a combined force of 26,000 people - blocked the escape routes and hunted down and attacked the terrorists. Over a 20 day period there were 13 encounters with the terrorists. in which 52 terrorists were killed. The authorities also arrested eight people involved in planting the bombs in Maungdaw.

The authorities also confiscated:

16 assorted guns	3,611 rounds of assorted ammunition	1,418 assorted mines
522 hand grenades	10 40-mm shells	five communication devices

The hand grenades, mines, guns, and explosives were provided by foreign terrorist organizations.

UNHCR - Every Sentence is Opposite of Truth

UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) claims - in numerous reports, analysis, articles, timelines and 'country facts and history' documents that:

1) ***“200 people (Muslims) were killed when government troops opened fire at a mosque in Arakan on April 5, 1992.”***

- That would be a major slaughter, reported in many publications, denounced at the highest political levels, and be high on any list of atrocities against the 'Rohingya', and certainly be prominent on any 'Rohingya' agenda. But, it never happened! A thorough internet search using all possible terms, comes up with nothing, except this UNHCR source - which is copied and repeated in many other documents by UN agencies, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and others.

2) (July 1991) - ***“At a secret camp deep in the jungle, run by the RSO, young Muslims are training to make war on the Buddhist military government of Burma. The goal of the rebels, calling themselves Mujahideen, is to restore the once-independent Muslim homeland of Arakan on Burma's west coast. It was an independent Muslim kingdom from 1430 to 1784 and now is the only Muslim majority province in Burma.”***

- First, the report admits that 'Rohingya' are intent to wage war. Then, the report says that Arakan was a once-independent Muslim homeland for the Bengalis! Again, this is the only source of this incredulous claim. Even the 'Rohingya' and their various supporters don't make the claim that Arakan was a Muslim kingdom - and the UNHCR even claims that it was a Muslim kingdom for 350 years! And, to top it off, this report names the years 1430-1784 - which are the actual years of the kingdom of Myohaung (Mrauk-U), which was overwhelmingly Buddhist as anyone can see by looking at photos of the monuments and ruins of the royal capital, with Buddhas and Buddhist symbology everywhere, as well as the many accounts of European, Indian, and Asian traders, monks, and explorers. And then, the report manipulatively says that Rakhine State is now the only Muslim majority province in Burma! Even the Muslims do not make such a fraudulent claim.

3) *“Guerrilla leaders accuse Burmese Buddhists of massacring 200,000 Muslims in the last 50 years.”*

- A blatant, conniving, and even immoral lie - claiming that the Buddhist killed 200,000 Muslims in Arakan, in the last 50 years. Once again, any kind of corroborating claims or evidence is unavailable, and it is obvious that if this was true, or even close to truth, there would be a lot of information about it and it would have been well-accounted for in media, and on the internet. This claim in UNHCR reports violates everything that the United Nations is supposed to stand for. The fact that UNHCR could let that level of totally inciteful and inflammatory lies be part of their knowledgebase for so long is vicious, incidious, and repugnant. Many, many people around the world assume the U.N. is a body to trust and respect, but once again the truth is dissapointing and even frightful.

Human Rights Watch and UNHCR Demonize and Scapegoat by Not Acknowledging the Rakhine Buddhists

Notice that UN Agencies, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, Doctors Without Borders, and many other organizations - large and small - glaringly mention nearly nothing positive about the Rakhine Buddhists people, culture, history, or their Buddhist ways. Almost all reference to them is negative: racist, violent, killers, extremist monks, genocidal Buddhist, etc.

The intent is to sway people to the pro-Rohingya view on all Arakan and Burma related news and issues. And, since almost no foreigners know about the very deeply-rooted Buddhism of Arakan it is easy to demonize, scapegoat, and pile all blame on the Buddhists of Rakhine State, and in doing so, to constantly overlook, or deliberately ignore the:

- 1) **Racism** - the Bengali Muslims are some of the most racist people in the world.
- 2) **Bigotry** - the Bengali Muslims have long ridiculed and insulted the Rakhine people and their Buddhism.
- 3) **Intolerance** - the Bengali Muslims have the goal of a land taken from the Rakhine, with no non-Muslims.
- 4) **Fraud** - the Bengali Muslims have no compunction to constructing false media, and rewrite a false history.
- 5) **Manipulation** - the Bengali Muslims willingly use lies, deceit and fraud to shape opinion about them.
- 6) **Violence** - the Bengali Muslims have been cruelly violent and abusive - even to monks and children.

UNHCR - Doesn't Follow It's Own 'Criteria for Source Assessment'

The UNHCR has a 161 page manual on standards and criteria to follow for research and reports:

RESEARCHING COUNTRY OF ORIGIN INFORMATION - A TRAINING MANUAL

In the chapter called - Knowledge and Assessment of Sources - there is a section called - Criteria for Source Assessment: Who, what, why, how and when?

From that section:

UNHCR summarizes the following principles of sources assessment:

In general, to evaluate any particular source it is important to ascertain:

- (i) Who produced the information and for what purposes (taking into account such considerations as the mandate and the philosophy of the information producer);
- (ii) Whether the information producer is independent and impartial;
- (iii) Whether the information producer has established knowledge;
- (iv) Whether the information produced is couched in a suitable tone (objective rather than subjective perspective, no overstatements, etc.);
- (v) Whether a scientific methodology has been applied and whether the process has been transparent, or whether the source is overtly judgmental.

The purpose of reporting (“why?”) plays a particularly important role: most human rights reporting is not done for information purposes alone, but to advocate measures taken to stop the violations and protect the victims. Some advocacy organizations may exaggerate the scope and intensity of the violation. Most human rights organizations, however, have realized that getting the facts right will enable them to do more effective advocacy work, and will take great pains to avoid errors in fact or judgment that could backfire on their ability to influence the public.

Reliability of information will also depend on the research methodology, i.e. how was the information gathered? Did the author get the information firsthand? Is it carefully researched and based on a large variety of sources that have firsthand and current information? Where secondary sources are used, you should double-check quotations and summaries in the original source as part of your corroboration and analysis. This will help you to assess a particular source where quotations are incomplete, inaccurate, or taken out of context.

Position papers and expert opinions are particularly important sources of country of origin information. They have been written precisely because an institution or expert is considered so authoritative as to be able to give an opinion on how a country situation will develop, or whether an individual or particular group of persons will be at risk when returned. Assess whether the opinion and argument given are based on facts that can be verified, either by corroboration of other sources, or by cross-examining the author of the information as to the way he or she gathered his or her knowledge. Where possible, use experts and contact persons you trust to enquire about sources that you can find little or no background information on.

Sources that appear unreliable should be corroborated as meticulously as possible. Using your knowledge about the country situation can help in assessing whether the information provided by such a source might be accurate, even if the source lacks credibility. While the rule of corroboration is important, often one will have to use dubious and ill-defined sources or “grey literature” precisely because there are no other sources available.

by Rick Heizman

rickheizmanreality.com