

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York
World History, 2008

This textbook has egregious errors, omissions, misrepresentations and falsifications in the areas of (A) the History of Early Islam, (B) the Arab-Israeli Conflict, and (C) the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Selected examples of problematic material with documented commentary are presented below.

(A) History of Early Islam

I. The Relationship Between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina.

Nowhere in Chapter 6, Section 1 does the textbook identify the presence of a Jewish community in Yathrib/Medina. It refers only to an entity called Yathrib whose population gave support to Muhammad.

On page 190 of Chapter 6, “**The World of Islam [-] 600 – 1500,**” Section 1, “**The Rise of Islam**”, in a subsection entitled “**The Life of Muhammad**”, the textbook states:

“... In 622, the year 1 of the Islamic calendar, [Muhammad] and his supporters left Makkah and moved north to Yathrib, later renamed “Madinah (Medina; “city of the prophet”). The journey to Madinah is known as the *Hijrah* (HIH-jruh). Muhammad began to win support from people in Madinah, as well as from Arabs in the desert, known as bedouin. These groups formed the first community of practicing Muslims.

Submission to the will of Allah meant submission to his prophet, Muhammad. For this reason, Muhammad soon became both a religious and political leader.”

This is misleading as Muhammad did not “**win support**” from the Jewish tribes of Yathrib, who comprised a significant portion of the population. They had been following their own monotheistic religion for more than 1500 years, and they did not wish to “**submi[t]**” to Muhammad and his new religion. Accordingly, Muhammad expelled or exterminated the Jews of Yathrib/Medina.¹

¹ A. Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad – A Translation of Sirat Rasul Allah by ibn Ishaq (died 767 AD), Oxford University Press (Oxford/New York, 1955/2006), pp.363-364, 437-445, 461-469; Bernard Lewis, The Arabs in History, Harper Torchbooks/Harper & Row (New York, Cambridge, etc., 1967), pp.40-45; Philip K. Hitti, History of the Arabs (Tenth Edition), Macmillan/St. Martin’s Press (London, New York, etc., 1970), pp.104, 116-17; M.G.S. Hodgson, The Venture of Islam – Vol.1, The Classical Age of Islam, University of Chicago Press (Chicago, 1974), pp.177, 190-191; Norman A. Stillman, The Jews of Arab Lands – A History and Source Book, Jewish Publication Society of America (Philadelphia, 1979), pp.9-16; Albert Hourani, A History of the Arab Peoples, Harvard University Press/Belknap (Cambridge, MA, 1991), p.18; Andrew G. Bostom, MD, Ed., The Legacy of Jihad – Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims (“Bostom, Jihad”), Prometheus Books (Amherst, NY, 2005), pp. 37-39; Efraim Karsh, Islamic Imperialism – A History, Yale University Press (New Haven & London, 2006), pp.11-13; Andrew G. Bostom, MD, Ed., The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism – from Sacred Texts to Solemn History (“Bostom, Islamic Antisemitism”), Prometheus Books (Amherst, NY, 2008), pp. 66-74, 275-278, 283-287, 299-305

The omission from Chapter 6, Section 1 of any mention of the existence of a Jewish community in Yathrib/Medina and of its expulsion and extermination erases from history the presence of the Jews in Medina and falsifies the relationship between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina.

II. Islamic *Shari'a* Law: Applicability to Non-Muslims and Separation of Church and State.

The textbook does inform the students that the *Qur'an* and Islamic *Shari'a* law control and regulate "Islamic" government. The egregious omission is that it completely ignores that there is a fundamental conflict between *Shari'a* law and the principle of separation of church and state.

A. On page 191 of Chapter 6, "The World of Islam [-] 600-1500," Section 1, in a subsection entitled "The Teachings of Muhammad", the textbook states:

"Islam is not just a set of religious beliefs but a way of life as well. After Muhammad's death, Muslim scholars developed a law code known as the *shari'ah* (shu-REE-uh). It provides believers with a set of practical laws to regulate their daily lives. It is based on scholars' interpretations of the Quran and the example set by Muhammad in his life. The *shari'ah* applies the teachings of the Quran to daily life. It regulates all aspects of Muslim life including family life, business practice, government, and moral conduct. The *shari'ah* does not separate religious matters from civil or political law."

B. On page 202 of Chapter 6, Section 3 "Islamic Civilization," in a subsection entitled "Islamic Society", the textbook states:

"To be a Muslim is not simply to worship Allah but also to live one's life according to Allah's teachings as revealed in the Quran, which was compiled in 635. As Allah has decreed, so must humans live. Questions concerning politics, economics, and social life are answered by following Islamic teachings."

This material accurately describes the all-intrusive control of *Shari'a* law over all aspects of human thought and behavior. However, as written it implies that *Shari'a* law applies only to Muslims. In fact, *Shari'a* law is also imposed, to varying degrees, on non-Muslims who live in lands conquered and controlled by Muslims. Further, according to the *Qur'an*, it the religious duty of all Muslims who are able to wage aggressive *jihad* warfare until Islam and Islamic *Shari'a* law are supreme over the entire world.²

Finally, although the textbook does state that *Shari'a* "regulates...government" and "does not separate religious matters from civil or political law," it completely ignores the critical significance of these facts: there is a fundamental conflict between *Shari'a* law and the principle of separation of church and state, as *Shari'a* law upholds the unity of mosque and state.

² The Holy Qur-an – English translations of the meanings and Commentary, King Fahd Holy Qur-an Printing Complex (Al-Madinah, 1990) ("*Qur-an Al-Madinah*"), p.219-220, Surah 4:34; Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri (died 1368 CE/AD), *Reliance of the Traveller – A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law* ("al-Misri, *Reliance*"), (N. H. M. Keller, transl.), Amana Publications (Beltsville, MD, 1994), pp.540-541; al-Misri, *Reliance*, pp.607-609; Khadduri, pp.194-195.

III. Status and Treatment of Christians and Jews Under Islam.

Chapter 6 egregiously misrepresents the status and treatment of Christians and Jews under Islam.

A. On page 193 of Chapter 6, Section 2 “**The Arab Empire and its Successors**,” in a subsection entitled “**Creation of an Arab Empire**”, the textbook states:

“Arab Rule

....

“In the conquered territories, Arab administrators were tolerant, sometimes even allowing local officials to continue to govern. Both Christians and Jews were allowed to practice their religion because they were “People of the Book.” Islam recognized the “People of the Book” as those who had written scriptures revealed to them by God before the time of Muhammad. Those who chose not to convert were required only to be loyal to Muslim rule and to pay taxes.”

This presentation seriously misrepresents the status and treatment of Christians and Jews under Islam. In addition to the onerous *jizya* tax, Islamic *Shari’a* law imposed to varying degrees numerous burdens and restrictions upon Christians and Jews, both in the practice of their religions and in their daily lives. Christians and Jews were

1. prohibited from building new houses of worship, or making repairs to existing ones;
2. prohibited from bearing arms;
3. required to open their homes to Muslims and provide food and lodging on demand;
4. not allowed to ride on horses;
5. required to rise from their seats when a Muslim sought to sit down;
6. not allowed to pray if the prayer could be heard by a Muslim;
7. not allowed to give testimony in Islamic courts;³

³ Ibn Rushd (died 1198), The Distinguished Jurist’s Primer, Volume II, transl. Prof. I.A.K. Nyazee, Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, Garnet Publishing (Reading, UK, Lebanon, 2006), p.557; Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri (d. 1368), Reliance of the Traveller – A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law (“al-Misri, Reliance”), (N.H.M. Keller, transl.), Amana Publications (Beltsville, MD, 1994), pp.607-609; A.S. Tritton, The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects, Oxford University Press (London, 1930), pp.5-17, 113-126, 186-187; Khadduri, pp.193-198; Hitti, p 353-54; S.D. Goitein, Jews and Arabs – Their Contacts through the Ages (3rd. Ed.), Schocken Books (New York, 1974), p.72; Bernard Lewis, Ed., Islam – from the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople – Volume II: Religion and Society (“Islam – Vol. II: Religion and Society”), Oxford University Press (New York, etc., 1987), pp.217-225; Lewis, The Jews of Islam, p.27; Bostom, Jihad, pp. 31-35, 108-109, 129-30; Bostom, Islamic Antisemitism, p. 519, 653-662; Spencer, pp.48-49, 62-63, 66, 116-122, etc. (*passim*); Stillman, pp. 25-26, 157-58; Bat Yeor, The Dhimmi – Jews and Christians Under Islam (“Ye’or, Dhimmi”), Fairleigh Dickenson University Press (Rutherford, NJ, etc., 1985), pp.52-60, 179, 184, 194-198.

8. required to wear distinctive clothing or a badge signifying their non-Muslim identity.⁴

Christians and Jews were “**allowed to practice their religion**” under Islam only as long as they meekly complied with those burdens and restrictions and acknowledged the supremacy of Islam.

B. On page 202 of Chapter 6, Section 3 “**Islamic Civilization**,” in a subsection entitled “**Islamic Society**,” the textbook states:

“Social Structure

According to Islam, all people are equal in the eyes of Allah.”

This statement may merely be a case of careless writing and ignorant editorial supervision. The author may have intended to say “**According to Islam, all [Muslims] are [spiritually] equal in the eyes of Allah.**” However, as written, the statement is false. “**According to Islam,**” Christians and Jews are definitely not “**equal**” to Muslims “**in the eyes of Allah.**” In the *Qur’an*, the immutable word of Allah “[a]ccording to Islam,” Christians and Jews are referred to as “apes”, “pigs”, and “dogs.”⁵ These degrading characterizations in Islam’s holiest book hardly connote “**equal[ity] in the eyes of Allah.**”

IV. Jihad and the Early Islamic Conquests.

A. The Meaning of “Jihad” and Warfare in the Name of Religion.

On page 192 of Chapter 6, Section 2 “**The Arab Empire and its Successors**,” in a subsection entitled “**Creation of an Arab Empire**,” under the heading of “**Arab Conquest**”, the textbook states:

“The Quran permitted fair, defensive warfare as jihad (jih-HAHD), or ‘struggle in the way of God.’”⁶

This definition of “**jihad**” as “**defensive warfare**” is false. Aggressive warfare for the purpose of making Islam supreme over the entire world, was, and is, the predominant meaning of *jihad*.⁷ Indeed, the textbook’s definition of “**jihad**” as solely “**defensive warfare**” is false. Aggressive warfare for the purpose of making Islam supreme over the entire world, was, and is, the predominant meaning of *jihad*. And what is “**fair warfare?**” The textbook’s definition of “**jihad**” as “**fair, defensive warfare**” is belied by its description of the Umayyad Conquests found on page 194:

⁴ al-Misri, *Reliance*, pp.607-609; Tritton, pp.5-17, 113-126; Hitti, p 353-54; Bernard Lewis, Ed., *Islam – from the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople – Volume II: Religion and Society (“Islam – Vol. II: Religion and Society”)*, Oxford University Press (New York, Oxford, 1987), pp.217-225; Bostom, *Jihad*, pp. 31-35, 129-30; Bostom, *Islamic Antisemitism*, p. 519, 653-662; Spencer, pp.48-49, 62-63, 116-122, etc. (*passim*); Stillman, pp. 25-26, 157-58; Ye’or, *Dhimmi*, pp.52-60, 179, 184, 194-198; Khadduri, pp.193-198.

⁵ See, e.g., *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, p.28 (*Surah* 2:65); pp.304-305 (*Surah* 5:59-60); p.452-455 (*Surah* 7:159-166); p.458 (*Surah* 7:176); and p.1044. (*Surah* 25:44).

⁶ The same definition of *jihad* appears in the glossary on p. R74.

⁷ <http://www.danielpipes.org/990/what-is-jihad>

“At the beginning of the eighth century, Arabs carried out new attacks at both the eastern and western ends of the Mediterranean world. Arab armies moved across north Africa and conquered and converted the Berbers, a pastoral people living along the Mediterranean coast.

Around 710, combined Berber and Arab forces crossed the Strait of Gibraltar and occupied southern Spain. ...

In 717, another Muslim force had launched an attack on Constantinople with the hope of defeating the Byzantine Empire. ...

By 750, the Arab advance had finally come to an end, but not before the southern and eastern Mediterranean parts of the old Roman Empire had been conquered. Arab power also extended to the east in Mesopotamia and Persia and northward into central Asia.”

None of these attacks, invasions and conquests was **“defensive”**. Every one of these attacks, invasions and conquests was offensive in nature, carried out in fulfillment of the *Qur’an’s* mandate of *jihad*, to establish the supremacy of Islam. Thus, in addition to sanitizing the concept of *jihad*, the textbook ignores the significance and ramifications of *jihad*. The textbook does not even raise the issue of waging warfare for the purpose of spreading a particular religion, much less encourage the students to consider whether it is appropriate.

B. Imperialism. In the Glossary, on page R73, the textbook defines **“imperialism”** as **“the extension of a nation’s power over other lands,”** with a cross reference to page 686, where the same definition is repeated. This definition clearly applies to the Muslim conquests described in Chapter 6. However, although the Muslim or Islamic **“empire”** is referred to more than ten times in Section 2 alone, the term **“imperialism”** is never used and the issue of Islamic **“imperialism”** is never raised in Chapter 10’s discussion of the early Islamic conquests.

C. Portrayal of the Early Islamic Conquests Compared to the Portrayal of Imperialism by non-Muslim Countries.

1. The textbook devotes three full chapters, a total of 92 pages to imperialism by European countries, the United States and Japan: (Chapter 13, **“The Age of Exploration [-] 1500-1800”**, pages 428-451; Chapter 21, **“The Height of Imperialism [-] 1800-1914”**, pages 684-721; Chapter 22, **“East Asia Under Challenge [-] 1800-1914”**, pages 722-751).

The textbook appropriately describes the characteristics of imperialism: greed, brutality, racism, slavery, economic exploitation, etc. The textbook routinely and repeatedly employs pejorative terminology and phraseology in describing the motives and behavior of the **“imperialist”** nations.

The textbook cites the **“Social Darwinism”** theory of European racial superiority (pages 678 and 687), and quotes the racist beliefs of Cecil Rhodes (pages 696 and 697). On page 687 of Chapter 21, Section 1, **“Colonial Rule in Southeast Asia”**, under the

heading of **“Motives for Imperialism,”** in a discussion of **“Social Darwinism,”** the textbook states:

“Racists erroneously believe that particular races are superior or inferior.”

On page 687 of Chapter 21, Section 2, **“Empire building in Africa,”** in a subsection entitled **“Effects of Imperialism,”** the textbook asks the students the following question:

“MAIN IDEA [-] HISTORY AND YOU [-] How do you feel when someone treats you with an air of superiority?”

2. In contrast, the textbook devotes four sections of two chapters (a grand total of 30 pages) to imperialist conquests by various Muslim empires, although they are never described as such. Embedded within Islam is a supremacist ideology commonly referred to as “radical Islam” or “political Islam, which served as the basis and rationale for the Islamic conquests throughout history. This ideology is never addressed anywhere in the entire textbook, much less characterized as **“erroneous”**. The students are never directed to consider how they feel **“when someone treats [them] with an air of [religious] superiority”**.

a. The Early Muslim Empires. The entire discussion of the establishment and decline of the Arab Muslim empire and the rise of the Seljuk Turks (from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries) is contained in Chapter 6, Section 2, **“The Arab Empire and Its Successors,”** pages 192-199, a total of eight pages. Included in these eight pages is material on the Crusades (covered in more detail later in the textbook) and the Mongol invasion. No negative consequences of the early Islamic conquests are even implied, much less described. Institutionalized discrimination against non-Muslims is omitted.

b. The Ottoman Empire. The rise and decline of the Ottoman empire from the 13th to the 17th centuries is discussed in Chapter 15, **“The Muslim Empires [-] 1450-1800,”** Section 1, **“The Ottoman Empire,”** pages 484-491, a total of eight pages. On page 484, the textbook states the “MAIN IDEA” of the section as follows:

“Over a span of three hundred years, the Ottomans conquered the Byzantine Empire and expanded into western Asia, Africa, and Europe to create the Ottoman Empire.”

In a subsection entitled **“Rise of the Ottoman Turks”**, pages 484-486, the textbook describes how the Ottomans conquered their empire. In a subsection entitled **“The Ottoman World,”** on page 486 the textbook states:

“Like the other Muslim empires in Persia and India, the Ottoman Empire is often labeled a “gunpowder empire.” Gunpowder empires were formed by outside conquerors who unified the regions that they conquered. As the name suggests, such an empire’s success was largely based on its mastery of the technology of firearms.”

However, the term **“imperialism”** is never used and the issue of Islamic **“imperialism”** is never raised. Further, with the exception of the siege and sack of Constantinople and

other military defeats, no negative consequences are even implied for the conquered peoples. In this regard it must be noted that the Ottomans did not merely “unif[y]” conquered lands. They dominated and economically exploited those lands, just like any other imperialist conqueror.

c. The Safavid Empire. The rise and decline of the Safavid Empire from the 16th to the early 18th centuries is discussed in Chapter 15, Section 2, “**The Rule of the Safavids**”, pp.492-497, a total of six pages. Although the concept of “imperialism” is never considered, this section accurately reflects the historical record of Safavid aggression as well as periodic brutality and intolerance.

d. India. The Islamic penetration and conquest of India is discussed in Chapter 8, “**The Asian World [-] 400-1500**,” Section 4, “**India After the Guptas**”, pages 284-287 (four pages); and Chapter 15, Section 3, “**The Grandeur of the Moguls**,” pages 498-501 (four pages), for a total of eight pages. On pages 285-286 of Chapter 8, Section 4, in a subsection entitled “**The Impact of Religion**,” the textbook states:

“The Eastward Expansion of Islam

In the early eighth century, Islam became popular in the northwestern part of the Indian subcontinent. ...

When the Arab armies reached India in the early eighth century, they did little more than move into the frontier regions. ...”

Although clearly relevant, the textbook never addresses the issue of how the presence of “**Arab armies**” in India’s “**frontier regions**” influenced the sudden “**popular[ity]**” of Islam in northwestern India. The phrase “became popular” is far different from the reality that Islam was forcibly imposed on non-Muslims. Otherwise, these sections contain brief but candid descriptions of the impact of the Turkish and Mogul (Mughal) Muslim conquests of India, and stand in stark contrast to the textbook’s relentlessly positive portrayal of the early Muslim conquests.

VI. Islam and Women.

Chapter 6 egregiously misrepresents the role of Islamic law in the lives of Muslim women.

On page 203 of Chapter 6, Section 3 “**Islamic Civilization**,” in a subsection entitled “**Islamic Society**,” the textbook states:

“The Role of Women

The Quran granted women spiritual and social equality with men. Believers, men and women, were to be friends and protectors of one another. Women had the right to the fruits of their work and to own and inherit property.

...

Islamic teachings did account for differences between men and women in the family and social order. Both had duties and responsibilities. As in most societies of the time, however, men were dominant in Muslim society.

... The Quran allowed Muslim men to have more than one wife, but no more than four.
... Women had the right to freely enter into marriage, but they also had the right of divorce under some circumstances. ...”

The first paragraph above is highly misleading. The *Qur'an* does not grant “**spiritual...equality**” to all women, as stated in the first sentence. The *Qur'an* does grant Muslim women “**spiritual...equality**” with Muslim men. Further, Muslim women do not have “**social equality**” with Muslim men. Under Islamic *Shari'a* law Muslim women are subject to many restrictions and legal disabilities.⁸

For instance, women do have “**the right of divorce under some circumstances**” – very specific and limited “**circumstances**”, and then only if the husband agrees. In contrast, a Muslim man can divorce any (or all) of his four wives, for any reason or no reason at all, merely by saying “I divorce you” three times (or even once). The purported justification for this blatant legal discrimination against women is, indeed, based on alleged “**differences between men and women.**”

“[T]he underlying reason for granting the authority of divorce to men is the weaker rationality of women, their being normally overpowered by emotions, and their inclination to disturb normal life.”⁹

Perhaps the most severe discriminatory legal disability imposed on Muslim women by Islamic *Shari'a* law is the reduced value assigned to their testimony in an Islamic legal proceeding. In order to “**account for differences**” in the cognitive abilities of men and women, the testimony of one man is worth the testimony of two women,

“So if one of [the women] errs,
The other can remind her.”¹⁰

Muhammad stated that the reduced value of the testimony of women “is because of the deficiency of a woman's mind.”¹¹

The textbook's discussion of “**The Role of Women**” conceals the blatant and severe prejudice and discrimination against women inherent in Islamic law.

V. Islam and Slavery

A. The Early Muslim Slave Trade

⁸ Bernard Lewis, *The Middle East – A Brief History of the Last 2,000 Years*, (NY: Simon and Schuster, 1995), p.318.

⁹ . Ibn Rushd, *The Distinguished Jurist's Primer, Volume II*, transl. Prof. I.A.K. Nyazee, Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, Garnet Publishing (Reading, UK, Lebanon, 2006), p.87

¹⁰ *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, p.129-130 (*Surah 2:282*).

¹¹ *Sahih al-Bukhari, USC Sunnah and Hadith, Volume 3, Book 48, Number 826. See also, Id., Volume 1, Book 6, Number 301, where, in addition to asserting “the deficiency in [women's] intelligence” as justification for discounting the value of their legal testimony, Muhammad states that “the majority of the dwellers of Hell” are women because they “curse frequently and are ungrateful to [their] husbands.”.*

On page 200 of Chapter 6, Section 3 **“Islamic Civilization,”** in a subsection entitled **“Prosperity in the Islamic World,”** the textbook mentions **“slaves”** as one of a dozen commodities (ivory, spices, silk, grain, etc.) that were traded across the Muslim empire.

In the subsection entitled **“Islamic Society,”** on pages 202-203, the textbook devotes three column inches to the institution of slavery in the Muslim world from 600 CE/AD to 1500 CE/AD. The textbook erroneously states that **“Muslims could not be slaves.”** In theory, Muslims were not supposed to enslave other Muslims. However, if an enslaved non-Muslim converts to Islam, that does not mean freedom. The converted Muslim slave remains a slave.

Although the textbook does state that slavery was **“widespread”** in the Islamic world, it provides no information whatsoever on the massive volume of the Muslim slave trade. In contrast, when discussing the Atlantic slave trade, the textbook provides detailed information on the number of Africans kidnapped and sent into slavery in Europe and the Americas.

B. The Muslim Role in the Atlantic Slave Trade.

This chapter is a clear example of the textbook’s failure to reveal both the extent of the early Islamic slave trade and the central role played by Muslims in the Atlantic slave trade.

1. On page 252 of Chapter 7, **“Early African Civilizations,”** Section 2 **“African Society and Culture,”** in a subsection entitled **“Aspects of African Society”**, the textbook states:

“Slavery

When we use the term African slavery, we usually think of the period after 1500, when European slave ships carried millions of Africans in bondage to Europe and the Americas (see Chapter 13). Slavery, however, did not begin with the coming of the Europeans. It had been practiced in Africa since ancient times. Furthermore, as we have seen, slavery was not unique to Africa, but was common throughout the world.

Berber groups in North Africa regularly raided farming villages south of the Sahara for captives. The captives were then taken northward and sold throughout the Mediterranean. ...”

The first sentence of the first paragraph is correct, primarily because academia and the media have concealed, ignored or minimized the connection between Islam and slavery and the fact that Islamic slavery existed centuries prior to 1500 CE/AD.

The first sentence of the second paragraph provides a superficial description of the first segment of the worldwide Muslim slave trading industry: the kidnapping and land transportation network. However, the Muslim connection is obscured. **“Berber groups”** were not the only Muslims who played a central role in the slave kidnapping and transportation network in Africa.

Further, the slaves kidnapped and exported from Africa were not merely **“sold throughout the Mediterranean.....”** Thanks to the international Muslim slave trading

industry, they were sold throughout the Islamic world, from the Atlantic Ocean to India. Even those Africans who were sold into slavery in non-Muslim European countries were sold primarily by Muslim slave traders. The only explicit mention of Muslim slavery found on page 252 implies benevolence relative to non-Muslim slavery:

“In Muslim societies in Southwest Asia, slaves might at some point even win their freedom.”

2. On page 440 of Chapter 13, **“The Age of Exploration [-] 1500-1800,”** Section 2, **“The Atlantic Slave Trade,”** the textbook states:

“As the number of European colonies increased, so did the volume and area of European trade. An Atlantic slave trade also began. Altogether, as many as ten million enslaved Africans were brought to the Americas between the early 1500s and the late 1800s.”

The estimate of **“as many as ten million”** Africans sold into slavery in the Americas is accurate. However, from the seventh to the early twentieth century between fourteen and eighteen million Africans were sold into slavery in the Muslim world. In addition, untold numbers of non-Africans were sold into slavery in the Muslim world.

There is no hint of the massive volume of the Muslim slave trade anywhere in the textbook.¹²

3. On page 441 of a subsection entitled **“Trade, Colonies and Mercantilism,”** the textbook states:

“The Slave Trade

Traffic in enslaved people was not new. As in other areas of the world, slavery had been practiced since ancient times. In the 1400s, it continued at a fairly steady level.

The primary market for enslaved Africans was Southwest Asia where most served as domestic servants as in some European countries like Portugal.”

In fact, from the 700s through the 1400s, **“[t]he primary market for enslaved Africans”** was the Muslim world from the Atlantic Ocean to India, and not merely **“Southwest Asia,”** as stated in the textbook.

4. On page 442 under the headings **“Growth of the Slave Trade”** and **“Sources of Enslaved Africans”** and on page 443 in a subsection entitled **“Effects of the Slave Trade,”** the textbook further discusses the Atlantic slave trade.

However, nowhere in the entire section does the textbook even indirectly address the central Muslim role in the Atlantic slave trade.

¹² Baroness Caroline Cox and Dr. John Marks, This Immoral Trade – Slavery in the 21st Century, Monarch Books (Oxford, UK, etc, 2006), p.124; Lewis, Slavery, pp.11-12; Bostom, Jihad, p.89 (17 million); Submission, p.131, (14 million - citing and quoting from Thomas Sowell, Race and Culture, BasicBooks, 1994, p.188).

C. Slavery in the Muslim World Today.

On page 443 of the last paragraph of the subsection “**Effects of the Slave Trade,**” the textbook discusses the end of the Atlantic slave trade:

“Not until...the 1770s did European feeling against slavery begin to build. Even then, it was not until the French Revolution in the 1790s that the French abolished slavery. The British did the same in 1807. Nevertheless, slavery continued in the newly formed United States until the Civil War of the 1860s.”

The abolition of slavery in Europe and the United States is also briefly addressed on page 637 in Chapter 19, “**Industrialism and Nationalism [-] 1800-1870,**” and on page 671 in Chapter 20, “**Mass Society and Democracy [-] 1870-1914.**” However, the students are never informed that the slave trade in the Muslim world continued unabated throughout the entire period of the Atlantic slave trade; that the Muslim world vigorously resisted Western efforts to end the slave trade in the nineteenth century; or that slavery in parts of the Muslim world continues into the twenty-first century.¹³

The textbook’s failure to provide any information on the persistent existence of slavery in the Muslim world is particularly egregious in view of the fact that on page 428, the very first page of Chapter 13, the textbook directly asks, “**Does slavery occur in any parts of the world today?**” This is a very important question, and the answer is clearly “YES”. Unfortunately, the textbook does not provide the students with any information that will lead them to the appropriate answer.

(B) The Arab-Israeli Conflict

The textbook’s presentation of the history of Israel, from biblical times to 2008, is skewed by the omission of pertinent facts and the inclusion of incorrect facts. The material, as presented to the students, reflects an agenda-based perspective and lacks historical authenticity. .

¹³ “2009 Human Rights Report: Saudi Arabia”, U.S. Department of State, op. cit.; Boston, Jihad, p.92; Cox And Marks, p.126; Lewis, Slavery, pp. 13, 59; John Eibner. “My Career Redeeming Slaves”, Middle East Quarterly, December 1999 – Volume VI: Number 4, December, 1999, <http://www.meforum.org/449/my-career-redeeming-slaves>; “Submission”, p.134-135; Carl Bombay, Let My People Go!, Multnomah Publishers (Sisters Oregon, 1998); Samuel Cotton, Silent Terror [-] A Journey into Contemporary African Slavery, Harlem River Press (New York 1998); David Littman, “*The U.N. Finds Slavery in the Sudan*”, Middle East Quarterly, Vol III, No 3, September 1996, <http://www.meforum.org/319/the-un-finds-slavery-in-the-sudan>; Richard Lobben, “*Slavery in The Sudan Since 1989*”, Arab Studies Quarterly, Spring 2001, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2501/is_2_23/ai_77384489/pg_1; “Four countries 'blacklisted' by US”, Jerusalem Post, Jun 17, 2009, <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1245184857234&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>; Nora Boustany, “*Allies Cited for Human Trafficking*”, Washington Post, June 13, 2007. p. A14, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/12/AR2007061202180.html>. In 2007, the International Criminal Court issued arrest warrants for high officials in the government of Sudan on charges relating to slavery. International Criminal Court, The Hague, Netherlands, Warrants of Arrest for the Minister of State for Humanitarian Affairs of Sudan, and a leader of the Militia/Janjaweed, May 2, 2007 (ICC-PIDS-PR-20070502-214), <http://www.icc-cpi.int/press/pressreleases/241.html>.

On page 996 of Chapter 30 “Africa and the Middle East,” Section 2 “Palestine and the Mideast Crisis,” the textbook states:

“The Zionists wanted the land of ancient Israel to be a home for the Jewish people. Many people had been shocked at the end of World War II when they learned about the Holocaust, the deliberate killing of 6 million European Jews in Nazi death camps. As a result, sympathy for the Jewish cause grew. In 1947, the United Nations (UN) resolution proposed that the Palestine Mandate should be divided into a Jewish state and an Arab state. The Jews then proclaimed the state of Israel on May 14, 1948.”

This material is problematic because it misrepresents history by egregious omission of facts. It creates the impression that Jews picked the “**land of ancient Israel to be a home for the Jewish people**” without any ancestral ties to the land. There is no historical information about the continuous presence of the Jews in Israel since biblical times. Furthermore, the wording concerning the UN Resolution to partition Palestine implies that the partition of Palestine into two states came as a result of the Holocaust and not because Britain went to the UN to end its mandate.

Glencoe needs to provide students with the following history of both the British Mandate for Palestine and the United Nations Resolution to Partition Palestine:

The British Mandate for Palestine came about as a result of the British defeat of the Ottoman Turkish forces during World War I. At that time, the British occupied and established a military administration in Palestine and Syria. In June 1922, the League of Nations approved the British Mandate for Palestine which determined that Britain could divide the Mandate territory into two administrative areas, Palestine under direct British rule, and autonomous Transjordan, under the rule of the Hashemite family from Hijaz. The Mandate formalized British rule in Palestine which continued until 1948.¹⁴ Britain was never able to resolve the contradictory aspirations of Arabs and Jews in Palestine and following World War II, escalating hostilities between Arabs and Jews and violence against the British in Palestine compelled Britain to relinquish its mandate over Palestine. The British requested that the recently established United Nations determine the future of Palestine.

On November 29, 1947, the UN General Assembly voted to terminate the British Mandate for Palestine and to partition Palestine into two states, one Jewish and the other Arab. The proposed plan was accepted by the leaders of the Jewish community in Palestine. However, and this is extremely important, the plan was rejected by leaders of the Arab community (the Palestine Arab Higher Committee), who were supported in their rejection by the states of the Arab League community.¹⁵ It is impossible to accurately understand the current Middle Eastern geopolitical landscape without this knowledge.

Also on page 996, the textbook states:

¹⁴ http://www.palestinefacts.org/pf_independence_un_arabrejection.php;
<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/un/res181.htm>

¹⁵ <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/un/res181.htm>

“As a result of these events, hundreds of thousands of Palestinians fled to neighboring Arab countries, where they lived in refugee camps. Other Palestinians remained as residents of Israel.”

While it is correct that **“hundreds of thousands of Palestinian fled to neighboring Arab countries,”** no information is given to the students about why the Palestinians fled. The Arabs who fled Israel in 1948-1949 did so largely at the instigation of their own leaders. Those who stayed were not forced out of the places where they lived and they now enjoy the rights and privileges of being free citizens of Israel.

In addition, there is no mention of the Jewish refugee problem created when Jews were expelled from Muslim lands. Between 1920 and 1970, 900,000 Jews were expelled from Arab and other Muslim countries: from Morocco to Iran, from Turkey to Yemen, including places where they had lived for twenty centuries. The 1940s were a turning point in this tragedy; of those expelled, 600,000 settled in the new state of Israel, and 300,000 in France and Canada.¹⁶

(C) Palestinian Liberation Organization

On page 997 of Chapter 30 **“Africa and the Middle East,”** in the chart **“Arab-Israeli Relations,”** the textbook states:

“1993: The Oslo Peace Accords signed – intifada ends; PLO recognizes Israel and gains control of a semi-independent area.”

On page 999 of Chapter 30, Section 2 **“Conflict in the Middle East,”** in the subsection section **“Palestine and Lebanon,”** the textbook states:

“Finally, in the Oslo Peace Accords of 1993, Israel and the PLO agreed that the PLO would control a semi-independent area. In return the PLO recognized the Israeli state.”

The textbook omits the critical fact that the PLO never honored its agreement. The textbook also fails to explain that the PLO’s recognition of Israel’s right to exist was a verbal recognition only; that Article 15, which explicitly denies Israel’s right to exist remains unchanged; that the Palestinian map of the Middle East still does not show Israel, and that Palestinian children are indoctrinated in their schools to deny Israel’s right to exist.

The textbook also fails to include the fact that the PLO’s translation of its Charter sometimes deviates from the original Arabic so as to be more palatable to Western readers. For example, in Article 15, the Arabic is translated as “the elimination of Zionism,” whereas the correct translation is “the liquidation of the Zionist presence.” “The Zionist presence” is a common Arabic euphemism for the State of Israel, so this clause in fact calls for the destruction of Israel, not just the end of Zionism.”¹⁷

¹⁶ <http://daphneanson.blogspot.com/2010/11/expulsion-of-jews-from-muslim-countries.htm>

¹⁷ <http://www.iris.org.il/plochart.htm>