

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Orlando, FL World History [-] Human Legacy, 2008

This textbook has egregious errors, omissions, misrepresentations and falsifications in the critical areas of (A) the History of Early Islam and (B) the Arab-Israeli Conflict. 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 9 does the textbook identify the presence of a Jewish community in Yathrib/Medina. It refers only to a city called Yathrib whose “**people were open to the preaching**” of Muhammad.

On page 258 of Chapter 9, “**Muslim Civilization [-] 550-1250**,” Section 1, “**The Origins of Islam**,” in a subsection entitled “**Muhammad the Messenger**,” the textbook states:

“Sharing the Revelations [-] In search of a new home, Muhammad visited the nearby city of Yathrib, where people were open to his preaching. In 622, Muhammad moved from Mecca to Yathrib, which came to be called Medina (muh-dee-nuh), ‘the Prophet’s city.’”

The Arabs of Yathrib were indeed “**open to [Muhammad’s] preaching**”, in part because they had already been exposed to monotheism by the Jews. However, there is no mention of the Jews of Yathrib, who were not “**open to his preaching**.” They had already been following their own monotheistic religion for more than 1500 years. Because they refused to adopt his new religion, Muhammad expelled two of the Jewish tribes from Yathrib and destroyed the third, beheading the men and selling the women and children into slavery. Muhammad’s expulsion and extermination of the Jews of Medina appear nowhere in this textbook and are therefore are erased from this history.

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

On pages 260-261 of Chapter 9, Section 1, in a subsection entitled “**Basic Ideas of Islam**,” the textbook states:

“The Sunna and Sharia [-] ...

...

Over time, Muslims developed a legal system that reflects the various rules by which all Muslims should live. The system is called Sharia (shuh-ree-uh). Sharia law has never become standardized but it does outline a method of reasoning and argument for legal cases. Numerous schools of thought contributed to the creation

of Sharia law, which is not recorded in a single book. It is made up of opinions and writings over several centuries. Differences in interpretation vary among the many people in the Islamic world.”

On page 270 of Chapter 9, Section 3, “**Society and Culture**,” in a subsection entitled “**Muslim Society**,” the textbook states:

“...Islam affected practically all aspects of daily life. Islamic texts provided guidance on how Muslims should deal with many issues, including family life, slavery and the economy.”

Although the textbook does not connect the statement on page 270 with *Shari’a* law, it is clearly related. Even when the statement on page 270 is considered, the textbook’s description of *Shari’a* grievously understates the all-encompassing nature of *Shari’a* over all aspects of human thought and behavior. The textbook fails to inform the students (a) that Islamic *Shari’a* law is also imposed, to varying degrees, on all non-Muslims living in lands conquered and controlled by Muslims; (b) that *Shari’a* law is grossly discriminatory against non-Muslims and Muslim women; (c) that according to the *Qur’an*, it is the religious duty of all Muslims who are able to wage aggressive *jihad* warfare until Islam and *Shari’a* law are supreme over the entire world;¹ (d) that *Shari’a* law also regulates and controls all governmental functions and is incompatible with the concept of separation of church and state.

Another problem with how this textbook represents *Shari’a* law is the claim that it “**is not recorded in a single book.**” While technically true, in that there is more than one source that encapsulates *Shari’a* law, it is misleading, because it may lead students to conclude that there is no “**single book**” of *Shari’a* law in existence. Reliance of the Traveller, an authorized English translation of *Shari’a* law according to the Shafi’i school of Islamic jurisprudence first written approximately 800 years ago, is an authoritative manual on Islamic law that is readily available today.

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

On page 261 of Chapter 9, Section 1, in a subsection entitled “**Basic Ideas of Islam**,” the textbook states:

“People of the Book [-] ... Muslims are told to respect Jews and Christians as ‘people of the book’ because they share the tradition of prophets who taught and received revelations from God.”

The nature of the “respect” to be accorded to Christians and Jews as ‘**people of the book**’ is clearly reflected in their characterization in the *Qur’an* as “apes”, “pigs”, “dogs” and “farther astray” than “cattle”; in the litany of oppressive burdens and restrictions placed on the practice of their religions and their daily lives; in their expulsion from the Arabian Peninsula; and in the *Qur’anic* mandate to wage perpetual warfare on all non-Muslims until they submit and acknowledge the supremacy of Islam.²

¹ Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri Reliance of the Traveller – A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law, (Beltsville, MD: Amana Publications, 1994), pp.607-609; Majid Khadduri, War and Peace in the Law of Islam, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1955), pp.194-195

² 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).

On page 265 of Chapter 9, Section 2, “**The Spread of Islam**,” in a subsection entitled “**The Umayyad Dynasty**,” the textbook states:

“...In general, Muslims allowed considerable religious freedom. They allowed Christians and Jews – People of the Book – to practice their religion. Non- Muslims did have to pay heavy taxes and endured some restrictions on their daily lives. For example, in some places, Muslims required synagogues to be built underground as a symbol of Judaism’s inferior status.”

This description of the treatment of Christians and Jews, although brief, is superior to that in most textbooks because it informs the students that Christians and Jews were subject to “**some restrictions on their daily lives**” in addition to “**heavy taxes**”. However, it is still deficient because the litany of burdens and restrictions on non-Muslims is considerably more onerous than the single example cited.³

IV. Jihad and the Early Islamic Conquests

A. The Meaning of “Jihad” and Warfare in the Name of Religion. On page 260 of Chapter 9, Section 1, in a subsection entitled “**Basic Ideas of Islam**,” the textbook states:

“Another requirement for the devout Muslim is jihad, a word that can be translated as ‘struggle for the faith.’ Jihad can also mean struggle to defend the Muslim community, or historically, to convert people to Islam. The word has also been translated as ‘holy war.’”

This description of *jihad* is better than what is found in most textbooks. First, the textbook does not imply that “inner struggle” is the sole or primary meaning of *jihad*. Warfare is explicitly acknowledged to be an integral part of *jihad*. Further, the textbook informs the students that, in addition to “**defend[ing] the Muslim community**” *jihad* is waged “**to convert people to Islam**.”

However, the textbook’s treatment of *jihad* is still deficient. First, the textbook never follows up or develops the issue of warfare in the name of religion. The students are never encouraged to consider whether waging war “**to convert people to Islam**” is appropriate. Further, the textbook fails to inform the students that, “**historically**” (and according to most modern Islamic theologians, scholars and jurists): (1) the highest form of *jihad* is armed struggle against

³ 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.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; Bat Ye’or, 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. 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;

unbelievers; and (2) *jihad* is a permanent state of “holy war” until Islam is supreme in the world.⁴

B. Imperialism. On page 742 of Chapter 25, “1800-1920 [-] The Age of Imperialism,” Section 1, “The British in India,” in a subsection entitled “Setting the Stage,” the textbook states:

“The arrival of the British in India was an example of European imperialism, the process of one people ruling or controlling another. By 1700, Spain, Great Britain, France and Portugal ruled vast territories in the Americas.”

As a result of military conquest between 632 and 750, Muslims ruled and controlled a vast empire that stretched from the Atlantic Ocean to India. The textbook makes clear the aggressive nature of the Islamic conquests. However, the term “imperialism” is never used in the textbook’s discussion of the early Islamic conquests, and the concept of “imperialism” is never discussed.

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

1. Although the concept of imperialism is never considered in connection with any Muslim conquest, the textbook does provide the students with some information about the aggressive nature of the early Islamic expansion. On page 263 of Chapter 9, Section 2, “The Spread of Islam,” the textbook devotes approximately four column inches to the “Expansion of Territory” under the first two caliphs. On page.264, the textbook devotes another four column inches to “Continued Expansion” by the Umayyad caliphs, stating, in part:

“Armies also extended the caliphate’s borders. To the east, Muslim armies conquered territory all the way to the borders of China and the Indus River Valley. To the west, Muslim forces took northern Africa, crossed the Mediterranean and took control of most of Spain.”

On page 381 of Unit 4, “Medieval Europe [-] 300-1500,” Chapter 13, “The Early Middle Ages,” Section 2, “New Invaders,” in a subsection entitled “The Muslims,” the textbook devotes another nine column inches to a description of early Muslim aggression in Europe:

“Muslims first came to Europe in large numbers as conquerors. In 711 a Muslim army from northern Africa crossed the Strait of Gibraltar and made rapid conquest of Spain. The Muslims would rule the Iberian Peninsula for more than 700 years. ...”

The next four paragraphs summarize Muslim invasions, raids and aggression against France and Italy, as well as Muslim piracy and slavery in the Mediterranean through “the 900s.” This information, although accurate, would have better served the students if it

⁴ 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; al-Misri, Reliance, pp.607-609; Khadduri, pp.194-195.

had been included in Chapter 9 (which is about Islam) rather than in Chapter 13, where it is lumped in with the European invasions of the Vikings and the Magyars.

2. In addition, Muslim empires are also discussed in Chapter 17, “**1200-1800 [-] New Asian Empires.**” On pages 499-503 of Section 1, “**The Ottoman and Safavid Empires,**” the textbook devotes 2½ pages to the rise and fall of the Ottoman Empire in Asia, Europe and Africa, and less than one page to the rise and fall of the Safavid Empire in Persia. Section 2 devotes another five pages to “**The Mughal Empire**” in India.

3. However, Chapter 17 devotes significantly more discussion to non-Muslim Asian empires. Chapter 17, Section 3, devotes seven pages to “**The Ming and Qing Dynasties**” in China, and Section 4 devotes eight pages to “**Medieval Japan and Korea**”.

4. Further, the textbook’s discussion of European conquests and imperialism dwarf its discussion of the early and later Muslim conquests. Chapter 16, “**1400-1700 [-] Exploration and Expansion**” (pp.466-495), and Chapter 25, “**1800-1920 [-] The Age of Imperialism**” (pp.738-769), devote a total of 62 pages to conquests and imperialism by European countries and the United States. The textbook appropriately describes the negative effects of European and American conquests and 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 western “**imperialist**” nations. On page 757 of Chapter 25, Section 3, “**The Scramble for Africa,**” the textbook cites the “**Social Darwinism**” theory of European racial superiority and quotes the racist beliefs of Cecil Rhodes. On the same page, the textbook states:

“...European imperialists felt that they were superior to non-European peoples. These Europeans argued that humanity was divided into distinct peoples, or races, and there were significant biological differences between the races. Most Europeans who held these views believed that people of European descent were biologically superior to people of African or Asian descent.”

All of this is true, and it is essential for the students to learn about the evils of European imperialism, including the reprehensible attitude of racial superiority.

It is a basic tenet of Islam that Muslims are religiously “**superior**” to all non-Muslims. Further, according to the *Qur’an’s* mandate of *jihad*, it is the religious duty of all Muslims who are able to wage war to make the “superior” religion of Islam supreme in the world. According to Islamic doctrine, the world is “divided into” *Dar al- Islam*, “the house of Islam”, and *Dar al-Harb*, “the House of War”, and that Islam is in a perpetual state of war against *Dar al-Harb* until the entire world submits to Islam.⁵

This information, including its contribution to centuries of Islamic imperialism, is also essential for the students to know, but it does not appear in the textbook.

V. Islam and Women.

⁵ <http://www.mideastweb.org/Middle-East-Encyclopedia/dar-al-harb.htm>

On page 271 of Chapter 9, Section 3, in the “**Muslim Society**,” the textbook states:

“The Family and Women [-] Islamic texts set forth roles within the family, the main social unit in Muslim society. The man was the head of the family. Men could have several wives. However, husbands were supposed to treat all of their wives equally. Other aspects of the law sought to protect the rights of children and women.

At the time of Muhammad, the rights of women varied from clan to clan. There were no laws regarding the status of all women. That situation changed somewhat under Islam. According to the Qur’an, women were equal to men before Allah. In addition, Islam acknowledged that women could inherit property and could seek divorce in some circumstances.

....”

This is a misleading half-truth. Women could, indeed, “**inherit property**”. However, a woman’s share of inheritance was half that of a man. Women could, indeed, “**seek divorce in some circumstances**” – very specific and limited “circumstances”, and then only with her husband’s consent. In contrast, a man could easily divorce any one of his four wives for any reason or no reason at all. Muslim women were (and are) subject to many other restrictions and legal disabilities under *Shari’a* law.⁶

VI. Islam and Slavery

A. The Early Muslim Slave Trade. On page 271 of Chapter 9, Section 3, in the subsection “**Muslim Society**,” the textbook states:

“Slavery [-] Islamic texts also addressed slavery, which was common throughout Muslim lands. Most slaves came from non-Muslim regions. ...

“...Although treatment of slaves improved under Islam, slavery remained a part not just of Muslim society but also of the economy. Muslim merchants traded in slaves over a wide area.”

On page 291 of Chapter 10, “**African Kingdoms [-] 100-1500**,” Section 2, “**Trading States of East Africa**,” in a subsection entitled “**Coastal City-States**,” the textbook states:

⁶ Bernard Lewis, *The Middle East – A Brief History of the Last 2,000 Years* (“Lewis, Middle East”). (NY: Simon and Schuster/Touchstone, 1995), p.318; *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.1012-1013, 1264-1265; See also, Sahih al-Bukhari, *USC Sunnah and Hadith, Volume 3, Book 48, Number 829*; *Sahih Muslim, USC Sunnah and Hadith, Book 026, Number 5395*; al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.512; M. S. A. A. Maududi, *Purdah and the Status of Women in Islam*, Markazi Maktaba Islami Publishers (New Dehli, 2009), pp.248-255; *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.219-220; al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.540-541; Maududi, pp.189-190; *The Submission of Women and Slaves* (“Submission”), Center for the Study of Political Islam (2007), pp. 44-48 ; *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.128-129. See also, Sahih al-Bukhari, *USC Sunnah and Hadith, Volume 1, Book 6, Number 301*; *Id., Volume 3, Book 48, Number 826*; al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.637-639; *Submission*, pp16-17.

“In addition [to other commodities, e.g., copper, coconut oil, ivory, gold], enslaved Africans captured in the interior were exported through the coastal city-states to slave markets in Arabia, Persia, and India. These enslaved Africans were then sent to regions across Asia, many to work as domestic servants. The trade of enslaved Africans would later increase substantially after Europeans began coming to Africa. Many of the enslaved Africans in this later European slave trade would be exported to the Americas.”

These statements contain some necessary information about the geographical extent of the early Islamic slave trade. The language on page 271 correctly (but vaguely) informs students that the Muslim slave trade extended **“over a wide area”**. In addition, the students are informed that Muslims benefited economically from slavery. The language on page 291 correctly informs students about **“slave markets in Arabia, Persia, and India”**. However, these quotations are contained in different chapters and separated by 20 pages.

The reference to **“slave markets in Arabia, Persia, and India”** is contained in a chapter on **“African Kingdoms.”** There is no explicit reference to Islam or Muslims or any indication that this was the **“wide area”** over which the Muslim slave trade extended. The fact that the **“slave markets in Arabia, Persia, and India”** were part of a vast Muslim slave trading network should be made explicit. Further, there is no reference whatsoever to the massive volume of the Muslim slave trade, unlike the textbook’s discussion of the Atlantic slave trade. This deficiency is addressed in the next subsection of this review.

B. The Muslim Role in the Atlantic Slave Trade and Slavery in the Muslim World Today.

The Atlantic slave trade is discussed in Chapter 16, **“Exploration and Expansion [-] 1400-1700,”** Section 4, **“The Atlantic Slave Trade,”** pages 488-491 and in the **“Reference Section”** on page R10 in the back of the textbook. There is no mention anywhere of the essential role that Muslims played in the Atlantic slave trade.

With regard to the volume of the Atlantic slave trade, on page 491 in a subsection entitled **“Effects of the Slave Trade”** the textbook states:

“Historians have estimated that about 15 to 20 million Africans were shipped to the Americas against their will. Millions more were sent to Europe, Asia, and the Middle East.”

However, on a map of **“The Atlantic Slave Trade”** on page 489, the textbook indicates that between 9 and 10 million Africans were sent into slavery in the Americas. Similarly, in the **“Reference Section”** on page R10, the textbook states that **“[b]y the time the [Atlantic] slave trade ended in the mid-1800s, some 10 million Africans had been transported to slavery in the Americas.”** The estimates provided on p.489 and on p. R10 (between 9 and 10 million) are accurate. Although the textbook states on page 491 that **“[m]illions more [African slaves] were sent to Europe, Asia, and the Middle East,”** this statement is totally inadequate to convey the massive volume of the Islamic slave trade (between fourteen and eighteen million, in addition to untold millions of non-African peoples).

Finally, there is no indication anywhere in the textbook that slavery continues in the Muslim world today. All of this information is essential for students to understand the impact of the Muslim slave trade from the seventh century to the present day.⁷

(B) Arab-Israeli Conflict

The presentation of the Arab-Israeli Conflict in this textbook is problematic due to both its structure and its flawed content. The material on the origins, history and development of Zionism that the students must know in order to understand the origins of the Arab-Israeli Conflict is contained in several fragmented chapters that precede the history of the creation of Israel and the conflict that ensued. Students arrive at Chapter 31 "**Africa and the Middle East**" and the subsection "**The Creation of Israel**" with the false impression that there were no Jews in Palestine since biblical times and that Zionism was merely a twentieth century nationalistic movement that brought persecuted European Jews to Palestine where they seized the land from the Arabs and settled. The textbook fails to include the fact that in 1914, although the Jews made up 12% of the population of Palestine, they were already 60% of the population of Jerusalem.⁸

In addition to this erroneous assumption, there are numerous erroneous facts in the material presented in Chapter 31.

On page 951 on Chapter 31 "**Africa and the Middle East**," in Section 3 "**Nationalism in North Africa and the Middle East**," in the subsection "**The Creation of Israel**," the book states:

"The war also caused a massive refugee problem. By the end of the fighting, more than 700,000 Palestinians had become refugees. They fled from areas that Israel took control of as well as from the general war and chaos."

This statement creates the misleading notion that Israel caused the "Palestinian refugee" problem. If the Arabs had accepted the 1947 UN Resolution calling for both an Arab and Jewish state, there would be no "Palestinian refugee problem." In addition the Palestinian Arabs who fled Israel in 1948-1949 did so largely at the instigation of Arab leaders.⁹ Those who stayed were not forced out of the places where they lived, which is why they and their descendants now enjoy the rights and privileges of being free citizens of Israel.

Further, this paragraph acknowledges only a Palestinian Arab refugee problem. 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

⁷ See the following sources for the place of Islam in the history of slavery: Baroness Caroline Cox and Dr. John Marks, *This Immoral Trade – Slavery in the 21st Century*, Monarch Books (Oxford, UK, etc, 2006), pp.124; 143. Thomas Sowell, *Race and Culture*, (NY: BasicBooks, 1994), p.188. Bernard Lewis, *Race and Slavery in the Middle East ("Slavery")*, Oxford University Press (Oxford, NYC, 1990), pp.11-12; 52-53; Murray Gordon, *Slavery in the Arab World*, (New York: New Amsterdam, 1989), p. 232); Hugh Thomas, *The Slave Trade*. (NY: Simon & Schuster, 1997), p.46.

⁸ *The Letters of Chaim Weizmann*, Series A, Vol. 9, Oct. 1918-Jul. 1920 (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 129-130; 230-231.

⁹ <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/un/res181.htm>; Mitchell G. Bard, *Myths and Facts: A Guide to the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise, 2005), pp. 62-71.

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.¹⁰

On page 955 of Chapter 31 **“Africa and the Middle East,”** in Section 3 **“Nationalism in North Africa and the Middle East,”** in the subsection **“Conflicts with Israel,”** the book states:

“A series of wars has led to the expansion of Israel, which controls more land now than it did in 1948. As a result, many Palestinian Arabs live under Israeli control, another source of tension and conflict in the region.”

One glaring omission here is that the **“series of wars”** was a series of wars of aggression launched by the Arab nations against the state of Israel in order to annihilate it. The quotation creates the false impression that Israel was the aggressor and that Israel waged the wars to acquire more territory. Furthermore, the textbook does not state that more than 95% of the land **“acquired”** as a result of these wars is now under Palestinian control.

On page 956 of Chapter 31 **“Africa and the Middle East,”** in Section 4 **“Conflicts in the Middle East”** in the subsection **“War in 1967 and 1973,”** the textbook states:

“In this war, called the Six Day War, Israel took control of the Golan Heights, the Sinai Peninsula, Gaza Strip, West Bank and East Jerusalem. Israel gained control of land in the West Bank and Gaza with a large Palestinian population.”

An important fact that is omitted here is that Israel offered to negotiate after the Six Day War and that the Arab response at a meeting held in August 1967 in Khartoum was **“no recognition, no negotiation, and no peace with Israel.”**¹¹ No mention is made of the fact that Israel subsequently returned more than 90 percent of the territories won in the defensive 1967 war after negotiations with its neighbors. As before, its neighbors rejected Israel’s offers to trade land for peace.¹²

Also on page 956 in the subsection **“Palestinian Unrest,”** the textbook states:

“As Egypt and Israel made peace, Palestinian Arabs continued their struggle for nationhood. Under the UN partition plan, there were supposed to be two states in Palestine – a Jewish state and an Arab state. After the Arab-Israeli war of 1948, however, the land set aside for the Arab state was occupied by Israel, Egypt and Jordan.”

The misleading omission here is that from the Weizmann-Faisal Agreement of 1919 to the Peel Commission Proposal of 1936 to the UN Partition Plan of 1947, the Jews have accepted every proposal for a **“two-state solution,”** whereas the Arabs have rejected every proposal¹³ and have

¹⁰ <http://daphneanson.blogspot.com/2010/11/expulsion-of-jews-from-muslim-countries.htm>

¹¹ Bernard Reich. *A Brief History of Israel* (New York: Checkmark Books, 2005), pp. 86-92.

¹² Mitchell Bard. *Myths and Facts* (Maryland: American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise, 2001), p. 87.

¹³ <http://israelipalestinian.procon.org/view.answers.php?questionID=00049;>

<http://israelipalestinian.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=000635#british>

<http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Peace+Process/Reference+Documents/The+Weizmann-Feisal+Agreement+3-Jan-1919.htm>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faisal%E2%80%93Weizmann_Agreement;

[http://middleeast.about.com/od/arabisraeliconflict/f/khartoum-declaration-faq.htm;](http://middleeast.about.com/od/arabisraeliconflict/f/khartoum-declaration-faq.htm)

opted for a “Final Solution of the Jewish Problem” in Palestine. The Six Day War, as the Arabs themselves described it, was to have been a war of extermination.

On pages 956-957 of Chapter 31 “**Africa and the Middle East,**” in **Section 4 “Conflicts in the Middle East”** in the subsection “**Palestinian Unrest,**” the textbook states:

“In 1987 Palestinian resentment of Israeli occupation boiled over into a rebellion called the intifada. During the intifada, Palestinian youths battled Israeli troops in widespread street violence. Israel responded with strong military and police resistance, but the fighting continued until the early 1990s.”

First, it was not just “Palestinian youths” who were battling the Israelis. It was during this intifada that Hamas emerged as an organization, headed by Ahmed Yassin, and joined the intifada. Arafat welcomed their involvement. The intifada was not merely “**widespread street violence.**” During this first intifada, more Palestinians were killed by other Palestinians than by Israelis, since any Palestinians who had the courage to suggest seeking peace met with “strong military and police resistance” from their own people.