

Harcourt Brace, Orlando, FL
Social Studies [-] The World, Teacher's Edition, Vols 1 & 2, 2002

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

(A) The History of Early Islam

I. The Relationship Between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina

The omission from Chapter 9, Lesson 2 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 of Medina and falsifies the size and role of the Muslim community in the spread of Islam by Muhammad.

On page 305 of Chapter 9, “**Heirs of Rome and Persia,**” Lesson 2, “**The Muslim Empire,**” in a section entitled “**Muhammad and Islam,**” the textbook states:

“Muhammad’s journey took him to the town of Medina, where he was welcomed by Muslims already living there.”

This passage incorrectly implies that Muslims were already a significant presence in Medina prior to Muhammad’s arrival. The fact is that only a small number of Muhammad’s followers preceded him to Medina. There was, however, a substantial Jewish community living in Medina for at least one hundred years before Muhammad’s arrival. This Jewish community did not welcome Muhammad’s arrival or espouse Islam. The textbook erases from history both the presence of the Jews in Medina and their expulsion and slaughter by Muhammad.¹

II. Islamic Shari’a Law.

There is no discussion of the origin, content, application or effect of Islamic *Shari’a* law anywhere in the textbook.

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.

On pages 303-308 of Chapter 9, Lesson 2, “**The Muslim Empire**,” the textbook does not discuss, or even disclose the existence of Islamic *Shari’a* law.

In contrast on pages 297-299 of Chapter 9, Lesson 1, “**The Byzantine Empire**” (which immediately precedes the Lesson on “**The Muslim Empire**,”) the textbook discusses the origin, content and effect of Byzantine law (the Code of Justinian). On pages 314-315 of Chapter 9, Lesson 3, “**Europe in the Middle Ages**” (which immediately follows the Lesson on “**The Muslim Empire**”) the textbook discusses the origin, content, effect and influence of medieval English and European law (the Magna Carta).

In addition, the textbook discusses the existence, origin, purpose, background, content and/or application of: law in general (p.75); Sumerian law (p.77); Babylonian law (the Code of Hammurabi, pp.80-81); Israelite/Jewish law (the Ten Commandments, p.85); Egyptian law (p.112); ancient Greek law (pp.234 and 236-237); Roman law (pp.256-258 and p.262); Chinese and Japanese law (pp.339-340); early modern English law (the 1689 English Bill of Rights, pp.499-500); United States law (the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, p.500-501); and French law (the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, and the Napoleonic Code, pp.503 and 505, respectively).

”**Islamic law, or *Shari’a***” is not mentioned until page 668 of this 699 page textbook, and then only in passing. The textbook merely states that “**many Muslims**” want to make it “**the basis for governing Muslim nations.**” There is no discussion of the origin, content, application or effect of Islamic *Shari’a* law on p.668, or anywhere else in the textbook.

The textbook fails to inform the students (a) that Islamic religious *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; and (c) that according to the *Qur’an*, it is the religious duty of all Muslims who are able to wage *jihad* warfare until Islam and Islamic *Shari’a* law are supreme over the entire world.²

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

There is no reference to the status or treatment of Jews or Christians in the textbook’s discussion of “**The Muslim Empire**”. However, in the “**Lesson 2 Review**” on page 308 the textbook does offer a misleading generalization about the treatment of all people conquered by Muslims. There, the textbook directs the students to answer the following question:

“**Check Understanding**

...

2 Recall the Main Idea [-] How did Islam affect the lives of people living in the lands to which it spread?”

Since the textbook’s discussion of “**The Muslim Empire**” never even hints that the Islamic conquests had any negative effects on any conquered peoples, the students are likely to answer this question by listing only benevolent effects. The implication of the verb “**spread**” is

²Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri (died 1368 CE/AD). 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.

innocuous, benign and seriously at odds with the reality of how *jihad* and conquest were the primary means of advancing the Islamic empire. However, in case the students do not conclude on their own that the effects of Islam on all conquered peoples were solely benevolent, the textbook importunes teachers to guide them to that conclusion. In the Teacher's Edition section on the left hand side of page.308, the textbook provides the following "**Lesson 2 Review - Answers**":

"Check Understanding

...

2. They gave up worship of many gods to worship Allah alone; they followed the Qur'an and Muhammad's example in their daily lives; their rulers governed according to the Qur'an and Muhammad's example."

If question 2 had been phrased "**How did Islam affect the lives of**" pagans who converted to Islam, the answer provided by the textbook would have been accurate. However, many of the "**people living in the lands**" conquered by Islam were Christians and Jews who did not want to convert to Islam. The textbook omits the fact that Islam negatively "**affect[ed] the lives**" of these Christians and Jews by imposing a litany of onerous burdens and restrictions on the practice of their religions and on their daily lives.³

IV. Jihad and the Early Islamic Conquests.

A. The Nature of Jihad and Warfare in the Name of Religion. The term "*jihad*" is never used or defined in the textbook's discussion of the Islamic conquests. Further, the textbook never even implies that Muslims waged aggressive warfare to make Islam supreme over the entire world, much less encourages students to consider the implications of waging warfare to advance a particular religion. The following quoted material, which appears on pages 305-306 of Chapter 9, Lesson 2, constitutes the textbook's entire discussion of the early Islamic conquests:

"The Muslim Empire Grows

Muhammad saw it as his duty to spread the message of Islam. He did this through teaching and by personal example. He also told his followers to spread the message to others.

After Muhammad's death, Muslim leaders chose a caliph (KAY-luhf), or 'successor' to Muhammad. The caliph's role was to govern the Muslim community according to the Qur'an and Muhammad's example.

Within a few years the first caliphs united Arabia under Muslim rule. Then they carried Islam to the peoples around them. Caliphs led their armies into Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt. The Arabs met little resistance from people such as the Persians and the Byzantines. These people welcomed the invaders, believing that they would then be freed from the heavy taxes and religious persecution of their own rulers.

³ Khadduri, p.194.

By about 750, less than 200 years after the death of Muhammad, the Muslim Empire reached from Spain and northern Africa through Arabia and Persia into parts of China and the Indus River Valley. Only the Byzantine Empire, much smaller than before, stood between the Muslim lands and eastern Europe.”

The first paragraph in the quote leads students to incorrectly conclude that Muhammad’s methods were exemplary or, at worse benign. The quote ignores the dozens of raids, battles, assassinations and other acts of violence that Muhammad ordered or even participated in to spread Islam. The term “*jihad*” is never used or defined in the textbook’s discussion of the Islamic conquests, and the reality of *jihad* is erased from history.

According to the textbook’s version of history, in the process of “**spread[ing] the message of Islam**” Muhammad never raised his hand in anger, much less urged or ordered others to use violence; he did it solely through “**teaching and...personal example**”. Further, according to the textbook, Muhammad’s successors (the *caliphs*) merely “**carried Islam to the peoples around them.**” Although the *caliphs* “**led...armies**”, they “**met little resistance**” because the “**people welcomed the invaders**”.

This entire presentation is a gross falsification of well-established historical facts. The textbook omits (1) the reality of Muhammad’s “**teaching and... personal example**” which included dozens of acts of violence; and (2) the methods by which the *caliphs* “**carried**” Islam to other peoples.

1. With regard to his “**teaching**,” Muhammad taught that Allah commands all Muslims who are able to wage perpetual *jihad* warfare against non-Muslims until Islam is supreme on earth. With regard to his “**personal example**” Muhammad ordered and witnessed the beheading of between 600 and 900 men of the Jewish Qurayza tribe after they had surrendered to him in Medina.⁴ He personally participated in at least twenty-five battles against non-Muslims.⁵ Reliance of the Traveller, an authoritative compilation of classical *Shari’a* law, states that Muhammad personally participated in 27 (or 29) battles.⁶ Further, Muhammad personally ordered numerous other military raids, forays and expeditions, including military invasions of Syria and other parts of the Byzantine empire.⁷ According to Reliance of the Traveller Muhammad “sent others to fight, himself remaining at Medina,” on 47 occasions.⁸ This textbook erases from history both Muhammad’s “**teaching**” of perpetual *jihad* and his “**personal example**” of using violence to spread Islam.

2. Further, in obedience to Muhammad’s religious command of perpetual *jihad*, the means by which the *caliphs* and their armies “**carried Islam to the peoples around them**” was through military conquest and subjugation of the conquered peoples.

⁴ Guillaume, pp. 464-468; Lewis, The Arabs in History, p.45; Hitti, p.117; Hodgson, p.191; Stillman, pp.15-16; Karsh, p. 13; Bostom, Islamic Antisemitism, pp.69, 73-74, 275-278, 286-287, 304-305.

⁵ Dr. Muhammad Hamidullah, The Battlefields of the Prophet Muhammad, Kitab Bhavan (New Delhi, 1923/2007), Foreword.to the Last Edition. This figure includes only military confrontations in which Muhammad faced armed opponents, and does not include, for instance, the extermination of the Jewish Qurayza tribe of Medina. Ibid., p.3.

⁶ al-Misri, Reliance, pp.599-600. See also, Cook, p.6.

⁷ Hamidullah, op. cit. See also, Hitti, p.147; Hourani, p.22; Cook, p.6.

⁸ al-Misri, Reliance, p.600. See also, Cook, p.6.

However, in the textbook's version of history the use or threat of force by Muhammad's successors is reduced to insignificance.

As if this falsification of history were not sufficiently egregious, it is reinforced and compounded in the "**Lesson 2 Review**" on page 308, where the textbook directs the students to answer the following question:

"Check Understanding

1 Remember the Facts [-] What did Muhammad and his followers do to bring about the growth of Islam?"

In the Teacher's Edition section on the left hand side of page 308, the textbook provides the following "**Lesson 2 Review - Answers**"

"Check Understanding

1 Through his teaching and his personal example, Muhammad spread the message of Islam and gained many followers; his followers spread the message to others."

This statement incorrectly depicts Muhammad as solely a peaceful "preacher" and his followers as peaceful "missionaries." Both characterizations are false and unsupported by historical facts. Thus, if the students themselves do not absorb the myth of a peaceful, bloodless expansion of Islam presented in Lesson 2, the textbook leads teachers to guide them to that conclusion in "**Review**" question 1.

Finally, in question 3 of the "**Lesson 2 Review,**" the textbook directs the students to consider whether "**some people resisted coming under Muslim rule.**" In the answer provided in the Teacher's Edition section on the left hand side of the page, the textbook admits that "**some people**" did resist Muslim invaders because they "**may not have wanted to follow Islam instead of their own religions and beliefs.**" Despite the textbook's equivocal characterization, many people did indeed want to continue to practice "**their own religions and beliefs**" rather than adopt Islam. This resistance to the spread of Islam is a historical fact that should have been made clear in the text material, and not left for the student's uninformed speculation in the "**Lesson 2 Review**".

Further, and more importantly, the textbook completely omits the consequences of resistance to Muslim invaders and/or adherence to any religion other than Islam: all those who refused to surrender and acknowledge the supremacy of Islam were killed, and all those who surrendered but continued to practice "**their own religions and beliefs**" were subjected to a litany of onerous burdens and restrictions on the practice of their religions and on their daily lives⁹. There is no hint of these historical facts anywhere in the textbook.

B. Imperialism.

⁹Robert Spencer, Ed., The Myth of Islamic Tolerance – How Islamic Law Treats Non-Muslims, (Amherst, NJ, Prometheus Books 2005), pp.48, 62, 92-95, 116-117; Lewis, The Jews of Islam, pp.14, 36-41; Ye'or, Dhimmi, pp.53, 64, 188, 196-198; Tritton, p.5; Bostom, Jihad, pp.29, 31-35, 129; Stillman, p.20 .

In the Glossary on page R58, the textbook defines “**imperialism**” as “[t]he practice by a country of adding more lands, establishing colonies, and controlling the colonies.” There is also a cross-reference to page 543. On page 543 of Chapter 18, “**Growth of Nationalism and Imperialism**”, Lesson 2, “**Age of Imperialism**,” the textbook states:

“In time the European countries began to compete with one another to add more lands to their colonial empires. Such empire building is called imperialism.”

During the period of the early Islamic conquests, the *caliphs* were constantly “**adding more lands**,” until they controlled an empire that stretched 6000 miles, from the Atlantic to India. “**Such empire building**” should also correctly be “**called imperialism**.” However, in its discussion of the early Islamic conquests the term “imperialism” is never used, and the concept of “imperialism” is never raised.

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

“[C]oloni[zation]” and “**imperialism**” by European countries are discussed in Chapter 14, “**Europe, Africa and the Americas Interact**,” on pages 448-469; and in Chapter 18, “**Growth of Nationalism and Imperialism**,” on pages 534-551. The textbook appropriately describes the negative effects of colonialism 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 the “**imperialist**” nations.

In contrast, to the extent that the textbook even addresses the early Muslim conquests, negative consequences for the conquered peoples are never discussed or even implied.

V. Islam and Women.

In the index on pages R92-R93, there are eight column inches of subject listings for “**Women**.” The textbook discusses the “**rights of**” women (or their lack of rights) in ancient Egypt (p.120), ancient Greece (pp.236-237), ancient Rome (pp.257-258), the Byzantine empire (p.299), the United States Constitution (p.501), and the French Revolution (p.503). The textbook informs students that the United States Constitution “**gave women few rights**.” The textbook informs students that the French “**Declaration of the Rights of Men and of the Citizen...promised freedom of speech and religion and equal treatment of all citizens under the law**” but that “[t]hese rights were not given to women.”

In stark contrast, the textbook does not devote a single word to a direct discussion of the extensive restrictions and legal disabilities imposed on Muslim women under Islamic *Shari'a* law.¹⁰ While there is one indirect reference to a restriction on Muslim women, it is obscure and oblique. On page 387 of Chapter 11, “**Overland Trade**,” Lesson 3, “**The Silk Route**,” the textbook states:

“DAMASCUS

¹⁰ Lewis, Middle East, p.318.

Arab merchants have brought bolts of silk from Baghdad to Damascus. Only the finest silk cloth has traveled this far; it includes intricately patterned brocades, brilliantly colored satins, and thin gauze to make nightgowns for aristocratic ladies. Wealthy Muslim women, heavily veiled, admire bolts of finished silk cloth in a shop.”

This reference to the veiling of Muslim women is buried between frivolous detail about **“nightgowns for aristocratic ladies”** and **“bolts of finished silk cloth in a shop”**.

In contrast to the textbook’s discussion of the status of women in other cultures and societies, the textbook fails to provide any meaningful discussion of the status and treatment of women under Islamic *Shari’a* law.

VI. Islam and Slavery

A. The Early Muslim Slave Trade. The terms “slave,” “slavery,” and “slave trade” do not appear anywhere in Chapter 9, Lesson 2, **“The Muslim Empire”**.

Chapter 11, **“Overland Trade”**, pp.364-389 and Chapter 12, **“Sea and River Trade”**, pp.390-413, discuss trade in Africa, the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea in considerable detail. Discussion of the Muslim role in this international trade is ubiquitous throughout both chapters.

However, in Chapter 11, in the only place where the slave trade is mentioned, no reference is made to any Muslim role. On p. 368 of Chapter 11, Lesson 1, **“The Trading Empires of West Africa”**, in a section entitled **“Ghana”**, the textbook states that **“North African merchants”** bought slaves in Ghana, and that these slaves were **“later sold to owners of salt mines or large farms.”** The slave traders and slave owners are not identified as Muslims, but only as generic **“North Africans”**.

Also in Chapter 11, Lesson 1, p. 369 there is a section entitled **“Growth of Islam in West Africa.”** However, slavery and the slave trade are not mentioned in this section. The textbook describes the **“change[s in] the lives of the people of West Africa”** brought about by **“[c]ontact with Muslim North Africans through trade”** as follows:

“The Muslim traders showed the West African traders how to use money instead of bartering. They also brought with them the Arabic language.

Most important, West Africans began to accept the religion of Islam. ...”

In fact, as a direct result of **“[c]ontact with Muslim North Africans through trade”**, the slave trade in Africa was transformed from a small, localized practice into a vast and complex slave kidnapping and transportation network serving the voracious appetite for slaves in the Muslim world.¹¹

¹¹ Baroness Caroline Cox and Dr. John Marks, This Immoral Trade – Slavery in the 21st Century, Monarch Books (Oxford, UK, etc, 2006), p.124 (18 million - citing and quoting from “slavery”, Encyclopedia Britannica, 2006, Encyclopedia Britannica Premium Service, February 7, 2006, www.britannica.com/eb/article-9109538>); Bostom, Jihad, p.89 (17 million); Submission, p.131, (14 million - citing and quoting from Thomas Sowell, Race and Culture, BasicBooks, 1994, p.188).

The expansion and internationalization of the African slave trade, if not the “[m]ost important” consequence of “[c]ontact with Muslim North Africans through trade” is at least sufficiently important to merit mention. However, in Chapter 11, Lesson 1, it is erased from history.

In Chapter 11, Lesson 2 “**Trade Routes Linking Asia and Europe**,” the Muslim slave trade is not erased entirely. Instead, it is reduced to insignificance. On page 376, in a section entitled “**Trade in the Lands of Islam**”, there is a diagram entitled “**Muslim Influence Through Trade**.” In the center of the diagram are the words “**MUSLIM TRADERS**”, with arrows pointing outward to various destinations (i.e., China, India, and various locations in Africa), and a list of commodities traded with each by Muslims. “Slaves” is but one of two dozen commodities listed on the diagram.¹² The caption to the diagram states:

“LEARNING FROM DIAGRAMS [-] The Muslims exchanged goods with peoples in Africa and Asia. - From where did Muslim traders get gold? spices? silk?”

With their attention directed by the textbook to “gold”, “spices” and “silk”, students are unlikely to notice “slaves” in the small print.

B. The Muslim Role in the Atlantic Slave Trade.

The enslavement of Africans in Europe and the Americas is discussed in Chapter 14, “**Europe, Africa and the Americas Interact**,” Lesson 1, “**Africa and Europe**”, in sections entitled “**Europeans in Africa**”, “**The Slave Trade**”, and “**The Effects of the Slave Trade**” found on pages.451-454. Slavery in the Americas is also discussed in Chapter 14, Lesson 2, “**A Time of Encounter**” in a section entitled “**Spanish Encounters**” on page 457.

However, no mention is made of any Muslim role in this slave trade. Islam is erased from the history of the Atlantic slave trade. In this regard it should be noted that in the section entitled “**The Effects of the Slave Trade**”, the textbook states on page 453:

“As many as 10 million enslaved Africans were taken to the Americas during the time of the slave trade. Many others died.”

The students are not given a hint anywhere in the textbook of the far larger number of Africans (and members of other races and ethnicities) sold into slavery as a result of the Islamic slave trade.

Further, on page 454 in the same section the textbook states:

“In lands affected by slavery, racism – a feeling of being better than other people because of their color – spread. Racism has been a continuing source of concern in the Americas, in Europe, and in Africa.”

The doctrine of Islamic religious superiority is a central tenet of Islam, enunciated in both the *Qur’an* and *hadith*. In lands conquered by Islam, Muslims imposed and enforced by law their doctrine of religious superiority. In addition, the *Qur’anic* mandate of *jihad* commands all Muslims who are able to wage perpetual war against non-Muslims until Islam is supreme

¹² Aloe, beads, ceramics, cloth, coconuts, cotton, ebony, dates, glass, gold, grain, horses, ivory, jewels, perfume, porcelain, precious stones, salt, silk, slaves, spices, sugar, teakwood, and weapons.

in the world. It is appropriate for the textbook to note that racism is a source of concern. However, the textbook should also note that the *Qur'anic* mandate of perpetual *jihad* and the Islamic doctrine of religious superiority should be, “**a continuing source of concern**” for the entire world. However, there is no hint of either anywhere in the textbook.

C. Slavery in the Muslim World Today. In view of the textbook’s treatment of the early Muslim slave trade and the Muslim role in the Atlantic slave trade, it is not surprising that the textbook makes no mention of the fact that slavery continues in parts of the Muslim world today.

(B) The Crusades

On page 312, of Chapter 9 “**Heirs of Rome and Persia,**” in the instructions created for teachers “**Meet Individual Needs Visual Learners,**” the textbook states:

“Over the centuries many foreign powers and groups have controlled the city of Jerusalem. To supplement the study of the crusades, invite interested students to make a time line that shows the history of the control of Jerusalem from A.D. 1 to the present. Direct students to encyclopedias or other references for information about the different groups that have controlled Jerusalem over the past 2,000 years.”

It is true that Jerusalem has been controlled by various invading occupiers over the last 2,000 years—Romans, Byzantine Christians, Arabs, Mamluk Arabs, Turks and the British. It is not clear why researching those who have seized control of Jerusalem from A.D. 1 to the present time supplements the study of the Crusades. However, the choice of this timeline is a perfect example of Islamist revisionism since it completely eliminates the presence of the Jews in Jerusalem from biblical times to the present.

On page 313 of the same chapter in the section “**The Church and the Crusades,**” the textbook states:

“In 1095 Pope Urban II called on all of Christendom to help seize control of the holy city of Jerusalem from the Seljuk Turks, who were Muslims.”

There is no explanation that the Christians did not launch the Crusades to conquer the Holy Land and that they were fighting to take it back after the Byzantine Christians lost it to the Arabs in 7th century.

On pages. 313-314 of the section the textbook states:

“The crusades brought Europeans into close contact with Muslims and their way of life. The new ideas they learned from the Muslims changed European thinking forever. Europeans returned home from the crusades, bringing spices and other Asian goods with them. A demand for such goods soon developed, leading to the growth of trade. This trade, in turn, helped European cities grow.”

There is also the misleading suggestion that “the new ideas” the Europeans learned from the Muslims changed European thinking forever, as if the Muslims were somehow superior to the Europeans. Harcourt Brace should provide at least one correct example of a new idea that came to Europe by way of the Crusades and an explanation of how it changed Europe.

(C) Arab-Israeli Conflict

On page 662 of Chapter 22 **Religious Influences**, Lesson 2 **The Middle East**, Unit 10 **“Arabs and Jews,”** the textbook states:

“The Arabs and the Jews have roots in the Middle East going back thousands of years. They both claim the same ancestor- Abraham. Yet these two peoples have been fighting each other for much of the twentieth century. The reasons for this conflict lie partly in the ancient past and partly in the recent past.

The early Jews and Arabs settled in southwestern Asia thousands of years ago. In A.D. 70, however, the Romans destroyed the Jewish capital of Jerusalem. Not long after that they forced many Jews from the region, which the Jews had called Judah. The Romans then referred to the region as Palestine, removing the Jewish people’s connection with the land they had once controlled.

Over the centuries Jews settled in nearly every part of the world. Those who left never forgot their homeland, however. Jews around the world end their Passover Seder – the religious ceremony reminding them of their ancestors’ departure from Egypt- with these words: “next year in Jerusalem.”

There are elements of historical truth in the above-cited paragraphs. However, the material is problematic because of egregious historical omissions which remove the presence of Jews from their biblical homeland from A.D. 70 when the Romans breached Jerusalem's outer walls, began a systematic ransacking of the city and destroyed the Second Temple. The statement that **“Not long after that they forced many Jews from the region,”** is also incorrect. It was not until AD 135, after the defeat of Bar Kokhba that Jerusalem was rebuilt and renamed Aelia Capitolina; that Judea was renamed Syria Palestina (Palestine), and many Jews were banished. It is an erroneous misperception that the Romans removed all of the Jews from their homeland and that 1,800 years later, the Jews suddenly appeared and returned to Palestine demanding their country back.

In reality, the Jewish people have maintained uninterrupted ties to their historic homeland for more than 3,700 years. It is indeed true that **“the Arabs and the Jews have roots in the Middle East going back thousands of years.”** However, the timeline for Jews in the land of Israel is very different than this sentence implies. And it is this timeline that Harcourt Brace needs to provide to the students if they are to understand the roots of the Arab-Israeli Conflict. The Hebrews entered the land of Israel about 1300 B.C.E. living under a tribal confederation until being united under the first monarch, King Saul. The second monarch, King David, established Jerusalem as the capital around 1000 B.C.E. David’s son, Solomon, built the Temple soon after and consolidated the military, administrative and religious functions of the kingdom. The nation was divided under Solomon’s son, with the northern kingdom (Israel) lasting until 722 B.C.E. when the Assyrians destroyed it and the southern kingdom (Judah) surviving until the Babylonian conquest of the First Jewish Commonwealth in 586 B.C.E. Even

after the Roman destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD ending the Second Jewish Commonwealth and the beginning of the exile, Jewish life in Israel continued and flourished. Large communities were re-established in Jerusalem and Tiberias by the 9th century. In the 11th century, Jewish communities grew in Rafah, Gaza, Ashkelon, Jaffa and Caesarea.

Although many Jews in Palestine were massacred there during the 12th century, the Jewish community continued and rebounded in the next two centuries as large numbers of Jewish pilgrims immigrated to Jerusalem and the Galilee. Prominent rabbis established communities in Safed, Jerusalem and elsewhere during the next 300 years. By the early 19th century, years before the birth of the modern Zionist movement, more than 10,000 Jews lived throughout what is today Israel. The Jews were a plurality in Jerusalem from the 1840s onward and a majority in the city by 1880. The 142 years of nation-building beginning in 1870, culminated in the re-establishment of the Jewish State in 1948 – the third Jewish commonwealth.

As concerns the Arab timeline, until the first Arab invaders arrived in the 700s, no descendants of Ishmael ever claimed any part of the land for themselves. Sherif Hussein, the guardian of the Islamic Holy Places in Arabia, said that the Palestinians' ancestors had only been in the area for 1,000 years. Even the Palestinians themselves have acknowledged their association with the region came long after the Jews settled there.

The statement that **“the Romans then referred to the region as Palestine, removing the Jewish people’s connection with the land they had once controlled,”** has certain historical validity. The term “Palestine” is believed to be derived from the name of the Philistines, an Aegean people who, in the 12th Century B.C.E., settled along the Mediterranean coastal plain of what are now Israel and the Gaza Strip. The Romans did indeed apply the name *Palaestina* to Judea (the southern portion of what is now called the West Bank) in an attempt to minimize Jewish identification with the land of Israel. The Arabic word *Filastin* is derived from this Latin name.

Contrary to the claim of current Arab leaders and to the agenda-based misuse of the name Palestine by most textbooks today, “Palestine” was never an independent Arab country. The term was always used to describe the area that included modern-day Israel and parts of surrounding countries. In testimony before the Anglo-American Committee in 1946, for example, they claimed a connection to Palestine of slightly more than 1,000 years, dating back no further than the conquest of Muhammad’s followers in the 7th century. During the British mandate, more than 100,000 Arabs emigrated from neighboring countries and are today considered Palestinians. By contrast, no serious historian questions the more than 3,000-year-old Jewish connection to the Land of Israel, or the modern Jewish people’s relation to the ancient Hebrews.

On page 663 of the same Chapter, in Lesson 2 **“The Middle East,”** in the section **“Arabs and Jews,”** the textbook states:

“As time passed, much changed in the land that had become known as Palestine. After the rise of Islam in the seventh century A.D., most Arabs became Muslims. Like the Jews and Christians, they considered Jerusalem a holy city. The Arab Muslims built an empire that governed most of the land in the Middle East. The Muslim Empire is remembered for its many achievements in science, medicine and art.”

It is only for the Jews that Jerusalem has always been a holy city. The Christians rejected the notion that Jerusalem was a holy site until the fourth century, when St. Helena went there to

identify the sites where major events in the life of Jesus took place. Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Quran. Further, the Arabs' national tie to the land of Israel is based on a history of conquest, not on a covenant with God.

As for the assertion that **the Muslim Empire is remembered for its many achievements in science, medicine and art,**" it is precisely because of this textbook and others like it that this has any historical validity. This textbook has removed most or all of the history of (1) the brutality of Muslim conquests; (2) the Muslim slave trade; (3) the treatment of women under *Shari'a* law; (4) the treatment of Christians and Jews under Muslim law; and (5) the meaning of *jihad* and its place in the Qur'an. These egregious omissions would indeed leave only **"its many achievements in science, medicine and art."**

On page 663, Lesson 2, "**The Middle East,**" in the Teacher's Notes in the right hand column, the textbook gives the teacher the following question, with its accompanying answer to assign to the students:

History

Debates and Controversies To help students understand both the Arab and the Jewish viewpoints, discuss the reasons each group claims the same area.

Q. Why would both the Arab Muslims and the Jews want Jerusalem under their control?

"They consider it a holy city, just as the Christians do."

First, based on the omission of pertinent historical facts and the inclusion of egregious errors, students cannot possibly understand the reasons that **"each group claims the same area."**

Further, textbook has not provided the historical place of Jerusalem in the history of the Jews and therefore students cannot possibly respond correctly to this question. The answer provided for the teacher that "they consider it a holy city, just as the Christians do," is not historically accurate since Jerusalem is mentioned nowhere in the Qur'an. Finally, the Arab Muslims claim to Jerusalem is political, not religious. Because of the egregious omissions in this textbook, students have no historical facts upon which to draw their conclusions.

On page 664, Lesson 2 "**The Middle East,**" in the section "**Arab-Israeli Conflict,**" the textbook states:

"Arabs, however, did not accept the decision of the United Nations. Five Arab nations declared war on Israel and invaded the new country. The Arabs began making great advances. Within a few months, however, Israeli troops drove back the Arab armies. When both sides agreed to a cease-fire in January 1949, Israel had already taken much of the Arab part of Palestine. The rest of the Arab land became part of the country of Jordan."

While it is true that **"both sides agreed to a cease-fire in January 1949,"** not all of the Arab nations signed Armistice Agreements: first came Egypt - February 24, 1949; followed by Lebanon - March 23; Jordan - April 3; and Syria - July 20. Iraq did not sign an armistice agreement with Israel. It preferred to withdraw its troops and hand over its sector to the Arab Legion of Jordan.

The wording: **"Israel had already taken much of the Arab part of Palestine,"** is problematic because there was no "Arab part of Palestine." The state that the UN had set aside for the

“Palestinians” (a term that did not exist at the time, as a term referring to the Arabs alone) was a state that the “Palestinians” had refused.

Further, another problem in this section is that students are not given any information on Transjordan and they cannot possibly understand the history of the region or the Partition Plan without it. Transjordan was originally a part of the British Mandate of Palestine. In March 1921, Winston Churchill visited the Middle East and endorsed an arrangement that removed Transjordan from the original territory of Palestine and named Abdullah as the emir under the authority of the High Commissioner. In August 1922, the British government presented a memorandum to the League of Nations stating that Transjordan would be excluded from all the provisions dealing with Jewish settlement. This memorandum was approved by the League on August 12th. From that point onwards, Britain administered the part west of the Jordan as Palestine, and the part east of the Jordan as Transjordan. Technically, they remained one mandate, but most official documents referred to them as if they were two separate mandates. In May 1923, Transjordan was granted a degree of independence with Abdullah as ruler. In March 1946, under the Treaty of London, Transjordan became a kingdom and on May 25, 1946, the parliament of Transjordan proclaimed the emir king, and formally changed the name of the country from the Emirate of Transjordan to the *Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan*.¹³

By eliminating the history of Transjordan, Harcourt Brace has omitted the fact that Transjordan was to have gone to the Arabs and Palestine to the Jews and that this, too, was a peace arrangement that the Arabs rejected and the Jews accepted.

On page 664, Lesson 2 “**The Middle East**,” in the section “**Arab-Israeli Conflict**,” the textbook also states

“During and after the war, more than 700,000 Arabs left Israel for neighboring Arab states. Many of them lived and suffered in refugee camps there. Meanwhile, thousands of other Arabs remained in Israel and became citizens. Most Arabs, however, refused to accept Israel’s existence as a nation...

“Over the years Israel and the Arab nations clashed again and again.”

There are several problematic points in this short quotation. The “**more than 700,000 Palestinians**” is an inflated number. Most scholars put the number of refugees between 472,000 and 750,000, so this figure is intentionally high. The UN determined that 360,000 required aid. When hostilities came to an end, the Arab High Command refused to allow the refugees to return, because they believed that this would amount to recognition of Israel as a state. The Arab interest in them was not humanitarian but purely political. Many Arabs who fled had been in Israel for a very short time, as there was a substantial Arab immigration to Palestine from the mid-1920s onward. Many fled at the instigation of the five Arab nations, who urged them to get out of the way as they annihilated the Jews. The fact that 600,000 were able to stay demonstrates that the Israelis did not have a program of forcing Arabs out of their homes and that they chose to leave.¹⁴ Many did stay; that is why there are about 1.4 million Arabs living in Israel as Israeli citizens today. The reason why they were forced to settle in “refugee camps” is that none of the Arab countries would take them in: they were important pawns in the Arab exterminationist campaign against the Jews.

¹³ Bernard Reich, *A Brief History of Israel* (NY: Checkmark Books, 2005), 40-42.

¹⁴ Mitchell G. Bard, *Myths and Facts: A Guide to the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Baltimore, MD: American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise, 2005), 62-71

Another problematic point is the assertion that **“over the years Israel and the Arab nations clashed again and again.”** The one glaring omission here is that these were not random clashes but rather a series of wars of aggression launched by the Arab nations against Israel in order to annihilate it.

On page 664, of the section **“Arab-Israeli Conflict,”** in the “Key Content Summary,” teachers are given the following material:

“In 1948 the Jewish state of Israel was created. As a result of fighting with neighboring Arab nations, Israel gained much of the Arab part of Palestine. The remaining Arab part became the nation of Jordan. The continuing Arab and Israeli wars yielded more Arab territory to Israel. The Arab nations joined together to form the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) to fight against Israel with their economic power. Another result of the Arab-Israeli conflict was the formation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), later led by Yasir Arafat. Most recently young Palestinians have organized uprisings within Israel.”

Several points of this “key content” material given to teachers to use as a basis for discussion are problematic due to the omission of critical historical information. The wording: **“when both sides agreed to a cease-fire in January 1949, Israel had already taken much of the Arab part of Palestine,”** is misleading because there was no “Arab part of Palestine.”

While the assertion that **“the continuing Arab and Israeli wars yielded more Arab territory to Israel”** is true, nowhere does the textbook state that Israel has always tried to negotiate and return land for peace and defensible borders and that more than 95% of the land “acquired” as a result of these wars is now under Palestinian control.

Again on page 664, of the section, **“Arab-Israeli Conflict,”** in **“History Connections Past to Present to Future,”** teachers are provided with the following guidelines for a classroom discussion on the Arab-Israeli Conflict. They are also given instructions to bring additional teaching materials into the classroom as well as a question for the students to discuss in class.

History

Connections Past to Present to Future To help students visualize the sequence of events in the Arab-Israeli conflict, start with the creation of Israel in 1948 as the event that initiated the current on-going struggle between the Arabs and the Israelis. Discuss with students any current events in the news that will bring events in the textbook up-to-date.

The instructions to the teacher to have the students start with the creation of Israel in 1948 as the event that initiated the current on-going struggle between the Arabs and the Israelis are misleading and historically skewed. They provide a false base for any discussion since they give students the faulty premise that if there were no Israel, there would be no conflicts in the Middle East. This is historically incorrect since the Middle East has been an area of tension and change since the early 1900s. Arabs were using violence and terrorist tactics against the Jews ever since the riots of 1920. Radical Arab hatred against the Jews was given a voice when the Muslim Brotherhood was founded in March 1928 by Hassan al-Banna and when Haj Amin al-Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem recruited Muslims to serve in SS killing units during the years 1937-1945.

As for the instructions to the teacher to **discuss with students any current events in the news that will bring events in the textbook up-to-date**, one can only imagine the accuracy of these discussions based on the historical inaccuracy of this textbook.

Q. Do you think the Arab-Israeli conflict will ever be resolved? Explain why or why not. Students should answer yes or no and be able to defend their choices.

Students have not been provided with substantial accurate facts concerning the Arab-Israeli Conflict. They have no historical basis upon which to draw their conclusions or to defend their answers.

On page 665 of the section “**Arab-Israeli Conflict**,” the textbook states:

“In 1967 Egypt, Syria, and Jordan prepared to attack Israel again. However, the Israelis acted first and drove back the Arab forces. During what is now called the Six-Day War, Israel captured large areas of land from Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. Israel gained control of the Sinai peninsula, the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank. It also united the city of Jerusalem, which had been divided since 1948.”

An important fact, omitted here, for students to know is that Israel offered to negotiate after the Six Day War and that the Arab response was “no recognition, no negotiation, and no peace with Israel.”¹⁵

On page 666 of the section “**Arab-Israeli Conflict**,” the textbook states:

“Palestinian Arabs also took another type of action against Israel. In 1964, at a meeting of Arab leaders, a group called the Palestine Liberation (PLO) was formed. The group’s purpose was to organize the Palestinians in their struggle for a homeland. PLO members often used terrorist tactics in Israel and then in lands taken over by the Israelis in the Six-Day War.”

The presentation of the PLO is problematic. Despite the textbook’s assertion, its purpose was not just to **organize the Palestinians in their struggle for a homeland**. There is no mention of the fact that the PLO and its military wing Fatah exist for the sole purpose of destroying the Jewish state, as stated in Article Fifteen of the PLO Charter.¹⁶ In addition, Article Twenty-Two states that Israel is a constant threat to “peace in the Middle East and the whole world,” labeling the Jews as a threat not only to the Palestinians but to all humanity.¹⁷

¹⁵ Reich, 86-92.

¹⁶ http://philologos.org/bpr/files/misc_studies/ms013.htm, “Article 15: The liberation of Palestine, from an Arab viewpoint, is a national (qawmi) duty and it attempts to repel the Zionist and imperialist aggression against the Arab homeland, and aims at the elimination of Zionism in Palestine. Absolute responsibility for this falls upon the Arab nation - peoples and governments - with the Arab people of Palestine in the vanguard. Accordingly, the Arab nation must mobilize all its military, human, moral, and spiritual capabilities to participate actively with the Palestinian people in the liberation of Palestine. It must, particularly in the phase of the armed Palestinian revolution, offer and furnish the Palestinian people with all possible help, and material and human support, and make available to them the means and opportunities that will enable them to continue to carry out their leading role in the armed revolution, until they liberate their homeland.

¹⁷ Matthias Kuntzel, Jihad and Jew-Hatred: Islamism, Nazism and the Roots of 9/11, trans. Colin Meade (New York: Telos Press, 2007), p. 113;

On the same page of the same section, the textbook states:

“In the late 1980s a change in the Palestinian struggle took place. Many young Palestinians who had spent their lives under Israeli occupation in the territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip began to take part in the struggle. The Palestinians started an intifada, or people’s uprising, in areas occupied by Israel. The Israelis tried to crush the intifada, but the outside world criticized their actions. The young Palestinians became more determined than ever.”

The phrase **“Israeli occupation”** is historically inaccurate. Neither Gaza, or the Golan or the West Bank is “occupied,” in the sense that the Israelis overtly seized the territory from the Palestinians. These three territories came under Israeli control as the result of a defensive war of survival that Israel fought in 1967. Despite Israel’s attempt to negotiate their control over these territories for secure borders and peace with Egypt, Syria and Jordan, three of the Arab nations who attacked Israel in 1967, no peace treaties were signed. However, it is important to note that if the land had been returned in 1967 in a trade of “land for peace,” the West Bank would have been returned to Jordan, not to the Palestinians; Gaza to the Egyptians and the Golan to Syria.

Further, the presentation of the **“intifada, or popular uprisings in areas occupied by Israel,”** is historically misleading. The Intifada was not just a series of spontaneous popular uprisings. False charges of Israeli atrocities and instigation from the mosques played an important role in starting the intifada. Throughout it, the PLO played a lead role in orchestrating the insurrection. The PLO-dominated Unified Leadership of the Intifada (UNLI), for example, frequently issued leaflets dictating on which days violence was to be escalated and who was to be its target.¹⁸

Finally, the statement that **“the Israelis tried to crush the intifada, but the outside world criticized their actions,”** is only partially true. The **“outside world”** did indeed criticize Israel’s actions. But Israel showed constant restraint in its response to the intifada and this was in no way due to the response of the outside world.

¹⁸ Bard, pp. 242-245.