

**Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA**  
**Discover Our Heritage [-] World Cultures and Geography, 2003**

This textbook has egregious errors, omissions, misrepresentations and falsifications in the critical 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.**

On page 257 of Chapter 10, “**Cultural Blending and Isolation**”, Lesson 1, “**The Rise of Islam**”, in a section entitled “**Prophet of Islam**”, the textbook discusses Muhammad’s “**invitation to move to the nearby city of Medina**” and his migration to Medina. No mention is made of the Jewish community that he found in Medina. The textbook erases from history both the presence of Jews in Medina, and their expulsion and extermination by Muhammad.<sup>1</sup>

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

The textbook does not use the term “*Shari’a*”. However, on page 256 of Chapter 10, Lesson 1, in a section entitled “**Prophet of Islam**”, the textbook states:

**“According to Islamic teachings, Muhammad received revelations from God for 23 years. These revelations were collected into a book known as the Qur’an (kur AHN), which in Arabic means ‘recitation.’ The Qur’an is the holy book of Islam. Muslims look to it for guidance in all aspects of their lives.”**

In the same section, the textbook states on page 257:

**“In Medina, Muhammad founded and ruled over the first Muslim state. The Qur’an and the Sunnah, a record of Muhammad’s words and deeds, laid out principles and laws for society. ...”**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 page 262 of Chapter 10, Lesson 2, “**The Spread of Islam**”, in a section entitled “**The Achievements of Islam**”, the textbook states:

**“Scholarship and Art**

**...Muslims worked on a legal system based on the Qur’an.”**

There are isolated references in this material to the all-encompassing nature of Islamic law, *Shari’a*, over the lives of Muslims. However, there is no hint whatsoever of the imposition or the effect of Islamic *Shari’a* law on non-Muslims. The textbook fails to inform the students (a) that Islamic *Shari’a* law is imposed, to varying degrees, on all non-Muslims living in lands conquered and controlled by Muslims; (b) that Islamic *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 Islamic *Shari’a* law are supreme over the entire world;<sup>2</sup> and (d) that *Shari’a* law regulates and controls all governmental functions, and is incompatible with the concept of separation of church and state.

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

The textbook makes no reference to the status, treatment, or even the existence of Christians and Jews under Islam. Christians and Jews are thereby erased from the history of Islam.

**IV. Jihad and the Early Islamic Conquests**

**A. The Meaning of “Jihad” and Warfare in the Name of Religion.** The term “*jihad*” is not used or defined in the textbook’s discussion of the Islamic conquests. On pages 260-261 of Chapter 10, Lesson 2, “**The Spread of Islam**”, in a section entitled “**Building an Empire**”, the textbook discusses the early Islamic conquests:

**“Focus [-] How did the early Muslims build an empire?”**

**Under the rule of the Rightly Guided Caliphs, Muslims moved to fulfill one of Muhammad’s wishes: that Islam be carried to other peoples and areas beyond the Arabian Peninsula. Muslim armies fought many battles in the belief that they were strengthening Islam, removing its enemies, and bringing justice to other peoples. ... Muslims took control of vast territories between 632 and 661.**

**In 661, a new dynasty called the Umayyads (oo MY ads) came to power. ... Advancing east and west, their armies conquered all of North African and continued into Christian Spain. They pushed into France until Christian forces under a leader named Charles Martel turned them back in 732. By 850, Islam had followers – farmers, city dwellers, and people in villages – from Spain to India.”**

This paragraph contains an oblique and misleading allusion to the Qur’anic mandate to wage *jihad* warfare against non-Muslims. The *Qur’anic* mandate to “carr[y]” Islam to “**other peoples**” is not merely “**one of Muhammad’s wishes**”. According to Islamic law, *jihad* is a perpetual

---

<sup>2</sup> See the following sources on status and treatment of Christians and Jews under Islam: 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.

religious obligation, transmitted directly from Allah into Islam's holiest book. The *Qur'anic* mandate of *jihad* commands all Muslims who are able to wage war against non-Muslims until Islam is supreme in the world.<sup>3</sup> The textbook never raises the issue of whether it is appropriate to wage war to spread religion nor encourages the students to consider the question.

**B. Imperialism.** In the Glossary on page 735, the textbook defines “imperialism” as “a policy of extending political and territorial control over other countries, usually by force”, with a cross-reference to page 365. On page 365 in Chapter 13, “European Exploration and Conquest”, Lesson 3, “The Building of European Empires”, the textbook states:

**“When a country controls the affairs of one or more other countries by force, it is practicing imperialism. ...Just as Greece and Rome had done centuries earlier, by the end of the 1800s many nations of Europe had built large empires.”**

As a result of the early Islamic conquests, Muslims “control[ed] the affairs of one or more other countries by force,” from the Atlantic Ocean to India. They did this “[j]ust as Greece and Rome had done centuries earlier” and just as “many nations of Europe” did in the 17<sup>th</sup> through 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. This is clearly “imperialism” within the meaning of the textbook’s definition. However, the term “imperialism” is never used and the concept of “imperialism” is never raised in the textbook’s discussion of the early Islamic conquests.

**C. Portrayal of the Early Islamic Conquests Compared to the Portrayal of Imperialism by non-Muslim Countries.** Conquests, colonialism and imperialism by European countries is discussed in Chapter 13, “Toward Modern Times”, Lesson 1, “European Exploration and Conquest” in a section entitled “The Impact of Exploration” (pp.352-353); Chapter 13, Lesson 3, “The Building of European Empires” (pp.364-369); Chapter 16, “Africa: An Overview”, Lesson 2, “Africa in the Modern Era”, in a section entitled “Life Under Colonial Rule” (pp.443-445); Chapter 17, “Africa: Patterns of Living”, Lesson 4, “South Africa: Building a New Nation” (pp.478-479); and Chapter 23, “North America and the Caribbean: An Overview”, Lesson 2, “North America and the Caribbean in the Modern Era” (pp.627-629).

The textbook appropriately describes the negative effects of colonialism and imperialism: greed, brutality, slavery, economic exploitation, etc. In contrast, although the textbook does inform the students that Muslims used armed force to establish the early Muslim empire, no negative consequences for the conquered peoples are discussed or even implied.

## **V. Islam and Women.**

The textbook does not devote one single word to the status, rights, or even the existence of women under Islam.<sup>4</sup> Women are thereby erased from the history of Islam. In striking contrast,

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See the following sources on the status and rights women in Islam: 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

the textbook discusses the status and/or rights of women (or their lack of rights) in ancient Israel (p.81), ancient Egypt (pp.96, 108), ancient Nubia (p.117), ancient China (p.141), ancient Africa (180, 182), ancient Greece (pp.200-201), ancient Rome (p.233-234), early Christianity (p.250), medieval Europe (pp.289, 291-292), renaissance Italy (p.305), Japan (p.518), and the United States (pp.662-664).

## VI. Islam and Slavery.

**A. The Early Muslim Slave Trade.** There is no mention of slavery or the slave trade in the textbook's discussion of the early history of Islam in Chapter 10, Lesson 1, "**The Rise of Islam**" or Chapter 10, Lesson 2, "**The Spread of Islam**". In this regard it must be noted that on page 263 of Chapter 10, Lesson 2, in a section entitled "**The Achievements of Islam**", the textbook states:

### "Trade and the spread of knowledge

**Islamic civilization played an important role in the spread of goods and knowledge from one part of the world to another. Muslim traders developed an extensive network of trade routes linking Africa, Asia and Europe. Paper, spices, dyes, glass manufacturing, and technologies for making textiles came through or from Muslim lands from the 700s to the 1400s."**

The textbook fails to inform the students that "**Islamic civilization**" also "**played an important role**", in fact, the leading role, in the "**spread**" of the "[t]rade" in African slaves from a small localized practice into a vast international industry. "**Muslim traders developed an extensive network of trade routes**" that transported between fourteen and eighteen million kidnapped and enslaved Africans to the Muslim world, Europe and Asia. However, the textbook erases the massive Muslim slave trade from the history of Islam.<sup>5</sup>

**B. The Muslim Role in the Atlantic Slave Trade.** Slavery and the slave trade in Africa, Europe and the Americas is discussed in Chapter 7, "**Ancient Africa**", Lesson 3, "**The Ancient Kingdom of Ghana**", in a section entitled "**Trade Routes Across the Desert**" (pp.186-187); Chapter 21, "**Central and South America: An Overview**", Lesson 2, "**Central and South America in the Modern Era**", in a section entitled "**A Mix of Peoples**" (p. 579); Chapter 22, "**Central and South America: Patterns of Living**", Lesson 3, "**Brazil: A Triple Heritage**", in a section entitled "**Africans in Brazil**" (pp.602-603); Chapter 23, "**North America and the Caribbean: An Overview**", Lesson 2, "**North America and the Caribbean in the Modern Era**", in a section entitled "**Independence in the Modern Age**"

---

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.

<sup>5</sup> In Chapter 10, Lesson 3, "**Cultural Change in Africa**", in a section entitled "**Islam Helps Unite West Africa**", on p.268 the textbook informs the students that when Mansa Musa, ruler of Mali and "**a devout Muslim**", made a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1324, his retinue "**included family, friends, local rulers, and enslaved people, as well as hundreds of elephants and camels.**" This statement that one African Muslim ruler owned slaves is the only connection between Muslims and slavery made in the entire textbook. This certainly does not constitute a meaningful discussion of the early Muslim slave trade.

(p.628); Chapter 24, “**North America and the Caribbean: Patterns of Living**”, Lesson 1, “**Hispaniola: One Island, Two Nations**”, in a section entitled “**Hispaniola – the island of Two Cultures**” (p.644); and Chapter 24, Lesson 4, “**The United States: Strength in Diversity**”, in a section entitled “**From Many, One Nation**” (p.661).

In spite of this considerable coverage of the history of the Atlantic slave trade, there is no reference whatsoever to any Muslim role. Islam and Muslims are erased from the history of the Atlantic slave trade.<sup>6</sup>

**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 298 of Chapter 11 “**Growth and Change in Europe,**” Lesson 2 “**Cultures Affect Each Other,**” in the section “**Results of the Crusades,**” the textbook states:

**“The Crusades left their long-lasting impressions on both sides. The Muslims now saw Christians as uncivilized enemies. And when the Crusaders returned home, they carried with them a hatred for the non-Christian people of Europe.”**

The Muslims did not “**now**” see “**Christians as uncivilized enemies**” as a result of the Crusades. Christians were part of the *Dar al-Harb* – people who refused to accept Islam and live under *Shari’a* law, people whom Muslims conquered centuries prior to the Crusades. To attribute Muslim animosity towards Christians to the Crusades is historically flawed.<sup>7</sup>

## **(C) The Arab-Israeli Conflict**

On page 556 of Chapter 20 “**South and Southwest Asia: Patterns of Living,**” Lesson 3 “**Israel: Changing the Environment,**” in the section “**Building a New Nation,**” the textbook states:

**“Beginning in the 1890s, people in a movement called Zionism urged Jews to relocate in the homeland of their ancestors, called Canaan several thousand years ago.”**

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> Bat Ye’or, Islam and Dhimmitude Where Civilizations Collide (NJ: Fairleigh University Press, 2002) p..89

While the statement is basically correct, the choice of the verb “**to relocate**” is misleading. To relocate means to move to a new place. Zionism is the movement that “**urged Jews**” to return to their homeland. Further, the textbook does not give the students any information on the formation of Zionism. It needs to include the fact that the modern Zionist movement gained its momentum in the aftermath of the Dreyfus affair in 1894. As violence broke out against the Jews all over France—added to the bloody pogroms that had swept across Eastern Europe since 1881—Theodor Herzl realized that the Jews would never be safe until they had a state of their own. The goal of Zionism was not only to create a homeland—it was to create a haven. Further, students need to be taught that Zionism is not only a modern Nationalist movement. Zionism or “the return to Zion” has been a part of Jewish history since the Jewish expulsion from their homeland in biblical days.

In the same subsection, the textbook states:

**“The trickle of immigrants that started in the 1890s grew into a flood during and after World War II. By 1948, about 600,000 Jews had settled in the region then called Palestine. That year, the United Nations recognized the modern state of Israel.”**

It is important for students to know that there was also substantial Arab immigration into Palestine between the two world wars and that the British did absolutely nothing to control it. A reasonable estimate is that Arab immigration constituted about 37 percent of the total immigration into pre-state Israel.<sup>8</sup>

Further, the statement that “**the United Nations recognized the modern state of Israel**” is historically incomplete. Students are not given any information on how the state of Israel was created in 1948. Nowhere in the textbook do they learn that the British handed back their Mandate over Palestine to the United Nations and that the United Nations voted to partition Palestine into two states – one for the Arabs, the other for the Jews. As a result students certainly have no idea that the partition granted more land to the Arab state than to the Jewish state and that the Arabs refused to accept this two state solution while the Jews did. Then and only then did the Jews declare the establishment of the state of Israel which the UN recognized in May 1948. Five Arab nations attacked the nascent Jewish state with the intent to destroy it.

Also on page 556 of Chapter 20, in the subsection “**Sources of Tension**,” the textbook states:

**“Over a period of 30 years, there were many armed conflicts and three major wars. A major reason for these conflicts was that Muslim Palestinians lived on the land that the Jewish settlers came to.”**

The final assertion is false. The source of these conflicts was not the fight over land. It was and remains the existence of the Jews. As Salafist Sheikh Muhammad Hussein Yaqoub (b. 1956) declared in a broadcast aired on Egypt’s Al-Rahma TV, 17 January 2009: “If the Jews left Palestine to us, would we start loving them? Of course not. We will never love them. Absolutely not. They are enemies not because they occupied Palestine. They would have been enemies even if they did not occupy a thing... . Our fighting with the Jews is eternal, and it will *not end until the final battle... , until not a single Jew remains on the face of the Earth.*”

The textbook further states:

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.meforum.org/522/the-smoking-gun-arab-immigration-into-palestine>

**“With the creation of the Jewish state, many of them [the Arabs] fled their homes. Most ended up in refugee camps in Arab nations that surround Israel.”**

It was not the creation of the state of Israel that created the refugee problem. If the Arabs had accepted the 1947 UN Resolution, there would not have been a single “Palestinian refugee.” Most fled largely at the instigation of Arab leaders; others fled out of fear.<sup>9</sup> Those who stayed in Israel were not forced out of the places where they lived; rather, they now enjoy the rights and privileges of being free citizens of Israel. Furthermore, the ones who **“ended up in refugee camps in Arab nations that surround Israel”** did do because they had no other place to go. The Arab nations who urged them to leave their homes and flee closed their doors to them.

Finally, the textbook states on the same page:

**“In a 1967 war with its neighbors, Israel captured the lands where some of the Palestinians lived.”**

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.”<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Israel subsequently returned more than 90 percent of the territories won in the 1967 war after negotiations with its neighbors. As before, its neighbors rejected Israel’s offers to trade land for peace.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Mitchell G. Bard, *Myths and Facts: A Guide to the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise, 2005), 62-71.

<sup>10</sup> [http://www.palestinefacts.org/pf\\_1967to1991\\_khartoum.php](http://www.palestinefacts.org/pf_1967to1991_khartoum.php);  
<http://middleeast.about.com/od/arabisraeliconflict/f/khartoum-declaration-faq.html>

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/07/israels\\_war\\_of\\_the\\_words.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/07/israels_war_of_the_words.html);  
[http://masbirim.gov.il/eng/i\\_greenline.html](http://masbirim.gov.il/eng/i_greenline.html)