

A blurred photograph of a classroom. In the foreground, the back of a student's head and shoulders is visible, wearing a pink and white striped shirt. In the background, several other students are seated at wooden desks, and many of them have their hands raised, suggesting an interactive lesson or a Q&A session. The lighting is bright and natural, creating a warm atmosphere.

# Education or Indoctrination?

The Treatment of Islam in 6th through 12th  
Grade American Textbooks

## Executive Summary

Log on to [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org) to view or download the complete Report.

© ACT! for America Education, Inc.



# ACT! for America Education

Dear School Board Member,

Enclosed in this mailer is the Executive Summary for a comprehensive report ACT! for America Education recently completed regarding the treatment of Islam in thirty-eight 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade public school textbooks that are commonly used throughout the country. The full report can be downloaded at [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org).

This report is years in the making. The head of our research team has been reviewing textbooks and providing information to textbook review committees and publishers for several years. The full report took eighteen months to research and write and contains nearly 375 footnoted citations and a bibliography of 275 sources.

The question the report raises is this: Does the way Islam is typically treated in these textbooks amount to “education” or “indoctrination?”

Our organization has no objection whatsoever to the teaching of Islam in the public schools. It is important that students understand the histories and doctrines of the major religions of the worlds. Having said that, treatment of the major religions should be done in a fair, objective and accurate manner.

To cite a particularly egregious example of how the textbooks reviewed fail to do this, the Crusades are routinely depicted as an unprovoked invasion by Christians of the Muslim-owned Holy Land, and Muslims depicted as victims of this aggression. This historical revisionism does not inform students that Muslims invaded and conquered the Holy Land (and the Jews and Christians who lived there) over four hundred years prior to the Crusades, and that the Crusades were an effort to regain the Holy Land from the Muslim conquerors. The Holy Land was not originally Muslim land, as is either stated or implied in the textbooks reviewed.

I urge you to read the attached Executive Summary, and then to view and download the complete report at [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org). As a school board member, you have an important responsibility to the students in your jurisdiction. The errors we have uncovered are serious and are adversely affecting the education of those students.

Sincerely,

*Brigitte Gabriel*

Brigitte Gabriel, Founder and President

# **Education or Indoctrination?**

## **The Treatment of Islam in 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> Grade American Textbooks**

### **Executive Summary**

**Log on to [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org)  
to view or download the complete Report.**

**© 2011 ACT! For America Education, Inc.**

## TEXTBOOKS REVIEWED

Chelsea House, New York

The Palestinian Authority (a volume of *The Creation of the Modern Middle East*)  
2003

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

The American Vision, 2008

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

World Geography and Cultures, 2008

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

World History, 2008

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

Discovering Our Past [-] Medieval and Early Modern Times, 2006

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

World Geography, 2003

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

American History [-] The Early Years to 1877, 2001

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

American History [-] The Modern Era Since 1865, 2001

Glencoe/McGraw Hill, New York

World History [-] The Human Experience, 2001

Harcourt, Orlando, FL

Horizons, 2005

Harcourt Brace, Orlando, FL

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

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Orlando, FL

World History [-] Human Legacy, 2008

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Orlando, FL

World History [-] Medieval to Early Modern Times, 2006

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Orlando, FL

World History [-] The Human Journey, 2003

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Orlando, FL

World History [-] People & Nations, 2000

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Orlando, FL  
World History [-] Continuity and Change, 1999

Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA  
Across the Centuries, 2003

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

Macmillan/McGraw Hill, New York  
Our World, 2003

McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, Evanston, IL  
World Geography, 2009

McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, Evanston, IL  
World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2007

McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, Evanston, IL  
Modern World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2003

McDougal Littell, Orlando, FL  
World History Medieval and Early Modern Times, 2006

Pearson Education AGS Globe, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
World History, 2008

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
World History, 2011

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
United States History, 2010

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
World Explorer [-] People, Places and Cultures, 2008

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
America [-] History of Our Nation, 2007

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
Global History and Geography, 2007

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
World History, 2007

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
World Geography: Building a Global Perspective, 2007

Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ  
World History [-] Connections to Today, 2005

**Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ**  
**World Regions in Global Context [-] Peoples, Places, and Environments, 2005**

**Performance Education, Free Union, VA**  
**The Middle East and the Cold War across the Globe, 2002**

**Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ**  
**World Cultures [-] A Global Mosaic, 2004**

**Prentice Hall, Needham, MA**  
**World Explorer [-] Medieval Times to Today, 2003**

**Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ**  
**World Explorer [-] Eastern Hemisphere, 2001**

**Teachers' Curriculum Institute, Palo Alto, CA**  
**History Alive! The Medieval World and Beyond, 2005**

## Introduction

- “indoctrinate: to teach (a person or group of people) systematically to accept doctrines, esp. uncritically” (The Free Dictionary)
- “indoctrinate: teach (a person or group) to accept a set of beliefs uncritically” (Oxford Dictionaries)
- “Indoctrination... is often distinguished from education by the fact that the indoctrinated person is expected not to question or critically examine the doctrine they have learned.” (Wikipedia)
- “Examples of indoctrinate: 1. The goal should be to teach politics, rather than to *indoctrinate* students in a narrow set of political beliefs.” (Free Merriam-Webster Dictionary)

---

The line between “education” and “indoctrination” is, at times, a fine one, and often not a bright one. However, common sense dictates that greater care should be taken to avoid what appears to be indoctrination when the objects of the information are children and youth. Experience demonstrates that children are more malleable than adults. Adults can be reasonably expected to be more able than children to distinguish between objective education and indoctrination.

Therefore, what is taught to children in our public schools should be subjected to a higher standard of scrutiny in order to ensure that what is taking place in the classroom is “education” rather than “indoctrination.” This is especially the case when the subject matter is world religions.

This Report does not argue that Islam should not be taught in our public schools. The major religions of the world are one part of our human history, and to exclude teaching about them impedes our understanding of who we are and why the world is at it is.

But when it comes to the teaching of any religion, Islam included, extra care should be exercised by textbook writers and teachers to ensure that what is being taught to their diverse student population is in fact “education” and not “indoctrination.” In public schools Muslim parents would no more want their children indoctrinated in Christianity, Judaism or Hinduism than Christian, Jewish or Hindu parents would want their children indoctrinated in Islam – regardless of whether what amounted to indoctrination was the result of honest mistakes, inattention to detail, ignorance of the subject matter, or bias.

Thus the question posed by this Report. Does the manner in which Islam is generally presented in 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade public school textbooks constitute proper and appropriate education – or does it amount to indoctrination?

Is Islam presented in a manner in which facts are embellished and its virtues exaggerated, while unfavorable, negative or detrimental information about the religion is omitted, glossed over, understated, or rationalized, thus amounting to “indoctrination” rather than education?

Is Islam presented in a manner that leads students to predetermined conclusions about the religion that are unsupported by historical facts and critical analysis, amounting to “teach[ing] (a person or group) to accept a set of beliefs uncritically?”

This Report set out to address and answer these questions. For as the British philosopher and educator Richard Stanley Peters wrote: “What matters is not what any individual thinks, but what is true. A teacher who does not equip his pupils with the rudimentary tools to discover this is substituting indoctrination for teaching.” (As quoted on <http://quotes.yourdictionary.com/indoctrination>.)

## Rationale

This Executive Summary represents a summary of the findings of ACT! for America Education’s analysis of the treatment of Islam in thirty-eight, 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade American textbooks that date from 1999-2011. The full Report reveals a pattern of historical revisionism, omissions, and bias in the presentation of all aspects devoted to Islam in these textbooks. These aspects include its theology and doctrines, its role as a world religion, its on-going struggle with Western tradition, and its intrinsic anti-Semitism.

Since the mid-1990s, the number of units devoted to Islam in world history textbooks has significantly increased while the number of pages allocated to Judaism and Christianity has conspicuously decreased.<sup>1</sup> This disparity raises the question as to whether the inequality represents what would amount to the validation of Professor John L. Esposito’s unsubstantiated claim of the existence of a “Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition” for America.<sup>2</sup> What’s more, the predominant place given to Islam in these textbooks highlights the issue of proselytization in the classroom, an issue raised by parents in Byron County, California when they claimed that their children were being indoctrinated in Islam.<sup>3</sup>

Pearson Prentice Hall has an excellent article on its website delineating how world religions should be taught in world history classes:

**“It is clear that the teaching about religion in the world history classroom is both constitutionally acceptable and educationally sound. Even a brief look at recently published world history textbooks indicates how seriously textbook publishers now take their responsibility to address religion**

---

<sup>1</sup> To understand the disparity in the coverage given to Islam compared to the other world religions, one need only to consult the Index in such textbooks as: Holt Rinehart and Winston. World History The Human Journey, 2003; McDougal Littell. World History Patterns of Interaction, 2007; Pearson Prentice Hall. World History World Explorer People, Places, and Cultures, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> F. E. Peters. The Children of Abraham: Judaism, Christianity, Islam: A New Edition With a foreword by John L. Esposito. (NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

<sup>3</sup> Houghton Mifflin. A Message of Ancient Days, 1997, Across the Centuries, 2003. Interaction Publishers. ISLAM: A Simulation of Islamic History and Culture, 610-1100., 1991. See: [www.blessedcause.org](http://www.blessedcause.org) for detailed account.



**in the history classroom. Religious scholars are extensively consulted as contributors and content reviewers. Themes such as Religions and Value Systems or Diversity speak to the need for today's students to understand perspectives and beliefs that differ from their own...**

**Familiarity with world religious beliefs and traditions enhances students' understanding of literature, art, architecture, culture, and history. In addition, educators today acknowledge that an understanding of the histories and belief systems of a diversity of religious traditions is vital and necessary if students are to grasp the complexity of contemporary issues such as the conflicts in the Middle East, the unrest in Afghanistan, the troubles in Northern Ireland, and the continuing struggles in the Balkans. Studying the role of religion in history helps students learn to value religious liberty and respect cultural diversity, important criteria in maintaining democracy and world peace...**

**Pedagogy: Understanding what is constitutionally permissible and developing strategies for dealing with religious content in the curriculum in ways that are educationally sound, fair, neutral, objective, and sensitive. .**

**Content: Obtaining accurate knowledge of the various faiths and their traditions covered by the curriculum, to ensure a fair and sensitive treatment in classroom lessons.”<sup>4</sup>**

The “Pedagogy” and “Content” definitions above provide excellent distinctions between “education” and “indoctrination.” “Sound,” “fair,” “neutral,” “objective,” “sensitive,” and “accurate” are the hallmarks of “education,” rather than “indoctrination.” If all the major publishing houses, including Pearson Prentice Hall, adhered to such guidelines and criteria with respect to the treatment of Islam, there would be no need for a Report like this. However, the full Report will demonstrate, as summarized in this Executive Summary, that the way Islam is typically presented in school textbooks violates the standards noted above that call for religions to be dealt with in “sound,” “fair,” “neutral,” “objective,” “sensitive,” and “accurate” ways.

Log on to [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org) to view and download the complete Report.

## **Methodology**

The Report investigates the treatment of Islam in thirty-eight, 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade American textbooks that date from 1999-2011. The Report begins with the Rationale for the project and proceeds to an examination of the origins of efforts to influence American education, including an examination of Saudi Arabia's plan for influencing American education, funded with billions of dollars from the mid-1970s until present time.<sup>5</sup> The

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.phschool.com/eteach/social\\_studies/2002\\_01/essay...](http://www.phschool.com/eteach/social_studies/2002_01/essay...)

<sup>5</sup> ADL Research Report, *Arab Petrodollar Influence on the American Campus*, 1979. <http://www.ainalyaqeen.com/issues/20020301/feat3en.htm>;  
<http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/viewSubCategory.asp?id=213>

section examining Saudi Arabia's plan contains material from doctoral dissertations, published in this country from the early 1980-1990s. The selections included in the full Report are representative samples from hundreds of historically flawed dissertations that were approved and then recognized as sources of reputable research by major American universities, thereby becoming instrumental in furthering the implementation of Saudi Arabia's plan to influence all levels of American education that had as its objective the influencing of American foreign policy with respect to the Middle East.

The full Report also includes a detailed examination of the influence on textbook publishers of three organizations formed in California: the Teachers Curriculum Institute (TCI); Arab World and Islamic Resources and School Services (AWAIR); and the Council on Islamic Education (CIE), founded by Shabbir Mansuri, now known as the Institute on Religion and Public Civic Values (IRPCV), and arguably the most influential of the three organizations.

According to Dr. Robert D. Crane, a scholar and a prolific writer and expert on subjects ranging from law to economics to international affairs and Islamic jurisprudence, and a co-founding board member and former Chairman of the Center for Understanding Islam, "Mansuri has rewritten the required textbooks on religion for 37 of America's fifty states, thanks to unlimited funding by America's first homegrown Muslim billionaire, Safi Qureshey. Selecting the appropriate textbook is no longer a problem, because once California adopted the set of textbooks that Shabbir prepared for the various grades, the publishers had to adopt it in order to make a profit."<sup>6</sup>

Mansuri is credited as saying that "he is waging a 'bloodless' revolution, promoting world cultures and faiths in America's classroom" and that the "CIE has warned scholars and public officials who do not sympathize with its requests that they will be perceived as racists, reactionaries, and enemies of Islam."<sup>7</sup> However, there is nothing about Mansuri's background on the earlier CIE websites or on the current IRPCV site that would render him as qualified to rewrite textbooks.

Textbook errors identified in the Report range from egregiously false historical statements to significant omissions and subtle half-truths. Some are blatant and obvious, others are subtle and deceptive. The errors in these textbooks are not grammatical or typographical. They are substantive, significant and often repetitive.

---

[http://www.memri.org/bin/opener.cgi?Page=archives&ID=SP36002;](http://www.memri.org/bin/opener.cgi?Page=archives&ID=SP36002)  
[http://townhall.com/columnists/BenShapiro/2002/12/20/king\\_fahds\\_plan\\_to\\_conquer\\_america;](http://townhall.com/columnists/BenShapiro/2002/12/20/king_fahds_plan_to_conquer_america)  
<http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sr&ID=SR01202>  
<http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=12833>  
<http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/224017/following-foreign-money/stanley-kurtz#>  
<http://www.campus-watch.org/article/id/4891>

Log on to [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org) to view documentation and citations in the complete Report.

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Robert D. Crane, "Educating Moral Idiots in America: The Case of Charter Schools" The American Muslim (TAM), June 16, 2008.  
[http://www.theamericanmuslim.org/tam.php/features/articles/educating\\_moral\\_idiots\\_in\\_america\\_the\\_case\\_of\\_charter\\_schools/](http://www.theamericanmuslim.org/tam.php/features/articles/educating_moral_idiots_in_america_the_case_of_charter_schools/)

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/shroder/041117>; Nick Shou, "Pulling His Cheney: Shabbir Mansuri critiques the Second Lady's critique of multiculturalism," OCWeekly, October 25, 2001.  
<http://www.ocweekly.com/2001-11-01/news/pulling-his-cheney>  
[.http://www.meforum.org/article/559#\\_ftn2](http://www.meforum.org/article/559#_ftn2)

Misinformation is conveyed by methods as simple and seemingly innocent as the order in which facts are presented. Order of presentation implies priority of importance. Another very common and effective method of falsifying or rewriting history is through the use of partial truth: emphasize and repeat facts that are favorable to one side, and omit or minimize unfavorable facts. Responding to an outright falsification is fairly straightforward: cite authoritative historical reference materials that contradict and correct the falsification. The use of partial truth is much more difficult to expose and refute. In order to demonstrate that selective omission of facts amounts to a falsification of history, it is necessary to show not only the omitted facts themselves, but why they are essential to create an accurate understanding of the issue.

At times, the criticisms and corrections noted in the Report may initially seem minor. When that appears to be so, the target audience for these textbooks must be kept in mind. These textbooks are not intended for the free market of ideas. They are intended for a captive audience of middle and high school students, whose only “knowledge” of ancient history comes largely from movies and television. They are virtually clean slates, each one a proverbial *tabula rasa*. To the vast majority, this will be their first, and most important, exposure to this history. Selection of these textbooks by the school system will be seen as an explicit and authoritative endorsement of the accuracy and objectivity of their contents. Therefore, even what appear to be “small” errors will have a significant impact on the students’ understanding of history and thus their comprehension of current events. What’s more, an accumulation of “small” errors can add up to a grossly inaccurate narrative that leads students to faulty conclusions and misunderstandings well out of proportion to the relative degree of the individual errors.

Finally, in some textbooks, the errors in how Islam is portrayed are so pervasive and consistent it is difficult to conclude they are inadvertent. In other textbooks, the common errors may just be a matter of parroting “conventional wisdom”. Whatever the intention or the reason, the result is the same: historical revisionism that amounts to a falsification of history. Students should not be force-fed falsified or revisionist history in their schools, and state textbook selection agencies and school boards should not finance or subsidize its dissemination.

This is especially important given the findings of the federal government’s National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Twelfth grade students performed the worst in the subject area of history – poorer than in science, math, and even economics. Therefore, anything that can be done to improve student performance in history, such as eliminating errors and historical revisionism, should be welcomed by anyone who is genuinely concerned about student understanding and performance rather than the advancement of a politically driven agenda.<sup>8</sup>

The portion of the Report devoted to Early Islam examines the following topics and sub-topics:

- I. Muhammad and Jerusalem
- II. The Relationship between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina

---

<sup>8</sup> Norm Augustine, “The Education Our Economy Needs,” Wall Street Journal, 9/21/2011, p. A 17.

III. Islamic *Shari'a* Law:

Applicability to Non-Muslims

Separation of Church and State

IV. Status and Treatment of Christians and Jews under Islam

V. *Jihad* and the Early Islamic Conquests

The Meaning of "*Jihad*"

Warfare in the Name of Religion

Imperialism

Portrayal of the Early Islamic Conquests Compared to the Portrayal of Imperialism by Non-Muslim Countries

VI. Islam and Women

VII. Islam and Slavery

The Early Muslim Slave Trade

The Muslim Role in the Atlantic Slave Trade

Slavery in the Muslim World Today

**McDougal Littell's World History [-] Patterns of Interaction (2007) ("ML PATTERNS 07") contains egregious examples of almost every one of the common historical errors. Accordingly, the errors in ML PATTERNS 07 are addressed in detail in the Report and that review serves as the primary analysis for the rest of the Report. Where the error(s) in another textbook are the same or similar to those in ML PATTERNS 07, they are briefly described, with a cross-reference to the specific section of ML PATTERNS 07 which addresses that particular issue in detail. Where another textbook contains a novel error or a variation on one of the errors in ML PATTERNS 07, it is addressed in the review of that textbook.**

**Given the common usage of ML Patterns 07 and the quantity and degree of errors contained within it, it is recommended that readers of the full Report read the section devoted to the review of ML Patterns 07, regardless of whether or not schools in their community utilize this textbook. At the very least, given the importance of the doctrine of *jihad* to history, and how frequently *jihad* is incorrectly defined and described in the textbooks reviewed, it is recommended that those reviewing the full Report read Appendix A, at the end of the analysis of ML PATTERNS 07.**

Readers who choose to skip over the review of **ML Patterns 07** in the full Report and go directly to reviews of other textbooks should note that when a textbook is cross-referenced to **ML Patterns 07** the review of that book does not typically include the citations and documentation associated with the **ML Patterns 07** review. To see the documentation and footnotes associated with that textbook's review, the reader should turn to the appropriate, referenced section of the review of **ML Patterns 07**. This has been done to avoid repetition of the footnotes throughout the Report.

Direct quotes from textbooks are identified by page number, set off in quotation marks, printed in bold type, and typically indented. Analyses of textbook quotes are printed in standard type and left-margin justified. When a portion of a quote from a textbook is included in the subsequent analysis, that portion is printed in bold type to help the reader refer back to the textbook quote in question.

Saudi Arabia's plan to influence American education, funded and implemented continuously for almost four decades, necessitated the rewriting of history in more areas than the history of Early Islam and Islam as a world religion. The sections that follow Early Islam in this Executive Summary and in the full Report deal with historical revisionism in the following areas:

- Islamism
- The Crusades
- The Holocaust
- The Arab-Israeli Conflict
- Terrorism
- 9/11: the Jihadist attack on America, September 11, 2001

Log on to [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org) to view and download the complete Report.

## **Summary of Findings**

### **The History of Early Islam**

As discussed in the Methodology section of this Executive Summary, the Early Islam portion of the Report examines seven major topics, three of which include sub-topics. Following is a representative sample of the errors, omissions, partial truths and misrepresentations found in these seven topics and three sub-topic areas in the textbooks which were reviewed.

In order to understand the nature of the historical errors in these textbooks, it is necessary to be aware of the fundamental and authoritative sources of Islamic belief, law and custom. These sources are (1) the *Qur'an*, considered by Muslims to be the immutable word of God, as revealed to Muhammad (the *Qur'an* is divided up into

Chapters, or “*surah*”); and (2) the *Sunna*, or *Sunnah*, the life and example of Muhammad. The *Sunna* is collected in volumes of *hadith*.<sup>9</sup>

### I. Muhammad and Jerusalem

**“The Qur’an tells the story of the Night Journey in which a winged horse took Muhammad to Jerusalem.”**

*Teachers’ Curriculum Institute, History Alive! The Medieval World and Beyond, 2005, p.87*

This statement is incorrect. The *Qur’an* does not say that Muhammad’s “Night Journey” went to Jerusalem, only to “the farthest mosque.” Although Jerusalem was well known at the time, it is in fact never specifically mentioned by name in the *Qur’an*, in the “Night Journey” verse or anywhere else.<sup>10</sup> Islamic tradition holds that it is alluded to in *Surah* 2:142-152, when Muslims in Medina were instructed to change the direction in which they were praying, away from the direction of Jerusalem and instead towards Mecca.

The tradition that the “**Night Journey**” went through Jerusalem originated more than fifty years after Muhammad’s death. There are at least two reasons for the creation of this tradition. First, there was a political and military rivalry between the Umayyad caliphate (which was based in Damascus and controlled Jerusalem), and a powerful faction of rebellious dissident Muslims which controlled Mecca. The Umayyad Caliphate needed a religious justification to substitute Jerusalem for Mecca as an alternate site for pilgrimage.<sup>11</sup> Second, it served to impress the triumph of Islam upon the Jews, and especially upon the Christians from whom Jerusalem had been seized.<sup>12</sup> If this religious tradition had no purpose other than to serve the spiritual needs of Muslims, it would be unobjectionable, and the textbook could have identified it as an Islamic tradition. However, the religious tradition that the “**Night Journey**” took Muhammad to Jerusalem is often used to deny the verified historical existence of the Jewish Temples in Jerusalem and the historical connection between Judaism and the Temple Mount.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> N. J. Coulson, A History of Islamic Law, Edinburgh University Press (Edinburgh, 1964/2005), p.2; Afif A. Tabbarah, The Spirit of Islam – Doctrine & Teachings, Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin (Beirut, 1978), pp. 436-479; Andrew Rippen and Jan Knappert, Textual Sources for the Study of Islam, University of Chicago Press (Chicago, 1990) pp.1-20; Imran Ashan Kahn Nyazee, Theories of Islamic Law, Islamic Research Institute Press (Islamabad, 1994), pp. 28-29; “*The Qur’an*”, University of Southern California, <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/>; “*Sunnah and Hadith*”, University of Southern California, <http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/hadith/>.

<sup>10</sup> The History of Jerusalem – The Early Muslim Period – 638-1099, Joshua Prawer and Haggai Ben-Shammai, Eds., New York University Press (New York, 1996), p.353; Some Religious Aspects of Islam, Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, E.J. Brill (Leiden, Netherlands, 1981), p.58.

<sup>11</sup> Norman Kotker, The Earthly Jerusalem, Scribners (New York, 1969), pp.150-151; Thomas A. Idinopulos, Jerusalem – A History of the Holiest City as Seen Through the Struggles of Jews, Christians, and Muslims, Elephant Paperbacks/Ivan R. Dee (Chicago, 1994), [revised edition of Idinopulos, Jerusalem Blessed, Jerusalem Cursed, Ivan R., Dee (Chicago, 1991)], p.231; Lazarus-Yafeh, p. 61; Daniel Pipes, “*The Muslim Claim to Jerusalem*”, Middle East Quarterly, Fall 2001, <http://www.meforum.org/article/490>.

<sup>12</sup> Idinopulos, pp.207, 230-233. Prawer and Ben-Shammai, p. 357.

<sup>13</sup> Yitzhak Reiter, Jerusalem and It’s Role in Islamic Solidarity, Palgrave/MacMillan (New York, 2008), pp.37-62; “Arab Leaders Deny Jewish History on The Temple Mount”, Anti-Defamation League, August 6, 2003, [http://www.adl.org/Anti\\_semitism/arab/temple\\_denial.asp](http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/arab/temple_denial.asp); Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook, “*Anti-Semitism among Palestinian Authority Academics*”, Jerusalem

## II. The Relationship Between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina

**“In Medina, Muhammad displayed impressive leadership skills. He fashioned an agreement that joined his own people with the Arabs and Jews of Medina as a single community. These groups accepted Muhammad as a political leader. As a religious leader, he drew many more converts, who found his message appealing.”**

*McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2007, p.265*

This language is a gross falsification of the relationship between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina. The Arabs of Medina did **“accept[] Muhammad as a political [and religious] leader.”** They accepted his new religion in part because they had already been exposed to monotheism by the Jews. However, the Jews did NOT **“accept[] Muhammad as a political leader.”** Further, the Jews did not want to adopt Muhammad’s new religion. They had been following their own monotheistic religion for over fifteen centuries. Muhammad considered this refusal to be a threat and a betrayal. As a result, he expelled two of the Jewish tribes from Medina and destroyed the third, beheading the men and selling the women and children into slavery.<sup>14</sup> This important and essential historical fact of the Medinan period is commonly omitted in the textbooks reviewed, and it is impossible for students to accurately understand the rise of Islam without it.

## III. Islamic Shari’a Law: Applicability to Non-Muslims

**“...The guidance of the Qur’an and Sunna was assembled in a body of law known as shari’a (shah-REE-ah). This system of law regulates the family**

---

Center for Public Affairs, June 1, 2008,  
[http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DRIT=3&DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=253&PID=0&IID=2110&TTL=Anti-Semitism among Palestinian Authority Academics; Nadav Shragai, “In the beginning was Al-Aksa”, Haaretz, November 11, 2005, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=650192%20>; Mike Seid, “Western Wall was never part of temple”, Jerusalem Post, October 25, 2007, <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1192380646406&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShragai> howFull; Pipes, supra.](http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DRIT=3&DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=253&PID=0&IID=2110&TTL=Anti-Semitism+among+Palestinian+Authority+Academics;+Nadav+Shragai,+In+the+beginning+was+Al-Aksa)

<sup>14</sup> A. Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad – A Translation of Sirat Rasul Allah by ibn Ishaq (died 767 CE/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.

**life, moral conduct, and business and community life of Muslims.”**  
*McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2007, p.268*

The textbook is correct in stating that *Shari'a* law is derived from the *Qur'an* and the *Sunna*. However, the textbook's explanation of the breadth of *Shari'a* law understates its control over all aspects of human thought and behavior, from intensely personal matters to government laws to universal beliefs.<sup>15</sup> Further, *Shari'a* also imposes elements of Islamic law on all non-Muslims living in lands conquered and controlled by Muslims.<sup>16</sup> The textbook also fails to inform students that *Shari'a* is grossly discriminatory towards non-Muslims and women. [See Sections IV and VI, below.]

#### IV. Status and Treatment of Christians and Jews Under Islam.

**“Shari'a law requires Muslim leaders to extend religious tolerance to Christians and Jews.”**  
*McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2007, p.268*

This statement is false, and represents one of the most egregious misrepresentations of Islam found in many textbooks. *Shari'a* law imposes a litany of burdens and restrictions on Christians and Jews, both in their daily lives and in the practice of their religions. See below for more detail.

**“The Muslims were extremely tolerant of those they conquered, as long as they were ‘people of the book.’ The Muslims allowed Christians and Jews to keep their churches and synagogues and promised them security. ...”**  
*Houghton Mifflin, Across the Centuries, 2003, p.66.*

At some times and in some places, such as during the early years of the Muslim conquest of Spain, Muslim conquerors exercised some degree of tolerance toward the people they conquered. But this was the exception, not the rule. The statement that the conquering Muslims were “extremely tolerant” of the peoples they conquered is a falsification lacking historical justification.<sup>17</sup> See below for more detail.

**“Islam respected Jews and Christians. ... Under Islam, Jews and Christians were allowed to practice their own faiths.”**  
*Prentice Hall, World Explorer [-] Medieval Times to Today, 2003, p.20*

**“Christians and Jews had full religious freedom. They built churches and synagogues, and several were financed by the state. The state did not ask**

---

<sup>15</sup> Majid Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, Johns Hopkins Press (Baltimore, 1955), pp.22-23

<sup>16</sup> See Section IV., Status and Treatment of Christians and Jews Under Islam, below.

<sup>17</sup> Robert Spencer, (editor), *The Myth of Islamic Tolerance: How Islamic Law Treats Non-Muslims*. Amherst, MA: Prometheus Books, 2005. This book consists of 58 essays covering nearly 600 pages, written by a wide range of scholars, researchers and historians, documenting the creation, application and perpetuation of the “myth of Islamic tolerance” and the historical facts that rebut the myth.



**Christians and Jews to perform military service, but it required them to pay a head tax, called *jizya*....”**

*Ibid.*, pp. 81-82

The nature of the “**respect**[]” which Islam has historically accorded to Christians and Jews is clearly reflected in their characterization in the *Qur’an* as “apes”, “pigs”, “dogs” and “farther astray” than “cattle”.<sup>18</sup> These *Qur’anic* teachings remain widespread in the Muslim world today.<sup>19</sup> The assertion that “**Christians and Jews had full religious freedom**” is a monumental falsification of history. In fact, *Shari’a* law has historically imposed numerous burdens and restrictions on Christians and Jews, both in their daily lives and in the practice of their religions. Professor Majid Khadduri, a founding faculty member of the Middle East Studies Program at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, states that the restrictions and burdens imposed on non-Muslims under *Shari’a* law “are the product of intolerance and oppression, not of toleration.”<sup>20</sup> For instance, the *jizya* tax is not in exchange for an exemption from military service, as the textbook above claims. The *jizya* is “a form of punishment for disbelief.”<sup>21</sup> In addition to paying the *jizya* tax Christians and Jews were:<sup>22</sup>

A. prohibited from building new houses of worship, or making repairs to existing ones;

---

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., *The Holy Qur-an – English translations of the meanings and Commentary*, King Fahd Holy Qur-an Printing Complex (Al-Madinah, 1990) (“*Qur-an Al-Madinah*”), p.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). See also, “*Antisemitism in the Qur’an*”, Bostom, *Islamic Antisemitism*, pp.34-56.

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., Harry de Quetteville, “Christians still 'swine' and Jews 'apes' in Saudi schools”, *Telegraph* (United Kingdom), June 25, 2006, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/06/25/wsaudi25.xml>; Aluma Solnick, “*Based on Koranic Verses, Interpretations, and Traditions, Muslim Clerics State: The Jews Are the Descendants of Apes, Pigs, And Other Animals*”, MEMRI, Special Report No. 11, November 1, 2002, <http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sr&ID=SR01102>; “*Friday Sermons in Saudi Mosques: Review and Analysis...Part II – 'Jews-The Descendants of Pigs and Apes'*”, MEMRI, Special Report No. 10, September 26, 2002, <http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sr&ID=SR01002>.

<sup>20</sup> Khadduri, p.194.

<sup>21</sup> Khadduri, p.196.

<sup>22</sup> Ibn Rushd (died 1198), *The Distinguished Jurist’s Primer, Volume II*, transl. Prof. I.A.K. Nyazee, Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, Garnet Publishing (Reading, UK, Lebanon, 2006), p.557; Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri (d. 1368), *Reliance of the Traveller – A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law* (“al-Misri, *Reliance*”), (N.H.M. Keller, transl.), Amana Publications (Beltsville, MD, 1994), pp.607-609; A.S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects*, Oxford University Press (London, 1930), pp.5-17, 113-126, 186-187; Khadduri, pp.193-198; Philip K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs (Tenth Edition)*, Macmillan/St. Martin’s Press (London, New York, etc., 1970), p 353-54; S.D. Goitein, *Jews and Arabs – Their Contacts through the Ages* (3<sup>rd</sup>. Ed.), Schocken Books (New York, 1974), p.72; Bernard Lewis, Ed., *Islam – from the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople – Volume II: Religion and Society* (“*Islam – Vol. II: Religion and Society*”), Oxford University Press (New York, etc., 1987), pp.217-225; Lewis, *The Jews of Islam*, p.27; Bostom, *Jihad*, pp. 31-35, 108-109, 129-30; Bostom, *Islamic Antisemitism*, p. 519, 653-662; Spencer, pp.48-49, 62-63, 66, 116-122, etc. (*passim*); Stillman, pp. 25-26, 157-58; Bat Ye’or, *The Dhimmi – Jews and Christians Under Islam* (“Ye’or, *Dhimmi*”), Fairleigh Dickinson University Press (Rutherford, NJ, etc., 1985), pp.52-60, 179, 184, 194-198.

- B. prohibited from bearing arms;
- C. required to open their homes to Muslims and provide food and lodging on demand;
- D. not allowed to ride on horses;
- E. required to rise from their seats when a Muslim sought to sit down;
- F. not allowed to pray if the prayer could be heard by a Muslim;
- G. required to wear distinctive clothing or a badge signifying their non-Muslim identity; and
- H. not allowed to give testimony in Islamic courts.

This litany of onerous burdens and restrictions is “the definitive law governing the relations of the *dhimmis* with Islam.”<sup>23</sup> The textbooks reviewed for the Report generally omit or seriously understate the number and extent of the burdens that were typically imposed upon Christians and Jews by their Muslim conquerors.

Education or indoctrination?

#### V. Jihad and the Early Islamic Conquests: The Meaning of “Jihad”

**“An Islamic term that is often misunderstood is *jihad* (jee HUHD). The term means ‘to struggle,’ to do one’s best to resist temptation and overcome evil. Under certain conditions, the struggle to overcome evil may require action. The Qur’an and Sunna allow self-defense and participation in military conflict, but restrict it to the right to defend against aggression and persecution.”**

*Houghton Mifflin, Across the Centuries, 2003, p.64*

The term *jihad* is, indeed, “**often misunderstood**”, primarily because faulty definitions like this are prevalent in academia and the media. First, this passage redundantly and incorrectly asserts that jihad warfare is solely defensive in nature. According to the *Qur’an*, the mandate of *jihad* includes aggressive warfare for the explicit purpose of making Islam supreme over the entire world.<sup>24</sup> For instance, *Surah* 9:5 commands Muslims to “fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, And seize them, beleaguer them, And lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war)...”(parenthetical in original)<sup>25</sup> *Surah* 9:29 commands Muslims to make war upon “People of the Book [Christians and

<sup>23</sup> Khadduri, p.195. “Dhimmi” is the term applied to Jews and Christians, as well as some other groups, who chose to continue practicing their own religions after being conquered by Muslims; al-Misri, *Reliance* p.607; Khadduri, p.176; Bostom, *Jihad*, pp. 31-32, 84-85; Ye’or, *Dhimmi*, p.45.

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., al Misri, *Reliance*, pp. 599-603; Ibn Khaldun (died 1406), *The Muqaddimah – An Introduction to History*, transl. Franz Rosenthal, Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ and Oxford, UK, 2005), p. 183; Khadduri, pp. 55-137; Bostom, *Jihad, passim*; Bassam Tibi, “War and Peace in Islam,” *The Ethics of War and Peace – Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Terry Nardin, Ed., Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ, 1966), p.130; Rudolph Peters, *Jihad in Classical and Modern Islam*, Markus Wiener Publishers (Princeton, 2005), p.3.

<sup>25</sup> Qur-an Al-Madinah p.497.

Jews], Until they pay the Jizya With willing submission, And feel themselves subdued.”<sup>26</sup> Most contemporary Islamic scholars, jurists and theologians are in agreement with the classical Islamic authorities that *jihad* includes mandatory, aggressive warfare to convert or subjugate infidels.<sup>27</sup> This textbook’s own descriptions of Muslim aggression and conquest explicitly contradict the textbook’s solely defensive definition. Muslim armies were most certainly not acting in “**self-defense**” or “**defend[ing] against aggression and persecution**” when, as accurately described on pp.78-81, they invaded and conquered Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, and “the lands that are today known as Turkmenistan, Afghanistan and Pakistan...”, or when they crossed the Mediterranean to conquer Spain and invade France.

Education or indoctrination?

In addition to falsely stating that jihad “**military conflict**” is solely defensive, this language inaccurately implies that the “**‘struggle,’ to do one’s best to resist temptation and overcome evil**” is the primary meaning of *jihad*, and that warfare is only a secondary and occasional meaning. This is a common misrepresentation in the textbooks reviewed. While the *Qur’an* does contain verses that refer to spiritual striving, both the *Qur’an* and the most authoritative *hadith* make it clear that “fight[ing] in the cause of Allah” is the highest form of *jihad*. For instance, *Surah* 4:95 states:

Not equal are those Believers who sit (at home)...[a]nd those who strive and fight in the cause of Allah...Allah hath granted a grade higher to those Who strive and fight...Than to those who sit (at home). Unto all (in Faith) Hath Allah promised good: But those who strive and fight Hath He distinguished Above those who sit (at home) By a great reward.<sup>28</sup> [Parentheticals in original.]

The *hadith* of Sahih Bukhari,<sup>29</sup> the most respected and authoritative collection of *hadith*,<sup>30</sup> contains 199 references to *jihad*, and every one uses the term to mean warfare against infidels.<sup>31</sup> For further detail on the meaning and application of *jihad*, see Appendix A in the full Report.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p.507. For other passages in the *Qur’an* mandating relentless war against infidels, See, e.g. *Surah* 2:191, 2:193, 2:216, 2:217, 2:218, 4:74, 5:33, 8:12, 8:15, 8:16, 8:39, 8:41, 8:65, 9:73, 9:123, 47:4; 66:9.

<sup>27</sup> See, e.g., Khadduri, pp.51-53, 62-64; Bernard Lewis, *The Political Language of Islam*, University of Chicago Press (Chicago, 1988/91), pp.72-73; Lewis, *Crisis*, pp. 29-37; Mufti M. Taqi Usmani, *Islam and Modernism*, transl. Dr. Mohammad Swaleh Siddiqui, Adam Publishers (New Dehli, 2002), pp. 130-39; Imran Ahsan Khan Nyazee, *Theories of Islamic Law: The Methodology of Ijtihad*. The Other Press (Kuala Lumpur, 1994), pp.251-252; David Cook, *Understanding Jihad*, University of California Press (Berkeley, etc., 2005) p.2, citing and quoting from Encyclopedia of Islam, new edition, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960-2003, “Djihad”.

<sup>28</sup> *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.244-245. See also, *Surah* 9:44-46, 9:81-83, *Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.514-515, 526.

<sup>29</sup> Muhammad ibn Isma'il Bukhari, *The Translation of the Meaning of Sahih al-Bukhari*, trans. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 8 vols. (Medina: Dar al-Fikr: 1981); Muhammad ibn Isma'il Bukhari, *Summarized Sahih Al-Bukhari*, trans. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, Maktaba Dar-us-Salam Publishers (Riyadh, 1994) (“Bukhari, *Summarized*”); USC, *Sunnah and Hadith*, supra.

<sup>30</sup> Bukhari’s collection of *hadith* “is accorded a rank in Sunni Islam just below that of the *Qur’an*....” David Cook, *Understanding Jihad*, University of California Press (Berkeley, etc., 2005), p.17. See also, Tabbarah, p.477.

<sup>31</sup> Douglas E. Streusand, “What Does Jihad Mean?”, *Middle East Quarterly*, September, 1997, Volume IV: Number 3, <http://www.meforum.org/article/357>, citing Muhammad ibn Isma'il Bukhari,

## V. Jihad and the Early Islamic Conquests: Imperialism and Portrayal of the Early Islamic Conquests Compared to the Portrayal of Imperialism by Non-Muslim Countries

In every textbook reviewed, the treatment of Islamic imperialism is a massive and material error of omission. For instance, in *McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2007*, on p.83 of the Glossary, the textbook defines “imperialism” as “a policy in which a strong nation seeks to dominate other countries politically, economically or socially.” This definition has a cross-reference to p. 773 (Chapter 27, “The Age of Imperialism, 1850 – 1914”), where “imperialism” is defined as the “seizure of a country or territory by a stronger country....” In addition, on p. 780, the textbook defines “imperialism” as “a policy in which one country seeks to extend its authority by conquering other countries.”

The Islamic conquests described in Chapter 10, “The Muslim World, 600-1250”, were clearly “imperialism” within the meaning of these definitions.<sup>32</sup> Indeed, Chapter 10 refers to the Muslim or Islamic “empire” more than a dozen times. However, the terms “imperialism” and “imperialist” never appear in the discussion of the early Islamic conquests. The issue of Muslim aggression is avoided entirely. Throughout Chapter 10, the early Muslim conquests are always presented in a positive or (at worst) neutral manner.<sup>33</sup> There is never any criticism expressed, or even implied. Sometimes the textbook expresses approval and/or offers false justification for Muslim wars of aggression. The most egregious of multiple examples is:

### “Previewing Main Ideas

...

...How far might cultural interaction have spread if the Muslims had won a key battle at Tours in 732?” (Emphasis added.)

*McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, World History - Patterns of Interaction, 2007, p.260*

It was not “cultural interaction” that was halted by the Muslims’ defeat at Tours in 732. The Islamic imperialist conquest of Europe was halted at the Battle of Tours. Asserting that the Muslim defeat at Tours halted the spread of “cultural interaction” conceals the aggressive, imperialist nature of the Islamic conquests. This absurd distortion is presented as a “Main Idea” on the very first page of this chapter.

The sanitization and/or positive portrayal of Islamic imperialism becomes even more obvious, and more egregious, when compared to this textbook’s portrayal of imperialism by non-Muslim countries. There is a gross disparity and clear double standard in terms

---

The Translation of the Meaning of Sahih al-Bukhari, trans. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 8 vols. (Medina: Dar al-Fikr: 1981). See also, Cook, pp.13-19; Bostom, Jihad, pp 136-140; Warraq, What the Koran Really Says, *passim*.

<sup>32</sup> The decisive characteristics that bring any territorial acquisition within the definition of “imperialism” are the nature of the territorial acquisition (by “seizure”), and the intent of the territorial acquisition (“to dominate”), regardless of the identity of the imperialist entity (a “nation” or a “country”). The fact that the identity of the aggressor entity is religious rather than nationalist would not justify excluding the Islamic wars of conquest from the definition of “imperialism”.

<sup>33</sup> E.g., “...a huge Muslim empire...grew...” (emphasis added, p.268); Muslims “made great progress in their quest to spread Islam.” (emphasis added, p.269).

of both terminology used and judgment rendered. This is common in the textbooks reviewed. In describing the European acquisition of colonies for economic exploitation, the textbook routinely employs terms and phrases with clearly negative connotations, such as **“European Domination”** (p. 773); **“scramble”** (defined on p. 775 as **“a frantic struggle to obtain something”**); **“occupation”** (p. 784); **“Europeans Grab Territory”** (p. 786); and **“paternalism”** (defined on p. 781 as **“govern[ing] people in a paternal way by providing for their needs but not giving them rights.”**). On p. 796, the textbook states that, **“[j]ust as the Europeans rushed to divide Africa, they also competed to carve up the lands of Southeast Asia.”** (Emphasis added.) Throughout Chapter 27 the textbook uses the term **“seize”** or **“seized”** to describe the acquisition of territory by European and American imperialists.

In contrast, negative or critical terminology is never used in the textbook’s description of the early Islamic conquests. If it is appropriate to describe the negative and harmful effects of European imperialism, which it is, then it is equally appropriate to describe the negative and harmful effects of Islamic imperialism, which the textbook fails to do. This disparate treatment and double standard is typical of the textbooks reviewed for the Report.

Education or indoctrination?

## VI. Islam and Women

### **“The Role of Women**

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

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

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

*Glencoe/McGraw Hill, World History, 2008, p.203*

The first paragraph above is highly misleading. The *Qur’an* does grant Muslim women **“spiritual...equality”** with Muslim men. However, because the text does not specify **“Muslim women,”** its statement, presented as fact, clearly leads students to conclude that the *Qur’an* grants both spiritual and social equality to *all* women.

There are claims made by Muslims that the *Qur’an* does provide for equality between the sexes and among all people. Such claims are largely based on interpretations of *Qur’anic* passages that do not actually refer to or specify equality, even in an indirect way. Many refer to God’s creation of both men and women. A common example: **“O men! Behold, We have created you all out of a male and a female, and have made you**

into nations and tribes, so that you might come to know one another. Verily, the noblest of you in the sight of God is all-knowing , all-aware" (*Surah* 49:13).

This, and verses similar to it, are typically cited by Muslims as justification that the *Qur'an* proclaims equality for all. If Muslims wish to make the claim of equality based on passages such as these, that is their right. But for a textbook to uncritically accept this claim and unequivocally assert as fact that the *Qur'an* grants all women "**spiritual and social equality with men**" illustrates a troubling lack of even the most elementary critical analysis.

Had the book instead stated "Muslims claim the *Qur'an* teaches that women have spiritual and social equality with men," provided some passages used to support that claim, and then provided passages that contradict or dispute it, of which there are many, that would have been "education" rather than "indoctrination." For example, *Surah* 98:6 describes those who reject Islam as "the worst of all creatures." Furthermore, the textbook should also point out that, in practice, Muslim women and non-Muslim men and women do not typically enjoy legal or social equality with Muslim men in Muslim societies. By handling this issue in an even-handed manner, students would be exposed to the claims Muslims make about equality and the evidence that disputes those claims.

For instance, in the *Qur'an* and under Islamic *Shari'a* law Muslim women are subjected to many restrictions and legal disabilities. Yes, women do have the right "**to own and inherit property.**" However, the *Qur'an* provides that a man's share of an inheritance is twice that of a woman.<sup>34</sup> Women do have "**the right of divorce under some circumstances**" – very specific and limited "**circumstances**", and even then the consent of the husband is required.<sup>35</sup> In contrast, a Muslim man can divorce any (or all) of his four wives, for any reason or no reason at all,<sup>36</sup> merely by saying "I divorce you" three times (or even once, if he "intends" the pronouncement to count as three).<sup>37</sup> The purported justification for this legal discrimination against women is, indeed, based on alleged "**differences between men and women.**" According to noted Islamic philosopher Ibn Rushd, known in the West as "Averroes," and one who challenged literalist interpretations of the *Qur'an*:

"[T]he underlying reason for granting the authority of divorce to men is the weaker rationality of women, their being normally overpowered by emotions, and their inclination to disturb normal life."<sup>38</sup>

Perhaps the most severe discriminatory legal disability imposed on Muslim women by Islamic *Shari'a* law is the reduced value assigned to their testimony in an Islamic legal proceeding. In order to "**account for differences**" in the mental abilities of men and

<sup>34</sup> *Surah* 4.11, *Qur'an Al-Madinah*, p.209. See also, al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.480; Sircar, *Vol. I*, p.78; Sircar, *Vol. II*, pp.204, 208-209, 212; Rushd, p.413; Bakhtiar, p.320.

<sup>35</sup> al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.562; Sircar, *Vol. I*, pp.411, 424-425; Ullah, pp.137, 140, 145, 152-156; Rushd, pp.79-87.

<sup>36</sup> Al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.556; S.C. Sircar, *Al-Shari'a, Vol. I*, Kitab Bhavan Publishers (New Dehli, 2006), p.389; Al-Haj Muhammad Ullah, *Women in Islamic Sharia – Laws of Marriage & Divorce*, Islamic Book Service (New Dehli, 2004), p.136.

<sup>37</sup> al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.560; Rushd, pp.89-90..

<sup>38</sup> Ibn Rushd, *The Distinguished Jurist's Primer, Volume II*, transl. Prof. I.A.K. Nyazee, Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, Garnet Publishing (Reading, UK, Lebanon, 2006), p.87

women, the Qur'an specifies that the testimony of one man is worth the testimony of two women, "So if one of [the women] errs, The other can remind her."<sup>39</sup> Muhammad stated that the reduced value of the testimony of women "is because of the deficiency of a woman's mind."<sup>40</sup>

In addition to legal restrictions and disabilities, Islamic law explicitly allows treatment of women which is clearly and blatantly abusive. The *Qur'an* states that a husband may beat his wife if he "fear[s] disloyalty" or "ill-conduct".<sup>41</sup> Muhammad became engaged to his favorite wife Aisha when she was six years old, and had marital relations with her when she was nine years old.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, according to Islamic *Shari'a* law, Muslim men may have marital relations with girls as young as nine years old.<sup>43</sup> The practice of middle-aged Muslim men marrying and having sexual relations with prepubescent little girls continues in some Muslim countries today.<sup>44</sup>

## VII. Islam and Slavery: The Early Muslim Slave Trade, The Muslim Role in the Atlantic Slave Trade, and Slavery in the Muslim World Today

---

<sup>39</sup> *Surah 2:282, Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.129-130.

<sup>40</sup> Sahih al-Bukhari, *USC Sunnah and Hadith, Volume 3, Book 48, Number 826*. See also, *Id.*, *Volume 1, Book 6, Number 301*.

<sup>41</sup> *Surah 4:34, Qur-an Al-Madinah*, pp.219-220; al-Misri, *Reliance*, p.540-541; Maududi, pp.189-190; *The Submission and Slaves ("Submission")*, Center for the Study of Political Islam (2007), pp. 44-48.

<sup>42</sup> See., e.g., Sahih al-Bukhari, *USC Sunnah and Hadith, Volume 5, Book 58, Numbers 234 & 236; Volume 7, Book 62, Numbers 64, 65, 88 & 90; Maxime Rodinson, Muhammad*, Pantheon Books (New York, 1971), pp.150-151; *Submission*, pp. 54-55. According to al- Bukhari, Aisha "used to play with dolls in the presence of [Muhammad]... (The playing with the dolls and similar images is forbidden, but it was allowed for 'Aisha at that time, as she was a little girl, not yet reached the age of puberty.)" [Parentheses in original.] Sahih al-Bukhari, *USC Sunnah and Hadith, Volume 8, Book 73, Number 151*. See also, *Sahih Muslim, USC Sunnah and Hadith, Book 008, Number 3311; Book 031, Number 5981; Submission*, p.54; Rodinson, p.151.

<sup>43</sup> *Rushd*, p.6; Shaykh Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid, "...[T]he ruling on marrying young girls", Islam Q&A, <http://islamqa.com/en/ref/22442/testimony>; "Saudi Cleric Muhammad Al-'Arifi: Islam Does Not Set a Minimum Age for Marriage", MEMRI, Clip No. 3023, July 5, 2011, <http://www.memritv.org/clip/en/0/0/0/0/0/3023.htm>, [http://www.memritv.org/clip\\_transcript/en/3023.htm](http://www.memritv.org/clip_transcript/en/3023.htm); Raymond Ibrahim, "New Saudi Fatwa Defends Pedophilia as 'Marriage'", Jihad Watch, July 21, 2011, <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2011/07/raymond-ibrahim-new-saudi-fatwa-defends-pedophilia-as-marriage.html>

<sup>44</sup> "2009 Human Rights Report: Saudi Arabia", U.S. Department of State, op. cit.; Donna Abu-Nasr, "Calls for end to Saudi child marriages", Washington Post, August 5, 2008, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/08/05/AR2008080502234.html>; "Yemeni 12-year-old dies while giving birth to a stillborn", Gulf News (Yemen), September 13, 2009, <http://gulfnews.com/news/gulf/yemen/yemeni-12-year-old-dies-while-giving-birth-to-a-stillborn-1.539240>; "Saudi Father Weds Daughter, 10, to Octogenarian", MEMRI, Special Dispatch No.2623, October 29, 2009, <http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/3733.htm>; "UN says Yemeni child bride's death is tragedy", Associated Press-Washington Post, September 15, 2009, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/15/AR2009091500050.html>; Sudarsan Raghavan, "Child brides' enduring plight", Washington Post, December 5, 2009, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/04/AR2009120404352.html>; Ahmad al-Haj, "13-year-old Yemeni bride dies of bleeding", Washington Post/Associated Press, April 9, 2010, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/08/AR2010040802684.html>.

The textbooks reviewed typically omit any reference to the Islamic slave trade or, at most, provide only vague, passing references to the duration and volume of the Islamic slave trade. This is a significant omission, because the Islamic slave trade began nearly eight centuries prior to the European-operated Atlantic slave trade and continues in some areas of the Muslim world even today. See below for more detail.

For instance, in *Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA, Across the Centuries, 2003*, Unit 3, “Sub-Saharan Africa”, Chapter 5, “West Africa”, Lesson 5, “Village Society in West Africa”, in a section entitled “Village Life”, the textbook states on p.127:

**“With rising prosperity in the Middle East and Asia after the 700s, slaves came to be in demand. Some African states exported slaves. Between 1200 and 1500, about 2.5 million Africans were taken across the Sahara or the Red Sea bound for slavery.”**

An astute reader with some background on the issue might recognize that “**rising prosperity in the Middle East and Asia after the 700s**” is a reference to the expansion of the Muslim empire. However, the students reading this book are unlikely to make the connection, particularly in view of the fact that no mention is made of slavery in the two preceding chapters on early Islam. This textbook erases slavery from the history of Islam.

In order to understand the historical significance and impact of the Muslim slave trade, it is essential to know its duration, extent and volume. The international Islamic slave trade began with the early Islamic conquests in the seventh and eighth centuries CE/AD. Various authorities and scholars estimate the number of black Africans sold into the Islamic slave trade from the seventh to the early twentieth century to be between fourteen and eighteen million.<sup>45</sup> In contrast, the Atlantic slave trade, which began around 1500 and ended around 1870, brought between ten and eleven million black African slaves to the Americas.<sup>46</sup> Further, the Atlantic slave trade depended on the huge and complex Muslim slave kidnapping and transportation industry that had already been in operation for 700 years.<sup>47</sup> In the late nineteenth century, when the Atlantic slave trade ended, the Muslim slave trade was still flourishing. Throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, the Muslim world strongly resisted European efforts to end the Muslim slave trade.<sup>48</sup> Indeed, the Muslim trade in black African slaves increased and flourished throughout most of the nineteenth century, despite vigorous diplomatic and

---

<sup>45</sup> Baroness Caroline Cox and Dr. John Marks, [This Immoral Trade – Slavery in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century](#), Monarch Books (Oxford, UK, etc, 2006), p.124 (18 million - citing and quoting from “slavery”, Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2006, Encyclopedia Britannica Premium Service, February 7, 2006, [www.britannica.com/eb/article-9109538](http://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).

<sup>46</sup> Cox and Marks, p.124, (10 million); Bostom, [Jihad](#), p.89 (10.5 million – citing Murray Gordon, [Slavery in the Arab World](#), (New York: New Amsterdam, 1989), p. 232); [Submission](#), p.131, (11 million - citing and quoting from Thomas Sowell, [Race and Culture](#), BasicBooks, 1994, p.188).

<sup>47</sup> [Submission](#). pp.127, 131; Hugh Thomas, [The Slave Trade](#), Simon & Schuster (New York 1997), p.46.

<sup>48</sup> Sowell, p. 212-14; Lewis, [Slavery](#), pp.72-74; Gordon, pp.162-170; Cox and Marks, pp.149-151.



military anti-slavery efforts by the European powers.<sup>49</sup> Finally, although the Muslim slave trade declined in the late nineteenth century, it continued throughout the twentieth century and it continues into the twenty-first century in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, Sudan, Mauritania, Syria, Algeria, Iran, Pakistan and Malaysia.<sup>50</sup>

In stark contrast to how the textbooks typically erase or downplay the history of slavery in Islam, the textbooks reviewed typically and appropriately devote significant space to the European-operated Atlantic slave trade and to the horrific nature of that slave trade. In doing so the textbooks exhibit the same double standard they apply to European imperialism as compared to Islamic imperialism. If it is appropriate to describe the European-operated Atlantic slave trade and its attendant horrors, which it is, then it is equally appropriate for the textbooks to describe the history and horrors of the Islamic slave trade, which they do not.

Education or indoctrination?

---

As discussed in the Methodology section of this Executive Summary, the following section deals with representative samples of historical revisionism in the following areas: Islamism; the Crusades; the Holocaust; the Arab-Israeli Conflict; September 11, 2001.

## Islamism

**“Perhaps one of the most widespread cultural counter-forces to globalization has been the rise of Islamism, which is more popularly, although incorrectly, known as Islamic fundamentalism. Whereas *fundamentalism* is a general term that describes the desire to return to strict adherence to the fundamentals of a religious system, Islamism is an anti-colonial, anti-imperial, and overall anti-core political movement. In Muslim countries, Islamists resist the core, especially Western, forces of globalization---namely modernization and secularization. Not all Muslims**

---

<sup>49</sup> Lewis, *Slavery*, pp.72-74; Gordon, pp.165-207; Cox and Marks, p.147.

<sup>50</sup> “2009 Human Rights Report: Saudi Arabia”, U.S. Department of State/Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, March 11, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2009/nea/136079.htm>; Bostom, *Jihad*, p.92; Cox And Marks, p.126; Lewis, *Slavery*, pp. 13, 59; John Eibner. “My Career Redeeming Slaves”, *Middle East Quarterly*, December 1999 – Volume VI: Number 4, December, 1999, <http://www.meforum.org/449/my-career-redeeming-slaves>; *Submission*, p.134-135; Carl Bombay, *Let My People Go!*, Multnomah Publishers (Sisters Oregon, 1998); Samuel Cotton, *Silent Terror [-] A Journey into Contemporary African Slavery*, Harlem River Press (New York 1998); David Littman, “*The U.N. Finds Slavery in the Sudan*”, *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol III, No 3, September 1996, <http://www.meforum.org/319/the-un-finds-slavery-in-the-sudan>; Richard Lobben, “*Slavery in The Sudan Since 1989*”, *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Spring 2001, [http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2501/is\\_2\\_23/ai\\_77384489/pg\\_1](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2501/is_2_23/ai_77384489/pg_1); “Four countries 'blacklisted' by US”, *Jerusalem Post*, Jun. 17, 2009, [http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1245184857234&pagename=JPost%2FJPostArticle%2FShoFull](http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1245184857234&pagename=JPost%2FJPostArticle%2FShowFull); Nora Boustany, “*Allies Cited for Human Trafficking*”, *Washington Post*, June 13, 2007. p. A14, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/12/AR2007061202180.html>.

**are Islamists, although Islamism is the most militant movement within Islam today.”**

*Pearson Prentice Hall, World Regions in Global Context Peoples, Places and Environments, 2005, p.200*

This quote portrays Islamism as if it has no origins within classical Islam and Islam’s holy books. This is incorrect. In fact, the Muslim Brotherhood, one of the 20<sup>th</sup> century icons of modern Islamism, overlaid modern anti-colonialism on classical Islam. The textbook claim that Islamism is “**anti-imperial**” is incorrect or at best misleading, because a commonly understood objective of Islamist organizations such as the Muslim Brotherhood is the creation of a worldwide caliphate, an Islamic empire governed by *Shari’a* law – which is clearly “imperialism.” Finally, while the final sentence is true, students must understand that as Khomeini and bin Laden have stated, it is a religious duty to acquire the modern technology to develop modern weapons for the spread of Islam to rule the world.<sup>51</sup>

## The Crusades

**“During the Crusades, Christians conquered the city [Jerusalem] for a time until the Muslims recaptured it.”**

*Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, World History A Global Mosaic, 2004, p. 600.*

This statement reverses history. It is typical of the faulty history of the Crusades in the textbooks reviewed, which leads students to believe that Christians were the initiators of the aggression in the Holy Land and that Muslims were the victims who were merely defending themselves. The Christians were in Jerusalem centuries before the Muslims. Muslims invaded the Holy Land by the mid-7<sup>th</sup> century. The Crusades were launched in the late 11<sup>th</sup> century, some 450 years later, to wrest back control of the Holy Land from the Muslims and liberate the Christians from the Muslim conquerors.

**“The armies of the First Crusade defeated the Muslims and held the Holy Land for about 100 years. Later, Muslims took back their lost lands. Seven more Crusades followed, but Muslims held on to the Holy Land.”**

*Macmillan/McGraw-Hill, New York, Our World, 2003 P. 352*

This also illustrates the faulty history of the Muslim revisionist perspective, that the Christians set out to capture the Holy Land and that the Muslims had to take back “**their lost lands.**” The reverse is what is historically true -- it was the Muslims who invaded the Holy Land and the Christians who were trying to take back “**their lost lands.**”

Education or indoctrination?

---

<sup>51</sup> Osama bin Laden, Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama bin Laden, ed. Bruce Lawrence, trans. James Howarth ( London: Verso, 2005), 46.  
Ruhullah Khomeini, Islamic Government (New York: Manor Books, 1979), 46.

## The Holocaust

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

*Glencoe/McGraw Hill, World History, 2008, p.996*

This material is misleading. It does not define Zionism and it creates the faulty impression that Jews picked the **“land of ancient Israel to be a home for the Jewish people.”** There is no historical information about the continuous presence of the Jews in Israel since biblical times. Furthermore, the wording concerning the UN resolution to divide Palestine implies that the partition of Palestine into two states came as a result of the Holocaust and not because Britain went to the UN to end its mandate. For more detail see “The Arab-Israeli Conflict” below.

**“Zionist leaders worked with the Nazi government to establish training camps in Germany to prepare immigrants for their futures in Palestine.”**

*Chelsea House, The Palestinian Authority (a volume of The Creation of the Modern Middle East), 2003, p.82*

This is one of the most blatant, thoroughly exposed, notorious lies told by Holocaust deniers, including Fatah leader Mahmoud Abbas in his book *The Other Side: The Secret Relationship between Nazism and the Zionist Movement* (1983). Dr. Abdel Aziz Rantisi, a co-founder of Hamas, made the same claim in an article published in 2003 in the Hamas weekly *Al-Risala*, arguing that the Holocaust was “the greatest of lies” perpetrated by the Jews and, if there was a Holocaust, the Zionists were behind it. Driving these claims is the premise that the Jews perpetrated the Holocaust in order to drive their fellow Jews out of Europe and into Palestine and that the Zionists were so evil, so murderous, that they slaughtered their brothers and sisters on a massive scale to serve own their nefarious Zionist ends. <sup>52</sup> We saw a similar tactic in the aftermath of 9/11, with the outrageous allegations that President Bush and/or the Mossad (Israeli Intelligence Service) were responsible for 9/11.

Education or indoctrination?

## The Arab-Israeli Conflict

**“In 1948, as frustrated British leaders abandoned the mandate for Palestine, Zionist leaders proclaimed the new state of Israel. War between the Jews and the Arab states broke out immediately. Although Israel survived this and other wars, for many years the history of bitterness**

---

<sup>52</sup>“Hamas Leader Rantisi: “The False Holocaust,” MEMRI, 27 August 2003,,  
<http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=subjects&Area=antisemitism&ID=SP55803>.

**between Jews and Arabs cast a shadow of violence and uncertainty over the region.”**

*Holt, Rinehart and Winston, World History Continuity and Change, 1999, p.779*

The information here is historically inaccurate. “On February 15, 1947 Great Britain turned the issue of the Palestine mandate over to the United Nations...The United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) was created to investigate the issue and suggest appropriate measures to be taken...After considerable deliberation, the UNSCOP proposed a plan that called for the partition of the British mandate of Palestine into an Arab state and a Jewish state, with an international regime (corpus separatum) for the city of Jerusalem and its environs.”<sup>53</sup> The textbook omits the important historical fact that UN Resolution 181 established a two-state solution in Palestine.<sup>54</sup> The second important 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 accepted every proposal for a “two-state solution,” whereas the Arabs rejected every proposal and opted instead for a “Final Solution of the Jewish Problem” in Palestine.<sup>55</sup>

With only a few exceptions, the textbooks reviewed typically omit the essential historical fact that the UN created a two-state partition, one for the Jews and one for the Arabs. The textbooks also typically omit the important historical fact that the Arabs rejected the UN partition plan and attacked Israel in 1948. As the Pearson Prentice Hall article quoted in the Rationale section of this Executive Summary states: “...**educators today acknowledge that an understanding of the histories and belief systems of a diversity of religious traditions is vital and necessary if students are to grasp the complexity of contemporary issues such as the conflicts in the Middle East.**” However, by omitting the two crucial historical facts noted above, the textbooks lead students to three faulty conclusions with respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The first faulty conclusion is that the Jews must have illegally expropriated the land mass that became Israel, and thus, that the founding of modern-day Israel was an illegitimate act. The second faulty conclusion is that the Palestinian Arabs were made victims of Jewish aggression necessitated by this supposedly illegal Jewish land grab. This in turn leads to a third faulty conclusion, that Israel is primarily responsible for the failure to achieve peace in the Middle East because it has been the aggressor from day one, while the Arabs and Palestinians have historically sought to co-exist with the Jews. These faulty conclusions make it virtually impossible for students to correctly understand the nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict today. Not coincidentally, these three faulty conclusions, unsupported by historical fact, are precisely the claims made by Hamas, the PLO, and their allies, who argue repeatedly that Israel is and has always been the aggressor and that the state of Israel is illegitimate.

---

<sup>53</sup> Bernard Reich, A Brief History of Israel (New York: Checkmark Books, 2005), pp. 40-42.

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/un/res181.htm>

<sup>55</sup> <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-Faisal+Agreement+3-Jan-1919.htm>  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faisal%E2%80%93Weizmann\\_Agreement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faisal%E2%80%93Weizmann_Agreement);  
<http://middleeast.about.com/od/arabisraeliconflict/f/khartoum-declaration-faq.htm>  
[http://www.sixdaywar.co.uk/khartoum\\_resolutions.htm](http://www.sixdaywar.co.uk/khartoum_resolutions.htm)  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1967\\_Arab\\_League\\_summit](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1967_Arab_League_summit)

Education or indoctrination?

**“Today, the country of Jordan worries that it does not have enough water to meet its needs. It plans to build a dam near the Sea of Galilee. No building has been done, because if Jordan starts without Israel’s approval, war could result.”**

*Pearson Prentice Hall, World Explorer People, Places and Cultures, 2008. p.534*

This is one of the most clever insinuations found in any textbook that Israel is the aggressor in the Region. It fails to note that in the peace treaty of October 26, 1994 Israel and Jordan agreed to terms with regard to the access and control of water resources that would assure the continuation of peace.<sup>56</sup>

## September 11, 2001

**“On September 11, 2001, the United States was the target of a horrible act of terrorism, or violence to further a cause...The United States soon found out that the 9/11 terrorists had links to the Taliban government of Afghanistan. The Taliban had allowed the terrorists to plan and train for the 9/11 attacks in Afghanistan. The United States demanded that the terrorist leaders be arrested, but the Taliban refused. Because of this, the United States and allies overthrew the Taliban government in late 2001.”**

*Harcourt, Horizons, 2005, p.656*

There is no mention that the perpetrators of this attack were Muslims engaged in Islamic *jihad*. This is a critical omission that is common in the textbooks reviewed in this Report. The statement that the 9/11 attack was carried out to **“further a cause”** is left undefined. There is no mention that the **“cause”** was Islamic *Jihad*. This omission may lead students to believe that the attack was a noble or idealistic act. Students must understand that 9/11 was perpetrated in the cause of Islamic *Jihad* to hurt the "Great Satan," as America is called by many in the Muslim world.

**“On September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four passenger planes, crashing two of them into New York City’s World Trade Center and the third into the Pentagon, the defense department headquarters in Washington, D.C. A fourth plane plummeted into a Pennsylvania field. The devastation and loss of so many lives made the United States firmly resolved to rid the world of terrorism.”**

*Glencoe/McGraw Hill, World Geography, 2003, p.163*

There are two critical omissions in this paragraph: there is no identification of the terrorists as Muslims or Islamic Jihadists and there is no explanation as to why the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were the targets. Further, there is a crucial piece of misinformation: the fourth plane did not “plummet” into a Pennsylvania field. The passengers on the plane gave their lives to prevent the hijackers from attacking the White House, which was the fourth target.

---

<sup>56</sup> <http://www.kinghussein.gov.jo/peacetreaty.html>

The quotes from the preceding two textbooks illustrate a pattern common to the textbooks reviewed. Rarely are the terrorists identified as Muslims, and the jihadist motivations for their actions are omitted. Omitting these two critical facts leaves students with an incomplete, and thus inaccurate, understanding as to why 9/11 happened.

## Conclusions

Thirty-eight textbooks were reviewed to prepare the full Report. The key problematic areas in the treatment of Islam in 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade American textbooks are listed below. The full Report reveals a pattern of historical revisionism, omissions, and bias in the presentation of all aspects devoted to Islam in these textbooks. Differences in presentation of key problematic areas lie primarily in the nature of the wording or the degree of historical revisionism, omission, bias, sanitization, and misrepresentation. The list that follows highlights problematic areas identified in the treatment of Islam as a world religion and of events in past and recent history when Islam and the West have come into conflict. Please note that not all of the points listed below are addressed in this Executive Summary, but they are all covered in the full Report.

- The doctrine of *jihad* is omitted, incorrectly defined, inaccurately described, or understated.
- Faulty description of women's rights under Islam: The oppressive and discriminatory nature of *Shari'a* law with respect to women is omitted, mischaracterized, or understated.
- Omission or minimization of the Islamic slave trade, in sharp contrast with what is typically an extensive and appropriately critical examination of the Atlantic slave trade operated by Europeans.
- Aggrandizement and elevation of Muhammad's character that is contradicted by accepted historical facts.
- Omission or minimization of Muslim conquest and imperialism, in sharp contrast with what is typically an extensive and appropriately critical examination of European and other imperialism.
- False claim of Islam's historical tolerance of Jews and Christians.
- Misrepresentation of *Shari'a* Law in such areas as its applicability to non-Muslims and the separation of Church and State.
- False presentation of the Crusades as the cause of the animosity between Christianity and Islam.
- Faulty historical narrative of the Crusades. Muslims in the Holy Land are commonly depicted as innocent victims of unprovoked aggression who were defending "their" lands against Christian invaders, rather than what is historically accurate: (1) that Muslims invaded and conquered the Holy Land centuries prior to the Crusades; (2) that Christians and Jews were victims of Muslim conquest and aggression centuries prior to the launching of the Crusades; and (3) that the Crusades were launched to wrest back control of the Holy Land from the Muslim invaders and conquerors.
- Chronological revisionism of the historical development of Judaism, Christianity and Islam which incorrectly portrays Islam as preceding Judaism and Christianity

- and the Muslims/Arabs as the indigenous people in the Holy Land, resulting in the delegitimization of Israel.
- Treatment of Islamism as though it has no origins within classical Islam and Islam's Holy Books.
  - Islamist Holocaust revisionism that attributes the creation of Israel to world guilt over the Holocaust and incorrectly maintains that Arabs were forced to give up land for the survivors of the Holocaust.
  - Omission of the fact that the United Nations created a two-state partition for Palestine, one for the Jews and one for the Arabs.
  - Omission of the fact that the Arabs refused to accept the offer of an independent Arab state contained in the 1947 United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine.
  - False claim of Israel's responsibility for the Palestinian Refugee problem.
  - Omission of the fact that the PLO's recognition of Israel's right to exist was and remains a verbal recognition only, contradicted by the unrevised PLO charter.
  - Inaccurate claim that most Middle Eastern terrorist groups have roots in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.
  - Omission of the fact that Islamic Jihadists target Americans not only for their support of Israel but also for what they consider the "decadent nature" of Western way of life that threatens the spread of Islam throughout the world.
  - Failure to identify the terrorists who perpetrated the September 11, 2001 attacks on America as Muslims or Islamic Jihadists.
  - Failure to explain why the Islamic Jihadists targeted the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and to identify the fourth target as the White House.

With regard to the techniques used to implement the historical revisionism common in these textbooks, some are blatant and obvious, while others are subtle and deceptive. Three particular categories of techniques stand out:

- (1) Errors of omission, in which information crucial to gaining an understanding of the topic is left out: e.g., omission of the historical fact that the Arabs refused the offer of an independent Palestinian state as part of a two-state solution proposed by the United Nations in 1947.
- (2) False statements or claims, presentation of facts that are demonstrably false and/or unsupported by historical or other evidence: e.g., the false assertion that Islam has historically been tolerant of Jews and Christians.
- (3) Partial truths, or the inclusion of some facts while omitting others that might be quite relevant to interpreting and understanding the issues at hand: e.g., asserting that under Islam women had certain "rights" and/or "spiritual equality", while omitting the facts regarding the many restrictions and legal disabilities imposed upon women in the *Qur'an* and under Islamic *Shari'a* law.

It is clear that the textbooks examined throughout this Report contain extensive amounts of material that is seriously historically flawed and often unmistakably biased. The errors in these textbooks are not grammatical or typographical. They are substantive, significant and often repetitive.

Perhaps the greatest disservice done to students is the net effect of the accumulation of these errors -- the creation of a faulty historical narrative that not only misrepresents Islam but creates an inaccurate comparison between Islam, Christianity and Judaism, and between the Muslim world and the West. Regardless of the issue -- slavery, conquest and imperialism, the Crusades, the Arab-Israeli conflict, to name a few -- Islam

and the Muslim world are not generally held to the same rigor of historical analysis that the textbooks apply to Christianity, Judaism and the West.

The horrors of the European-operated Atlantic slave trade are appropriately depicted in the textbooks reviewed, while the same books are virtually silent on the horrors of the Islamic-operated slave trade, which started eight centuries earlier and lasted much longer. The horrors of European conquest and imperialism are appropriately depicted in the textbooks reviewed, while the same books fail to even identify Islamic imperialism as “imperialism” and generally sanitize, downplay or omit the horrors of that imperialism. The Crusades are inaccurately depicted as an effort by Christians to “conquer” lands owned by Muslims, when in fact Muslims were the initial aggressors, invading those lands and conquering the Christians and Jews more than four centuries earlier. The Arab-Israeli conflict is falsely depicted as being instigated by Jews who unlawfully expropriated land from the Arabs, rather than by Arabs who refused to accept the UN two-state partition plan and attacked Israel.

While there are, of course, differences in the number, extent, and nature of errors from textbook to textbook, the typical textbook treatment of Islam does not meet the Pearson Prentice Hall standard, quoted at the beginning of this Executive Summary, of soundness, fairness, neutrality, objectivity and accuracy. More often than not, the typical treatment of Islam amounts more to indoctrination than to education.

Saudi Arabia’s plan, implemented in the mid-1970s, focused on changing how America looked at the Arabs and the Middle East. It focused as well on undermining American support for Israel. Islamist revisionism of Middle East history grew out of this plan, which has without a doubt significantly influenced the material in today’s textbooks.

Perhaps the senior editors who work for the textbook publishing houses do not know the history. Perhaps they check only for spelling and grammatical errors but not for historical inaccuracies and bias. Perhaps they have accepted, with little criticism or examination, material that has been provided them by Muslim organizations, such as the CIE, that lobby publishing houses. Perhaps these inaccuracies reflect the biases of the writers and editors. Perhaps it is a combination of all of the above. Whatever the reason, the errors must be corrected so that history is recorded accurately and passed on to generations of students who must learn from the past if they are to become the leaders of the future. They can only learn from the past if the history that they study is accurate and unbiased, if the history they receive is “education” rather than “indoctrination.”

## **Recommendations**

1. There are 22 states and territories which have a state textbook adoption process. They are: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia. This means that each one of these states either recommends or selects a list of textbooks to be used by all of its public schools. Often these decisions rely on already-set state standards and guidelines, and frequently those same decisions are subject to public input, either through public meetings or through minority and citizen representation on advisory committees. Teachers and districts seeking exceptions to the state



textbook lists can do so with the proper state-level approval. In the states where textbooks are approved statewide for all public schools in the state, we urge the following actions:

- a. Check your State Board of Education website to find out the years when Social Studies, Global Studies, and World History textbooks come up for review.
  - b. Identify the dates when public hearings are held and be prepared to participate in these hearings. Seek membership on advisory committees.
  - c. Choose representatives who will be able to speak to the issue of a specific problematic issue in a textbook under consideration. Make certain that each person is prepared to speak for approximately 3 minutes. This will most likely be the amount of time allotted each speaker. Inasmuch as there are many topics in the Report, designate one speaker per topic.
  - d. Present a copy of the Report to the Chairman of the State Board of Education prior to the beginning of the state hearings. Make certain to flag the textbooks under consideration for purchase.
2. In those states where textbooks are approved statewide for all public schools in the state, we urge local residents to meet with their respective school boards to discuss the Report, and request that their local school districts seek out supplementary materials and curricula that correct the errors noted in the Report.
  3. In states where local school boards make the decisions regarding which textbooks are purchased, we recommend the following actions.
    - a. Residents of school districts meet with their school boards to discuss the Report and to make them aware that there are additional reports that organize, by publisher, the analyses of all the flawed textbooks covered in the Report. These additional reports, along with the names and addresses of the persons to whom the reviews should be sent, are available at [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org) for school board members to use when contacting the publishing houses. Residents should urge school board members to contact the publishing houses that publish the book(s) used in their districts, and insist that revisions be made to the books before their school boards will consider future purchases of such textbooks.
    - b. Residents request that their local school districts seek out supplementary materials and curricula that correct the errors noted in this Report, until such time as revised textbooks are purchased.