

THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Revised second edition, November 1993

PART I: OVERVIEW

Go on to [Part II: Student Lessons](#) and [Part III: Background for Teachers](#) .

This unit consists of five lessons designed for high school classes in history, political science, and world affairs. The focus is on one of the most volatile and complex of all conflicts: that between Israeli and Palestinian nationalisms. The conflict has been called the War of Two Rights, a description that affirms the basic humanity of both Jews and Palestinians. Our goal is to put the conflict into historical context, to provide students with factual information on the structure of the conflict, and to inform them of the variety of Jewish and Palestinian perspectives. Designed to be used individually as two-day lessons or collectively as a ten-day unit, most lessons contain historical background, primary documents, maps, and/or statistical data.

Objectives

- There are certain [countries, cities, regions, geographical features](#) mentioned in the text. Students should know these and be able to point them out on a map.
 - Students should be able to explain the historic background of conflict in the Middle East, particularly the role of Western powers in creating the conditions of instability after World War I.
 - Students should be able to comment on the complexity and variety of [Zionism](#) and the conditions in Europe that pushed Jews towards a Jewish state.
 - Students should be able to list and explain key turning points in the conflict: the vote in 1947 to [partition](#) Palestine and the population shifts which followed; the [1967 war](#) and its implications; the election of [Menachem Begin](#) in 1977 and how it changed the nature of the conflict; and the [Intifada of 1987](#) and how it created a new reality.
 - Students should be able to identify the variety of Palestinian positions, and how they evolved since 1948. They will understand the Palestinian Declaration of Independence of 1988.
 - Students should see how to use data--measurable facts such as population figures--to analyze political processes.
 - Students should be able to use past developments and current data to project possible future outcomes.
-

Assumptions of the Unit

- Outside powers play a major role in the conflict.
- Understanding objective, measurable facts can contribute considerably to an understanding of the conflict.
- The outcome is not pre-determined. There are alternative outcomes possible, some more violent, some less.
- There is a large amount of poor information about this conflict. Our culture and our national political interests have led us to see the conflict through distorted lenses. Reading first hand perspectives will facilitate understanding.

- There has been an effort by all sides to present events from a judgmental perspective, as if one side is innocent and the other is wicked, and to denounce efforts at even-handedness as hostile bias against "our" side, which has a monopoly on "right" and "truth."
-

Materials Needed

There are numerous maps, documents and data sheets included. These should be used as you see fit. A wall map of the Middle East is desirable. In Lesson One students need access to an atlas. In Lessons Two and Four an optional activity requires butcher paper and paint or posterboard paper and magic markers. The student edition (pp. 13-92) should be duplicated to provide one copy for each student before the first class session.

In "[Possible Outcomes](#)," Lesson Five of the Student Edition, students are invited to interview a representative of a Jewish and an Arab organization, if both are available in their areas. (It is not recommended to interview one side but not the other.) They are also invited to write to the Israeli and Palestinian officials at the UN to ask them for their positions. If you choose to use these activities, it is advisable to arrange the visits or write the letters in advance, so that the visits may occur and the letters be available during the days you are studying Lesson Five.

STRUCTURE

Teacher Information Notes

To facilitate use of the unit, there are extensive teacher background information notes. These sections have more information than you will need, but by having facts and background issues easily available, you will be able to handle most questions that come up. At various points, there are also suggestions for discussion topics. These topics have worked in my own classes. Again, there are probably more than you can fit into the time available, but they are there for your use if you need them.

Bibliography

For those who want to read more on specific topics, there is a short bibliography. There is much good material available but also quite a bit of ideologically-based pseudo-analysis. Be wary of anything that makes one side look wicked or totally responsible for the conflict. There is a real danger from the Rhetoric Wars--efforts to put a spin on events to make one side look innocent and the other look evil. Such efforts are particularly vicious when they use ethnic or cultural stereotypes such as those that hint at secret Jewish power or Islamic tendencies to extremism and violence.

Approach

Most lessons have four parts: historical background, statistical data, primary documents, maps. You will want to get students away from the "What I think" approach. Such an approach can easily deteriorate into the Rhetoric Wars in which we simply repeat preconceptions or accusations and never get around to analysis or learning. In particular when you have discussions be sure to emphasize that students are discussing data and facts, not their own opinions. It is not what we *want* that is important, but what the

facts are.

Cartoons

Cartoons can be a very valuable teaching device, especially in teaching stereotyping and hostile imaging. Try to find cartoons that portray Jews or Arabs with big noses or wicked leers; or obsessed with money; or corrupt and decadent, or prone to violence, or manipulating power from behind the scenes. These are the classic ethnic stereotypes used to discredit whole peoples and positions. In addition to the pedagogical advantages, cartoons have two additional advantages. First, students will search their newspapers to find examples, which can be brought to class for discussion. Second, cartoons seem to appeal to the less advanced readers. There are various cartoon collections that can be used.

A good source on stereotyping (with an emphasis on cartoons and poses) is Sam Keen, *Faces of the Enemy* (San Francisco: Harper Row, 1986). An informative discussion of how television portrays Arabs is Jack Shaheen, *The TV Arab* (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1984). To see how American cartoonists saw the first year of the Intifada, see *The Uprising in Cartoons* (American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, 4201 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 500, Washington DC 20008, \$3.00).

A Problem

Students should understand that this is a political conflict that originated approximately a hundred years ago. There may be a tendency for some to see a continuation of things that happened three thousand years ago. Comments such as "they have been fighting since the time of Isaac and Ishmael" show an unsophisticated lack of historical perspective. Students oriented to the Bible may see Israelis as Hebrews and Palestinians as Philistines. The fact that some Israelis or Palestinians may agree does not change the fact that such an approach makes it difficult to discuss the data. If nothing has changed for 3,000 years, there is nothing to study. One can find Bible passages that portray Jews as good or wicked, as having the right to certain lands or as deserving nothing. This is a losing proposition. As delicately as possible, try to steer students away from this way of thinking. For some background on what is called Christian Zionism, see my article in the *Middle East Journal* (1987).

At the same time one might note that the geographic position of the Middle East has brought diverse cultures and religions into contact and conflict over many centuries, and that imperial armies have overrun the region countless times. Those wars of external conquest have inevitably helped foster suspicion of foreign powers and their habit of using bribery, threats, and actual force to gain influence.

Involved Students

Be particularly alert to the fact that your class may include students whose families are involved in the conflict and who may have intense personal feelings. In a recent semester when I was teaching the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, I had Jewish, Palestinian, Lebanese Shiite and Lebanese Christian students come to my office to discuss their personal perspectives and experiences. Each had family and friends involved in the conflict. To them, reading and studying was more than an abstract intellectual exercise. Any of the four could have been educationally damaged had I come across as biased or unsympathetic to human concerns.

The teacher can use involved students to the benefit of the class. A technique I use is to model students as experts with the following invitation: "Joe, you told me that your family is very interested in this

region. Could you tell us your family's story? And leaving aside your own personal views, could you summarize for us some of the perspectives that people in your family (group) might want us to understand?" By asking students to function as reporters, they are freed from personal statements that might provoke challenges. They can enlighten in a personal but neutral way.

The Rhetoric Wars

One or more of your students may be victims of the Rhetoric Wars and may have hostilities to one group or another. They may repeat sweeping hostile stereotypes about Jewish power, Palestinian terrorism, Islamic extremism, Arab backwardness, etc. This may be difficult. Such students may simply affirm that certain things are true and be hostile if you suggest they are not. I do three things:

- The first day of class, I warn students that the Rhetoric Warriors are around and tell them that we are going to study this in a way that frees us from simply accepting what someone else tells us. If you can tell students of a false view that you once had before you knew the facts it may help.
- During the unit I ask students to monitor and analyze their own pre-conceptions and to make a list of topics which they think they had misunderstood prior to studying the unit. This can be very revealing.
- I say to a student who makes a dogmatic statement, "Is there something in the reading that made you conclude that or is it a view you had before we began to study the material?" These techniques help students develop analytical detachment.

Empathy and New Learning

Learning takes place not just through the accumulation of facts but through a more open way of thinking and through changed understanding. It is probably fair to say that unless change occurs, learning has not taken place. It is imperative that you present both Jewish and Palestinian perspectives sympathetically, fairly, and with appreciation to the humanity of the peoples. Your role is to help your students understand controversial and complex positions. Present them in their best light, not as extremists or bigots or murderers. I often tell my students: when you understand someone's views well enough to defend them against their critics then you are free to say "but I still cannot accept 'x' or 'y.'" Until that point you are not reacting analytically but emotionally. It is good advice for us as teachers also.

It is not inconceivable that community militants may object to the presentation of certain views. The unit's goal is that all views be thoroughly and fairly presented. Your obligation is to help students understand. Your principal will back you up. If you have such a problem, call me.

Current Events

The unit has little on current issues such as peace talks. Palestinian and Israeli positions have a certain stability but are shifting across time (especially as governments and personalities change). *The Middle East Journal* and *The Journal of Palestine Studies* both have chronologies that are quite useful. JPS also reproduces in full speeches and position papers from all sides. These well-respected quarterly journals are available in academic libraries or from some newsstands.

Map Exercise

There is no separate map lesson plan, but you should make sure that students are familiar with the map, at least to the extent that they can understand the material. You might want to consider a one-day map orientation lesson. Some maps are included for your use.

Documents

There are primary documents included, stating first-hand the views of various participants. Some of these are incorporated in the text, others are attached as supplements. You will have to decide which are the most important and how many to use. Giving students a first-hand feel for what real personalities and groups say brings history and politics alive.

Terrorism

There is minimal reference to terrorism. There is reason for this. First, terrorism has become such a component of the Rhetoric Wars that it has almost ceased to have sufficiently precise meaning to be used in the classroom. Second, discussing graphic details is inherently inflammatory and inhibits learning. Even peoples whose leaders have engaged in attacks on innocent civilians have legitimate human interests in security, dignity, self-government. Very often there will be an effort to discredit Jews or Palestinians because of violent acts by their leaders. My advice: downplay such incidents as much as possible. Third, terrorism as a serious academic topic is sufficiently complex that it would require considerable effort on your part to do it justice. Hence, the only acts of violence that are mentioned in the unit are those that bear directly upon future events. Thus the Deir Yassin Massacre of 1948 is mentioned because it produced a flight of refugees, but the Entebbe hijacking of 1976 is not, since it had little long-range impact.

The problems of using the word terrorism can be illustrated by some examples of how different people have used it. **A)** When critics called Menachem Begin a terrorist, Begin wrote in his memoirs that his Irgun forces in 1948 were trying "to free our people of its chief affliction--fear." Since British rule was perpetuating fear and since fear was the essence of terrorism, "historically we were not terrorists. We were strictly speaking anti-terrorists." Begin says, "we used physical force because we were faced with physical force" but violence is not the issue. Terrorism "cannot be applied to a revolutionary war of liberation.... A revolution, or a revolutionary war, does not aim at instilling fear. Its object is to overthrow a regime and to set up a new regime in its place.... How could we go on living without arms, without a Homeland, without elementary means of defense?" (Begin, 59-61). This is a position that the violence-prone Palestinian extremist Abu Nidal could surely endorse. **B)** Israeli Defense Minister (later President) Ezer Weizman described his shock at being called a terrorist in a cabinet meeting because he criticized certain Israeli policies. **C)** A letter from a major Jewish organization says opposition to US aid to Israel is "economic terrorism." **D)** Arabs call Israeli bombing of Palestinian positions in Lebanon terrorism and insist that attacks on Israeli positions are legitimate resistance and not terroristic at all. **E)** Most Americans consider the destruction of the Beirut marine barracks in 1983 (when 241 marines were killed) a terroristic attack even though US government definitions of terrorism seem to exclude attacks on military targets. (The State Department in 1984 defined terrorism as "Premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine state agents.") **F)** There is also the unsavory modern usage of the word. World War II Germans used it to describe resistance to their occupation and the South Africa Terrorism Law included within it even peaceful resistance to apartheid. The word is best avoided.

Chronology

Students often have trouble with historical order. There is a chronology to help with this. This chronology is not meant to be complete in itself and has no explanations or discussions of events. It is designed to help orient students to time sequence.

THREE LEVELS OF CONFLICT

The conflict operates on at least three levels. The issues and players are different at different levels, but are interconnected. It is important to keep these levels separate.

1. International Level:

Outside powers have historically struggled to enhance their influence in the region. In the 1800s Britain, France, and Russia were the major players. In the mid-20th century, it was the US and the USSR. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 the dynamic again changed in a way not yet fully clear but probably enhancing the influence of Europeans and others (such as Germany, France, China).

A common tactic of outside powers is to align with an ethnic or religious minority and to build a power base upon that group. Thus in Lebanon the French built upon the Catholic Maronites while in Iraq the Turks and later the British built upon Sunni Arabs. In Jordan, Britain imported the Hashemite family from Mecca while in Palestine they worked with Jews from Europe. In each case, local parties had legitimate concerns and interests that were used by outsiders for their own purposes.

Historically, American policy has been to align with the three major non-Arab states in the region: Iran, Israel, and Turkey. (We also had ties with Jordan, Saudi Arabia and other states.) Our reliance upon these states began to disintegrate in 1979 when Ayatollah Khomeini overthrew the Shah of Iran, and in 1982 when the Israeli-Palestinian conflict spiraled out of control (this involved the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the siege of Beirut, the Sabra and Shatilla massacres, the death of 241 marines in Beirut, the hijacking of American commercial aircraft, the holding of American hostages for 5 years, and a host of violent acts against Westerners and Western institutions).

Since 1979 we moved closer to Egypt, tried to work out an arrangement with Iraq, secretly shipped arms to Iran (while denying it), cooperated with Syria in the 1991 Gulf War, and came close to an open break with the Shamir government in Israel (a break avoided by the defeat of Shamir at the polls in June, 1992). The talks that began in October 1991 were an American effort to reestablish a coherent foreign policy by defusing regional tensions and resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through negotiation.

2. Regional Level:

Within the region, countries compete against each other for influence, security, land, and water. Syria and Iraq are long-standing rivals, Israel and Jordan both staked historical claims to the West Bank (which Palestinians view as part of a future Palestinian state), Syria feels its security can only be assured if it has a friendly government in Lebanon, and Israel has similar concerns about the same country.

The most serious regional crisis centered on the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, an event that ultimately brought about the introduction of 500,000 American troops into the region. The consequent war led to a massive bombardment that dropped more tonnage on Iraq than fell upon all of Germany during the whole of World War II. It also led to widespread death, regional uprisings in Iraq and Turkey, and the presence of over a million refugees in Turkey.

3. Local Level:

This unit will focus primarily on the local level. If we conceive of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a one-hundred year long civil war, then many confusing issues are clarified. (Alternative approaches

would view it as a Western colonial intrusion into the Arab/Muslim world, a war of extermination by Arab states, a Christian-Jewish assault on Islam, or during the Cold War as a by-product of the US.-Soviet struggle). A local-oriented approach asks simple questions: How many people are on each side? How much land do they hold? How are they distributed across the geographic space? What resources do they bring to the struggle? Is a solution possible? That is the focus of this unit.

GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS AND PLACES

1. Eretz Israel:

This Hebrew term means "Land of Israel." It is not the same as the State of Israel. The word has mystical or messianic overtones that go beyond the boundaries of internationally-recognized Israel. To some Jewish nationalists, Eretz Israel includes Jordan and areas even up to the Euphrates (see Genesis 15:18-19). In Israel, politicians like Begin, Shamir, and Sharon vigorously resist the State Department's term "Occupied Territories" and use the Biblical terms Judea and Samaria. To them, the term "Occupied Territories" questions Jewish destiny and Biblical promises.

2. Green Line:

The Green Line refers to the area held by Israel when the fighting stopped in 1948 and hence was considered an armistice line in January, 1949. While that line is technically "temporary" it is in fact the border of internationally-recognized Israel. It does not include the areas occupied in 1967. This "temporary" border created diplomatic problems. Israel never defined its border, partially because it was waiting for a general settlement with its neighbors, partially because some Israeli parties (Likud and others on the right) hoped to move beyond the armistice lines of 1949. "Israel has remained a state without boundaries, the armistice lines lacking not only Arab or international recognition but internal Israeli recognition as well," according to Isaac. She says that "both internal and external constraints impeded Israel's recognition of the armistice lines as borders" and cites various tactical and diplomatic issues. "More numerous, of course, were those who refused to give formal sanction to the relinquishment of the historical boundaries of Israel" (p. 43).

This situation provoked concern among neighboring states who--rightly or wrongly--suspected Israel of having territorial ambitions. The failure to define the border was also a factor in the Vatican decision to withhold full diplomatic relations from Israel and Jordan. Jordan did not define its own western border until 1988 when it accepted the Jordan River as its frontier. The PLO refused until 1988 to define "Palestine" as anything less than the whole of the Mandate. Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt all have long-standing definitions of their borders, the Syrians finally clearing up remaining ambiguities by signing a treaty with Lebanon in 1990.

3. Jerusalem:

Keep in mind that there are several Jerusalems.

a. Ancient Jerusalem or the Old City is a small place less than a mile square, surrounded by an ancient wall. It is the "Holy City" of the three Abrahamic faiths: Judaism, Christianity, Islam. It includes the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the Western Wall, Al Aqsa Mosque, and the Dome of the Rock. It is broken into four "Quarters," one each for Jews, Christians, Muslims, and

Armenians (who are Christian but who have their own Quarter for historic reasons). By long-standing agreement each community controls its own Quarter. (During fighting in 1948, Jews were driven out of the Old City by Jordanian forces and did not return until 1967. This absence is a point of distress to Jews. After the Washington signing of the Israel-PLO Agreement, Yasser Arafat went to some lengths to emphasize that the Palestinian government would recognize Jewish rights to this area and that Jews would be warmly welcomed.)

b. West Jerusalem is Jewish Jerusalem. Much of it is the product of 20th century construction. Until 1948 it had many Palestinian communities, both Muslim and Christian. It now contains the Knesset (parliament), Yad Vashem (the Holocaust Memorial), the King David Hotel, most Israeli government ministries, and the main commercial and industrial districts.

c. East Jerusalem is Palestinian Jerusalem. It was mostly built in the late 19th and 20th century. It includes both Muslim and Christian populations. It also contains Jewish cemeteries.

d. Outer Jerusalem: As soon as the 1967 war ended, Israel built a phalanx of suburbs around the eastern and southern sides of the city in an effort to annex it. These include the Jewish neighborhoods of Neve Ya'akov, Sanhedria, French Hill.

e. Greater Jerusalem: Over the years, Israel expanded the boundaries of the city well to the north, south, and east, that is, well into traditionally Arab areas in West Bank. These annexations were not simply a response to urban expansion. "Jerusalem" now extends to the outskirts of Ramallah, the traditionally-Christian Palestinian town about 10 miles north of Jerusalem. It also includes part of the Muslim village of Beit Hanina. These different Jerusalems will surely become significant in talks as both Israelis and Palestinians insist that Jerusalem be their capital. The possibility of "cantonization" has been discussed. (three articles in *Foreign Affairs* address this topic. Palestinian professor Rashid Khalidi wrote "Thinking the Unthinkable: A Sovereign Palestinian State" in July, 1978; Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kolleck wrote "Sharing United Jerusalem" in Winter, 1989/90; and Jordanian diplomat Adnan Abu Odeh wrote "Two Capitals in an Undivided Jerusalem" in Spring, 1992).

4. Jordan:

At the end of World War I Britain and France divided the southwest Asia Arab part of the Ottoman Empire into three territories which we know as Palestine, Mesopotamia, Syria (these were ancient names). Syria and Palestine were quickly sub-divided, Syria into Syria and Lebanon, Palestine into Palestine and Transjordan. "Transjordan" was a typical British colonial name that located the colony in terms of London ("across the Jordan"). After the 1948 war, Transjordan united with the West Bank and renamed itself Jordan. The Emir of Transjordan then became the King of Jordan. To reduce student confusion, we use the term Jordan throughout.

5. Palestine:

This is the ancient name for what is today Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem). As currently used, it corresponds to the area known after World War I as the Mandate. Syria's Golan Province (partially occupied by Israel) is not a part of Palestine. Neither is Egypt's Sinai Peninsula, occupied by Israel from 1967 until the implementation of the Camp David Agreements in 1981. Nor is the Israeli-dominated "security zone" in southern Lebanon. Jordan is sometimes considered a part of geographic Palestine but is not a part of political Palestine since the Jordanians and Palestinians are separate (but related) peoples. Today the word Palestinian refers to the

Arab Palestinians be they Muslim or Christian and whether they live inside of Palestine or not. In Arabic, Palestine and Philistine are the same word, so when Palestinians read in the Bible about Philistines being on the coast when the Hebrews arrived, they consider themselves to be the same people, just as the Israelis consider themselves to be the same as the Hebrews. Before 1948 Jews from the area called themselves Palestinian. While a few Jews today identify with the Palestinian cause and call themselves Palestinians, this is unusual.

6. The Mandate:

At the end of World War I, Britain and France divided up the Arab World into what were called [Mandates](#). There were originally two of these, called Syria and Palestine. They were quickly sub-divided with Syria becoming Syria and Lebanon, and Palestine becoming Palestine and Transjordan. The Palestine mandate included a British commitment to create a Jewish homeland inside the territory. The final draft of the Palestine Mandate (approved by the League of Nations in 1922) split the mandate into two parts mentioned above. Many Zionists on the religio-nationalist right were angry at this since they believed that Jordan should be Jewish. Israeli supporters of this position often make the following argument: Jordan is part of the Jewish heritage and was promised to the Jewish people. We Jews agreed to one partition of Palestine in 1922 in which a Palestinian state (Jordan) was created. There should not be another Palestinian state. If the Palestinians want a state, they should recognize that they already have one and should go to it. Everything west of the Jordan River belongs to Israel as part of the Jewish heritage and Jewish state.

This position is not accepted by the international community. Neither Jordanians nor Palestinians nor Americans consider Jordan a Palestinian state. The 1993 Jordan-Israel agreement recognized the Jordan River as the boundary of Jordan.

7. Syria:

Under Ottoman/Turkish rule, the Arab lands south of Turkey (excluding Iraq) were treated as a common unit made up of several provinces (called Greater Syria by scholars). At the beginning of this century, all US immigrants from this area were typically identified as "Syrians" on immigration papers. Greater Syria included current-day Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, and the Palestinian Territories. When the various countries came into existence after World War I, the use of the term changed since then there was a country named Syria. It is important to keep this distinction in mind. There are political movements in the region (based mostly in Syria) that consider the whole region a common unit artificially partitioned by Western powers. To distinguish between the two usages of the word, use Syria to mean the country and Greater Syria to mean the larger province (but not including Iraq).

8. The Jordan Valley:

Students probably need to understand the geography of the Jordan Valley. It is a rift valley, meaning that there was a tear in the earth millions of years ago. (There is also a rift in Siberia in which Lake Baikal is situated.) Rifts are associated with deep lakes and earthquakes. The Jordan Rift includes the Gulf of Aqaba (which filled with water), proceeds south into Ethiopia, continues into Africa (it splits into two wings--one to the east through Kenya and Tanzania, one west bordered by Rwanda and Burundi) and finally peters out and exits into the Indian Ocean north of Durban.

If we could saw off the area vertically somewhere through Jerusalem and Amman and look at the cross-section from the side we would see a dramatic pattern. The land is flat on the coast (the Plain of Sharon), rises up to a mountainous plateau (including Jerusalem and the major Palestinian population centers),

then drops dramatically into the valley, then is flat for some miles, including the Jordan River, then rises dramatically up to another plain (that includes Amman and the major Jordanian population centers), then runs into the Jordan desert which is sparsely populated. When Israelis talk about "security settlements" in the Occupied Territories, they are talking about settlements along the Jordan River and along the rift escarpment overlooking the valley. Given the technology of 1967, there were legitimate concerns that a quiet mobilization across the Jordan could lead to a quick attack for which the Israelis would not be prepared. The settlements placed in the Valley and on the heights were designed to function as outposts. At the same time, these Palestinian highlands are where the bulk of the Palestinian population lives. In the Jordan valley there is less population because of the dryness. Few strategic thinkers in Israel today believe these areas are necessary for security reasons, because new radar and satellite technology have made advanced warning possible without physical outposts.

Note on Territory and Security: Several Israeli organizations and personalities hold the above view. The Council for Peace and Security, made up of more than 200 retired generals and other officers, holds that the occupation is a strategic liability for Israel. The Deputy head of the Jaffee Center, a Tel Aviv think tank close to Mossad and military intelligence, says that after the Gulf War, Israeli strategic thinking was that Israel's security border was the eastern border of Jordan and that if it were secure, the political border was less significant. General Dan Shomrom, head of the IDF, said in his farewell speech in 1991 the following: "A political arrangement, when it exists, is far more than just territory. It is linked to limiting weapons [and the] supervision of one country over another. Thus if you are talking about nations at war, without doubt territory has a very great significance. But when you talk about these other arrangements, it is clear that these include various elements that diminish the threat of giving up territory and offer the possibility, for example, of long range warning."

Likudists such as Moshe Arens, Defense Minister until 1992, would disagree: "I don't believe Israel should turn over any more territory. Israel is small enough as it is -- one of the smallest countries in the world. She is a country facing very serious security problems and is under the constant threat of attack by at least some of her neighbors. Relinquishing control over areas like Judea, Samaria, Gaza, or the Golan Heights would endanger the very existence of the State of Israel and our ability to defend ourselves." (Merrill Simon, *Moshe Arens, Statesman and Scientist, Speaks Out*. Middle Island, NY: Dean Books, 1988).

9. An Opportunity:

Because even names are politically charged, you might approach this directly and use it as an opportunity. Do we call the areas captured by Israel in 1967 the Occupied Territories, Judea and Samaria, or just Palestine? (The State Department prefers the first, Israel's Likud Party uses the second, the PLO prefers the last.) Ask students what names newspapers or magazines use. What do they find? What do they recommend we use in class?

PLACES STUDENTS SHOULD KNOW

1. Countries: Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Egypt
2. Regions: Galilee, Gaza, Golan Province/Golan Heights, Hejaz, Sinai peninsula, West Bank.
3. Cities: Amman, Baghdad, Beirut, Damascus, Haifa, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Nablus, Ramallah, Bethlehem and Hebron.
4. Other: Euphrates River, Gulf of Aqaba, Jordan River, Jordan Valley, Litani River, Red Sea.

TEACHING STRATEGY

Each Lesson includes a Teaching Strategy Section derived from the goals of the lesson. Some suggestions are projects that have worked in my own classes, some are from various curriculum specialists who read the unit. The suggestions are designed to dovetail with the Questions and Exercises section in the Student Lesson. Read that student section as a supplement to your Strategies section.

The suggestions in the Teaching Strategy section try to address the broader educational goal of the Lesson. In each Lesson there are certain facts to be learned, but there is also broader learning process lodged in the data. To the extent possible, these broader goals are outlined at the beginning of each strategy section. As you plan your class, keep in mind both levels of learning: factual and process.

Few teachers have the luxury of adding a long unit to the curriculum. One teacher found a way around this. Lessons One and Two can be used separately, the Partition lesson during classes on World War I, and the Zionism lesson during classes on nineteenth century Europe. Later, Lessons Three, Four and Five can be done as a block with students prepared and expectant.

You will find that each of these Lessons could easily stretch into several days if you explored all aspects of the topic fully. For that reason, there are far more suggestions than you will need. Pick and choose what you need and find useful. Tailor the Lesson to your students, and to your own strengths and interests. If a suggestion seems helpful, use it. If it does not, ignore it. If you think of something that works but is not in the lesson or if some suggestion simply fails, [write](#) or call me at 4901 Evergreen Road, Dearborn, Michigan 49126. I would be particularly interested in hearing how the unit works in classrooms. If problems arise, call me at (313) 593-5384.

Ronald R. Stockton, November, 1993

cmenas@umich.edu