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1. ABOUT THE CURRICULUM

The Choices Program was established in 1988 at Brown University’s Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs to teach high school students – and later general audiences – how to weigh contemporary international policy issues by weighing risks and trade-offs in considering the future of U.S. foreign and domestic policy.

The program was expanded to provide social science curricula for secondary schools with student readings and study guides that are available for purchase (print) or by subscription (digital). Its videos about history, current events and international policy are available online for free, as well being embedded in its digital subscription. Since 2018, the program has been affiliated with Brown University’s Department of History. The curriculum is marketed as a nexus between academia and high school and its promoters boast of its use in 8,000 high schools across the U.S. states, as well as in 200 international schools.

Choices offers 41 curriculum units on American History, World History, Current Issues, Geography, Africana Studies and Asian Studies, of which only a very few address – directly or tangentially – Zionism, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the State of Israel.

It is the treatment of the latter three topics that is the focus of our study.1

2. OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

The curriculum delivers an anti-Zionist, agenda-based narrative of the sort routinely advanced by the extremist, anti-Zionist Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) Movement and is representative of Palestine Liberation ideology that seeks an end to the Jewish state. Thus, its core messaging is not about why Palestinians should have their own, independent state in the Middle East but about why Jews should not.

It is part of an approach to teaching that values and promotes sectarian activism over objective scholarship and partisan politics over scholastic rigor and fact-based analysis. The curriculum is being increasingly pushed into the U.S. education system by anti-Zionist activist-scholars. Israel Academia Monitor explains their perspective:

The traditional positivist school of thought, which emphasized objectivity and facts, is a cover-up for Western dominance; scholars have a duty to expose these “falsehoods” and craft an alternative historical narrative. In the new narrative, the Palestinians are considered the

---

1 This analysis focuses primarily on the freely accessible videos addressing these topics and on “The Middle East: Questions for U.S. Policy,” the only unit that directly delves into Israel, Zionism and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Also examined here are passing references to the topics in the units “The Syrian Civil War,” “Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy,” and “Empire, Republic, Democracy: Turkey’s Past and Future.”
blameless victims of Western colonialism, with Israel being the modern colonial manifestation – an apartheid state.2

The Choices curriculum conveys this anti-Zionist narrative through videos and readings that repeat and highlight falsehoods to demonize and delegitimize the Jewish state. It is informed by faculty, students, and visiting scholars at Brown University specializing in Middle East Studies, many of whom are active promoters of the BDS movement against Israel.3 4 5

Their approach is heavily influenced by Brown’s Center for Middle Eastern Studies (CMES) Department and particularly the Palestine Studies division established by Beshara Doumani.6 Indeed, a major contributor to the Choices curriculum on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Adi Ophir, has conveyed similar messaging in a webinar organized by the Palestine Studies division of the CMES Department, where he revealed that he “pray(s) for the end of Jewish supremacy in Palestine” and made false allegations about “Jewish mobs thirsty for Palestinian blood” with the type of comparison to Nazi Germany that is considered a manifestation of antisemitism under the widely-adopted IHRA definition.7

While the Choices Program’s claims it “holds itself and its collaborators to the highest standards of scholarly integrity,” our investigation has revealed just the opposite. Contrary to the various codes of conduct, ethics and standards Choices claims to uphold, the curriculum’s treatment of Zionism, Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict is dishonest, unfair, and unscholarly. It is marked by a selective account of events that conceals critical information, blurs timelines and distorts history. Its repeated themes include Palestinian indigeneity, Zionism as a form of European colonialism, the justification of Arab aggression, the erasure of Palestinian terrorism and the delegitimization of the Jewish state.

Among the dozens of workshops, webinars and conferences hosted by the Choices program as part of its professional outreach are workshops on teaching the Middle East, some of which were co-sponsored with the Qatar Foundation International (QFI).8 9 Choices similarly partnered with QFI to

cover the cost of Middle East-focused units of the curriculum for Middle and High school teachers.\textsuperscript{10} Qatar Foundation International is the U.S. subsidiary of the Qatar foundation, a registered foreign agent. An investigation by The Lawfare Project of its involvement in the American education system concluded that “the influence Qatar exerts through its funding of programs amount to paid political speech that emphasize an understanding of only the positive aspects of Islam while omitting a balanced discussion of other religions or belief systems, most notably Judaism.” \textsuperscript{11} 12

3. PRIMARY ANTI-ZIONIST VIDEOS

In 2016, the \textit{Choices} program introduced a video portal to access the curriculum’s collection of instructional videos. The program now offers more than 1,800 short (1-4 minutes in length) videos on a variety of topics by invited scholars. These form a central component of the various teaching units and are available for free online and as recommended resources for students.

The videos addressing Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict are of major concern, not only because the curriculum uses them as the basis for assignments, lessons and projects but because they are freely accessible as an online resource to anyone with internet access, regardless of whether or not they purchase or subscribe to the curriculum. According to the program’s promotional material, the next step is to create a stand-alone, searchable collection, accessible directly from the \textit{Choices} home page.

The instructors who address Israel, Zionism and the Arab-Israeli conflict are billed as “scholars” and “leading experts” but include longtime, anti-Zionist activists — non-academic professionals as well as professors and students — who use the \textit{Choices} platform to advance their biased agenda. The program’s website conceals their partisan affiliations, activism, and campaigns, allowing them to promote their anti-Zionist narrative under the guise of scholarship.

b. REMA HAMMAMI

Rema Hammami is one of the main video contributors, with eight videos addressing the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Her bio on the \textit{Choices} Scholars page includes a long list of her academic credentials -- BA in political science, MA and PhD in cultural anthropology, associate professor of anthropology at Birzeit University, faculty member in the Institute of Women’s Studies, contributing editor to \textit{Middle East}

\textsuperscript{10} Following The Lawfare Project’s exposure of Qatar’s involvement in the American education system, QFI’s website no longer includes the curriculum award offer. The archived page, however, is still accessible. “Curriculum Award Program,” \textit{Qatar Foundation International}, available at \url{https://web.archive.org/web/20210116015650/https://www.qfi.org/opportunities/curriculum-award-program/} (archived version dated 16 January 2021).


What her bio omits, however, is that she is a strong proponent of the BDS movement against the Jewish state, who calls for boycotting Israeli academic institutions in general, who has campaigned to boycott an international oral history conference in Israel, and who, in a letter urging the Dutch government to “take measures of boycott, divestment and sanctions against the State of Israel,” falsely accused Israel of committing war crimes against the civilian Palestinian population.

Like most BDS proponents, Hammami opposes the very existence of a Jewish state: She campaigns against a two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and lobbies against the IHRA definition of antisemitism that has been widely adopted around the globe.

**THEMES**

How does Hammami’s activism inform her teaching about U.S. policy in the Middle East? With her aura of scholarship and quiet, authoritative tones, the professor turns the *Choices* curriculum into a portal through which to indoctrinate an uninformed and unsuspecting audience with a political, revisionist white-colonialist-narrative to delegitimize the State of Israel.

**i. Palestinian Indigeneity/European Colonialism**

Hammami presents Palestinian Arabs as the indigenous people who were colonized and dispossessed to make room for European Jews with only a tenuous biblical connection to the land. She explains:

Fundamentally, [the Palestinian-Israeli conflict] is a conflict over land. What you see on the map now is Israel. Until 1948, that was Palestine. It wasn’t independent but it was Palestine, and it was predominantly populated by Palestinian Arabs—Muslims and Christians. And then it was decided to be made also the national home for the Jewish people, who have biblical links but who were not a big part of the population. Especially after the Holocaust, the world felt very strongly that the Jewish people needed a home and a haven and the Zionist...
movement that represented the vast majority of Jewish people at that time wanted that home to be in biblical Israel, which was Palestine.

...Due to the circumstances at the time – the understandable sympathy with the Jewish people – the UN decided to partition, to split the land, and say, ‘OK, these parts are going to be the Jewish homeland and they’re going to be called Israel and these parts are going to be for the Palestinians.’ And they said very clearly that the parts that are going to be the Jewish homeland, the indigenous people, the Palestinians who were living there, should have the right to stay.”

By employing the name “Palestine” and referring to “Palestinian Arabs – Muslims and Christians” but never mentioning “Palestinian Jews” — as the Jewish inhabitants of the land were then called — Hammami implies a direct connection between Arab inhabitants of the land in 1948 and the ancient, dwellers of the Roman-named Palaestina. In this way, as well as with her direct reference to Palestinians as ‘indigenous’, Hammami is establishing the Palestinians as the native people of the land. As the late historian and Middle East expert Bernard Lewis pointed out, it is a deliberate “tactic meant to create a connection and sense of identity [between modern Palestinian Arabs] with the homeland through the ages.”

At the same time, the centrality of the Land of Israel to Judaism is misrepresented as little more than some “biblical links.” Erased from this narrative are the millennia of Jewish habitation in the Land of Israel, including the time when they were sovereigns of the land. The periods of Jewish sovereignty are the only examples of autonomy in the long history of that land. Students do not learn that despite the attempts by various conquerors to expel the Jews from their homeland, the love and yearning for Zion (one of the biblical names for Jerusalem and the Land of Israel) – continued to constitute a central core of Judaism and Jewish identity. The acceptance of Zion as the Jewish homeland was maintained throughout conquests by Babylonians, Greeks, Romans (the ones who changed the name of Judea to Palaestina), Arabs, Crusaders, Mamluks, Ottoman Turks, and British. Thoughout the various attempts to subjugate and expel the Jews from their land, the Jewish people maintained an almost continuous presence there, returning to restore communities even during periods of exile.

In an inversion of history, this narrative entirely ignores Arab and Muslim imperialism that engulfed vast stretches of north Africa and southern Europe, as well as the historic Land of Israel inhabited by Jews and other non-Arabs while discrediting the Zionist movement as more recent European colonialism.

ii. Establishment of the Jewish State is Due to Holocaust

Hammami does not explain that the root of the modern Zionist movement lies in the historic Zionism that is at the core of Judaism.

Nor does she indicate that international support for re-establishing a modern Jewish state in the Jewish ancestral homeland began with the Balfour Declaration in 1917 and that the British Mandate

---


was supported by the League of Nations in 1922,\textsuperscript{21} granted specifically to allow for the “reconstitution of a Jewish ‘national home’ in their ancestral homeland.” Instead, Hammami engages in historical revisionism by falsely implying that the entire raison d’être of the Jewish state was to serve as a refuge for Jewish victims of the Nazis. It distorts the nature of the Jewish state and of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

### iii. Palestinians: Blameless Victims of Zionist Greed and Aggression

Hammami ties current events to the history of the region by falsely painting every new event as part of an ongoing, unilateral tale of Zionist land grab and dispossession of native Arabs:

> “What you have now is that within Israel, which is much more powerful, from 1967, they took the last Palestinian territories that were left in 1948, which is Gaza and the West Bank, and then continued to keep building and trying to take more of Palestinian land, so when you see on the news that a new settlement has been built, this is really what we’re talking about. A settlement is not just a community. It’s a way of spreading the space of Israel into the remaining Palestinian territory until there’s almost nothing left for Palestinians to live on.”\textsuperscript{22}

By strategically omitting significant events and crucial history, Hammami alters the narrative. She conceals the Arab leadership’s rejection of the partition plan, the 1948 invasion of the nascent state of Israel by five Arab armies to rid the area of a Jewish state. She makes no mention of the continuous attacks by Arab fedayeen and Palestinian terrorists against the Jewish population in Israel, the 1967 war of aggression by Jordan, Egypt and Syria against Israel which resulted in Israel gaining control of the West Bank and Jordan, the subsequent refusal of Arab leaders to negotiate peace with Israel, and the steadfast rejection by Arab Palestinian leaders of a Jewish state alongside a Palestinian one.

In other words, Hammami erases Arab agency, aggression and responsibility for the ongoing conflict to blame Israel entirely for the lack of peace and lack of a Palestinian state.

The expunging of Palestinian terrorism and terrorists is seen again in another video by Hammami where she whitewashes Hamas, designated a terrorist organization by much of the non-Arab international community including Israel, the U.S., Canada, Japan, the U.K., Australia and the European Union, a group whose recent massacre of civilians in Israel and abduction of infants and elderly, children, women, and men leaves no question about Hamas’ terrorist, genocidal nature.

But even before the graphic proof of Hamas’ atrocities and the repetition by its leaders of its genocidal goals, the declared goal of Hamas has always been to destroy the Jewish state and replace it with an Islamic one. And its enmity was directed not only toward Israel, but toward the Jews.

Nonetheless, Hammami, in her 2014 video, describes Hamas as a political party akin to Israel’s Likud party on the political right. The Hamas party, she declares, is

> “an Islamic movement that doesn’t believe in a two-state solution and has historically rejected the existence of Israel, although over the last five years, they have taken political positions


\textsuperscript{22} Hammami, Why is There a Conflict Video.
that Israel is a reality, and, therefore, they’re just going to have to accept it… The Likud, even though it says it’s for a two-state solution, actually is also [like Hamas] very rejectionist and has been the most powerful political party in making sure that the West Bank gets colonized and Israeli territory extended into it.”

In order to set up this false “parallel” between Israel’s major political parties on the one side and Hamas and the PA on the other side, Hammami hides not only the terrorist actions by Hamas and affiliated Palestinian terrorist organizations and their genocidal foundational ideology, but the rejectionism of a Jewish state by both the Palestinian Authority (PA) and Hamas.

Thus, students are not told that while Israel has come to the negotiating table time and time again, with both major parties – Likud and Labor – offering compromises for a peaceful, two-state solution, Hamas and the Palestinian Authority (PA) have remained steadfast in their rejection of a Jewish state as part of a two-state solution. PA President Mahmoud Abbas asserted this decisively in a television interview:

I’ve said it before, and I’ll say it again: I will never recognize the Jewishness of the state, or a “Jewish state.”

He reiterated this stance again a few years later when he declared:

The Palestinians won’t recognize the Jewishness of the State of Israel and won’t accept it. The Israelis say that if we don’t recognize the Jewishness of Israel there would be no solution. And we say that we won’t recognize or accept the Jewishness of Israel and we have many reasons for this rejection.

The PA president and PA officials have repeated their adamant refusal to recognize Israel as a Jewish state.

And, contrary to Hammami’s whitewashing of Hamas by suggesting it softened its rejectionist and extreme stance, the terrorist group never revoked its governing Covenant/Charter of 1988 which continues to dictate the groups’ foundational ideology, goals and methods:

“This Covenant of the Islamic Resistance Movement (HAMAS), clarifies its picture, reveals its identity, outlines its stand, explains its aims, speaks about its hopes, and calls for its support,

---


adoption and joining its ranks. Our struggle against the Jews is very great and very serious. It needs all sincere efforts. It is a step that inevitably should be followed by other steps. The Movement is but one squadron that should be supported by more and more squadrons from this vast Arab and Islamic world, until the enemy is vanquished and Allah's victory is realised” (Preamble).\(^9\)

“The Islamic Resistance Movement aspires to the realisation of Allah's promise, no matter how long that should take. The Prophet, Allah bless him and grant him salvation, has said, 'The Day of Judgement will not come about until Moslems fight the Jews (killing the Jews), when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and trees will say O Moslems, O Abdulla, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him. Only the Gharkad tree, (evidently a certain kind of tree) would not do that because it is one of the trees of the Jews.' (related by al-Bukhari and Moslem)” (Article 7).\(^{30}\)

“The Islamic Resistance Movement believes that the land of Palestine is an Islamic Waqf consecrated for future Moslem generations until Judgement Day. It, or any part of it, should not be squandered: it, or any part of it, should not be given up” (Article 11).\(^{31}\)

“Initiatives, and so-called peaceful solutions and international conferences, are in contradiction to the principles of the Islamic Resistance Movement. Abusing any part of Palestine is abuse directed against part of religion.... International peace conferences are only ways of setting the infidels in the land of the Moslems as arbitrators... There is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad. Initiatives, proposals and international conferences are all a waste of time and vain endeavors. The Palestinian people know better than to consent to having their future, rights and fate toyed with” (Article 13).\(^{32}\)

In her discussion about how the ongoing conflict impacts Palestinian women, Hammami reinforces the image of Palestinians as blameless victims of Israeli Jews. Among her assertions:

“Men are not very good at coping, especially in a war in which men are not fighters. They’re just a husband and breadwinner, then suddenly your whole house is bombed or your business is lost or something like this... situations where men cannot protect their families...This is what happens over and over again.”\(^{33}\)

In Hammami’s inversion of reality, there exist no Palestinian terrorists who murder and maim innocent Israelis. There are no control centers and underground tunnels where terrorist attacks are planned and organized, no covert “factories” and network of tunnels where explosives are constructed, stored and transported. There are no Palestinian terrorist groups that target civilian population centers inside Israel with rockets and missiles. There are no Palestinians who threaten the security and indeed, the existence of Israel’s citizens. In this version of events, Palestinians are all


\(^{30}\) Ibid.

\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.

blameless victims who bear no role in the perpetuation of the conflict and Israel is the sole aggressor arbitrarily targeting Palestinian innocents.

iv. The Jewish State is Entirely to Blame for Arab Suffering

To engage American students, Hammami sets up an analogy between Palestinian Arabs in the area and a hypothetical American family living in different U.S. states. It is a confusing analogy predicated upon the false notion that Israel is arbitrarily occupying and restricting rights to residents of what was once an independent Palestinian Arab state that encompassed all of Israel and the disputed territories.

“The Palestinians are one people. Because of what happened in 1948, they got split into these different territories. The ones who were able to stay in the Israeli zone after 1948 ultimately became Israeli citizens. The ones in the Gaza and the West Bank between 1948 and 67 came under other governments, Gaza was integrated into Egypt, the West Bank was integrated into Jordan... It’s like Americans. If you’re all American, you’ve probably got bits of your family maybe in California, or New Jersey or whatever. And then, somebody comes along and splits America into three zones and then says, ‘you’re east Americans, and you’re middle Americans, and you’re West Americans, so you have different levels of rights and different kinds of citizenship.

Israel controls all three areas now, since 1967, but it has different rules and laws operating for Palestinians in each different zone... Israel, of course, controls all of the movement -- with checkpoints and with permits, with walls and fences. Any Palestinian outside of Gaza cannot get into Gaza because Israel controls who goes in. And the same is true. Gazans cannot come into Israel and they can’t get into the West Bank, so we have a situation where Palestinians in each one of these three areas are completely cut off from each other. The whole Gaza economy cannot function because of this Israeli blockade on it. The population is plunged into poverty, the levels of people who are out of work, the inability of businesses to function because they can’t get materials in, they can’t get products out. The West Bank is not under such a stringent siege and sanction. At the same time, the West Bank economy is completely controlled by Israel. Palestinians can’t independently import anything or export anything.”

Contrary to Hammami’s implication, there was never an independent Palestinian state that was taken over by the Jews. It is part of the false notion she promotes of indigenous Palestinian Arabs vs. Jewish colonizers. Again, the contributing factors to the current situation for which Arabs bear responsibility are concealed. These include Arab rejection of partition of the territory into a Jewish and an Arab state in 1947 and the subsequent 1948 Arab war on the State of Israel; all the other Arab attempts to annihilate the Jewish state through war and terrorism; the fact that following Israel’s complete withdrawal of its forces from the Gaza Strip, the Hamas terrorist group took over governance of Gaza, violently ridding themselves of their Palestinian Authority rivals, and turned the territory into a base from which to attack Israel and achieve the goal of eliminating a Jewish state in the region. With the total erasure of Arab aggression and Israel’s security needs, Hammami distorts history to blame the plight of Palestinians on the creation of, and efforts to maintain, a secure Jewish state of Israel.

v. Israel Prevents the Possibility of a Two-State Solution

The BDS movement is adamantly opposed to a two-state solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which has long been the accepted goal of successive American governments, because it does not accept the existence of a Jewish state within any borders in the region. Hammami uses the Choices platform to further her campaign against the two-state solution, adopting strategic argumentation for uninitiated American youth to discredit the notion of two neighboring states. She presents it as unfeasible due to Israel’s alleged greed.

“The problem with [a two-state solution] is that even though Israel stopped being inside Gaza in 2005, it still holds on to Gaza from the outside, not letting Gazans go in or out, not letting UN humanitarian aid go in or out, not letting anyone or anything go in or out. In the West Bank, Israel wants a big chunk of the territory in the West Bank and that’s why it’s built all these settlements in the West Bank. And there are now 400,000 Israelis who are living in these colonies in the West Bank, so Israel does not want to give up the West Bank, and this situation has reached such a high level of really chopping up the territory of the West Bank that many Palestinians – and not just Palestinians – are starting to say this two-state solution is just not going to work because in the West Bank, the fertile land, which is the place you can really have a state geographically and territorially, compared to Gaza which is just a tiny little strip, has disappeared into being part of Israeli territory...The reality is that the facts on the ground are leading to a situation where [a two-state solution] is going to be physically impossible.”36 [emphasis added]

Hammami’s account is untrue, riddled with omissions and patent falsehoods. Concealed is the fact that the Palestinians were offered a state of their own multiple times, but their leaders rejected any two-state solution that would include a Jewish state.37

Also concealed, is that after Israel completely withdrew from the Gaza Strip, Hamas violently took over the territory from the Palestinian Authority (June 2007). The terrorist group turned the strip into a launching ground to attack Israel. Egypt to Gaza’s south was also threatened by political unrest and concerns about the new terrorist regime. Israel and Egypt restricted their borders with Gaza to limit entry of Gazans into their borders and to restrict entry of dual-purpose materials that could be used for weaponry and the extensive terrorist infrastructure Hamas was building. Despite Hamas’ ongoing state of war and openly stated mission to eliminate the Jewish state, Israel had granted thousands of Gazans both humanitarian and work permits to enter Israel for medical treatment or work. Until the Oct. 7, 2023 Hamas massacre, Israel also provided Gaza with water and electricity and allowed humanitarian aid through its border.

Throughout the years, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) has kept monthly tallies of the access of people and movement from and into Gaza at the various

35 Open Letter to Mahmoud Abbas.
crossing points, which changes according to security risks. That Israel prohibits “anyone and anything” from entering or exiting Gaza is therefore a clear and absurd prevarication.

b. ADI OPHIR

Adi Ophir is another major contributor, with seven videos on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Although he has made clear his extremist views in webinars and lectures at Brown University (as mentioned above), his bio on the Choices website portrays him as a more mainstream academic -- an Israeli philosopher and professor emeritus at Tel Aviv University, director of The Minerva Humanities Center, and a visiting professor at the Cogut Institute for the Humanities and the Center for Middle East Studies at Brown University. It also mentions that he is the founding editor of Theory and Criticism, which it describes as “Israel’s leading journal of critical theory” and lists titles of books he’s authored.

What it does not say is that the journal he founded is considered “the flagship organ of post-Zionist thought” and that that he is notorious as an anti-Zionist on the fringes whose scholarship is dedicated to delegitimizing the existence of the Jewish state. In fact, Ophir himself even acknowledged in a May 2021 teach-in at Brown University that his views are representative of only “a very tiny minority within Israeli society.”

The Choices bio makes no mention of Ophir’s radical, public activism at Brown and elsewhere: He was a keynote speaker at “Israeli Apartheid Week,” an anti-Zionist event held jointly at London’s School of Oriental and African Studies, the London School of Economics and University College, London. He petitioned for the dismantlement of a Jewish state, accusing it of being apartheid, and signed onto multiple anti-Israel petitions.

---

40 See Yoram Hazony, The Jewish State: The Struggle for Israel’s Soul (Basic Books, 2000), p. 12. Ophir is quoted as saying “They keep on telling us about the return of the Jews to history as a political and military power [...] and about the Jewish military strength that enables us to defend Jews wherever they may be [...] [But] Jewish sovereignty [...] has turned out to be the biggest danger to Jewish cultural and moral existence [...] They tell us that the only question left open, the only real question, is how to get "peace" [...] They fail to realize that the real question lies in the very idea of national sovereignty [...] We envision a state that will not be a [Jewish] nation-state.”
44 See “Open letter: Professor Alison Bashford – Please reconsider the Dan David Prize,” Google Docs, https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfJrVyp7UzD7h8813e9vezuolHxC3YOpT6w6izYxg-D6N6yQ/viewform?pli=1 (last visited 20 December 2023).
46 Brown Solidarity Letter.
Ophir uses his *Choices* platform to discredit the creation and existence of the Jewish state. His focus, he explains, is the lexicon used in Israeli political discourse. Ophir employs his own lexicon—e.g., “seize,” “deport,” “colonize,” “Land of Palestine”—to impart the false message that the Jewish state is racist and apartheid, born and expanded through the dispossession and ethnic cleansing of a native, Arab population.

### i. Zionists Seized and Colonized Palestinian Land

Ophir’s video about how the “events of 1948” affected the lives of Jews and Arabs, begins with the following introductory text:

> After World War II, the United Nations proposed a partition plan for separate Jewish and Arab states in Palestine that was accepted by Jewish Zionist leaders and opposed by Palestinian and other Arab leaders. This led to a war that ended in 1949 with **Zionist troops having seized an even larger portion of the land than what had been proposed** by the UN. [emphasis added]^{47}

The same message is repeated in the video regarding “the events of 1967,” where Ophir asserts that in 1948, the “Land of Palestine” was partitioned, and the “Palestinian community” was dispersed. The screen text reads:

> The United Nations proposed a partition in 1947, but when the 1947-1949 Israeli-Palestinian war ended, **Israel had occupied even more land the partition plan had proposed.** [sic] [emphasis added]^{48}

Ophir then explains:

> “The big change of ’67 was to bring **all of Palestine** under Israeli control for the first time, and this control continues until this day.”^{49}

Employing the same rhetorical trick as Hammami, Ophir deceptively using the phrase “Land of Palestine” to suggest it was indigenous Palestinian land and reserves the term “Palestinian” for Arabs alone, although both Jews and Arabs were residents of Palestine, with the Jewish inhabitants known as “Palestinian Jews.” It is a common tactic used by anti-Zionist activists to portray Arabs as the indigenous people of the land displaced by Jewish interlopers. (See above, discussion of Hammami’s videos.)

Like Hammami, Ophir conceals the fact that five Arab armies sought to eliminate the newly declared State of Israel in violation of the UN Charter. Rather than accurately informing students that Israel

---


^{49} Ibid.
went to war to repel hostile forces and defend the Jewish state from annihilation, Ophir falsely suggests that Jews went to war to “seize” and “occupy” additional territory.

ii. Palestinian Arab Refugees vs. Jewish Refugees

Ophir declares that three quarters of a million Palestinian Arabs were “deported” or escaped from Israel and couldn’t come back.

The definition of “deportation” is the forcing of people to leave the country on the grounds of illegal status or for having broken the law. However, the vast majority of Arabs who became refugees were not deported but fled the territory -- at the urging of their leaders, or following the example of Arab elites, or out of concern for their own safety, often despite exhortations from the Palestinian Jewish leadership for them to stay.

In a small minority of cases, Arab residents were expelled from their homes during fighting and in the context of a war that was initiated by their leaders. This is not the concept of “deportation” Ophir leads students to believe.

Ophir draws upon an entirely different lexicon to distort the case of Jewish refugees from Arab countries, claiming that Jews “from North Africa and Arab countries – Iraq and Syria” were “brought” to Israel in 1948 “as a kind of a supplement for European Jewry.”

He deceptively uses the language “brought to” Israel instead of the accurate “found refuge in” or “were absorbed by” Israel. In this way, he conceals that these immigrants were among the more than 800,000 Jews from Arab and Muslim countries who were driven from their homes or otherwise forced to flee from countries where they had lived for generations during the increasing hostility of Arabs toward Jews following the 1948 Arab war on Israel and the creation of a Jewish state.

The Iraqi Jews to whom Ophir alludes had been, just a few years earlier, in 1941, targets of a brutal and extended massacre known as the Farhoud, and, after the passage of the partition resolution, were subject to new depredation, persecution and oppression by Iraqi authorities angered at the idea of a Jewish state in Israel. The persecution resulted in effective expulsion for almost the entire Iraqi Jewish community.

As to the Syrian Jews he mentions, a devastating pogrom on Aleppo Jews, followed by intensive persecution of Jews by Syrian authorities—freezing of bank accounts, seizure of and prohibition from purchasing property, boycott of businesses, and physical attacks on Jews resulted in the flight of Syrian Jews to Israel.

---

50 Ophir, Events of 1948 Video.
51 Ophir, Events of 1967 Video.
52 See, for example, David Ben-Gurion, REBIRTH AND DESTINY OF ISRAEL (Philosophical Library, 1954), p. 220 (The Assembly of Palestine Jewry issued an appeal on October 2, 1947, saying: “We will do everything in our power to maintain peace, and establish a cooperation gainful to both [Jews and Arabs]. It is now, here and now, from Jerusalem itself, that a call must go out to the Arab nations to join forces with Jewry and the destined Jewish State and work shoulder to shoulder for our common good, for the peace and progress of sovereign equals.”).
54 Ophir, Events of 1948 Video.
In fact, more Jews from Arab countries became refugees than did Arabs fleeing Israel as the result of the 1948 war – a fact strategically missing from Ophir’s narrative. The difference is that three quarters of the Jews displaced from Arab countries found refuge in the new Jewish state while the Arab refugees were denied citizenship and absorption in most Arab states (with the exception of Jordan).

Ophir also twists history by concealing the Arab aggression and hostile acts that precipitated the 1967 war. Without explaining that it was another war forced upon the Jewish state by its Arab neighbors and fought by Israel in self-defence55, Ophir misleadingly tells students that the war meant Israel’s “colonizing project was open again” with “a new frontier for colonization.” 56

iii. The Jewish State is Racist

With the cover-up of Arab aggression and the concomitant erasure of Israeli security concerns, Ophir’s message is that Israeli policies that negatively impact Palestinians are racist and apartheid in nature.

He implies that Israel imposed race-based, martial law on Arab citizens of Israel in 1948 without noting that the military administration was established as a security measure within a defined geographical area, i.e. border communities and not on racial grounds. And he contends that Israel made the Arabs who remained in 1948 into “second-class citizens”57 and that their “discrimination and deprivation is...institutionalized under Israeli law.”58

The professor makes no attempt to provide any evidence for these assertions, no attempt to show or explain how deprivation and discrimination is institutionalized in Israeli law or in what way Arabs are second-class citizens. His mere statement, he apparently believes, is proof enough.

But examining the echo chamber of activists opposed to a Jewish state who do specify the types of laws they consider discriminatory, for example, Adalah,59 it becomes clear that most pertain to characterizing Israel as a nation-state of the Jewish people – for example, the Flag and Emblem Law that designates the Israeli state flag, which includes a Star of David (Jewish symbol); or the Law of Return and Citizenship Law which allow Jews to freely immigrate to the State of Israel but in no way discriminates between non-Jewish and Jewish citizens within the country – in other words, laws that are akin to rights of immigration and residence to ethnic or cultural kin groups found in many democracies. Laws that determine Saturday — Shabbat— as the national day of rest; and those that establish the use of the Hebrew calendar or Hebrew as the national language are similarly deemed racist. Other laws that are claimed to be discriminatory are counter-terrorism laws meant to protect all Israeli citizens – Arabs and Jews alike – from terrorism and that discriminate against terrorists regardless of where they come from and their national origin, race, religion or gender. That such anti-

56 Ophir, Events of 1967 Video.
57 Ibid.
terrorist laws are considered racist, in fact, tells more about the racism of those alleging the laws are racist than the laws themselves.⁶⁰

In another example of proof by assertion, Ophir claims that after the 1967 war, Israel was guilty of “very harsh oppression of any kind of [Palestinian] political organization – student organizations, teachers organizations, any kind of collective effort to express something was harshly oppressed.”⁶¹

Contrary to what Ophir proclaims, the student movement took a leading role in West Bank politics in the years after the 1967 war. While Israeli security forces attempted to curb violence and militant attacks on Israel, Palestinian political expression only increased under Israel’s watch. After the General Federation of the Students of Palestine came under the control of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), a terrorist group, and “armed struggle” against Israel was incited and pursued, Israeli responded to the militancy and violence by cracking down on this organization (in 1969). The rival student organization, the Jordanian Student Union (JSU), succeeded in becoming the most influential group, with unchallenged control of student politics. JSU, associated with the Jordanian Communist party, worked to politicize the student body but stayed away from militant activity – armed struggle – and, thus, operated freely without clampdown by Israel’s security forces.

By the 1970’s, student organizations occupied a central role in political activism. The ascendancy and influence of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the large increase in the Palestinian student population at newly-established Arab universities in the territories under Israel’s control, put Palestinian students and their organizations in a position of power and radicalized their politics with power struggles ensuing between student organizations affiliated with the nationalists, the Marxists and the Islamists.⁶² ⁶³

More than half of the Arab youth clubs operating in Jerusalem and the West Bank were established after the 1967 war. These groups freely expressed political themes and national identity through annual exhibits of art, crafts, books, and posters.⁶⁴ By the 1980s, Palestinians in middle and high school were also involved in violent demonstrations and strikes.⁶⁵ Ophir’s attempt to smear Israel with charges of political and professional repression are thus entirely false.

iv. The Jewish State is Apartheid

Among the clichéd litany of accusations Ophir flings to undermine the legitimacy of a Jewish state is the apartheid charge.⁶⁶ His lead argument is that Israel has been called “apartheid” by international as well as Jewish organizations.

---

⁶¹ Ophir, Events of 1967 Video.
⁶⁵ Sahliyeh, p.120.
⁶⁶ Ophir, Responses Video.
But the fact that certain biased organizations run by activists who share Ophir’s opposition to the existence of a Jewish state share the same tactics and parrot the same false apartheid charges does not render their tendentious proclamations true.

The charges, as well as the falsehoods that prop them up, have been frequently and thoroughly debunked.\(^67\) \(^68\)

Human Rights Watch (HRW), whose anti-Israel bias is well documented and so extreme that the organization was disavowed by its own founder,\(^69\) put out a report charging Israel with apartheid in April 2021.\(^70\) But it has been demonstrated that the report recycled “old, debunked charges” \(^71\) and was based on “lies, distortions of the law and regurgitated propaganda.” \(^72\) HRW’s charges are entirely predicated on opposition to a homeland and haven for Jews.\(^73\) For example, it portrayed Israel’s Law of Return that grants Jews the right to immigrate and allows them expedited citizenship as a violation of human rights law and an example of discrimination against Palestinian Arabs. Dr. Alex Safian has pointed out that this law is neither racist nor unique to Israel:

Similar laws have been in effect in many democracies, especially those with large diasporas, such as Mexico, Ireland, Finland, Greece, Poland, Germany, Italy, Denmark, etc. Furthermore, such laws are expressly permitted by, for example, the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965). According to Article 1(3) of this convention, nations are permitted to favor certain groups for citizenship provided there is no discrimination targeting any particular group.

Furthermore, Article 1(4) provides for “affirmative action.” That is, a state may employ a preference in granting citizenship to undo the effects of prior discrimination. In the case of Israel, such prior episodes of discrimination are clear: the British decision in 1939, for example, to bar Jewish immigration to Mandatory Palestine, thereby consigning millions of Jews to deaths in the crematoria of Europe. To an exceedingly small degree, the Law of Return helps to mitigate this wrong.\(^74\)

---


\(^74\) Safian, HRW Lies on Top of Lies.
Other arguments are based on outright fabrications and reversal of facts that falsely charge Israel with stealing water and land from Palestinian Arabs.75

Amnesty International, another organization cited by Ophir, comes with its own long history of anti-Israel activism.76 Its activists use similar sophistry to support their apartheid charges.77 For example, they falsely proclaim that “statements by leading Israeli politicians over the years confirm that the intention to maintain a Jewish demographic majority and to oppress and dominate Palestinians has guided Israel’s policies since the state’s creation.”

As evidence, they suggest Israel’s first prime minister, David Ben-Gurion “openly praised the use of unlawful means to forcibly and cruelly change the demographic composition of the country to the benefit of Jewish Israelis by expelling Palestinians and destroying their homes and properties,” pointing to a statement Ben-Gurion made as then-chairperson of the Jewish Agency for Israel during the 1948 war after touring an Arab village emptied of its inhabitants, many of whom were instructed to leave by Arab militias.

Contrary to Amnesty’s assertion, the statement neither praised nor suggested using unlawful means to change the demographic composition of the country.

Arab Palestinians were displaced in the context of war, fleeing their homes, often despite pleas by the Jewish leadership for them to stay. They became refugees as a consequence of a war that their leaders unlawfully waged to destroy the Jewish state. The same war resulted also in the displacement of Jewish Palestinians from their homes, expelled by Arab forces, their homes and synagogues destroyed – something that Amnesty avoids.

At the same time, Amnesty also avoids mentioning Ben-Gurion’s statements in the same period. For example, even after Arabs reacted violently to the passage of the UN’s partition plan to establish separate Jewish and Arab states, Ben-Gurion told his Labor party, “in our state there will be non-Jews as well—and all of them will be equal citizens; equal in everything without any exception; that is: the state will be their state as well.”78

Beyond the biased propaganda put out by HRW and Amnesty International, Ophir also refers to an Israeli group that shares his anti-Israel views, B’tselem. Apparently believing that citing an Israeli group that agrees with him is the final “evidence” he needs to validate his anti-Israel falsehoods, he cites B’tselem as an Israeli group to bolster his charge of apartheid. But as NGO Monitor has indicated, “B’Tselem is part of a network of NGOs that promote artificial and manufactured definitions of apartheid to extend the ongoing campaigns that seek to delegitimize and demonize Israel.”79

75 Ibid.
79 Kern & Herzberg Apartheid Definitions Report.
Foremost among these is the central claim of B’tselem’s apartheid libel, casting the building of Jewish communities in Israel as a form of “Jewish supremacy.” As CAMERA’s Gilead Ini points out:

B’tselem casts the very existence of a Jewish state open for Jewish immigration as evidence of “Jewish supremacy.” Israel’s mission of facilitating the entry of Jews, which is described in the country’s Declaration of Independence in the same sentence that promises equal social and political rights to all religions and races, is according to B’tselem one of the “methods the Israeli regime uses to advance Jewish supremacy.”

That Ophir and all of the NGOs he refers to use identical rhetoric to argue against the existence of a Jewish state is hardly evidence of Israel being an apartheid state, but is rather an echo chamber of unsubstantiated, baseless declarations by those who consider the Jewish state an illegitimate entity.

v. Israeli Checkpoints and the IDF’s Withdrawal From Gaza Are Meant to Harm Palestinian Arabs

Ophir twists the purpose of Israeli checkpoints in the West Bank – both temporary and permanent. He does not explain that Israeli security forces have erected checkpoints or put up “flying” (i.e. temporary) checkpoints in response to waves of terrorist attacks perpetrated by Palestinians who have entered Israeli cities to bomb buses, restaurants, and beaches. Nor does he indicate that these checkpoints have thwarted numerous attempts to kill innocent civilians in Israel. Instead, he suggests that Israel employs checkpoints in order to “control the lives of Palestinians by controlling their movement.”

He similarly twists Israel’s compromises and quest for peace with the Palestinians into something ugly and malevolent: Ophir depicts Israel’s evacuation/expulsion of Israeli civilians and its withdrawal of its military forces from the Gaza Strip in 2005 as part of a nefarious effort by Israel to separate Palestinians in the West Bank from Gaza. He accuses Israel of turning Gaza into “the largest prison on earth” by maintaining “absolute control over the periphery, the borders of Gaza” while abdicating “responsibility for the people of Gaza.”

To distort the narrative in this way, Ophir hides relevant historical facts, like the takeover of Gaza by the terrorist group Hamas and the conversion of that territory into a launching site for rocket and missile attacks targeting Israeli homes, schools and hospitals as well as a staging ground for sending kidnappers through tunnels dug under the Israeli-Gaza border and for dispatching suicide bombers and other terrorists into Israel to murder and maim civilians there. Ophir’s narrative denies Israel the right to defend its people from cross-border attacks.

---

82 Ibid.
vi. Dissolving the Nation State of the Jews

Ophir has long advocated the end of a Jewish state. Like Hammami and other like-minded activists who lobby against the existence of a Jewish state, Ophir blames Israel entirely for the alleged impossibility of a two-state solution:

“With the colonization project growing...the two-state solution today, if it is done in earnest would mean a new wave of refugees and would meet enormous resistance on the part of the Israeli public.” 83

Instead, he describes an alternate solution that would entail “decolonization and the dissolving of the nation state...with no privileges to the Jews,” where “Jews and Palestinians will become equal.” 84

SREEMATI MITTER

Sreemati Mitter is also a large video contributor, with seven videos addressing the Palestinian-Israeli situation. The Choices website describes her as the Kutaiba al-Ghanim Assistant Professor of Middle Eastern History and International and Public Affairs at Brown University and an author who is completing her first book, A History of Money in Palestine, “about the economic and monetary dimensions of statelessness.”

It does not mention her anti-Israel, anti-Zionist activism – for example, her work for Hanan Ashrawi’s MIFTAH organization that describes its goal as seeking “to engage local and international public opinion” and “promote the Palestinian narrative”85 and whose leaders have urged Palestinian political leaders to reject recognition of Israel as a Jewish state in any form.86

It makes no mention of Mitter’s signed attestations that “the Palestinian struggle [is] an indigenous liberation movement confronting a [Jewish] settler colonial state”87 or that she is signatory to Brown University’s “Solidarity with the Palestinian Liberation Struggle” urging BDS against Israel, condemning Israel as apartheid and “upholding the Palestinian resistance” against “Israeli settler-colonialism”88

THEMES

Mitter promotes the same narrative as the activist-scholars mentioned above, describing the Palestinian-Israeli situation as “not a conflict” but as a “colonial struggle” between colonizers (Jews) and colonized (Palestinians).

87 Palestine & Praxis Letter.
88 Brown Solidarity Letter.
The Jewish State is an Imperialist Project/Palestinian Arabs Are Blameless Victims of Jewish Colonization

Mitter rewrites history to falsely suggest that Arabs were initially welcoming of Jewish refugees but ended up opposing a Jewish state because it entailed their expulsion from their homes and land. It is a novel, albeit ahistorical, approach to misinform about Zionism and the Jewish state, Mitter explains:

“The Arabs of Palestine were far more welcoming than any European people have been to the Jews at the time. They said ‘Yeah, I mean people can come and live here.’ The problem is the people who came then started buying up land and squeezing out the Arabs who lived there...and what happened in the mix of all of that is that the Arab inhabitants of Palestine lost their land, lost their livelihoods and then began to look at these people who were refugees coming in... they come and they take your land, they take your livelihood, they throw you out of your country and then they say, ‘Well, actually this is ours because it was given to us in the Bible’.... and there has never been a way for Palestinians to say, ‘Well, this is not about the Bible or anything like that. It’s about our land and our homes and our jobs that have been taken away from us’ ... the word ‘conflict’ doesn’t do justice to what this is all about.”

Contrary to Mitter’s revisionist history, Palestinian Arabs were carrying out organized attacks against Jews living in the area long before the partition plan for separate Jewish and Arab states was passed (in 1947) and before the Mandate for Palestine was assigned to Great Britain by the Allies at the San Remo Conference (April 1920) and endorsed by the League of Nations (July 1922).

Organized, murderous assaults by local groups of Arabs against Jewish communities in the north began in early 1920 and around the same time, Muslim pilgrims attacked Jews living in Jerusalem. In 1921, Arab rioters attacked Jews in Jaffa and its environs. The primary agitator behind these attacks was the Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin al Husseini, who harnessed Arab discontent over Jews moving to the area, fomenting violent riots. Wholesale massacres of Jews by their Arab neighbors – in Hebron, Safed and Tiberias – as well as individual violent attacks continued well into the 1930s. These were not directed at any Jewish state but at Jewish residents living side-by-side with Arabs in the same territory. The campaign of murder, intimidation, and sabotage by Arab residents against their Jewish neighbors intensified in 1936 and continued through 1939, resulting in the 1939 British White Paper limiting Jewish immigration to the area.

Mitter’s tactics are much the same as those of activist/scholars Hammami and Ophir: She implies that Palestinian Arabs were the indigenous people, while Jews were colonizers with only a tenuous biblical connection to the land, and she blames Jews entirely for the conflict. She does, however, add a novel twist to her revisionist history, suggesting there were initially two groups of Zionists – one in favor of co-existence and the other which shunned it. According to Mitter, the bad group won out and the Jewish state was precipitated upon the ethnic cleansing of non-Jews in order that the state remain ethnically pure, for Jews alone.

---


“The reason Arabs have a problem with this [a Jewish state] is ... just [that they] don’t want to be thrown out of their land and they think this is their land, too, and to the extent to which the Jews were going to come and live there, they thought they would come and live side-by-side with them...there were a lot of Zionists who felt there was going to be a coexistence......and the Land of Israel didn’t have to be this exclusive thing that would require throwing out of other people who lived there...those Zionists lost out [to] the other Zionists who basically decided that Israel had to be a state for the Jews and only for the Jews and not for anyone else.\textsuperscript{91}

Beyond the falsehoods within her messaging are the omissions that underlie it. Like Hammami and Ophir, Mitter erases the millennia of Jewish history in the land; ignores the stated intent of Arab leaders to rid the area of a Jewish state; hides the wars and terrorist attacks by Arabs to annihilate the Jewish state and end the Jewish presence in the land; omits the statements by Zionists leaders promising Arabs willing to live in peace with their Jewish neighbors a place in a democratic Jewish state; and conceals the efforts and compromises by Israel to make peace with their Palestinian Arab neighbors. (See above refutations to Ophir and Hammami videos.)

Belying Mitter’s assertion that the winning Zionists had decided that Israel would be “a state for the Jews and only for the Jews” is Ben Gurion’s above-mentioned statement (p. 18) about Jews and non-Jews living together in the proposed state that would be for non-Jews as well. Moreover, Israel’s Declaration of Independence included an appeal by the founding Zionists to the Arab inhabitants of the state:

“WE APPEAL - in the very midst of the onslaught launched against us now for months - to the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve peace and participate in the upbuilding of the State on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its provisional and permanent institutions.”\textsuperscript{92}

Many Arabs fled or were told to leave by their leaders, but those who stayed and chose to become Israeli citizens indeed enjoy the same civil rights as Jewish citizens. Today, the Arab society comprises 21% of Israel’s citizenry, with a rise in the standard of living, life expectancy, education and personal achievement.\textsuperscript{93}

Mitter devotes a video to the freezing of Arab bank accounts during the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. She suggests Palestinian Arabs were made stateless by the establishment of a Jewish state, although they never had a state of their own. Nor does she make any mention of Israel’s intricate negotiations over the ensuing years to release frozen funds to their depositors despite the Arab refusal to directly negotiate a peace settlement with Israel.

Mitter’s is yet another voice advocating against the existence of a Jewish state based on a biased, revisionist history.

\textsuperscript{91} Sreemati Mitter, \textit{What are some common misunderstandings about the situation between Israel and the Palestinians?}, Choices Video, 7 December 2017, https://www.choices.edu/video/what-are-some-common-misunderstandings-about-the-situation-between-israel-and-the-palestinians/


4. TANGENTIAL ANTI-ZIONIST VIDEOS

Choices features other anti-Zionist activists who tangentially incorporate deceptive, anti-Israel messaging into their videos.

SARA LEAH WHITSON
Singles Out Israel Among Nations for War Crimes and Human Rights Abuses

As then-director of Human Rights Watch’s Middle East and North Africa division, Sarah Leah Whitson was invited by the Choices program to contribute videos about human rights issues. Her current role (since making the videos) is executive director of Democracy for the Arab World Now (DAWN).

Although she is listed and introduced as a “scholar” on the Choices website, Whitson’s career was entirely as an activist, best known for her anti-Israel activism. Starting with the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee where she lobbied the UN Secretary General against Israel, she also worked for Madre and the Center for Social and Economic Rights (CESR), both of which label Israel “apartheid,” before being hired by Human Rights Watch (HRW).

Whitson is hardly an honest or objective arbiter of human rights. Her positions are governed by her animus toward Israel: While she has shown support for Armenian settlements in Nagorno-Karabakh, which the Armenians see as part of their historic homeland (Whitson is of Armenian heritage) but which the UN, international courts and the U.S. all consider occupied Azeri territory, she calls for boycott and international prosecution against the Jewish state for what she excoriates as “occupation” and settlement of what she calls “Palestinian” (i.e. disputed) territory that Jews view as part of their historic Jewish homeland.94

Whitson’s relentless attempts to delegitimize Israel resulted in HRW losing much of its credibility as a human rights organization, and led to its founding chairman, Robert Bernstein, dissociating himself from the organization he had started. As he explained in an op-ed in the New York Times:

“As the founder of Human Rights Watch, its active chairman for 20 years and now founding chairman emeritus, I must do something that I never anticipated: I must publicly join the group’s critics...Human Rights Watch has lost critical perspective on a conflict in which Israel has been repeatedly attacked by Hamas and Hezbollah, organizations that go after Israeli citizens and use their own people as human shields. These groups are supported by the government of Iran, which has openly declared its intention not just to destroy Israel but to murder Jews everywhere. This incitement to genocide is a violation of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.”95

---

Whitson’s rancour toward Israel is exemplified by her tactics in raising funds for HRW in Saudi Arabia, an enemy of Israel: She sought to collect money by emphasizing her division’s efforts to discredit and delegitimize Israel and her battles against what she referred to as “pro-Israel pressure groups.”

Whitson encourages boycott against Israel, promotes BDS campaigns and universalizes the vilification of Israel as the root of human rights abuses globally. Honesty and truth are abandoned in the interest of Whitson’s hostility against the Jewish state. She continues to demonize Israel in her current position at DAWN and urges the severing of the U.S.’s special relationship with the Jewish state.

Given her extremist, partisan background, it is unsurprising that Whitson turns her Choices platform into an opportunity to indoctrinate students with animus toward Israel. She declares that:

The most glaring violations of the laws of war continue to be Israel’s 43-year-old occupation of the Palestinian territories...which continues to result in daily violations of the human rights of the Palestinians who live there, their freedom of movement, their freedom from arbitrary restrictions, very, very tight security restrictions and a host of abuses.

Whitson imbues her videos with antipathy toward America, as well, accusing it of “human rights abuses” and faulting it for supporting Israel and others she describes as “repressive” and “law abusing.” The U.S., she claims, has “a direct hand in enabling... [these governments’] abuses.”

At the same time, Whitson portrays HRW falsely as a neutral documenter of human rights violations, promoting its work as “objective,” “non-partisan,” “non-ideological,” and “not taking a position on

97 YouTube Video, @icipalestine, Sarah Leah Whitson, Executive Director, DAWN, 31 May 2022, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tpJGFvVH_WsQ (hereinafter, Whitson ICJP Video).
98 Sarah Leah Whitson, Twitter Post, @SarahLeah1, 19 November 2018 (11:00am EST), https://twitter.com/sarahleah/status/1064549050211594242 (BREAKING: On eve of @HRW report of human rights harms of #Airbnb business in settlements, company announces it will remove all settlement listings. This is the right outcome. Kudos.
99 Sarah Leah Whitson, Twitter Post, @SarahLeah1, 3 June 2022, https://twitter.com/sarahleah/status/1532631391535607809 (This transnational repression isn’t coming only from Russia and China but from erstwhile US allies Israel, Saudi and Egypt. Anti-BDS laws, IHRA antisemitism rules all meant to silence and intimidate critics of Israel in US and around the world.
102 Whitson ICJP Video.
who’s right and who’s wrong.” In this way, she not only indoctrinates students with her own obsessive bias, but also misinforms them about the reliability of her prejudiced charges.  

NAOKO SHIBUSAWA  
Israel Settler-Colony Displacing Indigenous Palestinians  

Another Choices contributor who delegitimizes both the U.S. and Israel is Naoko Shibusawa. According to her Choices bio, she is an Associate Professor of History and American Studies at Brown University, a historian of U.S. political culture and an author of books about transnational Asian American identities, Cold War ideologies and other topics related to American history. And while the Middle East is not part of her purview, she has been involved in BDS campaigns against Israel and is a major detractor of the Jewish state.  

Her Choices videos focus primarily on a negative portrayal of what she depicts as “American imperialism” and “colonialism.” She makes a point of placing “Israel-Palestine” in the same imperialist boat and highlights it as an example of “people [who] come from somewhere else and displace the indigenous population to take possession of their land.”  

These references to Israel in Whitson and Shibusawa’s videos reinforce the messaging provided by Hammami, Ophir, and Mitter. All contribute to the anti-Zionist agenda that is being promoted in schools.

5. ARE THERE ANY VIDEOS/CONTRIBUTORS TO COUNTER THE PARTISAN, ANTI-ISRAEL MISINFORMATION?  

There are two contributors about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict who are not anti-Zionist, BDS activists -- Melani Cammet, professor of international affairs and holder of several prestigious positions at Harvard University and Ari Shavit, an author and journalist who previously wrote for the left-wing Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz. They contributed a total of five videos out of the 27 videos addressing the conflict. That is, more than 80% of the video material focusing on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict took an extreme, anti-Zionist position. The other 20% was neutral and did not address any of the misinformation in the other videos.

Cammet’s videos were shot in 2011 before Brown’s Center for Middle East Studies was established and before the university became so radicalized (more than 10% of faculty now support BDS against Israel). Her contribution on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict consists of only one video (3:45 minutes) addressing the obstacles to a peace agreement.

Ari Shavit’s videos were shot in November 2014, one month after Rema Hammami’s videos were made. Presumably, Hammami was meant to present a Palestinian perspective while Shavit was

---

106 Sarah Leah Whitson, Why is it important for NGOs to remain objective?, Choices Video, 13 April 2010, https://www.choices.edu/video/why-is-it-important-for-ngos-to-remain-objective/.  
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meant to present an Israeli one, from a left-leaning perspective. Compared to Hammami’s eight videos (~16 minutes total) on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, however, Shavit contributed only four (~8 minutes total), half as much.

Moreover, unlike the propagandistic videos of Hammami and Ophir, neither Cammet’s nor Shavit’s videos are used as the basis for student assignments.

Another professor, Thomas Nichols, a professor of national security affairs and former chairman of the Strategy Department at the United States Naval War College, tangentially addresses the 1967 Arab-Israeli war in a video about pre-emptive and preventative military actions. There, he presents Israel’s strike on Egyptian forces on June 5, 1967 as an example of justified pre-emption:

“The Israeli attack on the Egyptian-led forces that were massing against them in 1967 is considered the classic case of legitimate pre-emption. There were armies in the field massing foreign attack. The leader of Egypt had made very plain an intention to engage in military action against Israel and so rather than wait to take the first punch, the Israelis launched airstrikes that spoiled the attack and actually provided the margin of victory. That’s considered the classic case of a justified pre-emptive strike.”

While this accurate, unbiased information counters the narrative of an expansionist war by Israel that is conveyed by the other videos addressing the Arab-Israeli conflict and Zionism, it is found in an entirely different context not connected to the units focusing on Zionism. Addressing a specific strike on a specific battlefront as part of a series about military strategy and deterrence fails in countering the preponderance of misinformation students learn in the units about Zionism and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

6. DIGITAL AND PRINTED MATERIALS

The digital and printed materials for subscription or purchase consist of student readings, lesson plans and graphics. The digital versions include the relevant embedded, videos while the print materials simply directs students to watch them. Many of the above-mentioned biased, ahistorical messages about Zionism found in the videos are reinforced by similar and complementary messaging in the student readings and lesson plans available in print and digitally.

We focused primarily on the student readings for the unit entitled “The Middle East: Questions for U.S. Policy,” which deals most directly and extensively with Israel, Zionism, and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This unit was updated in July 2022.

The “Curriculum Consultant” who is credited with writing, editing, and producing the student readings for this unit is listed (in the print edition) as Joe Leidy, then a Ph.D. candidate in modern Middle Eastern history at Brown University and a teaching fellow in Global Islamic Studies at Connecticut College. He was also a signatory to the 2021 Brown University statement condemning “Israel’s settler-colonial project, human rights violations, and war crimes in Palestine” and “upholding

the Palestinian resistance ... against Israeli settler-colonialism, occupation, apartheid...”111 Of the nine listed faculty members who served as advisors and reviewers for this unit, almost half (Faiz Ahmed,112 Ian Straughn,113 Nina Tannenwald,114 and Alex Winder115) were signatories to anti-Israel statements and petitions or otherwise campaigned against Israel.

While our analysis focuses primarily on “The Middle East: Questions for U.S. Policy” unit, we also see some of the same problems repeated in other units whose attention is not mainly directed on Israel. When we do not specify the unit we are discussing, we are referring to the materials in the Middle East unit whose main focus is Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict. When we address examples from other units that exemplify the same biased approach, we directly specify the name of the additional unit we are critiquing.

THEMES

Zionism – An Outsider Movement with Little Connection to the Land – Displaces Indigenous Palestinians

Zionism is downplayed as a Johnny-come-lately, nationalist movement founded by outsiders—Jewish elites from Europe—in response to the persecution of Jews with few real ties to the Land of Israel:

“Outside the borders of the Ottoman Empire, a group of Jewish intellectuals founded a nationalist movement called Zionism...to refer to the land of Jerusalem. Zionism is based on the idea that Jews were destined to return to the territory from which they had been exiled by the Roman Empire in the first century CE. The Zionist movement originated in the late nineteenth century in Eastern Europe where Jews had long been subjected to antisemitism, violence, and persecution.“ 116

By identifying only one previous point in the Holy Land’s Jewish history – when the Second Jewish Commonwealth was brought to an end with the defeat and exile of Jews by the Romans in 70 CE – and entirely omitting the fact that for thousands of years, Jews had maintained an almost continuous presence in the Holy Land, both before and after the Roman conquest, including periods where they were sovereign, the reading minimizes the Jewish connection to the Holy Land.

Emphasizing that “Arabs had lived in Palestine for over a thousand years,” the reading omits that Jews had lived in Palestine for even longer and that the Jewish presence in the land predated the Arab conquest and the emergence of Islam by more than a thousand years. And while the reading describes Palestine as “a territory in southern Syria” that was “home to hundreds of thousands of

111 Brown Solidarity Letter.
112 Ibid.
Palestinian Arabs,” it does not similarly refer to Jewish inhabitants of the area as “Palestinian Jews.” In fact, the only reference to the area’s Jewish residents is that “Jews did not live in large numbers in what they saw as their ancestral homeland.”

Entirely missing from the section about “What is Zionism” are its essential roots in what is considered a core tenet of Judaism: *Love of Zion*, in which the Land of Israel is the heart of Jewish nationhood, the focus of Jewish law, prayer and aspiration. These omissions diminish the centrality of Zion (Israel) to Judaism, as do such statements as:

“Jews living in countries around the world also considered part of Palestine the home of their ancestors.”

Jews do not merely “consider” it the home of their ancestors, there is substantial archeological and historical documentation of this fact, which is accepted by non-Jews as well as Jews. And beyond just having Jewish ancestry in the land, Jews continued to live in the land of their forefathers. To those living in the Diaspora, the territory was important not only as the land of their ancestors to which they aspired to return, but as one that was central to their identity as Jews.

With Zionism introduced as a foreign enterprise and the importance of the Holy Land to Zionism downplayed, the reading concludes:

“Zionists decided Palestine would be the best place to settle in spite of the presence of Palestinian Arabs.”

The overall message conveyed is a false and biased one in which foreign Jewish interlopers with only ancient, flimsy ties to the land created a national movement that displaced indigenous Arabs.

**Role Reversals: Blaming the Creation of Jewish State for Conflict While Justifying Arab Aggression**

It is the establishment of a Jewish state – rather than Arab rejectionism and violence -- that is blamed for creating the Arab-Israeli conflict. “The creation of the state of Israel,” begins an eponymous section, “inflamed local tensions and led to a series of conflicts.”

Arab rejection of the U.N. partition plan and the attempt by Arab leaders to annihilate the nascent state is, by contrast, justified:

“Most Arab leaders opposed partition because it would divide up lands where Arabs already lived. Arabs, who were in the majority in Palestine, feared they would be ruled by a minority Jewish settler population. Some also worried that the creation of Israel would lead to regional instability.”

---

120 *The Middle East Curriculum Unit*, p.18. Digital: “The Creation of Israel”
The reading does not explain that, in fact, Jews made up the majority of existing residents in the area allotted for the Jewish state,\textsuperscript{122} so that any supposed fear of “a minority settler population” ruling an Arab majority population would have been unfounded. Nor does it note that the stated fear of “regional instability” is itself a tautology and example of circular reasoning: Regional instability would not result from peaceful coexistence with a Jewish state but by the attempt to eliminate it by force.

The reading further deceives by claiming:

“As the departure of the British approached, Zionists began to take control of the territory allotted to them by the UN, including many predominantly Arab towns. Violence erupted as Zionists fought to extend their control.”\textsuperscript{123}

Contrary to this account, violence did not erupt because Zionists were fighting “to extend their control” over Arab land. It began with an onslaught of Arab attacks against Jewish residents, and Zionists fought back to protect Jewish communities from destruction.

Had the account hewed to the historical record, it would have noted that no sooner was UN Resolution 181 (partition plan) passed than Jerusalem-bound buses carrying Jewish passengers were ambushed by Arab assailants who murdered seven and wounded five Jews. This was followed by shooting, stabbing, bombing and arson attacks by Arabs against individual Jews and Jewish communities. In this first phase of what was to become the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, the Palestinian Arabs were on the offensive, inflicting numerous casualties among the Jewish residents and cutting off their transportation routes. By mid-December the militant Jewish Irgun and Stern Gang, denounced by the Jewish Agency and the Haganah, carried out a reprisal attack on Arabs, which was followed by deadly attacks by the Arab Legion on the Haganah.\textsuperscript{124}

On May 14, 1948, the head of the Jewish Agency in Palestine, David Ben-Gurion, proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel, which the U.S. immediately recognized. The next morning, Great Britain withdrew from the area, and Egypt, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq and Saudi Arabi invaded Israel, starting another phase of the Arab-Israeli war.\textsuperscript{125}

While the reading acknowledges that five Arab states invaded Israel – unlike the above-mentioned videos that completely erased that fact – it nonetheless blames the conflict on the establishment of the Jewish state:

“The creation of the state of Israel led to the first Arab-Israeli War in 1948. Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Transjordan (present-day Jordan) invaded Israel to defend Palestinian Arabs’ claim to this land.”\textsuperscript{126}

The reading thus reverses the roles of aggressor and victim: Jews are portrayed as the aggressors, while Arabs are depicted as victims fighting in self-defence despite the historical record indicating


\textsuperscript{123} \textit{The Middle East Curriculum Unit}, p. 19. Digital: “The Creation of Israel”.

\textsuperscript{124} Martin Gilbert, \textit{ISRAEL: A HISTORY} (Harper Perennial, 2008), p.154-7

\textsuperscript{125} Efraim Karsh, \textit{PALESTINE BETRAYED} (Yale University Press, 2011), p.100-23.
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That it was the Jews who were engaged in an act of collective self-defence from an Arab war of extermination.

That the Arab invaders meant to annihilate the Jewish state and rid the land of Jews was made clear by the Arab League Secretary-General Abdul Rahman Azzam (aka Azzam Pasha), who had warned in October 1947 that rather than accept a Jewish state, Arabs would embark upon “a war of extermination and momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Tartar massacre or the Crusader wars.”\(^\text{127}\) That this intended war of extermination failed in its mission does not absolve Arabs of their role as aggressors.

Emphasizing the anti-Zionist narrative is the contrasting language used to describe Jewish vs. Arab acquisition of territory—Jews are said to “seize” land (a term that connotes aggression), while Arabs are said to “take control” and “lay claim” to territory:

“By the time a truce was reached in January 1949, the Zionists had **seized** a large portion of the land that the UN had designated for the Palestinians.” [emphasis added]

**vs.**

“Egypt **took control** of the Gaza Strip and Transjordan **claimed what was left** of the former Palestinian mandate...” [emphasis added]

In fact, Transjordan conquered territory that the Partition Plan had internationalized – i.e., eastern Jerusalem. The Jordanian Arab Legion destroyed and desecrated the ancient Jewish synagogues and cemeteries there and drove out the Jewish population. It was part of the larger Arab war of extermination that violated both the Partition Plan (Resolution 181) and the UN Charter and nullified the terms and boundaries set out in that resolution. The Zionists, by contrast, were engaged in a justified act of collective self-defence in territory whose boundaries had been mooted by the Arab actions. The reading’s lexicon in this way reverses the Jewish and Arab roles in this war, validating the Arab claim to the land and invalidating the Jewish one.

The section on the 1948 Arab-Israeli war reinforces Adi Ophir’s message in his videos that Israel “forced out” Palestinian Arabs, implying ethnic cleansing by Israel when, in fact, only a small minority were expelled from their homes during fighting in the context of a war that was initiated by their leaders. (See discussion above).

**Role Reversals: Blaming Other Arab-Israeli Wars on Israel/Justifying Arab Aggression**

**1956**

The reading selection introduces Egypt’s war role in heroic terms as “an important example of national resistance to European imperialism” but diminishes the threat Egypt posed to Israel:

“Israel also [in addition to Britain and France] wanted to remove [Egyptian President Gamal Abdel] Nasser from power because they saw his policies as a threat to Israel.”\(^\text{128}\)

---


\(^\text{128}\) *The Middle East Curriculum Unit*, p. 20-21. Digital: “What Was the Suez Crisis?”
Omitted from this account is what “policies” or actions Israel “saw as a threat”: There is no reference, for example, to Nasser’s encouragement and enabling of the gangs known as fedayeen to infiltrate Israel from Egyptian bases to ambush Israeli vehicles, boobytrap fields and roads and murder Jewish men, women, and children. Hundreds of Israelis were killed in Fedayeen attacks launched from Egypt.

Nor does it mention the decision in the early 1950s to restrict Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, in contravention of the 1949 armistice resolution signed by Egypt and Israel, the Constantinople Convention of 1888, and UN Security Council Resolution 95.

This same heroic presentation of the Egyptian leader’s role in the 1956 war is found in the unit about Syria (The Syrian Civil War) where Israel is referred to only tangentially, as an invader:

“Nasser’s success in nationalizing Egypt’s Suez Canal despite a European and Israeli invasion in 1956, and in showing military solidarity with Syria against Western-backed Iraqi and Turkish intimidation in 1957, had only added to his popularity.”

1967

Contrary to the previously mentioned Choices video by military strategist Thomas Nichols holding up Israel’s strike on Egyptian-led forces in 1967 as “the classic case of legitimate pre-emption,” (see p. 25) the account of the war here again covers up Arab aggression, shifting the blame to Israel.

Egyptian aggressive actions – its demand to withdraw United Nations Emergency Forces troops from the Sinai Peninsula and its blockade of Israel’s port of Eilat, the latter of which is considered a casus bello (an act of war) under international law, is not presented as such. They are described only as a “response to incorrect reports that Israel was preparing a military operation against Syria.”

Unmentioned is that all the evidence to the contrary was ignored. The Egyptian chiefs of the general staff and of military intelligence who investigated the erroneous reports described no Israeli troop buildup. Nor did the US embassy in Cairo and the CIA – information shared with the Egyptian leader, Gamal Abdel Nasser. But despite the evidence that debunked the incorrect reports, Nasser continued to mass troops on the border with Israel. The reading omits mention of the troop buildup on Israel’s borders, as well as the public calls and threats to destroy Israel.

Nor does the account mention anything about Jordan’s offensive actions against Israel from the eastern portion of Jerusalem and from lands it occupied west of the Jordan river (the West Bank), despite the pleas by Israel to Jordan not to enter the war. Responding to Jordan’s aggression, Israeli forces fought back and defeated the Jordanians, gaining control of all of Jerusalem and the West Bank, the historical heartland of the Jewish people known to Israelis as Judea and Samaria.

---


It similarly conceals Syria’s airstrikes on communities in the north of Israel and its attempt to attack the Haifa oil refineries. In other words, there is no hint that Israel in 1967 fought a defensive war from Egypt, Syria and Jordan. On the contrary, the readings suggest Israel was the aggressor:

“Israel attacked the Egyptians in Sinai and advanced to the Suez Canal. The Israelis drove the Jordanian army out of the Old City of Jerusalem and overran the West Bank, both formerly controlled by Jordan. Despite U.S.-led efforts to establish a cease-fire agreement, Israeli forces attacked Syrian defenses in the Golan Heights, taking control of this strategic territory.”

A similar approach is taken in the unit on Syria (The Syria Civil War) where Syria’s role as aggressor is downplayed:

“Palestinian guerillas had been raiding Israel from Syrian territory since the founding of Israel in 1948. Many of the guerillas were refugees who had been displaced from their homes. In 1967, growing tensions and increased U.S. and Soviet involvement ignited a war between Israel and its neighbors, Egypt, Syria and Jordan.”

This unit misleads students to believe that Palestinian refugees who had lost homes in Israel were carrying out independent cross-border raids as a form of resistance. It does not explain that Syria was actually backing and sending terrorists into Israel to attack Israeli citizens. Moreover, nothing is written about Syria’s fortification and use of the Golan Heights high ground to relentlessly shell Israel, forcing Israeli civilians in northern communities to seek refuge in bomb shelters. Nor is there any mention of the fact that already on June 5, before Israel had ever engaged with Syria, the Syrian army launched airstrikes on communities in the north of Israel, including Tiberias, and attempted to attack Haifa oil refineries. Instead, the unit portrays Israel as the aggressor and Syrians as on the defense:

“The U.N. Security Council attempted to establish a ceasefire agreement. Ignoring these attempts, Israel attacked Syrian defenses in the Golan Heights, and took control of this strategic territory.”

1973
While the Middle East unit’s section on the 1973 war acknowledges that “Egypt and Syria attacked Israel,” it comes after a de facto justification:

“Egypt’s president...wanted to regain the Sinai Peninsula from Israel and prove that the Israeli military was not the most powerful in the region.”

Concealed is the fact that the war was launched with a coordinated surprise attack by Egypt and Syria against Israel on Yom Kippur, the holiest day in Judaism, when many Jews are at synagogue engaged in prayer.

We find the same approach in the unit on Syria (The Syria Civil War) where the nature of Syria’s surprise attack on Judaism’s holiest day is never mentioned, but where its decision to go to war with

---
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Israel is placed in the context of what is inferred to be legitimate grievances against the Jewish state for allegedly seizing land that was viewed as Syria’s by right.

“Syrians viewed Israel as a threat to Syria. Israel had occupied the Golan Heights, area that belonged to Syria. Most Syrians also sympathized with the Palestinians, who were in a long conflict with Israel over land. The Palestine Mandate which had become Israel in 1948 had once been part of Greater Syria.” 138

**Ignoring, Whitewashing or Justifying Arab Violence and Terrorism**

**Pre-State Violence and Incitement**

It is not only Arab military aggression that is justified, minimized, or erased, but also violence against Palestinian Jews starting decades before there was any partition plan or Jewish state. For example, large-scale massacres of Jewish residents in Hebron, Safed and Tiberias and numerous other murderous attacks on Jews were perpetrated by Palestinian Arabs in the 1920s and 1930s, incited by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin Al Husseini. The reading only obliquely references this, justifying the violence as “resistance”:

“As the Jewish population of Palestine rose...Zionist settlers escaping persecution and antisemitism in Europe increasingly encountered resistance from Palestinian Arabs regarding ownership and control of the land.”139

In fact, many of the Palestinian Jews who were targeted were born and raised in the Holy Land and came from families who had lived there for generations. Massacres against these Jews took place in the Jewish holy cities of Hebron, Safed and Tiberias. The targeted Jews were no more “settlers” than were the gangs of Arabs who murdered and brutalized them in their homes.

Dutch-Canadian journalist Pierre Van Passen who was in Palestine at the time, wrote about the 1929 Hebron massacre of Jews, among the violent activities that were fomented by the Grand Mufti. One of the victims was Eliezer Dan Slonim, director of the Anglo Palestine Bank, member of the Hebron city council and son of the chief rabbi of Hebron. The Slonims had lived in Hebron for generations and Eliezer Dov had enjoyed friendly relationships with his Arab neighbors, yet he and his family were among those brutally slaughtered in the attack. Van Passen describes a visit to Slonim’s home in the aftermath of the massacre:

“What occurred in the upper chambers of Slonim’s house could be seen when we found the twelve-foot-high ceiling splashed with blood. The rooms looked like a slaughterhouse. When I visited the place in the company of Captain Marek Schwartz, a former Austrian artillery officer, Mr. Abraham Goldberg of New York, and Mr. Ernst Davies, correspondent of the old *Berliner Tageblatt*, the blood stood in a huge pool on the slightly sagging stone floor of the house. Clocks, crockery, tables and windows had been smashed to smithereens. Of the unlooted articles, not a single item had been left intact except a large black-and-white

---


139 *The Middle East Curriculum Unit*, p.14. Digital: “What agreement was reached after World War I at the Paris Peace Conference?”
photograph of Dr. Theodore Herzl, the founder of political Zionism. Around the picture’s frame the murderers had draped the blood-drenched underwear of a woman.”

The suggestion that such anti-Jewish violence constituted “resistance” is nothing short of a validation of genocidal butchery.

Indeed, the genocidal intents of Palestinian Arab leaders and terrorist groups are concealed throughout. Omitted from the reading is the role played by Jerusalem Grand Mufti Haj Amin al Husseini in agitating the Palestinian Arabs against the idea of a Jewish state and promoting anti-Jewish hatred and murder from as early as 1920.

Nor is there any mention of the Mufti’s collaboration with Nazi Germany and the Nazi propaganda against Jews that he disseminated in the Arab world. For example, the Mufti broadcast in Arabic from the Nazi capital of Berlin in March 1944, calling upon Arabs everywhere to

“Rise as one and fight for your sacred rights. Kill the Jews wherever you find them. This pleases God, history and religion. This serves your honor. God is with you.”

Between 1920 through 1948, more than 1,000 were killed through Palestinian terrorism. Between 1949 and 2022, more than 2800 Israeli civilians, security personnel, and foreigners were murdered in Israel and the territories by Palestinian terrorists engaged in bombings, stabbings, car rammings, and stonings. Many more were wounded. Yet, the only mention of Palestinian “terrorism” in the book is:

“As the departure of the British approached...Violence erupted as Zionists fought to extend their control. Intense fighting – including terrorist acts from both sides – soon engulfed much of Palestine.” [emphasis added]

This minimal acknowledgement of the use of terrorism by Palestinian Arabs is coupled with an invalid equivalence to the much more limited terrorist acts by Zionists, and, in effect, justifies Arab terrorism as a reaction to Zionist actions.

Palestinian Terrorist Attacks Against Israel

As for the ongoing Palestinian terrorist attacks that have continued to plague Israel, taking thousands of lives over the 75 since Israel’s establishment, they are entirely erased from the picture. The only allusions to Palestinian violence are:

“Ongoing violence and hostility between Israelis and Palestinians have commanded a large share of the United States’ diplomatic energy since the 1980s.... Since [1967], Palestinian
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military and political organizations have fought to recover control of Palestinian land from Israeli occupation and control.”\(^{146}\)

“The next few years [after 1967] saw the rise of Palestinian military and political organizations that wanted to recover Palestinian land from Israeli occupation.”\(^{147}\)

“Divisions within Israeli and Palestinian societies and violence from militant groups on both sides disrupted the negotiation process.”\(^{148}\)

Palestinian terrorism is, thus, downplayed with the vague, catch-all term “violence,” and is justified as a legitimate fight or equated with Israeli actions – despite the fact that the latter are primarily defensive military actions, with non-defensive violence and terrorist acts by Israelis dwarfed in comparison to the widespread and deadlier Palestinian terrorism. Moreover, the few instances of terrorist acts perpetrated by Israelis have been harshly condemned by Israeli leaders as well as the overwhelming majority of Israelis and have been prosecuted in Israeli courts while terrorist attacks by Palestinian perpetrators are encouraged and celebrated by both Palestinian leaders and by the Palestinian society at large.

PLO

Similarly whitewashed are the Palestinian terrorist groups that organize and execute murderous attacks in Israel and the territories. Throughout the reading, they are justified with the label – “resistance groups.” If and when their violent attacks are alluded to, they are referred to in such heroic terms as “armed struggle against Israeli occupation.” For example:

“After the June 1967 War, Palestinian resistance organizations began to play a more active role. They were disillusioned with the Arab leadership that had failed to liberate Palestine and lost additional territory to Israel. They hoped to retake their land, establish a Palestinian state and govern themselves.”\(^{149}\) [emphasis added]

“The Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was an organization that coordinated several resistance groups. Led by Yasir Arafat, the PLO emphasized Palestinian nationalism...In addition to leading the armed struggle against Israeli occupation, the PLO provided social services and took on diplomatic initiatives.”\(^{150}\)

What the reading conceals from students are the massacres perpetrated by these so-called resistance groups that the reading characterizes as “armed struggle” – for example. the slaughter of children and their caregivers on school buses\(^{151}\) and in school buildings,\(^{152}\) the murders of families in their
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homes and hotels, the slaying of civilians on buses, and in airports, among others, not to mention the terrorist attacks outside of Israel – including hijackings and midair bombing of international flights, targeting of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics, the murders of American and other foreign diplomats.

The reading goes on to state, “The PLO recognized Israel’s right to exist and renounced the use of violence” [emphasis added] and later “Divisions within Israeli and Palestinian societies and violence from militant groups on both sides disrupted the negotiation process.” [emphasis added]

In other words, Palestinian “violence” is mentioned only when paired and equated to alleged violence from Israelis, or when it is claimed to have been disavowed by a Palestinian leader. Contrary to the implication of the reading, there is no equivalence between the numerous, documented massacres perpetrated by Palestinians and the few, isolated incidents of terrorism by Israeli perpetrators who have been prosecuted and condemned for their crimes. And contrary to PLO leader Yasir Arafat’s claim of having renounced the use of violence, he continued to promote, finance and orchestrate terrorist attacks in Israel and the territories, in direct violation of the accords he signed with Israel.

Similarly, the unit on Syria (The Syrian Civil War) refers to PLO terrorists only as “fighters,” “guerillas,” or “commandos.”

Hamas
Hamas, an anti-Semitic terrorist organization that is openly committed to genocidal violence and the destruction of the Jewish state (see excerpts from Hamas Charter, in discussion of Rema Hammami’s videos in section “Palestinians: Blameless Victims of Zionist Greed and Aggression”) has targeted civilians inside Israel with rockets and mortars, sent incendiary balloons into Israel and taken credit for, praised or celebrated hundreds of murderous terrorist attacks against Israelis, including bombings of cars, buses, malls, markets, restaurants, clubs, synagogues, a communal Passover seder.
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162 Ibid.
at a hotel, etc. 165 Although the curriculum unit was prepared before the latest and largest massacre inside Israel, perpetrated by Hamas on Oct. 7, 2023, the group was notorious for its numerous, deadly attacks and acts of brutal terrorism targeting Israeli Jews over decades. Nonetheless, the unit whitewashes this group as a “Palestinian resistance group that rejects a two-state solution,” 166 parenthetically adding that:

“While the United States and Israel say Hamas is a terrorist organization, the United Nations does not. Hamas calls itself an Islamic national liberation and resistance movement.” 167

The authors have made it clear they choose to adopt Hamas’ self-description as a “resistance” movement to convey as settled fact to the students, and to bolster their choice, they simultaneously attempt to minimize the widespread designation of Hamas as a terrorist organization. Indeed, it is not only the U.S. and Israel (both being criticized in the book as imperialist) that designate Hamas a terrorist organization. Canada, 168 the UK, 169 the EU, 170 and Australia, 171 also designate Hamas as a terrorist organization, as does Colombia, which recently accepted the full US and EU designated terrorist list. (The same type of characterization of Hamas can be found in the unit on Syria.)

Rather than explaining to students the terrorist nature of Hamas, the readings criticize U.S. condemnation of Hamas and its support of Israel by casting these as part of a biased policy:

“Most Israelis believe that they are under constant threat of attack, so U.S. policies that defend Israeli settlements and counter groups like Hamas are viewed favorably. Israeli officials grow concerned when U.S. administrations take a more neutral stance toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and expect Israel to compromise with Palestinian demands.” 172

The real threat Hamas poses is dismissed as just perceptual. And the ramifications of adopting such an approach to teaching students became tragically evident on October 7, 2023.

Intifadas

The unit devotes a section to “The Intifada,” referring to the First Intifada (1987-1993), which it describes as “a protest movement” by “Palestinian resistance groups” against what it alleges were discriminatory and unjust actions by Israel:

165 E.g., Hindustan Times, YouTube Video, @HT-Videos, Palestinians celebrate Jerusalem synagogue attack; Sweets distributed, crackers burst | Watch, 28 January 2023, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0xPNTbtUHVc.
166 The Middle East Curriculum Unit, p.47. Digital: “What is Hamas?”
167 Ibid.
172 The Middle East Curriculum Unit, p.49. Digital: “What are Perspectives on U.S Policy Among Israelis?”
“...The Israeli government confiscated Palestinian land, arrested and detained Palestinians, and implemented discriminatory taxes and regulations. In response, Palestinians began a series of strikes and protests. Over time, the uprising became more violent.”173

In fact, the causes of the intifada were many and complex.174 175 But rather than explaining this, the authors chose to include only a simplistic list of general and vague accusations against Israel without the specificity, timeline, or context that would enable validation. The authors present this list of grievances against Israel as an accepted truth and as the entire reason and justification for the intifada.

Moreover, the readings provide no examples of what the “protests” by the Palestinian resistance group consisted. For example, while some protesters confined themselves to civil disobedience, Palestinian rioters targeted Israeli soldiers and civilians from the get-go with stones and firebombs. These were not just symbolic weapons of the weak and oppressed: At least 271 Israeli civilians were killed, including 18 children, in addition to 150 Israeli security forces killed in Israel and the territories during the first intifada and hundreds more were wounded.176 Rachel Weiss, a 26-year-old Israeli mother, pregnant at the time, was one such victim as she and her three young children lost their lives on a civilian, inter-city bus that was firebombed by Palestinian protesters. A fellow passenger who tried to pull her from the burning wreckage was killed as well.177 In another incident, a Palestinian ‘protester’ forced a civilian bus off the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem highway into a ravine, killing the 16 civilians on board, including three North Americans.178 It is yet another attempt to conceal deadly violence by Palestinians against Israelis.

Nor is there any mention here of the internal violence, fueled by intra-Palestinian rivalries, that became a feature of this intifada. Palestinians were stabbed, beaten and shot by fellow Palestinians who accused their victims of being “collaborators.” With nearly 1,000 Palestinians killed in fratricidal attacks during this time, the first intifada was dubbed an “intrafada.”179

Entirely missing from the readings is any mention of the Second Intifada, that lasted from 2000-2006, with more than 25,000 attacks perpetrated by Palestinian terrorists, including suicide bombings, car

---
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rammings, stabbings, and drive-by shootings targeting non-combatant civilians and other attacks on security forces. A total of 1,118 Israelis were killed and 8,103 wounded in these attacks.180

Israel Blamed as Terrorist/Aggressor While Palestinian Terrorist Role Expunged

The same approach is repeated in the unit on international terrorism (Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy). The only mention of terrorism in Israel and the territories in this unit is a section devoted to Baruch Goldstein, the single Jew to have ever perpetrated a large-scale shooting attack on Palestinian civilians.

That 1994 terrorist attack in which 29 Palestinian Muslims were murdered at Hebron’s Tomb of the Patriarch is detailed in the book and referred to as “the Hebron Massacre.” Erased from the curriculum is the 1929 even larger-scale massacre of Jews living in Hebron by Palestinian Arab perpetrators. Nor is there any reference to the Safed massacre of Jews by Palestinian-Arab perpetrators that took place in 1929 or to the Tiberias Massacre of Jews by Palestinian-Arab perpetrators that took place in 1938. Indeed, there is no mention whatsoever of any of the dozens of similar, large-scale terrorist acts in Israel and the territories in which Jewish civilians were murdered by Palestinian perpetrators, not to mention any of the smaller casualty suicide bombings, stabbings, shootings, and car rammings in which Palestinian Arabs target Jews.

In a unit devoted entirely to terrorism, Arab terrorism in Israel and the territories is expunged, just as it is in the other areas of the curriculum that focus on Israel, Zionism and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, leaving students with the false notion that the real terrorists in the region are Jews.181 (The only mention of Palestinian terrorism in the unit is the 1972 Munich Massacre that took place in Germany.)

Similarly, in the unit about Turkey (Empire, Republic, Democracy: Turkey’s Past and Future) reference to a violent incident in 2010 that contributed to a deterioration of relations between Turkey and Israel presented Israelis as violent aggressors against innocent humanitarians, although that was not at all the case. The 2010 incident involved the Mavi Marmara, a passenger ship owned by Turkish Islamists carrying anti-Israel activists who sought to break Israel’s naval blockade of the Hamas-run Gaza Strip. The primary organizers of the flotilla trying to break the blockade were linked to terrorist groups and supported violence against Israel.182 As Israeli commandos boarded the ship to turn it back, they were violently attacked by militant passengers, who stabbed, beat and injured several of the Israelis. Two Israeli commandos were reportedly shot and three were seized and hauled below deck; nine of the anti-Israel passengers aboard the ship were killed in the Israeli counterattack.183 184 According to the Choices curriculum account, however, there was no mention of anti-Israel violence,

181 Curriculum unit: Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy, Ninth Edition (Brown University, 2021)
or terrorist groups. Here, too, Israel was portrayed as the sole aggressor and party to blame for the ills in the area:

“U.S.-Turkish relations have also been strained by tension between Turkey and Israel, a major U.S. ally. The 2010 Israeli military attack on a Turkish civilian ship carrying humanitarian aid to the Gaza Strip severely harmed Turkey’s relationship with Israel. In addition, Turkey has been critical of Israel’s occupation of the Palestinian territories since 1967.”

7. PROMOTING BIASED SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES ABOUT ISRAEL

To compound the problems in the curriculum mentioned above, recommended supplementary resources convey the same biased, anti-Zionist narrative as does the curriculum.

For example, the program directs students to the book, *The Israel-Palestine Conflict: One Hundred Years of War* by James Gelvin, which exemplifies the Zionist “colonialist” narrative. Gelvin presents a revisionist history, dismissing the Zionist narrative as a “misrepresentation” and portraying it as a “prototypical” European nationalist movement usurping the land of indigenous inhabitants.

Another recommended resource is *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* by John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, which charges the “Israel lobby” with distorting U.S. foreign policy in favor of Israel and to the detriment of the Americans, to the point of allegedly making the country a target of Al Qaeda and other terrorists.

Two human rights organizations whose anti-Israel bias has been discussed above — Amnesty International, which has been shown to play fast and loose with the truth when it comes to advancing its biased agenda and Human Rights Watch, from which its own founder dissociated himself because of its relentless anti-Israel bias (see above, p. 23) — are promoted as reliable resources:

“NGOs such as Amnesty International advocate for human rights by lobbying governments and shine a spotlight on grave abuses by organizing petitions and campaigns. Human Rights
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Watch monitors the human rights performance of governments and corporations and relays news of human rights abuses to the international community.”

Students are recommended to join and promote these organizations:

“Have students research and contact organizations devoted to furthering human rights. Students could locate a nearby event or group, such as an Amnesty International chapter, to join and share their projects.”

8. CONCLUSION

On October 7, 2023, Palestinian terrorist groups under Hamas invaded Israel to carry out mass atrocities in a bloody massacre of civilians inside Israel, butchering 1200 and seizing hundreds of hostages, in the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust. From infants to the elderly, no one was spared. Hamas official Ghazi Hamad publicly vowed to repeat the massacre until the Jewish state no longer exists. Hamas leaders have made no secret of the fact that their goal and mission is not merely the elimination of Israel and its replacement with a caliphate under Hamas, but a global caliphate with Jerusalem as its capital. Since then, across the globe the antisemites’ masks have dropped, dividing societies into those who support Hamas’ goals and those who push back against them.

The Choices curriculum with its historical revisionism that whitewashes Palestinian aggression and terrorism, erases Hamas’ stated goals and genocidal intent and portrays the existence of the Jewish state as illegitimate leaves students woefully unprepared to deal with the realities of this changing world. Indeed, a curriculum, like Choices, that entrenches anti-Zionist stereotypes and lies, can only feed the growing antisemitism in U.S. classrooms.

Brown University should pull the problematic videos from its offerings and revamp the curriculum on the Middle East to include more balanced, factual and scholarly perspectives. Meanwhile, teachers, parents and students should reject the anti-Zionist indoctrination as dispensed by Choices.
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Thanks to David Orenstein for his contributions to this report.
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