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Selected Quotes:
2007-2008 Textbooks of the Saudi Ministry of Education

- “The Jews and Christians are enemies of the believers, and they cannot approve of Muslims.” ¹
- “The clash between this [Muslim] nation and the Jews and Christians has endured, and it will continue as long as God wills.” ²
- “He (praised is He) prohibits killing the soul that God has forbidden [to kill] unless for just cause… [such as] unbelief after belief, adultery, and killing an inviolable believer intentionally.” ³
- “Major polytheism makes blood and wealth permissible.” ⁴
- “Building mosques on graves is an expression of polytheism” [Condemns Shiite practice] ⁵
- “The punishment for homosexuality is death.” ⁶ “Ibn Qudamah said, ‘The companions of the Prophet were unanimous on killing, although they differed in the description, that is, in the manner of killing. Some of the companions of the Prophet stated that [a homosexual] is to be burned with fire. It has also been said that he should be stoned, or thrown from a high place. Other things have also been said.’” ⁷
- “In Islamic law, however, [jihad] has two uses: One usage is specific. It means to exert effort to wage war against the unbelievers and tyrants.” ⁸
- “In its general usage, ‘jihad’ is divided into the following categories: … --Wrestling with the infidels by calling them to the faith and battling against them.” ⁹
- “In these verses is a call for jihad, which is the pinnacle of Islam. In (jihad) is life for the body; thus it is one of the most important causes of outward life. Only through force and victory over the enemies is there security and repose. Within martyrdom in the path of God (exalted and glorified is He) is a type of noble life-force that is not diminished by fear or poverty.” ¹⁰
- “As cited in Ibn Abbas: The apes are Jews, the people of the Sabbath; while the swine are Christians, the infidels of the communion of Jesus.” ¹¹
- “The decisive proof of the veracity of the Protocols [of the Elders of Zion] and the infernal Jewish plans they contain is that the plans, plots, and conspiracies they list have been carried out. Whoever reads the protocols – and they emerged in the 19th century – will realize today how much of what they described has been implemented.” ¹²
- “You can hardly find an example of sedition in which the Jews have not played a role.” ¹³
- “The new approach to the crusades took several forms, including …[t]he establishment of schools. They founded many schools in the Islamic world at various educational levels. These include: the American Universities of Beirut and Cairo, the Jesuit University, Robert College in Istanbul, Gordon [Memorial] College in Khartoum, and others too numerous to mention.” ¹⁴
- “[Baha’ism] is one of the destructive esoteric sects in the modern age… It has become clear that Babism [the precursor to Baha’ism], Baha’ism, and Qadyanism [Ahmadiyyaism] represent wayward forces inside the Islamic world that seek to strike from within and weaken it. They are colonial pillars in our Islamic countries and among the true obstacles to a renaissance.” ¹⁵
- “Lesson goals: The student notes some of the Jews’ condemnable qualities” ¹⁶
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FOREWORD

Saudi Wahhabism, as it spreads throughout the Islamic diaspora, has been likened by one terrorism expert to “kindling for Usama Bin Laden’s match.”

The terrorist attack of 9/11 awakened Americans to a growing movement by extremists within the Islamic world – a movement motivated by a radical political doctrine that can be best thought of as Islamist totalitarianism.

It has become quite clear that extreme Islamist ideologies have been gaining adherents throughout the world. Where they are implemented as governing ideologies, we see a brutally-enforced hierarchy of group rights, favoring Muslims over non-Muslims, men over women, and a dominant Muslim sect over other Muslims, with individual rights and freedoms subordinated for all. Such extreme rule lies at the heart of the Islamist terrorists’ radical agenda.

It is equally clear that much of this extremist religious thought is originating from and being spread by the Saudi Arabia’s Islamist sect known as Wahhabism.

Wahhabi teachings, if one reads their fatwas and these Saudi Ministry of Education textbooks, are murderously intolerant toward the Shi’a, Jews, Baha’i, Ahmadiyya, homosexuals, apostates, and “unbelievers” of all kinds, and horribly repressive with respect to everyone else, especially women. The ultimate Wahhabi objective is quite clear from a wide range of their writings – the establishment of a world-wide theocratic dictatorship, the caliphate. These are essentially the same basic beliefs as those expressed by al Qaeda. A bit like the Stalinists and Trotskyites of the 20’s and 30’s, the Wahhabis and al Qaeda do not disagree about underlying beliefs and objectives, but rather about which of them should be in charge. The hate-filled and totalitarian underlying views of both, however, point in the same overall direction. Recent criticism of al Qaeda by Sayyid Imam al-Sharif (also called “Doctor Fadl”), Ayman Zawahiri’s mentor and later his rival, and by other Islamists, chiefly because al Qaeda has killed so many Muslims, adds an interesting tension to the current picture but does not fundamentally change it.

The Saudi government’s sponsorship of the ideas and objectives that the Wahhabis and al Qaeda share gives them reach and legitimacy, and threatens the longstanding relationship between our two countries and much more besides.

Even before President Franklin Roosevelt’s historic meeting with King Abdulaziz al-Saud aboard the USS Quincy north of the Suez Canal on February 14, 1945, the United States and the Saudis had forged a mutually beneficial alliance. The House of Saud had been helpful to the American war effort during World War II, and both nations were later on the same side during the Cold War. As recently as the 70’s, the world of US-Saudi relations was a reasonably close and relaxed one. A number of Saudis prominent in government, the military, and the oil business had been educated in the West and were on quite easy terms, at least privately, with us, our values, and our ways. The serious bumps along the road began with the Saudis’ 1973 oil embargo against us – essentially punishment for our efforts in that year to provide Israel with emergency help when she was attacked by her Arab neighbors. But the United States and Saudi Arabia continued to be strategically interdependent – our protection, our dollars, and our
technology for their oil. Today, however, the relationship has become strained to the breaking point by the Faustian bargain the House of Saud has made with its Wahhabi establishment.

The watershed year was 1979, when Ayatollah Khomeini seized power in Shiite Iran and Sunni extremists took over the holiest of Islam’s shrines, the Great Mosque in Mecca, which was under the protection of the Saudi King. The threatened Saudi monarchy lost no time – and has spared no expense – in shoring up its legitimacy as the rightful and only defender of the faith. This is a claim it had made for well over half a century, since seizing the holy cities of Mecca and Medina from the Hashemites. From the 1980s onward, in return for the protection of their own powers and privileges, the Saudi royal family chose not only to accommodate Wahhabi views about propriety, pious behavior, and Islamic law, but effectively to turn over education in the Kingdom to the Wahhabi establishment.

They also began to fund with over $75 billion during the intervening years the expansion throughout the world of the Wahhabis’ extreme, hostile, anti-modern and anti-democratic form of Islam. Many Wahhabi-funded madrassahs world-wide, using the very types of texts examined in this report, echo and perpetrate this Wahhabi hatred and thus promote its consequences. According to Lawrence Wright in his book *Looming Tower*, with just over one per cent of the world’s Muslim population, the Saudis support via the Wahhabis “90 per cent of the expenses of the entire faith, overriding other traditions of Islam.”

It is now nearly thirty years on, and the Faustian bargain still stands. Once regarded as an austere, fringe group by a large majority of Muslims, the Wahhabi sect is now extremely powerful and influential in the Muslim world due to the Saudi government’s support and the oil resources of the Arabian Peninsula. Unfathomable wealth has enabled Saudi Arabia to modernize its architecture, communications, and transportation infrastructure, and project itself internationally, including most recently (and preposterously, given e.g. its leaders’ lethal view of apostates) as a convener of interfaith dialogue. But it resists the cultural reforms of even its Wahhabi neighbor Qatar, which tolerates churches, allows women to drive, and has taken some steps toward adapting to globalization’s demand for pluralism. Saudi Arabia’s religio-political ideology, reflected in its textbooks, remains mired in the insular and xenophobic desert traditions of the ancient Arabian peninsula. The Saudi-funded, Wahhabi-operated export of hatred of us and our bed-rock belief in the centrality of individual freedom continues and, due to Saudi Arabia’s oil-funded prosperity, reaches around the globe.

The twentieth century saw the rise and fall of four highly lethal totalitarian ideologies, each guiding a powerful empire and bent on our destruction: Fascism, Nazism, Japanese Imperialism, and Communism. These movements produced tens of millions of deaths and were responsible for World War II, various regional guerrilla wars, and the Cold War. By the beginning of the nineties these four totalitarian “isms” and their empires had been defeated, both intellectually and militarily. Some were calling it the “end of history,” meaning that liberal democratic capitalism, based on the “self-evident” principles of equality, individual freedom and human rights, had prevailed in winning the minds and hearts – if not to that point the governments – of virtually all of humanity. In those years at the beginning of the last decade it was extraordinarily difficult to believe that another “ism” with the power to pose a fundamental threat to the underpinnings of the free world would soon come to mount a world-wide attack on the rule of law and the right of
people to govern themselves – on our lives, our liberties, and our pursuit of happiness. But that is now indeed the case.

The world has been slow to respond to this new ideological challenge. Algeria is taking some tentative steps to extirpate Wahhabi influence from its own curriculum and restrict Saudi schools within its borders. In India, after some thirty percent of the mosques of the Barelvi Sufi sects have been taken over by Wahhabis, according to newspaper accounts, Indian Muslims are posting warnings to Wahhabi front groups to stay out of their mosques and prayer halls. Two years ago the United States negotiated and received a confirmation from the government of Saudi Arabia that it would remove destructive Wahhabi lessons from all its educational materials, both those used inside the Kingdom and those proliferated abroad. The deadline for that reform has now been reached, but the State Department has not demonstrated that it intends to subject the textbooks to the intense scrutiny and follow through required to enforce compliance. We hope this analysis shows the need for continued American engagement on this issue and helps this process move forward.

In the meantime, we need to end our dependency on oil, the international market for which is Saudi-dominated. An increasing share of our payments for oil, along with others’, finds its way to Saudi Arabia. The billions that Saudis provide annually to their Wahhabi sect for global expansion comes from these petrodollars. Thus, as has often been said, when we pay for Middle Eastern oil today, this Long War in which we are engaged becomes the only war the U.S. has ever fought in which we pay for both sides.

If our nation, guided by our founders’ values, is to survive then, this dependency on oil must end.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This report compares textbooks from the Saudi Ministry of Education, which are posted on its website as this is issued, with those analyzed in our 2006 study, Saudi Arabia’s Curriculum of Intolerance, and shows that the same violent and intolerant teachings against other religious believers noted in 2006 remain in the current texts. All of these textbooks have been reissued at least once and all but two of them reissued twice, yet overall the changes to the passages in question have been minimal, and the degree of substantive change has been negligible. Taken together, the revisions that have been made amount to moving around the furniture, not cleaning the house. This analysis is issued as the deadline nears for the removal of intolerant teachings from all Saudi textbooks. This commitment stems from the Saudi government’s “confirmation” of policies that were publicly announced and lauded as “significant developments” by the U.S. State Department in July 2006, and are to be implemented in full by the start of the 2008-2009 school year.

In May 2006, the Center for Religious Freedom, with the Institute for Gulf Affairs, released a ground-breaking report that analyzed excerpts from a dozen textbooks published by the Saudi Ministry of Education and used at that time in the Saudi public school curriculum. Saudi Arabia also disseminated these texts internationally, including to some 19 academies founded by Saudi Arabia and chaired by the local Saudi ambassadors in or near major foreign cities, one of which is the Islamic Saudi Academy (ISA) outside Washington, D.C.

The 2006 report concluded:

“The Saudi public school religious curriculum continues to propagate an ideology of hate toward the ‘unbeliever,’ that is, Christians, Jews, Shiites, Sufis, and Sunni Muslims who do not follow Wahhabi doctrine, Hindus, atheists, and others. This ideology is introduced in a religion textbook in the first grade and reinforced and developed in following years of the public education system, culminating in the twelfth grade, where a text instructs students that it is a religious obligation to do ‘battle’ against infidels in order to spread the faith.”

This new analysis takes as markers for comparison twelve key points contained in a summarized list in the 2006 analysis. They cover Saudi government lessons on other religious groups, both non-Muslim and Muslim, and on non-believers, as well as a passage on jihad. This analysis finds that all these concerns remain valid in the updated books used in the 2007-2008 curriculum and currently found on the Saudi government’s website. In the new books, only the text relevant to marker four, described below, has been rewritten, but even in this case the lesson remains the same; it teaches its readers to “hate the infidels.” Moreover, in the passage quoted in marker four, the injunction not to treat the unbeliever “unjustly,” wording that was touted as a reform in 2006 by the then Saudi ambassador, has been removed from the current texts.

See the section “Comparing Saudi Textbooks: 2006-2008,” below, for further discussion of the comparisons.
The twelve point list below is taken directly from the 2006 report and applies equally to the Saudi textbooks for the 2007-2008 year that are currently posted on the website of the Saudi Education Ministry (http://www2.moe.gov.sa/ebooks/index.htm). The changed wording, affecting only marker four, is noted in italics:

Regarding Sunni, Shiite, Sufi and other non-Wahhabi or non-Salafi Muslims, the textbooks:

1. Condemn the majority of Sunni Muslims around the world as “bad successors” of “bad predecessors.”

2. Condemn and denigrate Shiite and Sufi Muslims’ beliefs and practices as heretical and call them “polytheists.”

3. Denounce Muslims who do not interpret the Qur’an “literally.”

Regarding Christians, Jews, Polytheists (including Muslims who are not followers of Wahhabism) and other infidels, the books:

4. Command Muslims to “hate” Christians, Jews, polytheists, and other “unbelievers,” including non-Wahhabi Muslims, though, incongruously, not to treat them “unjustly.”

5. Teach that the Crusades never ended and identify the American Universities in Beirut and in Cairo, other Western and Christian social service providers, media outlets, centers for academic studies of Orientalism, and campaigns for women’s rights as part of the modern phase of the Crusades.

6. Teach that “the Jews and the Christians are enemies of the [Muslim] believers” and that “the clash” between the two realms “continues until the Day of Resurrection.”

7. Instruct students not to “greet,” “imitate,” “show loyalty to,” “be courteous to” or “respect” non-believers.

8. Define jihad to include “wrestling with the infidels by calling them to the faith and battling against them” and assert that the spread of Islam through jihad is a “religious obligation.”

[The word qital, translated here as “battle,” is derived from the verb qatala, “to kill,” and is virtually never used metaphorically.]

Regarding Anti-Semitism, they:

9. Instruct that “the struggle between Muslims and Jews” will continue “until the hour [of judgment].” that “Muslims will triumph because they are right,” and that “he who is right is always victorious.”
10. Cite a selective teaching of violence against Jews, while, in the same lesson, ignore the passages of the Qur’an and hadiths [narratives of the life of the Muslim Prophet Muhammad] that counsel tolerance.  

11. Teach the Protocols of the Elders of Zion as historical fact and relate modern events to it.  

12. Discuss Jews in violent terms, blaming them for virtually all the “sedition” and wars of the modern world.

The more extensive excerpts from which these twelve markers are taken have undergone some additional wording changes and reformatting over the past two years, but the Saudi government has not removed the objectionable message of these lessons. Any improvements that may have been made to those Saudi textbooks we did not review would be undercut or negated by these teachings in the ones we did. As in 2006, the Saudi Ministry of Education religion textbooks reviewed in this report teach bigotry and violence and deplore tolerance. (These more extensive excerpts, for both the 2005-2006 and the 2007-2008 academic years, and brief discussions of the changes in them are included in Appendix C; side by side Arabic and English translation versions of these lessons can be found on the Center’s website: www.hudson.org/religion.)

In addition, we verified that the currently posted 2007-2008 textbooks also contain the same passages that were found last month in ISA textbooks by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). The Commission assessed these passages as “overt exhortations to violence” and “promot[ing] intolerance.” They include assertions that it is permissible for a Muslim to kill an “apostate,” an “adulterer,” and those practicing “major polytheism.” One lesson states that “it is not permissible to violate the blood, property, or honor of the unbeliever who makes a compact with the Muslims,” but is pointedly silent on whether security guarantees are extended to non-Muslims without such a compact. One very brief passage discusses jihad. With no further guidance or clarification of the ambiguities it raises, this passage asserts jihad is the “pinnacle of Islam,” exalts “force and victory over the enemies,” and glorifies “martyrdom” as a “noble life-force.” Other lessons demonize members of the Baha’i and Ahmadiyya faiths and blame “the Jews” for having “conspired against Islam.” (See, Appendix D.)

There is also a lesson from a tenth grade text on Jurisprudence now posted on the Saudi Ministry of Education website that sanctions the killing of homosexuals and discusses methods for doing so. Burning with fire, stoning, or throwing from a high place are methods that are mentioned. Though the lesson quotes a traditional scholar saying the Prophet Muhammad made no judgment on homosexuality, it presents the Saudi *sharia* ruling that homosexuals should be killed as definitive. (See, Appendix E.)

These texts teach students that there exist two incompatible realms – one consisting of true believers in Islam, the monotheists, and the other of infidels or unbelievers – and that these realms never coexist in peace. They assert that unbelievers, such as Christians, Jews, and Muslims who do not share Wahhabi beliefs and practices, are hated “enemies,” and that true believers should aid and show loyalty only to other true believers. These texts teach that
Christians, Jews, and others have united in a war against Islam that will ultimately end in the complete destruction of these infidels. The books promote global jihad as an “effort to wage war against the unbelievers.” In these lessons, no argument is made that such references to jihad mean only spiritual struggle and defensive warfare. Some Saudis themselves have linked the Kingdom’s educational curriculum to patterns of violence in young Saudi men.

In the lessons examined in this report, the Saudi government discounts or ignores passages in the Qur’an and in the accounts of the life of the Muslim Prophet Muhammad that support tolerance. This is in striking contrast to the Saudi government’s invocation of just such passages when it addresses Western audiences. In the international arena, the Saudi government argues that there is no religious coercion in Islam and that the Islamic tradition supports “inalienable human rights” and the peaceful coexistence of Muslims with other religious believers. These are the types of arguments that the Saudi government needs to make in its own textbooks and educational materials in place of lessons that sanction and promote violence and extreme intolerance.

Saudi Arabia’s religious legitimacy, through the custodianship of the two Islamic holy shrines, and its vast oil wealth enable it to exert unprecedented influence within the Muslim world. Saudi religious texts are being disseminated worldwide through the internet and other means. This means that millions of Muslim students are being indoctrinated from textbooks that some Saudis themselves have linked to religious violence. Largely due to such educational materials, Saudi Wahhabi extremism threatens to become a mainstream or even the dominant expression of Islam among the world’s 1.3 billion Muslims. While the Saudi state has recently initiated a program to re-educate some Islamic terrorists, it appears to be educating even greater numbers with a religious curriculum that legitimizes, as some Saudi scholars wrote, the “violent repression” and “physical elimination” of the other.

Simultaneously, the Saudi King has assumed a leading role on the international stage in initiatives for both intrafaith and interfaith dialogue. The Saudi Ministry of Education’s continued teaching of hatred and violence against other religious believers, however, raises the concern that the King’s overtures will be of greater benefit to the Saudi public relations campaign to counter growing world discontent about soaring oil prices, than to finding common ground.

A key test of the Saudi government’s commitment to tolerance and pluralism will be whether it cleans up its textbooks before the start of the next school year, in September 2008. The government of Saudi Arabia is bound to respect religious freedom and not discriminate on the basis of religion under the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other international instruments. It also specifically confirmed to the United States it would reform its textbooks and do so by the start of the 2008-2009 school year. In 2006, following protracted bilateral discussions with the Saudi Foreign Ministry, the State Department publicized that Saudi Arabia confirmed it would revise its textbooks and make other related reforms within two years. Relying on the Saudi “confirmation,” the Secretary of State waived taking action against Saudi Arabia, as required under the International Religious Freedom Act. Whether this will prove to be an historic turning point or simply a public relations maneuver by Saudi Arabia remains to be seen. This analysis documents that thorough textbook reform has not yet occurred. It is in
American interests that the U.S. Government, in this administration and the next, hold Saudi Arabia to its obligations.
A MUSLIM CASE FOR SAUDI TOLERANCE

Within worldwide Sunni Islam, followers of Wahhabism and other hard-line movements are a distinct minority. This is evident from the many Muslims who have chosen to make America their home and are upstanding, law-abiding citizens and neighbors. It was just such concerned Muslims who first brought world attention to the pernicious content of Saudi textbooks and decried the Wahhabi doctrine they promoted as foreign to the toleration contained in Islam and its injunction against coercion in religion.

These Muslims believe they would be forbidden to practice the faith of their ancestors in today’s Saudi Arabia and value religious freedom. They affirm the importance of respecting non-Muslims as well, pointing to verses in the Qur’an that speak with kindness about non-Muslims. They raise examples of Islam’s Prophet Muhammad visiting his sick Jewish neighbor, standing in deference at a Jew’s funeral procession, settling a dispute in favor of a truthful Jew over a dishonest person who was a Muslim, and forming alliances with Jews and polytheists, among others. They criticize the Wahhabis for distorting and even altering the text of the Qur’an in support of their bigotry. They say that in their tradition jihad is applicable only in defense of Islam and Muslims.

Abdurrahman Wahid, the former President of Indonesia and former head of the world’s largest Muslim organization, Nahdlatul Ulama, and Sheikh Muhammad Hisham Kabbani, the Lebanese-American Chairman of the Michigan-based Islamic Supreme Council of America, are two Muslim world leaders who have courageously spoken out and written about the threats posed by Wahhabi ideology and its global expansion. Saudi expert Ali Al-Ahmed, Director of the Washington-based Gulf Institute, published his first evaluation of Saudi textbooks in January 2001. Ali Alyami of the Center for Democracy and Human Rights in Saudi Arabia, scholar Sheikh Ahmed Subhy Mansour, and authors Stephen Schwartz and Mai Yamani are among other Muslim leaders and intellectuals who, from outside the Kingdom, write strong and persuasive human rights critiques of Saudi education.

Even within Saudi Arabia, some are beginning, despite intimidation, to make these points publicly. A notable example is Dr. Hamza Al-Maziani, a linguistics professor at King Saud University, who was charged by a colleague with describing Islamic textbooks used at the University as “radical.” He had written several pieces on problems in Saudi universities, including an article in the Al-Watan daily that criticized the deteriorating quality of education at King Saud University. He argued that the dominance of radical Islamists over university culture had harmed the quality of cultural programs. For speaking out, he was sued for defamation and insult by a Saudi professor of Islamic culture. In March 2005, a sharia court found Al-Maziani guilty of “mocking religion” and sentenced him to be flogged and imprisoned. The sentence was annulled by the King and his case transferred to an administrative panel within the Ministry of Information, which ordered him to pay a fine in May 2006. Despite this ordeal, Al-Maziani continued to advocate educational reform, and, while giving an address on this issue in September 2006, he was assaulted by a group of young men who called him an infidel.

In the schoolbook lessons examined in this report, the Saudi government discounts or ignores passages supporting tolerance in the Qur’an and in the stories of the life of the Muslim Prophet
Muhammad. Yet, in addressing Western audiences, the Saudi government invokes just such passages. In the international arena, the Saudi government recognizes and employs the argument that there can be found support within Islamic tradition for “inalienable human rights,” and the peaceful coexistence of Muslims with other religious believers.

For example, in its 1970 memorandum to the United Nations (Appendix F), the Saudi government quoted extensively from Islamic sacred texts to argue that “the dignity of a human person” would be “protected by us without any distinction between one man and another under the impetus of the divine Islamic creed and not by the material law.” The Saudi government cited numerous Qur’anic and other passages to establish that Islam ensures basic human rights, including religious freedom. It wrote as follows:

The dignity of man, in conformity with the Koranic verse which says: "We have honoured the sons of Adam". (XVI, 70).

No distinctions in dignity and fundamental rights between one man and another as race, sex, blood relations or wealth, in accordance with the Saying of the Prophet of Islam: "There is no advantage for an Arab over a non-Arab, or for a white man over a black man excepting by piety," and in his saying: "Women are partners to men".

The call for the unity of the human race. The persons most favoured by God are those who are most beneficial to mankind, in accordance with the Saying of the Prophet of Islam: "Human creatures are the families of God and the ones who are most loved by Him are those who are most useful to their families."

The call for acquaintance and cooperation for the common good as well as for the performance of all kinds of righteous deeds towards all human beings regardless of their citizenship or religion, in conformity with the Koranic verse: "O mankind we created you from a single pair of a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is he who is the most righteous of you." (XLIX, 13). The same theme is repeated in the following Koranic verse: "God forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) faith nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them: For God loveth those who are just." (LX, 8).

Religious freedom to every one and prohibition of any exercise of force in this respect, in response to God's Sayings in the Glorious Koran: "Let there be no compulsion in religion," (II, 256) and "Wilt thou then compel mankind against their will to believe!" (X, 99). These sayings show how the use of pressure on man's religious freedom is denounced.

Prohibition of any attack on the property or the life of a man as expressed in the Saying of the Muslim Prophet: "You are forbidden to attack the property or the lives of others."
House immunity for the protection of man's freedom as mentioned in the following Koranic Saying: "O ye who believe! Enter not houses other than your own, until ye have asked permission and saluted those in them; that is best for you, in order that ye may heed (what is seemly)." (XXIV, 27).

... There are countless other Islamic religious laws for the protection of those rights which are referred to above. They explain, on the whole, the basic inalienable Human Rights. They also deal in a comprehensive way with man's economic, social and cultural rights from the humanitarian and idealistic aspects which do not make any distinction or allow for any kind of distinction between one human being and another, particularly concerning the things provided for in the International Human Rights Declaration, namely sex or colour or language or religion or opinion or national or social origin or wealth or country. We also go farther than that and add things that were not recognized by the Drafting Body of Human Rights, such as those that appear in the following Koranic Verse: "O ye who believe! Stand out firmly for God, as witness to fair dealing, and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just: that is next to piety; and fear God, for God is well-acquainted with all that ye do." (V 8). We can infer from these holy words that no discrimination in human rights ought to be made because of hatreds or animosities.

These are the types of arguments that the Saudi government needs to make in its own textbooks and educational materials in place of lessons that sanction and promote violence and extreme intolerance, including those examples highlighted in this report.
INTOLERANT TEXTBOOKS VIOLATE SAUDI ARABIA’S INTERNATIONAL AND BILATERAL OBLIGATIONS

Saudi government sponsorship of textbooks that promote violent and intolerant teachings constitutes a threat to American interests, and violates both international and bilateral human rights obligations that Saudi Arabia has freely assumed. The Saudi state’s international agreements – in particular its confirmation to the United States government that it would remove all intolerance from its textbooks – give jurisdiction over this matter to the U.S. Department of State.

This analysis is concerned exclusively with the issue of religious freedom and is based on two grounds.

International Obligations

First, as a Member State of the United Nations, Saudi Arabia is obligated under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to uphold tolerance, end religious discrimination, and respect the right to religious freedom and pluralism. Saudi Arabia also is bound under non-discrimination provisions of various other treaties it has ratified or acceded to. These include the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Saudi reservations to the effect that compliance would be within the limits of sharia have prompted the UN treaty bodies that monitor compliance to criticize it for having a “narrow interpretation of Islamic texts… impeding the enjoyment of many human rights,” specifically in the areas of “equality and tolerance.”

The UN Charter affirms that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Articles 55 and 56 of the UN Charter state, as follows:

Article 55

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

...  
c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 56

All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

The Declaration provides:
Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

This right is to be examined in conjunction with the other non-discrimination provisions in the Declaration, which guarantee rights to each individual without discrimination on the basis of religion.

While Saudi Arabia abstained from voting for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights when it was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, the Declaration’s basic rights are now considered by international law experts to be part of customary law, binding on all governments. Saudi Arabia’s responsibility in upholding such basic rights is implicit in its membership on the UN’s Human Rights Council; it is one of 47 members that sit in judgment of the world’s countries on basic human rights issues, including religious freedom.56

**Bilateral “Confirmation” of Policies**

Our second ground for holding Saudi Arabia responsible for textbook reform is that, two years ago, as a result of protracted bilateral negotiations with the United States government, Saudi Arabia “confirmed” to the U.S. government that it would reform its curriculum thoroughly within two years.57 On July 19, 2006, the State Department issued a press release announcing the diplomatic confirmation of policy: “The Saudi Government is conducting a comprehensive revision of textbooks and educational curricula to weed out disparaging remarks toward religious groups, a process that will be completed in one to two years” (see, Appendix A).

The State Department’s press release reported that U.S. Ambassador at Large for Religious Freedom John Hanford had briefed Congress on religious practice and tolerance issues in Saudi Arabia, focusing primarily on the results of bilateral discussions on these topics.58 The problem of intolerant language in textbooks and educational curricula was a particular focus of the briefing.

Ambassador Hanford emphasized the significance of the Saudi government’s commitment, noting that it was made openly, and inviting public monitoring of the effort: “I am pleased that the Government of Saudi Arabia has been willing to engage with us in a substantive manner on these critical issues. These policies are significant developments, and I appreciate the Saudi Government’s interest in confirming them publicly so that all interested parties may follow progress made in these areas.”

The State Department explained that the discussion process had made it possible to “identify and confirm a number of key policies that the Saudi Government is pursuing and will continue to pursue for the purpose of promoting greater freedom for religious practice and increased tolerance for religious groups.” The understanding is that the process will be completed by the start of the 2008-2009 school year, according to a January 2008 letter from a State Department official to Senator Jon Kyl (see, Appendix B).
According to an informal document circulated by Ambassador Hanford, Saudi Arabia had pledged, among other things, to “halt the dissemination of intolerant literature and extremist ideology within Saudi Arabia and around the world.” The document listed the following specific steps among those that the government of Saudi Arabia would take:

- Revise and update textbooks to remove remaining intolerant references that disparage Muslims or non-Muslims or that promote hatred toward other religions or religious groups, a process the Saudi Government expects to complete in one to two years.
- Review revised materials to expunge any remaining intolerant references about any religion or religious groups that were not removed in previous revisions.
- Prohibit the use of government channels or government funds to publish or promote textbooks, literature, or other materials that advocate intolerance and sanction hatred of religions or religious groups.
- Thoroughly review and revise educational materials and other literature sent abroad to ensure that all intolerant references are removed, and where possible, attempt to retrieve previously distributed materials that contain intolerance.
- Ensure Saudi embassies and consulates abroad review and destroy any material given to them by charities or other entities that promote intolerance or hatred.
- Control distribution of Saudi educational curricula to ensure that unauthorized organizations do not send them abroad.

It is clear that the U.S. government took the Saudi “confirmation” seriously, both in its public announcement of it and in the subsequent formulation of U.S. policy. Since 2004, Saudi Arabia has been designated by the State Department as a “Country of Particular Concern,” under the International Religious Freedom Act. The Act requires presidential action that could include sanctions against governments that have been thus designated as among the world’s worst religious freedom persecutors. However, on the strength of the Saudi government’s confirmation it would undertake textbook reforms and other measures to advance religious freedom and tolerance, as stated in the July 19, 2006, State Department press release, Secretary of State Rice kept in place a waiver of any presidential action against Saudi Arabia (see, Appendix A).

Thus, Saudi Arabia has freely assumed both international and bilateral obligations to eliminate violent, bigoted and discriminatory teachings against the religious “other” from its Ministry of Education textbooks, as well as other materials. This report is a comparative analysis showing the status of textbook reform as the two year compliance period that was negotiated with the United States comes to a close.

It remains to be seen whether the Saudi government will reform its textbooks before the start of the new school year that begins in two months, as it obligated itself to do. We are releasing this analysis at this time to document that fundamental textbook reform has not yet been made and to provide some examples, by no means comprehensive, of violent and extremely intolerant teachings that remain in the Saudi government’s textbooks.

That Saudi Arabia is now an influential global power and a leader within the Muslim world makes it all the more urgent that the Kingdom live up to its international agreements and be a proponent of religious tolerance and freedom.
ABOUT THE REPORT

This analysis takes twelve key points we identified as objectionable in the 2006 textbooks as markers for comparison with the current textbooks. The list covers Saudi government lessons on “unbelievers,” which in Saudi Wahhabi ideology include Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Hindus, other Sunnis, Shiites, Sufis, and others, as well as a passage on jihad also discussed in the 2006 report. Apart from these markers, we include more extensive excerpts for both the 2005-2006 and the 2007-2008 academic years, and a brief discussion of each excerpt in Appendix C. In addition, included in Appendix D are several excerpts found in the 2007-2008 textbooks, which are currently posted on the Saudi government’s website, that had been identified as disturbing examples of violent and intolerant teachings by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) in its analysis of a sample of Saudi textbooks from the Islamic Saudi Academy near Washington, D.C. Appendix E contains an excerpt from a tenth grade textbook currently posted on the Saudi Ministry of Education website that endorses violence against homosexuals.

All the books used in this study are in Arabic and were translated by two independent translators. Photocopies of all the excerpts in their original Arabic, side by side with the English translations, are available on our website at http://www.hudson.org/religion.

The new texts used for this report were downloaded from the Saudi Ministry of Education’s website. As this report goes to print, all of the original Arabic-language textbooks for all grades in the Saudi curriculum for the 2007-2008 academic year can be found in their entirety at the Saudi government’s website: http://www2.moe.gov.sa/ebooks/index.htm.

These textbooks are used in Saudi public school classrooms in elementary, middle, and high school levels. They are part of the government’s religious curriculum, which can encompass up to five courses in the upper grades, thus comprising a significant part of the Saudi school day.

In addition, the texts are disseminated through the internet and other means by Saudi Arabia for use around the world. For example, the Saudi religious curriculum is followed by the network of some 19 international academies founded by the Saudi government, each chaired by the local Saudi ambassador. At the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year, the Saudi academy outside Washington, D.C., stated in its web brochure that it used the Saudi Ministry of Education “curriculum, syllabus and materials” for its Islamic and Arabic studies classes. In June 2008, USCIRF released its analysis of seventeen of the Washington-area Saudi academy textbooks on religion, finding that they appeared to be Saudi Ministry of Education textbooks, containing some alterations but still with identical wording in many sections of the texts. The federal Commission observed the use of correction tape or fluid and cutting and pasting in the textbooks, “but not sufficient revision to remove all objectionable material.” The Washington-area Islamic Saudi Academy, with a student body approaching 1,000, states on its website that its mission is to be “the premier educational institution” for the American Muslim community. Its goal appears to be establishing in the United States, as well as other countries, a homegrown leadership for the next generation of adherents of the Saudi Wahhabi sect of Islam.
COMPARING SAUDI TEXTBOOKS: 2006-2008

In May 2006, the Center for Religious Freedom, with the Institute for Gulf Affairs, released *Saudi Arabia’s Curriculum of Intolerance*, a ground-breaking report that analyzed excerpts from a dozen Saudi textbooks. All of those textbooks had been published by the Saudi Ministry of Education and were used at that time in the curriculum of Saudi public schools between the first and twelfth grades. They also were being disseminated internationally, including to the network of about 19 academies founded by Saudi Arabia and chaired by the local Saudi ambassadors in major foreign cities, such as the Islamic Saudi Academy near Washington, D.C.

The 2006 report concluded:

“As demonstrated by excerpts from the dozen current Islamic studies textbooks analyzed in this report, the Saudi public school religious curriculum continues to propagate an ideology of hate toward the ‘unbeliever,’ that is, Christians, Jews, Shiites, Sufis, Sunni Muslims who do not follow Wahhabi doctrine, Hindus, atheists and others. This ideology is introduced in a religion textbook in the first grade and reinforced and developed in following years of the public education system, culminating in the twelfth grade, where a text instructs students that it is a religious obligation to do ‘battle’ against infidels in order to spread the faith.”

The 2006 analysis had been undertaken in the context of repeated assertions by Saudi government officials, including in a Saudi public relations campaign directed at American audiences, that educational reform had been completed. For example, on March 7, 2005, Adel al-Jubier, a Saudi Foreign Ministry spokesman and now the Saudi ambassador to the United States, had unequivocally asserted: “We have reviewed our educational curriculums. We have removed materials that are inciteful or intolerant towards people of other faiths.”

Two years ago, *Saudi Arabia’s Curriculum of Intolerance* demonstrated that such Saudi claims of having cleaned up the Kingdom’s textbooks were far from true.

The 2006 report presented the following list of twelve excerpts as “disturbing examples” of intolerant passages in the texts:

Regarding Sunni, Shiite, Sufi, and other non-Wahhabi or non-Salafi Muslims, the textbooks:

1. Condemn the majority of Sunni Muslims around the world as “bad successors” of “bad predecessors.”

2. Condemn and denigrate Shiite and Sufi Muslims’ beliefs and practices as heretical and call them “polytheists.”

3. Denounce Muslims who do not interpret the Qur’an “literally.”

Regarding Christians, Jews, Polytheists (including Muslims who are not followers of Wahhabism), and other infidels, the books:
4. Command Muslims to “hate” Christians, Jews, polytheists, and other “unbelievers,”
including non-Wahhabi Muslims, though, incongruously, not to treat them “unjustly.”

5. Teach that the Crusades never ended and identify the American Universities in Beirut and
in Cairo, other Western and Christian social service providers, media outlets, centers for
academic studies of Orientalism, and campaigns for women’s rights as part of the modern
phase of the Crusades.

6. Teach that “the Jews and the Christians are enemies of the [Muslim] believers” and that
“the clash” between the two realms “continues until the Day of Resurrection.”

7. Instruct students not to “greet,” “imitate,” “show loyalty to,” “be courteous to” or
“respect” non-believers.

8. Define jihad to include “wrestling with the infidels by calling them to the faith and battling
against them” and assert that the spread of Islam through jihad is a “religious obligation.”
(The word qital, translated here as “battle,” is derived from the verb qatala, “to kill,” and is
virtually never used metaphorically.)

Regarding Anti-Semitism, they:

9. Instruct that “the struggle between Muslims and Jews” will continue “until the hour [of
judgment]” and that “Muslims will triumph because they are right” and “he who is right is
always victorious.”

10. Cite a selective teaching of violence against Jews, while, in the same lesson, ignore the
passages of the Qur’an and hadiths [narratives of the life of the Muslim Prophet Muhammad]
that counsel tolerance.

11. Teach the Protocols of the Elders of Zion as historical fact and relate modern events to
it.

12. Discuss Jews in violent terms, blaming them for virtually all the “sedition” and wars of
the modern world.

academic years, and, while some changes in wording and format were made, no overall material
change to this list of twelve objectionable passages is evident. Compared to the 2006 list, above,
there are changes in the wording and format that affect only one example, marker number 4
(above), from a fourth grade textbook, and in this case the intolerant meaning expressed in the
passage remains in the 2007-2008 textbook. In addition to the list above, our 2006 analysis also
examined lengthier excerpts from the 2005-2006 curriculum. In the 2007-2008 versions of these
passages there are changes in the fifth, sixth, and ninth grade lessons in addition to that
mentioned above, though such changes do not alter the objectionable message of these lessons
either. All these changes are discussed, below. [Appendix C contains the more extensive excerpts}
from the 2006 analysis side by side with the corresponding excerpts from the 2007-2008 curriculum.]

In the 2007 and 2008 editions of the fourth grade text *Monotheism and Jurisprudence*, there are changes in the lesson so that the objectionable example cited in our 2006 analysis is now presented in the format of an exercise that asks the student to identify true belief. At first glance, it may seem that this section has been toned down with the removal of the imperative, “hate the polytheists and infidels,” but a closer examination shows that this is not the case. In the question, below, hatred of the unbelievers is taught as a necessary component of true belief.

In the newer editions, the text corresponding to example 4, above, reads:

“Is belief true in the following instances?

a. A man prays but hates those who are virtuous.

b. A man professes that there is no deity other than God but loves the unbelievers.

c. A man worships God alone, loves the believers, and hates the unbelievers.”

Though the correct answers are not provided, a fifth grade textbook elaborates upon this theme, and there can be no doubt that the right answer above is “c.” It should be noted that this particular fourth grade lesson has dropped the injunction against treating the unbelievers “unjustly.” As the 2006 analysis had noted, the admonition not to treat unbelievers “unjustly” was reform language that had been highlighted by the Saudi ambassador to USCIRF in a document dated March 2006. Therefore, this editorial change retracted a prior year’s touted “reform.”

While not affecting the twelve concerns listed in our 2006 analysis, above, editorial changes have been made to the new fifth grade text as well and are worth pointing out here. The instruction from the 2005-2006 text that “[s]omeone who opposes God, even if he is your brother by family tie, is your enemy in religion” has been removed. There seems to be no practical significance to this since the new lesson still teaches that “a Muslim is forbidden to love and aid the unbelieving enemies of God.” The declaration that “Jews and Christians are enemies of the believers” continues to be found in a 2007-2008 textbook for ninth grade that is currently posted on the government’s website. Other lessons remain in upper grade texts that teach that Jews and Christians are apes and swine, Jews conspire to “gain sole control over the world,” the Christian Crusades never ended, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion are historical fact, and on Judgment Day “the rocks or the trees” will call out to Muslims to kill Jews.

Furthermore, the new fifth grade lesson now introduces an exercise in which a chart, below, is presented profiling four types of individuals and the student is asked to fill in the blanks with the right “attitude” toward those individuals choosing from either “love” or “hate.” The first answer is filled in by the textbook authors as a demonstration. It reads: “Condition of the individual: One of your relatives who does not pray, does not fast, and does not worship God.” This practice question provides the answer: under the rubric “Your attitude,” the words “I hate him in God” are written. The questions at the end of this fifth grade lesson in the 2005-2006 edition have been reworded to be less direct. In a question about whom it is permissible to love, the explicit reference to “Jews and Christians” is now replaced by the term “unbelievers” or “infidels” in the
new edition. However, in other chapters of the religious curriculum, starting with first grade, the identification of Jews and Christians as unbelievers is repeated throughout.

The new student exercise in the fifth grade Saudi text on *Monotheism, Hadith, Jurisprudence, and Qur’anic Recitation* reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of the individual</th>
<th>Your attitude</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of your relatives who does not pray, does not fast, and does not worship God</td>
<td>I hate him in God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who prays, fasts, and worships God but is not one of your relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person from another country who is poor and ardent about praying and worshiping God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person from your country who does not like to pray and does not worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some revisions to the lesson on jihad in the new version of the twelfth grade text *Hadith and Islamic Culture*. The 2005-2006 edition stated: “Jihad in the path of God – which consists of battling against unbelief, oppression, injustice, and those who perpetrate it – is the summit of Islam.” In the new edition of this textbook, the hyphenated clause was deleted, so that the sentence now simply reads: “Jihad in the path of God is the summit of Islam.” This edit should not be mistaken for an improvement, however, since this same lesson defines jihad to mean, in part, an “effort to wage war against the unbelievers and tyrants.” Once again, this lesson asserts that “jihad to spread the faith of God is an obligation.” As before, the word *qital* is used in this lesson’s discussion of jihad, which is derived from the verb *qatala*, “to kill,” and is virtually never used metaphorically. The new edition includes new questions at the end that quiz the student about jihad, including the justifications for “battle” jihad. As in the prior edition, the text explains there is more than one meaning of jihad. While, as the text explains, one of the meanings of jihad is self-perfection or “wrestling with the spirit,” this lesson teaches a more militant and aggressive meaning as well. It makes no mention of Islam’s injunction against coercion in religion.

Thus in the textbooks now posted on the Saudi of Ministry of Education website, the entire list of markers highlighted in our 2006 analysis remains of concern.

Appendix C contains longer excerpts from the twelve textbooks, for both the currently posted and the prior editions, and a discussion of each passage. While there are some further changes in the text, none are material for the purposes of this analysis. For example, in a sixth grade religious textbook the prayer given for funerals is now worded differently from the one given in 2006. However, the main lesson of that section, the banning and denunciation of the mourning
traditions of many Shiites and other Muslims, remains. This was our concern with regard to the prior sixth grade textbook and it remains a concern now.

Appendix D contains excerpts from the Saudi textbooks currently posted on the Ministry of Education website that correspond to those discussed in a recent statement by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, which had found them in the textbooks being used outside of Washington at the Islamic Saudi Academy (ISA), an arm of the Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia. These passages include instructions that it is permissible for Muslims to kill apostates and adulterers. They also permit the killing of those practicing “major polytheism,” by which USCIRF found the Saudis to mean “Shi’a and Sufi Muslims, who visit the shrines of their saints to ask for intercession with God on their behalf, as well as Christians, Jews, Hindus, and Buddhists”; a footnote in the textbook found on the Ministry website states that the decision to kill must come from the head Muslim religious leader. One lesson in the Saudi public school textbooks posted on the government’s website, like its counterpart found by USCIRF in the Islamic Saudi Academy books, states that “it is not permissible to violate the blood, property, or honor of the unbeliever who makes a compact with the Muslims,” but is silent on whether security guarantees are extended to non-Muslims without such a compact. Here also, as in the texts examined by USCIRF, one very brief passage discusses jihad. With no further guidance or clarification of the ambiguities it raises, this passage asserts jihad is the “pinnacle of Islam,” exalts “force and victory over the enemies,” and glorifies “martyrdom” as a “noble life-force.” These lessons demonize members of the Baha’i and Ahmadiyya faiths and blame “the Jews” for having “conspired against Islam.” All of the specific passages of concern highlighted by USCIRF are found in the Saudi public school textbooks currently posted by the Saudi Ministry of Education.

Appendix E contains an additional extremist lesson from a currently posted tenth grade Saudi Ministry of Education textbook. It teaches that “the punishment for homosexuality is death” and discusses ways to carry this out. Burning with fire, stoning, or throwing from a high place are methods that are mentioned. Though the lesson quotes a traditional scholar suggesting that the Prophet Muhammad made no judgment on homosexuality, it presents the Saudi sharia ruling on this subject (without identifying it as such) as definitive.

These texts instruct students to believe that there exist two incompatible realms – one consisting of true believers in Islam, the monotheists, and the other of infidels or unbelievers – and that these realms never coexist in peace. Students are being taught that unbelievers, such as Christians, Jews, and Muslims who do not share Wahhabi beliefs and practices, are hated “enemies,” and that true believers should aid and show loyalty only to other true believers. These texts teach that Christians, Jews, and others have united in a war against Islam that will ultimately end in the complete destruction of these infidels. Like the statements of Osama bin Laden, they advance the belief that the Crusades never ended and continue today in various forms. They promote global jihad as “effort to wage war against the unbelievers.” In these lessons, no argument is made that such references to jihad mean only spiritual struggle and defensive warfare. Some Saudis themselves have linked the Kingdom’s educational curriculum to patterns of violence in young Saudi men.
The word changes and reformatting that have taken place over the past two years in these more extensive excerpts from which our twelve markers were taken amount to moving around the furniture, not cleaning the house. All of the textbooks analyzed in the 2006 report have been reissued at least once and all but two of them reissued twice, yet the changes to these passages have been minimal and the degree of substantive change overall has been negligible. The Saudi government has not removed the objectionable message of these lessons. Any improvements that may have been made to those Saudi textbooks we did not review would be undercut or negated by these teachings in the ones we did. As in 2006, the Saudi Ministry of Education religion textbooks reviewed in this report promote an ideology of hatred that teaches bigotry and violence and deplores tolerance.
EDUCATIONAL REFORM IS CRITICAL: 
Saudi Arabia's Global Influence

A century ago, Saudi Arabia was sparsely populated with nomadic tribes who were not yet united into a recognized nation. With relative suddenness, it has emerged from subsistence living and obscurity to become a wealthy regional power, and an influential leader within the Muslim world. Yet, its public educational system, reflecting its governing ideology, remains rooted in the blend of the harsh desert traditions and severe Islamic interpretations of its past.

The origins of the modern Saudi regime lie in the partnership forged in the eighteenth century between Muhammad bin Saud, founder of the modern-day Saudi dynasty, and Abd al-Wahhab, a fundamentalist Muslim scholar. An extreme offshoot of Islam’s Hanbali school, Wahhab’s thought is based on a dualistic worldview in which true “monotheists” are obliged until judgment day to “fight” “polytheists” and “idolaters,” including Christians, Jews, Shiites, and insufficiently zealous Sunni Muslims. It was made the ruling ideology and the underlying philosophy of the *sharia* or law in the regions of Arabia under Saudi control. In the early twentieth century, Saudi leader Abdulaziz al-Saud (Ibn Saud) unified the disparate tribes in the Arabian Peninsula, mainly through conquest. The Hejaz, encompassing Mecca and Medina, was among the areas that fell under Saudi control. In 1926, Ibn Saud convened a global Islamic conference to affirm his position as guardian of the two holiest shrines in Islam. In 1932, the current Saudi state officially emerged, keeping intact the close relationship between the Saudi ruling family and the al Sheikh family, the hereditary leaders of the Wahhabi religious establishment. The final element that would complete the definition of modern-day Saudi Arabia was put in place in 1945, when Ibn Saud met with American President Franklin D. Roosevelt to consolidate an economic alliance that his country had entered into a decade earlier with the American company Standard Oil. Saudi Arabia, it was to be discovered, has one quarter of the world’s proven oil reserves, a fact that has undergirded a U.S.-Saudi strategic alliance for the past sixty years.84

Governed on a monarchical model, Saudi Arabia defines itself today as an Islamic state.85 Religion and government remain interlocked. It has established Wahhabism as the official state political ideology and the basis of jurisprudence for its *sharia*,86 pays the salaries of the Wahhabi clerical establishment, and has elevated the office of Grand Mufti to a government cabinet-level position.87

Within Saudi Arabia, Muslims who openly disagree with Wahhabi rulings are denounced, discredited, and intimidated and may be officially punished for blasphemy or apostasy. Dissent from the state’s religious dogma can result in job loss or criminal prosecution. Political reformers who peacefully petitioned for rights through a constitutional monarchy were imprisoned for over a year for using “un-Islamic terminology,” and other offenses.88 Despite the presence of millions of non-Muslims and non-Wahhabi Muslims in the Kingdom, Saudi authorities forbid the public practice of non-Muslim religions and severely restrict the practices of Shi’á Muslims, including the Ismailis.89

Saudi Wahhabism is the core of the public school curriculum, comprising much or most of the school day through high school. Some five million Saudi students are educated with these
textbooks each year. Inside the Kingdom, the Saudi government exercises strict control over what teachers say to their students about those who do not subscribe to the Wahhabi doctrine. Those who advocate tolerance and reform risk being condemned as blasphemers and punished. An infamous example was the Saudi schoolteacher who was fired in 2005 from his job and sentenced to 750 lashes and a three-and-a-half year prison term for making positive statements about Jews and the New Testament; he was pardoned after public protests and international pressure.90

Saudi Arabia has long sought to be the leading Islamic power and the protector of the faith, a claim asserted in the Saudi Basic Law. With its vast oil wealth and the religious legitimacy derived from its custodianship of the shrines and control of the hajj, the pilgrimage to Mecca that is one of the five pillars of Islam, Saudi Arabia’s long-term ambitions are within reach. It is positioning itself to be the authoritative voice of Islam worldwide. This would be a dramatically new development. In the history of Sunni Islam, theological authority has been located in various centers, but never in the House of Saud.

To Western audiences, the monarchy has repeatedly compared itself to the Vatican, with the King as a type of Islamic pope. Saudi Ambassador to the United States Adel al-Jubeir publicly stated, “the role of Saudi Arabia in the Muslim world is similar to the role of the Vatican.”91 In an interview with Barbara Walters in 2005, then-Crown Prince Abdullah also drew a parallel between Saudi Arabia’s role within Islam and the Vatican’s within worldwide Catholicism.92 Likewise, then-Saudi Ambassador Turki Al-Faisal highlighted this analogy in 2006 in a letter to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.93 One Saudi royal family member recently placed full-page ads in the international press that make the same point with visual parallels between the pope and the king, and the Vatican and Mecca. A slogan at the bottom reads, “Two great faiths, sharing one great cause: humanity.”94

The implication is that Saudi Arabia is not only hallowed ground or Islam’s spiritual homeland as custodian of the two holiest Muslim sites, but also the arbiter of orthodoxy for the world’s 1.3 billion Muslims.

Since 1979, the year when Islamic terrorists laid siege to Mecca and threatened Saudi rule, and when a Shi’a regime seized control of Iran, Saudi Arabia has poured enormous sums into foreign evangelism, funding mosques, schools, libraries, and academic centers worldwide.95 Some analysts estimate that over the past quarter century Saudi Arabia has expended over $75 billion for disseminating Wahhabism worldwide, roughly three times more a year than what the Soviet Union spent annually in exporting its ruling ideology during the height of the Cold War.96 This ideological export is having an effect. Wahhabi thought and customs are taking root in Muslim communities from the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, to Algeria, Egypt, Sudan, Nigeria, Pakistan, India and elsewhere. As Abdurrahman Wahid, the former President of Indonesia and ex-director of the world’s largest Muslim organization lamented, it is making “inroads” even in his famously tolerant part of the world.97

A recent example of Saudi Arabia’s quest to lead the Muslim world can be seen in the Saudi King’s initiative to promote international dialogue between Muslims and followers of other monotheistic faiths. Last November he traveled to Rome to meet with Pope Benedict XVI, the
first meeting of its kind, to advance the idea of interfaith talks. Subsequently, the World Muslim League, which the Kingdom sponsors, invited 200 representatives of different faiths, including an Israeli rabbi, to join the King in interfaith talks in Spain in mid-July 2008.\textsuperscript{98} In early June 2008, King Abdullah also had convened in Mecca a conference of religious leaders and Islamic scholars from more than 50 countries to address intrafaith dialogue. At the June meeting, the King’s tone reportedly was one of reconciliation toward the rival branch of Islam, the Shi’a,\textsuperscript{99} with some Muslim observers, according to the Voice of America, saying the King’s call for dialogue would reverberate throughout the Muslim world.\textsuperscript{100} While others were more skeptical about its lasting importance,\textsuperscript{101} the King’s attempt to spearhead an endeavor to unite Muslims is undeniable.

The United States government has repeatedly turned to Saudi Arabia, not only as an ally and trading partner, but also as a Muslim leader. One highly symbolical example occurred a year ago, when President Bush chose to give his “Muslim Initiative” address at the Washington Islamic Center, as a tribute to the 50th anniversary of that mosque's founding by Saudi Arabia. Though the President's remarks were intended for all American Muslims, the administration left the invitation list to the Saudi-influenced Washington Islamic Center's authorities. Predictably, they excluded a diverse array of Muslims whose organizations are not Saudi-founded or funded. In effect, the United States government made this Saudi institution the gatekeeper for all American Muslims at this high-profile, official address to the American Muslim community.\textsuperscript{102}

Saudi Arabia’s custodianship of the two Islamic holy shrines and its vast oil wealth enable it to exert unprecedented influence over the world’s Muslims. Saudi religious textbooks and educational materials, which the Saudi government disseminates worldwide through the internet and other means, aim to indoctrinate Muslim students in Wahhabi thought. Wahhabism threatens to become a mainstream or even the dominant expression of Islam. In addition, current Saudi efforts to initiate and lead intrafaith and interfaith dialogue occur simultaneously with Saudi Arabia’s international promotion of its ideology of violence and intolerance toward other believers. The Kingdom’s failure to revise its own educational materials raises the concern that the King’s overtures to Christians, Jews and Shiites will give greater benefit to the public relations campaign to improve Saudi Arabia’s image abroad at a time of growing world discontent about soaring oil prices than to finding common ground.

**The Saudi curriculum and religious violence**

It is becoming disturbingly apparent that a disproportionately large number of the world’s suicide terrorists, acting in the name of Islam, have been born, raised, and educated in Saudi Arabia. When it was discovered that three quarters of the hijackers on 9/11, along with the founder of al Qaeda himself, were from Saudi Arabia, the whole world suffered the realization that Saudi nationals are deeply involved in suicide terror.

The United States has not been the only nation to be targeted by Saudi terrorists. A Saudi was also the mastermind of terror in Chechnya, where he transformed a secularist independence movement into a major Islamist terrorist push.\textsuperscript{103} Saudis figured prominently in more recent suicide attacks against Spanish tourists in Yemen, and a Saudi doctor was a principal in the attack against the Glasgow airport in June 2007. Over the past year, the state-backed Saudi
Human Rights Organization has made several trips to visit self-proclaimed Saudi jihadists imprisoned in Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon. The Saudi Human Rights Organization reported last year that 74 Saudis were imprisoned in Jordan, including a Saudi national who was sentenced to life imprisonment for an attempted suicide attack in Jordan. Diplomatic sources say that up to 980 Saudi al Qaeda members were at a refugee camp in Syria, and that Saudi Arabia demanded that they be turned over as a precondition to negotiations between the two countries. At Guantanamo Bay facilities, Saudis have reportedly comprised the second largest contingent of detainees, outnumbered only by those from Afghanistan. Within Saudi Arabia itself, Saudi authorities reported in mid-2008 that 520 al Qaeda-linked militants have been apprehended so far this year.

On November 22, 2007, the New York Times reported that American military officials released data showing that Saudis accounted for the largest number – 41% – of foreign fighters and suicide bombers in Iraq. The data came from a trove of documents and computers containing biographical sketches discovered in a tent camp raided by American forces in the desert near Sinjar, close to the Syrian border. In July 2007, a senior U.S. military officer told the Los Angeles Times that nearly half of the 135 foreigners in U.S. detention facilities in Iraq were Saudis; and fighters from Saudi Arabia are thought to have carried out more suicide bombings than those of any other nationality. The Saudis admitted that 800 or so foreign insurgents who have gone to Iraq are Saudis; the real figure is undoubtedly higher. A Saudi, Muhammad al-Thibaiti, was reported last August by Al-Hayat (a London-based paper whose Saudi edition was one of the most popular papers in the Kingdom) to have been a key figure in the Islamic State of Iraq, a group that is a front for al Qaeda. The paper, which was subsequently banned in Saudi Arabia, said that al-Thibaiti had studied at Imam Muhammad bin Saud University.

What is the link between religiously-inspired violence by Saudi nationals and the Saudi public education curriculum? Criticism of Saudi educational extremism grew after the terrorism on September 11, 2001. Some Saudis, themselves, have openly criticized the Kingdom’s educational system on the basis it promotes violence.

A panel of Saudi professionals prepared a study of the Saudi public schools' religious curriculum that was presented at the Second Forum for National Dialogue, held in Saudi Arabia in late December 2003 under the patronage of then-Crown Prince Abdullah. The panel observed that the Kingdom’s religious studies curriculum “legitimiz[es] the violent repression of the ‘other’ and even his physical elimination because of his views on disputed issues…. These things may create a misapprehension that violent treatment of the ‘other’ is a task in which the pupil is obliged to take an interest.”

The release of our 2006 analysis, Saudi Arabia’s Curriculum of Intolerance, which was republished in the Saudi press, spurred further debate in the Saudi media, with a number of voices agreeing that the curriculum needed to change because it was promoting extremism. One Saudi couple told the report’s author about their frustrations that the school books led their child to view them as “enemies” since they did not practice the Wahhabi interpretation of Islam reflected in the textbooks. They also complained that the curriculum was not preparing their child for a productive adult life, since much of the school day was devoted to teaching Wahhabi-oriented material rather than skills and knowledge with practical application.
In the past year, Saudi journalists have written anguished columns about the proclivity toward terrorist violence of Saudi youth, demanding to know why Saudi young males seem more susceptible to suicide recruiters than others. The Middle East Media Research Institute translated and published excerpts from this debate, including the following:

- **Why are Saudi youngsters attempting to change the world through extremist terrorist thinking and through spreading death in all parts of the world? Why are they forcing the world to think of the Saudis only as candidates for suicide bombings anywhere?... Yet they nevertheless are easy prey for terrorist organizations, and constitute a generous and self-renewing source of suicide [bombers]. What justification could there be for [the fact that] the Saudis are so susceptible to extremist and terrorist mentality?** (Jamil Al-Dhaydi, editor of and columnist for the London-based daily *Al-Hayat*, Saudi edition.)

- **Why is it the Saudis [who are involved in terrorism]? Because, like ... time bombs, they are mentally and politically ready, [and are like] pawns in the hands of organizations with very dangerous political plans. We must investigate why Saudis have become so willing to die for a cause whose aim they do not [even] understand.** (Abd Al-Rahman Al-Rached, former editor of the London daily *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat*, in that paper.)

- **An interesting aspect of this [website] system is that it targets mainly the [Saudi] kingdom and Saudi youth. These sites would not have been established had it not been known for certain that thousands of young Saudis thirst for ... [extremist] ideology. These sites are not aimed at young people from Syria, the Gulf, or Malaysia, or Muslim youth anywhere else... They focus only on the [Saudi] kingdom and on Saudi youth. This explains why the common denominator in all world terrorism is the involvement of young Saudis.** (Abdallah bin Bakhit, in the Saudi daily *Al Jazeera*.)

Finally, the official position of the Saudi government, itself, is to acknowledge the need for change in the state’s curriculum. Since 2001, Saudi officials have publicly and voluntarily made numerous assertions to the American public that the curriculum needs to be revised and that, with time, reform would be accomplished. In our 2006 analysis, we documented many such official statements. Saudi Arabia, after extensive negotiations with the United States, confirmed that its policy is to thoroughly revise its textbooks to “remove remaining intolerant references that disparage Muslims or non-Muslims or that promote hatred toward other religions or religious groups.”

Both the Kingdom’s wealth and its religious legitimacy as custodian of the two Muslim shrines ensure that the worldwide dissemination of Saudi educational materials will continue for the foreseeable future. Unless the curriculum is fully reformed, millions of Muslim students will be indoctrinated from textbooks that promote extreme intolerance and hatred, and have even been linked by some Saudis to religious violence. While the Saudi state has recently initiated a program to re-educate some Islamic terrorists, it appears to be educating even greater numbers with a religious curriculum that legitimizes the “violent repression” and “physical elimination” of the other. The thorough reform of these educational materials – as Saudi Arabia confirmed would occur following protracted bilateral negotiations with the United States government in July 2006 – is essential to American interests.
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Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom Briefs Congress on U.S.-Saudi Discussions on Religious Practice and Tolerance

Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom John Hanford briefed Congress today on religious practice and tolerance issues in Saudi Arabia. Ambassador Hanford’s briefing focused on the results of bilateral discussions on these topics, as well the problem of intolerant language in textbooks and educational curricula.

Ambassador Hanford explained that this process has made it possible to identify and confirm a number of key policies that the Saudi Government is pursuing and will continue to pursue for the purpose of promoting greater freedom for religious practice and increased tolerance for religious groups. These include policies designed to halt the dissemination of intolerant literature and extremist ideology, both within Saudi Arabia and around the world, to protect the right to private worship, and to curb harassment of religious practice. For example, the Saudi Government is conducting a comprehensive revision of textbooks and educational curricula to weed out disparaging remarks toward religious groups, a process that will be completed in one to two years. The Saudi Government is also retraining teachers and the religious police to ensure that the rights of Muslims and non-Muslims are protected and to promote tolerance and combat extremism. The Saudi Government has also created a Human Rights Commission to address the full range of human rights complaints.

Saudi Arabia was first designated a Country of Particular Concern under the International Religious Freedom Act in 2004. In light of these ongoing developments, and in view of the policies that the Saudi government has put in place to promote greater tolerance for members of the various religious groups in Saudi Arabia, the Secretary has decided to leave in place a waiver "to further the purposes of the Act," as provided for under the legislation.

Ambassador Hanford commented, "I am pleased that the Government of Saudi Arabia has been willing to engage with us in a substantive manner on these critical issues. These policies are significant developments, and I appreciate the Saudi Government’s interest in confirming them publicly so that all interested parties may follow progress made in these areas."

2006/696
Dear Senator Kyl:

Thank you for your letter of November 15 regarding the issue of textbooks and the Islamic Saudi Academy (ISA).

We strongly believe that no government should be producing materials that are intolerant of other religious, racial, or ethnic groups, or teaching such intolerance as part of its educational curriculum. For this reason, we have been engaged over the last few years in a vigorous dialogue with the Saudi Government. In July of 2006, the Saudi Government confirmed to us its policy to undertake a program of textbook reform to eliminate all passages that disparage or promote hatred toward any religion or religious groups. This process is scheduled to be completed in time for the start of the 2008 school year. While we have noted reasonable progress to date, we will continue to monitor the progress of Saudi revisions, and consider it premature to judge the overall success or failure of the Saudi Government’s efforts at this time.

With respect to the ISA, the Department of State has urged the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), the ISA, and the Saudi Embassy to work together to ensure that USCIRF receives copies of the books being used at the ISA. In this context, we understand that ISA has offered to make textbooks available to USCIRF. Also, according to media reports, a Fairfax County Supervisor has sought and been granted access to the ISA’s textbooks. Additionally, the ISA recently hosted a group of local journalists who were also given the opportunity to visit the school and conduct an initial review of the school’s materials.

The Foreign Missions Act provides the Department broad authority to regulate foreign missions in the United States in order to facilitate relations, to protect the interests of the United States, and for other specified purposes. The Department has not determined that action against the ISA under the FMA is appropriate, but will continue to carefully monitor the situation.

The Honorable
John Kyl,
United States Senate.
We hope this information is helpful. Please feel free to contact us further on this or any other matter of concern to you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey T. Bergner
Assistant Secretary
Legislative Affairs
Appendix C


The excerpts below in regular typeface appeared in the appendix of our 2006 analysis. The excerpts in bold-face type, which follow each of these, are the corresponding passages found in the textbooks for the 2007-2008 school year and which are currently posted on the website of the Saudi Ministry of Education. In other words, for each excerpt, the 2005-2006 version is provided first and is immediately followed in bold by a designation of “no change” or the excerpt containing the current text. As before, the brief discussions preceding each excerpt are included as they appeared in the 2005-2006 analysis. These discussions now also include comments concerning the updated textbooks. The side by side English and Arabic translations for the passages from both the 2005-2006 and the 2007-2008 academic years can be found on the website of the Center for Religious Freedom of the Hudson Institute, www.hudson.org/religion.

FIRST GRADE:

In the First Grade textbook on Monotheism and Jurisprudence, students are taught that Jews, Christians, and other non-Muslims are destined for “Hellfire.” While many religions teach that they are the one true faith, Saudi assertions are distinctive: They are government-sponsored, they contradict the Islamic teaching that Judaism and Christianity are “heavenly religions,” and they are used as the starting point for an argument that eventually leads in high school textbooks to a justification of religious violence.

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

• “Every religion other than Islam is false.”\(^{113}\)
  No change\(^{114}\)

• “Fill in the blanks with the appropriate words (Islam, hellfire):
  Every religion other than _____ is false. Whoever dies outside of Islam enters ____.”\(^{115}\)
  No change\(^{116}\)

• “Give examples of false religions, like Judaism, Christianity, paganism, etc.”\(^{117}\)
  No change\(^{118}\)

• “Explain that when someone dies outside of Islam, hellfire is his fate.”\(^{119}\)
  No change\(^{120}\)

FOURTH GRADE:

A 2005-2006 Fourth Grade textbook on Monotheism and Jurisprudence instructs students to “hate (tubghida) the polytheists and the infidels” as a requirement of “true faith.” Incongruously,
the same sentence instructs that they are not to treat the infidels “unjustly,” but does not provide any clarification of what this meant.

In the 2007 and 2008 editions, this fourth grade text been changed so that the objectionable example cited in our 2006 analysis is presented in the format of an exercise that asks the student to identify true belief, rather than a straightforward declaration. Three cases are given, and students are instructed to state whether belief is true in each case. Though the correct answers are not provided, a fifth grade textbook elaborates upon this theme, and there can be no doubt that the only answer intended as an example of true belief is “c” (see below), which includes “hat(ing)” the unbelievers. It should be noted that this particular fourth grade lesson has dropped the injunction not to treat the unbelievers “unjustly” from its discussion. As our 2006 analysis had noted, the admonition not to treat unbelievers “unjustly” was reform language that had been highlighted by the Saudi ambassador to USCIRF in a document dated March 2006. Therefore, this editorial change retracted a prior year’s touted “reform.”

- “Belief is not just a word that a person pronounces with the tongue. It consists of speech, conviction, and action.”

“Belief is not just a word that a person pronounces with the tongue. It consists of speech, conviction, and action.”

“Belief is not just a word that a person pronounces with the tongue. It consists of speech, conviction, and action.”

“We act on the following:
1. We know that belief is a primary obligation
2. We know the meaning of belief
3. We act on this”

“True belief means:…That you hate the polytheists and infidels but do not treat them unjustly.”

“True belief means:…That you hate the polytheists and infidels but do not treat them unjustly.”

“Is belief true in the following instances?
   a. A man prays but hates those who are virtuous
   b. A man professes that there is no deity other than God but loves the infidels.
   c. A man worships God alone, loves the believers, and hates the infidels.”

FIFTH GRADE:

The theme of hating the infidel is developed further in a discussion of loyalty and friendship in a Fifth Grade textbook on Monotheism, Hadith, Jurisprudence, and Qur’anic Recitation. Students are instructed to be loyal to and befriend only other monotheist believers.

The instruction from the 2005-2006 text that “[s]omeone who opposes God, even if he is your brother by family tie, is your enemy in religion” has been removed. There seems to be no practical significance to this, since the new lesson still teaches that “a Muslim is forbidden to love and aid the unbelieving enemies of God.” The declaration that “Jews and Christians are enemies of the believers” continues to be found in a 2007-2008 textbook for ninth grade. Other lessons remain in upper grade texts that teach that Jews and Christians are apes and swine, Jews conspire to “gain sole control over the world,” the Christian Crusades never ended, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion are historical fact, and on Judgment Day “the rocks or the trees” will call out to Muslims to kill Jews.
Furthermore, the new fifth grade lesson now introduces an exercise in which a chart, below, is presented profiling four types of individuals; the student is asked to fill in the blanks with the right “attitude” toward those individuals, choosing from either “love” or “hate.” The first answer is filled in by the textbook authors as a demonstration. It reads: “Condition of the individual: One of your relatives who does not pray, does not fast, and does not worship God.” This practice question provides the answer: under the rubric “Your attitude,” it is written, “I hate him in God.” The questions at the end of this fifth grade lesson in the 2005-2006 have been reworded to be less direct. In a question about whom it is permissible to love, the explicit reference to “Jews and Christians,” is now replaced by the term “unbelievers” or “infidels” in the new edition. In other chapters of the religious curriculum, starting with first grade, the identification of Jews and Christians as unbelievers is repeated throughout.

• “It is not permitted to be a loyal friend to those who oppose God and His Prophet.”\(^{126}\)

  “Prohibition on loyal friendship with those who oppose God and His Prophet.” (This injunction is stated as the title of the lesson.)\(^{127}\)

• “Whoever obeys the Prophet and accepts the oneness of God cannot be loyal to those who oppose God and His Prophet, even if they are his closest relatives.”\(^{128}\)

  No change.\(^{129}\)

• “It is forbidden for a Muslim to be a loyal friend to someone who does not believe in God and His Prophet, or someone who fights the religion of Islam.”\(^{130}\)

  “A Muslim is forbidden to love and aid the unbelieving enemies of God.”\(^{131}\)

• “A Muslim, even if he lives far away, is your brother in religion. Someone who opposes God, even if he is your brother by family tie, is your enemy in religion.”\(^{132}\)

Which of the following should you love in God, and which of them should you hate in God?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of the individual</th>
<th>Your attitude</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 One of your relatives who does not pray, does not fast, and does not worship God</td>
<td>I hate him in God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A person who prays, fasts, and worships God but is not one of your relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A person from another country who is poor and ardent about praying and worshiping God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A person from your country who does not like to pray and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIXTH GRADE:

The Sixth Grade textbook on Monotheism, Hadith, Jurisprudence, and Qur’anic Recitation commands students not to “cry” at funerals or “pray” at grave sites or construct mosques over graves, thus banning the mourning traditions of many Shiites and other Muslims.

The new text for this excerpt is worded differently. All of the prohibitions, which appear specifically directed at banning the funeral practices of many Shiites and other Muslims, remain. A new point is added clarifying that silent crying at funerals is permitted. Therefore, the concern about intolerance toward Shiite and other Muslims’ funeral traditions and rites remains.

“Funeral prohibitions:

1. It is forbidden to be angry upon bereavement, cry out loudly, tear one’s clothes, or beat one’s cheeks or other [parts of the body].
2. It is forbidden to sit on graves, and walk on them.
3. It is forbidden to pray at graves, with the exception of the funeral prayer.
4. It is not good to raise one’s voice during the funeral, even in mentioning the name of God or reading the Qur’an.
5. It is forbidden to build mosques on graves.”

“Things that are forbidden at funerals:

1. Anxiety and anger, the tearing of clothing, and the striking of the cheeks. One must be steadfast in the face of bereavement.
2. Raising one’s voice with loud crying. Crying without raising one’s voice is permitted because it shows compassion for the dead individual.
3. Walking or sitting on graves.
4. Praying at graves (except for the funeral prayer).
5. Building mosques on graves.
6. Raising one’s voice during the funeral, even if it is to take the name of God or read the Qur’an.”

The Sixth Grade text on The History of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia contains a lesson on Palestine in which students are instructed that if the Muslims unite in a “fight” against the Jews they will be victorious over the Jews and their American and British allies, as they once were against Christian Crusaders. By linking a discussion of the Crusades with the Palestinian issue, the text can be easily read to mean that the “fight” could or should be a military one. A map of the region is provided, but it labels Israel within its pre-1967 borders as “Palestine: Occupied 1948.”

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.
• “Just as Muslims were successful in the past when they came together in a sincere endeavor to evict the Christian crusaders from Palestine, so will the Arabs and Muslims emerge victorious, God willing, against the Jews and their allies if they stand together and fight a true jihad for God, for this is within God’s power.”

No change.135

• “Who is the Muslim leader who was victorious over the crusaders and liberated Bayt al-Maqdas [Jerusalem]?”

No change.137 138

• “What is the name of the battle in which he triumphed?”

No change.139

• “Give another verse [from the Qur’an] that affirms God’s aid to the believers.”

No change.140

• “Cite a noble hadith that explains the qualities of the Jews.”

No change.141

“Cite a noble hadith and a Qur’anic verse that explain[s] the qualities of the Jews.”142

EIGHTH GRADE:

In the Eighth Grade, the textbook on Monotheism warns against imitating the unbelievers and teaches pupils to spot “condemnable” characteristics in Jews. It teaches that unbelievers include Muslims who do not follow the Wahhabi practice of not building mosques at gravesites.

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

• “The student notes some of the Jews’ condemnable qualities.”

No change.143

• “The student is warned against imitating the Jews’ and Christians’ excessive veneration of righteous men.”

No change.144

• “The student gives examples of polytheism among members of this nation.”

No change.145

• “They are the people of the Sabbath, whose young people God turned into apes, and whose old people God turned into swine to punish them.” “As cited in Ibn Abbas: The apes are Jews, the keepers of the Sabbath; while the swine are the Christian infidels of the communion of Jesus.”

No change.146
• “God told His Prophet, Muhammad, about the Jews, who learned from parts of God's book (the Torah and the Gospels) that God alone is worthy of worship. Despite this, they espouse falsehood through idol-worship, soothsaying, and sorcery. In doing so, they obey the devil. They prefer the people of falsehood to the people of the truth out of envy and hostility. This earns them condemnation and is a warning to us not to do as they did.”

No change.

• “The Jews lost their religion and attacked the religion of Islam, which consists of accepting the oneness of God and the worship of Him alone.”

No change.

• “They are the Jews, whom God has cursed and with whom He is so angry that He will never again be satisfied [with them].”

No change.

• “Some of the people of the Sabbath were punished by being turned into apes and swine. Some of them were made to worship the devil, and not God, through consecration, sacrifice, prayer, appeals for help, and other types of worship. Some of the Jews worship the devil. Likewise, some members of this nation worship the devil, and not God.”

No change.

• “Building mosques on graves is an expression of polytheism.”

No change.

• “Some Muslim countries have seen the graves of righteous men venerated through the construction of mosques. Graves have even been worshipped. In doing this, they [Muslims] imitated the Christians.”

No change.

• “Note some condemnable characteristics of the Jews in the verse.”

No change.

• “Activity: The student writes a composition on the danger of imitating the infidels, giving some examples of imitation among the students. He then presents it to his classmates.”

No change.

NINTH GRADE:

A Ninth Grade Saudi textbook on Hadith teaches teenagers in apocalyptic terms that violence towards Jews, Christians, and other unbelievers is sanctioned by God. It selectively cites a particularly inflammatory hadith about violence towards Jews and makes it broadly applicable, while failing to provide any historical context and ignoring other contradictory hadiths showing respect for Jews. It then directly ties this lesson to the Palestinians’ political situation.

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.
• “The clash between this [Muslim] community (umma) and the Jews and Christians has endured, and it will continue as long as God wills. In this hadith, Muhammad gives us an example of the battle between the Muslims and the Jews.”\textsuperscript{171} No change.\textsuperscript{172}

• “Narrated by Abu Hurayrah: The Prophet said, The hour [of judgment] will not come until the Muslims fight the Jews and kill them. [It will not come] until the Jew hides behind rocks and trees. [It will not come] until the rocks or the trees say, ‘O Muslim! O servant of God! There is a Jew behind me. Come and kill him.’ Except for the gharqad, which is a tree of the Jews.”\textsuperscript{173} No change.

• “It is part of God’s wisdom that the struggle between the Muslim and the Jews should continue until the hour [of judgment].”\textsuperscript{175} No change.\textsuperscript{176}

• “The good news for Muslims is that God will help them against the Jews in the end, which is one of the signs of the hour [of judgment].”\textsuperscript{177} No change.\textsuperscript{178}

• “Muslims will triumph because they are right. He who is right is always victorious, even if most people are against him.”\textsuperscript{179} No change.\textsuperscript{180}

• “God will help Muslims if their intentions are sincere, if they are united, if they adhere to the law of their Lord, if they obey His judgments, and if they are patient and enduring.”\textsuperscript{181} No change.\textsuperscript{182}

• “The Jews and Christians are enemies of the believers, and they cannot approve of Muslims.”\textsuperscript{183} No change.\textsuperscript{184}

• “This hadith showed one of the qualities of the Jews. It is: [fill in the blank.]”\textsuperscript{185} No change.\textsuperscript{186}

• “Help your classmates to give some examples of how our Muslim brothers suffer in Palestine and to propose some ways for you to ease their sufferings.”\textsuperscript{187} No change.\textsuperscript{188}

A Tenth Grade textbook on Monotheism contains a lengthy discussion condemning as “polytheists” other Islamic traditions that interpret the Qur’an differently, alluding to other Sunnis, Shiites, and Sufis, who together comprise the majority of Muslims residing in Saudi Arabia, as well as in the world at large. The followers of the Asharite doctrine (Sunni Muslims found throughout the world) and the Maturidi doctrine (Sunni Muslims found primarily in Pakistan and India), who comprise millions of Sunni Muslims in the world, are referenced by name as “polytheists,” or idol worshipers.
There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

- It states that the founders and followers of these Sunni doctrines are “bad predecessors to bad successors.”
  No change.

- It condemns them either for not interpreting the text of the names and characters of God in a literal way, “such as interpreting the face [of God] as His essence, and His hand as the blessing He bestows”; or for “believing that the [scriptures] do not mean what their literal meaning would suggest.”
  No change.

Another textbook for boys for Tenth Grade on Hadith and Islamic Culture contains a lesson on the “Zionist Movement.” It is a curious blend of wild conspiracy theories about Masonic Lodges, Rotary Clubs, and Lions Clubs with anti-Semitic invective. It asserts that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion is an authentic document and teaches students that it reveals what Jews really believe. It blames many of the world’s wars and discord [fitna, in Arabic] on the Jews. While easy to dismiss as loopy, these conspiracy theories are gaining ground. In its charter, Hamas has adopted conspiracy theories that mirror virtually point by point those given in this Saudi textbook. In 2006, the U.S. Holocaust Museum opened an exhibition on the Protocols, identifying it as “dangerous” and noting “despite countless exposures of the Protocols as a fraud, the myth of a Jewish world conspiracy has retained incredible power for Nazis and others who seek to spread hatred of Jews.” As the exhibition showed, Hitler used the Protocols to indoctrinate Nazi Youth.

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

- “Freemasonry is covertly Jewish. It puts forward general, humanist slogans, and non-Jews may rally to its cause. It is a secular, atheist, secret movement that serves the Jews indirectly. It is the secret power that creates circumstances and conditions for the Jews. As such, it helps Zionism to achieve its aims.”
  No change.

- “Goals of the Zionist Movement
  1. Instill a fighting spirit among the Jews, as well as religious and nationalist fanaticism to challenge [other] religions, nations, and peoples.
  2. Establish Jewish control over the world. The starting point for this is the establishment of their government in the promised land, which stretches from the Nile to the Euphrates.
  3. Incite rancor and rivalry among the great powers so that they fight one another, and kindle the fire of war among states so that all states are weakened and their state arises.”
  No change.

- The Protocols of the Elders of Zion “were discovered in the 19th century. The Jews have tried to deny them, but there are many proofs of their veracity and their origin among the elders of Zion.”
No change.

• “The following points summarize the protocols:
  1. Undermine the foundation of the existing international community and its systems to enable Zionism to gain sole control over the world.
  2. Eliminate Christian nationalities, religions, and nations in particular.
  3. Work to increase the corruption of existing governments in Europe. Zionism believes in the corruption and collapse of these governments.
  4. Gain control over the means of publication, propaganda, and newspapers; use gold to incite unrest; and exploit people's desires and spread depravity.”

No change.

• “The decisive proof of the veracity of the protocols and the infernal Jewish plans they contain is that the plans, plots, and conspiracies they list have been carried out. Whoever reads the protocols – and they emerged in the 19th century – will realize today how much of what they described has been implemented.”

No change.

• “Examples of how the Zionists achieve their goals:

  1. Sedition, ruses, and conspiracies throughout history. Examples include…
     c. The French Revolution: The Jews exploited the French Revolution to fight against religions, break down values, and spread meaningless slogans. They had a hand in planning the revolution and its code of morals.
     d. The First World War: The Jews played a role in starting it.
     e. Bringing down the Ottoman Islamic caliphate: the role of the Jews of Donma in this is no secret.
     f. The Bolshevik Russian revolution against Tsarist rule. It is known that the roots of Marxist thought are Jewish. Karl Marx was a Jew from Germany.”

No change.

• “You can hardly find an example of sedition in which the Jews have not played a role.”

No change.

• “2. Attempting to inundate peoples with vice and rampant prostitution. The Jews have taken control of this trade and they try to spread it. They manage bars in Europe and America, as well as in Israel itself.
  3. Gaining control over literature and the arts; spreading degenerate, pornographic literature; and encouraging perverted trends in literature, thought, and the arts.”
  4. Gaining control over the film industry in the Western world and elsewhere.”
  5. Fraud, bribery, theft, and swindles.”

No change.

• “Destructive Movements that Zionism has used to achieve its aims.
1. Freemasonry. This is a secret Jewish organization that works surreptitiously to advance larger Jewish interests. Masonry is a deceptive word that fools listeners into thinking that it is a noble profession, since it means "free builders" and its slogan is "freedom, brotherhood, and equality."

2. B’nai B’rith, or sons of the covenant. This group was founded in 1834 in America.

3. International Lions Clubs. "Lions" means lions. These are Masonic clubs based in America and they have secret agents all over the world.

4. Rotary Clubs. They were founded in 1905 in Chicago, America, and then spread all over the world.  

No change.

The Tenth Grade text on Jurisprudence teaches that, in law, the life of non-Muslims (as well as women, and, by implication, slaves) is worth a fraction of that of a “free Muslim male.” Blood money is money paid to the victim or the victim’s heirs for murder or injury.

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

- “Blood money for a free infidel: Half of the blood money for a male Muslim, whether or not he is ‘of the book’ or not ‘of the book’ (such as a pagan, Zoroastrian, etc.).” No change.

- “Blood money for a woman: Half of the blood money for a man, in accordance with his religion. The blood money for a Muslim woman is half of the blood money for a male Muslim, and the blood money for an infidel woman is half of the blood money for a male infidel.” No change.

The Eleventh Grade Hadith and Islamic Culture textbook for boys in the Management, Social Studies, Natural History, and Technical Studies track instructs Muslims not to greet unbelievers and not to extend courtesies to them.

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

- “The greeting ‘Peace be upon you’ is specifically for believers. It cannot be said to others.” No change.

- “If one comes to a place where there is a mixture of Muslims and infidels, one should offer a greeting intended for the Muslims.” No change.

- “Do not yield to them [Christians and Jews] on a narrow road out of honor and respect.” No change.

The Eleventh Grade Hadith textbook for boys in the Management, Social Studies, Natural History, and Technical Studies track also includes a selective history lesson on “The Crusader
“Threat,” which it identifies as the “origin of the clash between the Muslims and the Christians.” It does not mention the Muslim conquest of the Middle East or the Muslim invasions of Europe before the Crusades, or any example of peaceful coexistence between Muslims and the West, or any example of United States military support of and cooperation with Saudi Arabia or any other Muslim country. It teaches that the Crusader threat began with the first Crusade in 1095 and continues in modern times with Christian proselytizing, Orientalist studies, and colonialism. It includes “raising women’s issues” as part of the modern crusade. Various medical missions and Christian schools, universities, radio programs, and social services in the Middle East are cited by name as part of the modern crusade. Most troubling, it maintains that the crusades have not ended. In this, it finds an echo in the declarations of Osama bin Laden, who has identified his enemy as the “Zionist-Crusaders.”

There are no relevant changes to this lesson in the 2007-2008 curriculum.

- “The new approach to the crusades took several forms, including:

  1. Proselytizing (Christianization): undertaken by the church and supported by Christian governments.
  2. Orientalism: undertaken by scholars and intellectuals to serve the church and Christian governments.
  3. Military colonialism.”

No change.

- “Areas of Missionary Activity

  1. Health services

      This activity consists of establishing Christian hospitals and clinics and sending out traveling doctors. As one of the Christianizers said, ‘Where you find people, you find pain. And where there’s pain, there’s a need for a doctor. And where there’s a need for a doctor, there’s an appropriate opportunity for missionary activity [Christianization].’

      One of the first examples was the American Medical Mission in Sivas, Turkey in 1859.

      After 1875, crusader medical centers were established in Gaza, Nablus, and other cities in Syria and Palestine.

  2. The establishment of churches, monasteries, and convents

      This has taken place in every Islamic country where there are Christians, even if they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. They have even established churches in countries where there are no Christians among the original inhabitants.

  3. The establishment of schools
They founded many schools in the Islamic world at various educational levels. These include: the American Universities of Beirut and Cairo, the Jesuit University, Robert College in Istanbul, Gordon [Memorial] College in Khartoum, and others too numerous to mention.

4. Social services

These include homes for orphans, the elderly, widows, divorced women, etc.

5. The establishment of radio stations broadcasting to Muslim countries in their languages


6. Printed materials and books calling people to Christianity.225

No change.226

A Twelfth Grade textbook on Hadith and Islamic Culture for boys in the Management, Social Studies, Natural History, and Technical Studies track contains a chapter entitled “Jihad in the Path of God.” It explains various meanings of jihad and examines their application. While, as the text explains, one of the meanings of jihad is self-perfection or “wrestling with the spirit,” it acknowledges a more militant meaning as well. This discussion does not mention the ban against coercion in Islam, or clarify whether infidels can be militarily forced to submit to the “call.” In fact, in repeated statements, it justifies a militant jihad for the purpose of spreading the faith. The word qital, translated here as “battle,” is derived from qatala, “to kill” and is virtually never used metaphorically.

There are some edits in the new twelfth grade text regarding this lesson on jihad. The 2005-2006 edition stated: “Jihad in the path of God – which consists of battling against unbelief, oppression, injustice, and those who perpetrate it – is the summit of Islam.” In the new edition of this textbook, this sentence was edited to delete the hyphenated clause, so that it now simply reads: “Jihad in the path of God is the summit of Islam.” This edit should not be mistaken for an improvement, however, since this same lesson defines jihad to mean, in part, an “effort to wage war against the unbelievers and tyrants.” Once again, this lesson asserts that “jihad to spread the faith of God is an obligation.” As before, the word qital is used in this discussion of jihad, which is derived from the verb qatala, “to kill,” which is virtually never used metaphorically. The new edition includes new questions at the end which quiz the student about jihad, including the justifications for “battle” jihad. As in the prior edition, the text explains there is more than one meaning of jihad. While, as the text explains, one of the meanings of jihad is self-perfection or “wrestling with the spirit,” it teaches a more militant and aggressive meaning as well. There is no mention here of Islam’s injunction against coercion in religion.

• “Jihad in the path of God – which consists of battling against unbelief, oppression, injustice, and those who perpetrate it – is the summit of Islam. This religion arose through
jihad and through jihad was its banner raised high. It is one of the noblest acts, which
brings one closer to God, and one of the most magnificent acts of obedience to God.”227

“One usage is specific. [Jihad] means to exert effort to wage war against the
unbelievers and tyrants. Another is general. Shaykh-al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah defined
it as follows: ‘Jihad is truly the effort to acquire the faith and virtuous action that
God loves, and to drive away the unbelief, depravity, and rebellion that God hates.’
…Jihad in the path of God is the summit of Islam. This religion arose through jihad
and through jihad was its banner raised high. It is one of the noblest acts, which
brings one closer to God, and one of the most magnificent acts of obedience to
God.”228

• “Muslim scholars have agreed that jihad to spread the faith of God is an obligation, but it is
a collective obligation. If a sufficient number of people undertake it, those who remain
have not committed a sin.”229
  No change. 230

• “God has forbidden Muslims to go to jihad en masse and urged them to mobilize a group
from each community of them that will undertake the obligation of jihad, which frees the
other group [from this obligation].”231
  No change. 232

• “When is battle jihad in the path of God? Battle can only pursue two aims: To fulfill an
order from God, sacrifice in His path, spread the creed of monotheism, defend the realms
of Islam and Muslims, and raise up the word of God. This is jihad in the path of God.”233
  No change. 234

• “Jihad continues until the Day of Resurrection.”235
  No change. 236

• “It is part of God’s wisdom that he made the clash between truth and falsehood continue
until the Day of Resurrection. As long as this clash endures, jihad continues.”237
  No change. 238
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Saudi Arabia: USCIRF Confirms Material Inciting Violence, Intolerance Remains in Textbooks Used at Saudi Government’s Islamic Saudi Academy

WASHINGTON—Last fall, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom asked the U.S. Department of State to secure the release of all Arabic-language textbooks used at a Saudi government school in Northern Virginia, the Islamic Saudi Academy (ISA). The Commission took this action in order to ensure that the books be publicly examined to determine whether the texts used at the ISA promote violence, discrimination, or intolerance based on religion or belief. The ISA is unlike any conventional private or parochial school in the United States in that it is operated by a foreign government and uses that government’s official texts. It falls under the Commission’s mandate to monitor the actions of foreign governments in relation to religious freedom. The government of Saudi Arabia, as a member of the international community, is committed to upholding international standards, including the obligation not to promote violence, intolerance, or hate.

The Commission requested Saudi government textbooks repeatedly during and following its trip to Saudi Arabia in May-June 2007. Shortly after the Commission raised the issue publicly, the Saudi government turned over textbooks used at the ISA to the State Department, but as of this writing, the Department has not made them available either to the public or to the Commission, nor has it released any statement about the content of the books that it received. Nevertheless, although it was unable to obtain the entire collection, the Commission managed to acquire and review 17 ISA textbooks in use during this school year from other, independent sources, including a congressional office. While the texts represent just a small fraction of the books used in this Saudi government school, the Commission’s review confirmed that these texts do, in fact, include some extremely troubling passages that do not conform to international human rights norms. The Commission calls once again for the full public release of all the Arabic-language textbooks used at the ISA.

In July 2006, the Saudi government confirmed to the U.S. government that, among other policies to improve religious freedom and tolerance, it would, within one to two years, “revise and update textbooks to remove remaining references that disparage Muslims or non-Muslims or that promote hatred toward other religions or religious groups.” The Commission is releasing this statement as the two-year timeframe is coming to an end, and with particular concern over the content of textbooks used at the ISA, in order to highlight reforms that should be made before the 2008-09 school year begins at the ISA.

Examples of Problematic Passages in Current ISA Textbooks
The most problematic texts involve passages that are not directly from the Koran but rather contain the Saudi government’s particular interpretation of Koranic and other Islamic texts. Some passages clearly exhort the readers to commit acts of violence, as can be seen in the following two examples:

- In a twelfth-grade *Tafsir* (Koranic interpretation) textbook, the authors state that it is permissible for a Muslim to kill an apostate (a convert from Islam), an adulterer, or someone who has murdered a believer intentionally: “He (praised is He) prohibits killing the soul that God has forbidden (to kill) unless for just cause…” Just cause is then defined in the text as “unbelief after belief, adultery, and killing an inviolable believer intentionally.” (*Tafsir*, Arabic/Sharia, 123)

- A twelfth-grade *Tawhid* (monotheism) textbook states that “[m]ajor polytheism makes blood and wealth permissible,” which in Islamic legal terms means that a Muslim can take the life and property of someone believed to be guilty of this alleged transgression with impunity. (*Tawhid*, Arabic/Sharia, 15) Under the Saudi interpretation of Islam, “major polytheists” include Shi’a and Sufi Muslims, who visit the shrines of their saints to ask for intercession with God on their behalf, as well as Christians, Jews, Hindus, and Buddhists.

The overt exhortations to violence found in these passages make other statements that promote intolerance troubling even though they do not explicitly call for violent action. These other statements vilify adherents of the Ahmadi, Baha’i, and Jewish religions, as well as of Shi’a Islam. This is despite the fact that the Saudi government is obligated as a member of the United Nations and a state party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and other relevant treaties to guarantee the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. The statements include the following:

- “Today, Qadyanis [Ahmadis] are one of the greatest strongholds for spreading aberration, deviation, and heresy in the name of religion, even from within Islamic countries. Thus, the Qadyani [Ahmadi] movement has become a force of destruction and internal corruption today in the Islamic world…” (“Aspects of Muslim Political and Cultural History,” Eleventh Grade, Administrative/Social Track, Sharia/Arabic Track, 99)

- “It [Baha’ism] is one of the destructive esoteric sects in the modern age... It has become clear that Babism [the precursor to Baha’ism], Baha’ism, and Qadyanism [Ahmadism] represent wayward forces inside the Islamic world that seek to strike it from within and weaken it. They are colonial pillars in our Islamic countries and among the true obstacles to a renaissance.” (“Aspects of Muslim Political and Cultural History,” Eleventh Grade, 99-100)

- “The cause of the discord: The Jews conspired against Islam and its people. A sly, wicked person who sinfully and deceitfully professed Islam infiltrated (the Muslims). He was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba’ (from the Jews of Yemen). [___]* began spewing his malice and venom against the third of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, ‘Uthman (may God be pleased with him), and falsely accused him.” (*Tawhid*, Administrative/Social Sciences Track, 67).
  (*The word or words here were obscured by correction fluid.)

- Sunni Muslims are told to “shun those who are extreme regarding the People of the House (Muhammad’s family) and who claim infallibility for them.” (*Tawhid*, Arabic/Sharia 82; *Tawhid*, Administrative/Social Sciences Track, 65) This would include all Shi’a Muslims, for whom the doctrine of infallibility is a cardinal principle.

Other problematic passages employ ambiguous language, and the textbook authors do nothing to clarify the meaning.

- A ninth-grade *Hadith* textbook states: “It is not permissible to violate the blood, property, or honor of the unbeliever who makes a compact with the Muslims. The blood of the *mu’ahid* is not permissible unless for a legitimate reason…the *mu’ahid* is an unbeliever who contracts a treaty with a Muslim providing for the safety of his life, property, and family.” (*Hadith*, Ninth Grade, 142-3)
The passages about the *mu'ahid* are most troubling for what they leave out. They address the protected status of an unbeliever in a Muslim country, but are silent on whether unbelievers living in non-Muslim countries are afforded the same protections of “blood, property, or honor.” Such an omission, taken together with the outright incitement to violence and vilifying language noted above, could be interpreted as tacitly condoning violence against non-Muslims living in non-Muslim countries.

The Commission would urge the textbook authors to put more context into some sections of the textbooks to avoid any perception that they could be encouraging violence. For example, one passage that requires clarification is the following explication of the Koranic phrase, “Respond to God and His Messenger when He calls you to that which will give you life.” (Q 8:24)

Although this Koranic passage does not in itself invoke the term *jihad*, the Saudi textbook authors write:

- “In these verses is a call for *jihad*, which is the pinnacle of Islam. In (*jihad*) is life for the body; thus it is one of the most important causes of outward life. Only through force and victory over the enemies is there security and repose. Within martyrdom in the path of God (exalted and glorified is He) is a type of noble life-force that is not diminished by fear or poverty.” (*Tafsir*, Arabic/Sharia, 68)

While there are various meanings of the term *jihad*, including an internal struggle of the soul, none are given in this brief discussion, which also includes an emphasis on the importance of power or force over one’s enemies and discusses “martyrdom” with approval. Such an ambiguous interpretation can be perceived as giving the verse a militant connotation, potentially justifying acts of violence, which should not be left without elucidation in a textbook that is aimed at children who are still learning the main tenets of religion.

More broadly, the analysis of the ills of the Muslim world that is offered in the ISA textbooks—that it was strong when united under a single caliph, a single language (Arabic), and a single creed (Sunnism), and that it has grown weak because of foreign influence and internal religious and ethnic divisions—is identical to some of the exclusionary ideological arguments used by extremists to justify acts of terror.

In the Commission’s view, these troubling passages should be modified, clarified, or removed altogether from the next edition of the textbooks in order to bring the books at this Saudi government school into conformity with international human rights standards.

**Long-term Commission Concern over Content of Saudi Government Textbooks**

The Commission has long called for Saudi Arabia to be designated a “country of particular concern,” or CPC, for its egregious and systematic violations of religious freedom. In particular, the Commission has expressed concern about the promotion of religious intolerance and religion-based violence in official Saudi government textbooks used both within Saudi Arabia and at Saudi schools abroad, such as the ISA. The Commission has been urging the U.S. government to press the Saudi government to promote religious tolerance in the Saudi curriculum since 2001, and in 2003 it issued an in-depth report about religious freedom conditions in Saudi Arabia, including intolerance and incitement to violence found in Saudi textbooks and the country’s official educational curriculum. It was not until September 2004 that the State Department first publicly expressed concern over the Saudi government’s “export of religious extremism and intolerance to other countries” at a press conference announcing Saudi Arabia’s CPC designation.

In mid-2007, the Commission visited Saudi Arabia to assess the government’s progress in implementing textbook reform and other policies. However, based on that visit and subsequent research into Saudi
government textbooks, including those used at the ISA, the Commission concluded that despite some improvements, these commitments, regrettably, remain largely unfulfilled.

In every official meeting during the visit to Saudi Arabia, the Commission delegation asked Saudi interlocutors for copies of textbooks. The Saudi government’s refusal to make them available during that visit or after the Commission’s return, despite repeated requests, left the Commission with continued concerns about their content and serious questions about whether they were in fact being reformed. The Commission also sought to obtain the textbooks used at the ISA. Until the Commission drew attention to the problem at a press conference in October 2007, the ISA publicly stated on its Web site that it adhered to the official Saudi government curriculum. The Commission called for the ISA to be closed under the terms of the Foreign Missions Act until the official Saudi textbooks used at the school were made available for comprehensive public examination. Soon after the Commission released its October 2007 report, the ISA dropped the language on its Web site stating that its Arabic-language and Islamic studies curriculum “is based on the Curriculum of the Saudi Ministry of Education.” In the months following the Commission’s report, the Saudi government has also posted copies of the official 2007-2008 Saudi textbooks on the Internet.

Members of Congress, some of whom had also sought in vain to obtain official Saudi textbooks for review, have joined the Commission in expressing concern. In November 2007, Reps. Frank Wolf (R-VA), Steve Israel (D-NY), and Anthony Weiner (D-NY) introduced a resolution, H.Con.Res. 262, calling on the State Department to heed the Commission’s requests regarding the ISA and to create a mechanism to monitor implementation of the 2006 Saudi commitments to improving educational materials. Twelve U.S. Senators, led by Sens. John Kyl (R-AZ) and Charles Schumer (D-NY), wrote a bipartisan letter to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice the same month, echoing the Commission’s call for closing the ISA until the official Saudi textbooks used at the school were made available for comprehensive public examination in the United States.

While neither the ISA nor the Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia complied with the Commission’s requests to release the school’s books publicly, the Commission did obtain some Arabic-language books currently used in the twelfth grade and a random selection of texts currently used in middle and high school classes. The Commission’s review of these textbooks found that they did contain passages justifying violence toward, and even the killing of, apostates and so-called polytheists. The texts also include highly intolerant passages about non-Sunni Muslims, such as Shi’a, Ismailis, and Ahmadis, and non-Muslims, such as Jews and Baha’is. A list of the books reviewed is appended to this statement.

The ISA and Claims of Revisions

The ISA operates as an arm of the Saudi government. The ISA’s board is chaired by the Saudi ambassador to Washington, it is located on two properties, one of which is owned, the other leased, by the Saudi Embassy, and it shares the Embassy’s Internal Revenue Service employer tax number under the name of the “Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia.” It is part of a network of 19 international schools run by the government of Saudi Arabia. The ISA distributed some textbooks during a series of open houses held for selected reporters and congressional staffers after the Commission’s press conference, but it did not make available the texts with the most problematic passages—*Tawhid* (monotheism) and *Tafsir* (Koranic interpretation)—which the Commission obtained from other sources.

Last fall, after the Commission held a press conference, ISA personnel were quoted in the media as saying that they had already revised the Saudi Ministry of Education textbooks used at the school. However, the books reviewed by the Commission in the winter of 2007-2008 show evidence of truncation, omission, cutting and pasting, and the use of correction tape or fluid to cover over text—but not sufficient revision to remove all objectionable material, as evidenced by the passages cited above.
They appear to be Saudi Ministry of Education textbooks, with some alterations but with identical wording in many sections of the texts.

**Bilateral and International Commitments by the Saudi Government**

The Saudi government is bound by more than just its 2006 confirmation of policies with the United States. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights not only guarantees religious freedom and bans discrimination and incitement to discrimination on a number of bases, including religion; it also provides specifically that education “shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups...” The UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination based on Religion or Belief also bans such discrimination, which it calls “an affront to human dignity,” a “disavowal of the principles of the [UN] Charter,” a violation of international human rights law, and “an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations.” That Declaration, moreover, specifically provides that “[t]he child shall be protected from any form of discrimination on the ground of religion or belief. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood, [and] respect for freedom of religion or belief of others. . . .” The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which Saudi Arabia is a party, contains similar provisions mandating non-discrimination and the teaching of tolerance in education. The UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination also calls on States Parties, which include Saudi Arabia, “to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, color, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law” in the enjoyment of rights including “the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.”

Those provisions stand in stark contrast to the problematic passages that continue to appear in the ISA textbooks. It is deeply troubling that high school students at a foreign government-operated school in the United States are discussing when and under what circumstances killing an “unbeliever” would be acceptable. The U.S. government must ensure that the Saudi government thoroughly reviews and, as necessary, revises the books it has distributed globally. In both the UN Human Rights Council and UN General Assembly, Saudi Arabia has co-sponsored and supported repeated resolutions urging UN member states to “take resolute action to prohibit the dissemination . . . of racist and xenophobic ideas and material aimed at any religion or its followers that constitute incitement to racial and religious hatred, hostility or violence” and to “ensure that all public officials, including . . . educators, in the course of their official duties, respect different religions and beliefs and do not discriminate against persons on the grounds of their religion or belief.” The U.S. government should insist that the Saudi government meet these commitments fully as a member in good standing of the international community.

**Recommendations for the U.S. Department of State**

The Commission reiterates its recommendations that the State Department should:

- make available all textbooks that it has received from the Saudi government, so that their content and compliance with international human rights standards can be assessed; and
- promptly create a formal mechanism to monitor and encourage implementation of the Saudi government’s 2006 policies as part of every meeting of the U.S.-Saudi Arabia Strategic Dialogue, and ensure that U.S. representatives to each relevant Working Group of the Strategic Dialogue, after each session, or at least every six months, report the group’s findings to Congress.

The Commission reaffirms that governments have a clear obligation to teach tolerance, not hatred. No government should be teaching children that it is justified to kill anyone on the basis of his or her religion or belief. The Commission is seriously concerned that the Saudi government is not abiding by the
policies it confirmed in 2006 to promote greater religious freedom and tolerance, including by revising its school textbooks. The texts used at the ISA are only one example.

APPENDIX

Islamic Saudi Academy Arabic-Language Textbooks Reviewed by the Commission

*Monotheism (Tawhid)*, Twelfth Grade, Administrative, Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences Track
*Monotheism (Tawhid)*, Twelfth Grade, Sharia and Arabic Sciences Track
*Interpretation (Tafsir)*, Twelfth Grade, Sharia and Arabic Sciences Track
*Interpretation (Tafsir)*, Twelfth Grade, Administrative, Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences Track
*Hadith and Islamic Culture*, Twelfth Grade, Administrative, Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences Track
*Hadith and Islamic Culture*, Twelfth Grade, Sharia and Arabic Sciences Track
*Jurisprudence (Fiqh)*, Twelfth Grade, Natural Sciences Track
*Jurisprudence (Fiqh)*, Twelfth Grade, Sharia and Arabic Sciences Track
*The History of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*, Twelfth Grade, Natural Sciences Track
*Sociology*, Twelfth Grade, Sharia and Arabic Sciences Track
*Studies from the Islamic World*, Twelfth Grade, Administrative, Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences Track
*Hadith*, Seventh Grade
*Hadith*, Ninth Grade
*Jurisprudence (Fiqh)*, Ninth Grade
*Jurisprudence (Fiqh)*, Tenth Grade
*Aspects of Muslim Political and Cultural History*, Eleventh Grade, Administrative and Social Track, Sharia and Arabic Track
*History of the Prophets, the Prophet’s Biography, and the Spread of Islam*, Tenth Grade
The passages identified in the preceding USCIRF press release were all also found in books currently posted on the Saudi Ministry of Education website. Their locations are:

“He (praised is He) prohibits killing the soul that God has forbidden [to kill] unless for just cause… [which includes] unbelief after belief, adultery, and killing an inviolable believer intentionally.”

“Major polytheism makes blood and wealth permissible.¹
¹. But this is not permissible for anyone; it is for the Grand Imam of Muslims [to decide].”

“Today, Qadyanis [Ahmadiyyas] are one of the greatest strongholds for spreading aberration, deviation, and heresy in the name of religion, even from within Islamic countries. Thus, the Qadyani [Ahmadiyya] movement has become a force of destruction and internal corruption today in the Islamic world…”

“[Baha’ism] is one of the destructive esoteric sects in the modern age… It has become clear that Babism [the precursor to Baha’ism], Baha’ism, and Qadyanism [Ahmadiyyaism] represent wayward forces inside the Islamic world that seek to strike from within and weaken it. They are colonial pillars in our Islamic countries and among the true obstacles to a renaissance.”

“The cause of the discord: The Jews conspired against Islam and its people. A sly, wicked person who sinfully and deceitfully professed Islam infiltrated (the Muslims). He was ‘Abd Allah b. Saba’ (from the Jews of Yemen). And this Jew began spewing his malice and venom against the third of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, ‘Uthman (may God be pleased with him), and falsely accused him.”

“Shun those who are extreme regarding the People of the House (Muhammad’s family) and who claim infallibility for them.”

“The mu’ahid is an unbeliever who contracts a treaty with a Muslim providing for the safety of his life, property, and family. …
It is not permissible to violate the blood, property, or honor of the unbeliever who makes a compact with the Muslims. The blood of the mu’ahid is not permissible unless for a legitimate reason.”

“In these verses is a call for jihad, which is the pinnacle of Islam. In (jihad) is life for the body; thus it is one of the most important causes of outward life. Only through force and victory over the enemies is there security and repose. Within martyrdom in the path of God (exalted and glorified is He) is a type of noble life-force that is not diminished by fear or poverty.”
Appendix E

Tenth Grade (Lesson 16)

Jurisprudence (Fiqh)

pp. 76-77 Arabic, 2006-2007
الدرس السادس عشر: اللاتواط

من أشد المعاصي وأعظم الجرائم اللاتواط الذي لم يبطل الله به إلا عقوبة جزءهم، وهو شهد منهم، مخالف للغرض السليم. ومن أعظم المعاصي مفسدة وخيثاً.

تعريفه

اللاتواط هو: وطّد الذكر في الدبر.

حكمه

اللاتواط محرم، وهو كبيرة من كبار الذنوب، وقد دل على غريبه الكتاب والإجماع.

فمن الكتاب قوله تعالى: "ولو أنك قلت اللاتواط، أنت من أهل الفسفسة، فاستعملت حكم بكم من أهل الفسفسة".

وقال تعالى مخبرا عن نبيه لوط: "وقد خسرت من أهل المدينة الذي كنت تعمل فيه. إنهم كنا قوم سوء سبرين".

وقد أجمع المسلمون على غريبه.

عقوبته

حد اللاتواط القتيل، فيقتل الفاعل والفعل به، سواء أكانا مقصدين أم غير مقصدين.

وبدل عل ذلك الكتاب وإجماع الصحابة.

(1) سورة الأعراف: آية 80. (2) سورة الأنبياء: آية 74.
فمن القرآن: قوله تعالى: {في غيابك لأمرنا خصصنا علية سلوكها وأدمنا عليها جحارة} {لبن سيجيل مثيره} {عطرة عزيزه} {والمثلك من أظهرها} {بغير الله} {1}.
فتعلى تعالى قوم لوط مما لم يعتقهم به غيرهم، وجمع عليهم انواعاً من العذاب، ثم الحير.
ان هذه العقاب ليست بعيدة من نشيء بهم في فهمهم. قال ابن القيم رحمه الله: {ولم يثبت عن النبي ﷺ أنه قضى في المواط بشيء؛ لأن هذا لم
تكن تعرفه العرب، ولم يرفع إليه ﷺ} {2}.
وقد جمع الصحابة على قتله. قال ابن قدامة رحمه الله: {إنا الصحابة أجمعوا على قتله
وإذا اختلفوا في صفته على كيفية قتله} {3}.
وقد ذهب بعض الصحابة إلى أنه يحرق بالنار، وقال: يرحم بالحجارة، وقيل: يرمي من
شاهق وقيل غير ذلك.

آثاره على الفرد والمجتمع

للواطع آثار سلبية على الفرد والمجتمع الذي يرتكر فيه، ومنها:

1- إنه تقلّب النفع وله تأثيراته السلبية في الناس إلى الخضوع. إذ الميل إلى الفطرة
تكون بين الرجال والنساء لا بين الرجال والرجال.

2- إيمان القبرة في المفعول به، وإنسداد حال الفاعل والمفعول به.

3- الخلاف على أسرة المفعول به، بل على المجتمع بأسره به هذه الفعلة القبيحة الشنيعة.

4- إنه من أسباب زوال النعيم وحلول النقم؛ فإنه يوجب البلاء والمقت من الله وإعراضه
عن فاعلته وعدم نظره إليه.

Lesson 16: Homosexuality

Homosexuality is one of the most disgusting sins and greatest crimes. God did not afflict any people with this before [He afflicted] the folk of Lot, and He punished them as He punished no one else. It is a vile perversion that goes against sound nature, and it is one of the most corrupting and hideous sins.

Definition

Homosexuality is intercourse in which the penis enters the anus.

The Ruling

Homosexuality is forbidden. It is a great sin. The Qur’an and the majority opinion [of scholars] confirm the prohibition on it. The Qur’an states: “We also (sent) Lut: he said to his people: "Do ye commit lewdness such as no people in creation (ever) committed before you? For ye practise your lusts on men in preference to women: ye are indeed a people transgressing beyond bounds.” [7:80-81] God the Most High said about His prophet, Lut: And to Lut, too, We gave Judgment and Knowledge, and We saved him from the town which practised abominations: truly they were a people given to Evil, a rebellious people. [21:74]

Muslims have been unanimous in prohibiting this practice.

Punishment

The punishment for homosexuality is death. Both the active and passive participants are to be killed whether or not they have previously had sexual intercourse in the context of a lawful marriage. The Qur’an and the unanimous opinion of the Prophet’s companions show this.
In the Qur’an we read: “When Our decree issued, We turned (the cities) upside down, and rained down on them brimstones hard as baked clay, spread, layer on layer. Marked as from thy Lord: nor are they ever far from those who do wrong!” [11:82-83]

God the Most High punished the people of Lut as he had not punished anyone else. He subjected them to various torments, and then He said that this punishment awaits those who do as they did.

Ibn al-Qayyim said, “It has not been confirmed that the Prophet made any judgment on homosexuality, for this was unknown to the Arabs and did not rise to His attention.”

The companions of the Prophet were unanimously agreed upon killing [those who commit this sin]. Ibn Qudamah said, “The companions of the Prophet were unanimous on killing, although they differed in the description, that is, in the manner of killing.”

Some of the companions of the Prophet stated that [the perpetrator] is to be burned with fire. It has also been said that he should be stoned, or thrown from a high place. Other things have also been said.
Appendix F

MEMORANDUM

SUBMITTED BY THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA

TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

WITHIN ITS TERRITORY

The General Secretariat of the Arab League:

1. The Saudi Ministry of Foreign Affairs received your Memorandum No. 10/6/10/J6/1350 dated 15-6-70 AD in conjunction with a message from Mr. Edward Lowson, Vice-President of the Human Rights Section at the United Nations in connection with the Resolution of the Human Rights Commission No. 14 (25th Meeting) and Resolution No 1421 (46) of the Economic and Social Council, each entitled as follows: "The subject of the implementation of the economic and social rights embodied in 'The International Human Rights Declaration' and the 'International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights'."

2. The Ministry also received along with your Memorandum the following attachments:
   - A copy of the Message of Mr. Henry Mazau, of the office of the Director of Human Rights Section.

3. On studying your Memorandum and the relative enclosures we have come to know the following:

   a) We are advised that Mr. Manuchehr Janji, a professor of Teheran University, was appointed as Rapporteur in accordance with the two Resolutions mentioned above for the preparation of a study on the implementation of the economic, social and cultural rights in the member countries of the United Nations, which differ in their systems and methods used for the promotion of such rights.

   b) We have been requested to assist the named Rapporteur and to furnish him with data and observations which can serve the Arab cause.
c) Presenting any information we have in connection with this subject particularly from our national legislative system,

d) Mentioning the domestic practices we have and which aim at the realization of the implementation of the economic, social and cultural rights.

e) Studying the special problems connected with Human Rights in the member states, particularly those effected by foreign factors, so as to submit a report on them to the Human Rights Commission during its 27th Meeting in 1971.

4. In order to assist the named Rapporteur in his task of preparing a comprehensive study on the extent of the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights in the member countries of the United Nations in accordance with the International Human Rights Declaration and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, we shall speak hereafter about all the points mentioned above and which were requested for his assistance, in spite of the fact that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has not joined until now the signatories to either 'The International Human Rights Declaration' or 'The International Covenant on the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights'. Saudi Arabia's failure to join was not, as we shall see, due to its disapproval of the aims of the Declaration and the Covenant which stands for the dignity of man as outlined in their provisions, but:

a) Because of our determination to let the dignity of a human person be protected by us without any distinction between one man and another under the impetus of the divine Islamic creed and not by the material law. We are fully convinced that most of the confusions and perversions of the youth of the civilized world have been the result of their loss of the divine creed and their resort to a purely material life in which crimes and perversions have increased in society in proportion to the detachment of such youth from the faith in God.

b) Because of our reservations on some of the points mentioned in the Declaration, and the Covenant, for Islam had its own reasoning with regard to the support of the dignity of man, and the protection of human freedom. Our call for peace among all human beings is based on our Islamic principles which have been distorted by both the ignorant and the prejudiced. Adhering to its scientific philosophy which some researchers have failed to penetrate and which is supported with decisive historical facts in respect of this subject, we had to differ in our interpretations of some of the applications of the rules of the Declaration and the Covenant in as far as the points we mentioned before are concerned, and not over the basic principles relating to the dignity of man, his freedom and coexistence among all human beings and which we shall refer to in this Report when we get to them. We shall avoid all superficial propaganda pretensions which proved sometimes that they were not for the service of the dignity of man or his security or his fundamental rights (such as the distinction given to the workers over others in relation to rights, and their empowerment with the right to go on strikes as we shall see later on).

---

HUMAN RIGHTS IN OUR DOMESTIC LEGAL SYSTEM
5. We now begin with the first point pertaining to this subject by giving short data on "The Principles of Human Rights in Islam" prevailing in our country, mentioning some of the legal provisions related thereto and which form our written National Law. Besides, these principles are closely connected with the Muslim creed and are an integral part of it, and we derive our general policy from them.

6. These rights can be summed up in the following points which have been outlined in the Rules of the Islamic Religion:

a) The dignity of man, in conformity with the Koranic verse which says: "We have honoured the sons of Adam". (XVII, 70).

b) No distinctions in dignity and fundamental rights between one man and another as race, sex, blood relations or wealth, in accordance with the Saying of the Prophet of Islam: "There is no advantage for an Arab over a non-Arab, or for a white man over a black man excepting by piety," and in his saying: "Women are partners to men".

c) The call for the unity of the human race. The persons most favoured by God are those who are most beneficial to mankind, in accordance with the Saying of the Prophet of Islam: "Human creatures are the families of God and the ones who are most loved by Him are those who are most useful to their families."

d) The call for acquaintance and cooperation for the common good as well as for the performance of all kinds of righteous deeds towards all human beings regardless of their citizenship or religion, in conformity with the Koranic verse: "O mankind we created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is he who is the most righteous of you." (XLIX, 13). The same theme is repeated in the following Koranic verse: "God forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) faith nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them: For God loveth those who are just." (LX, 8).

e) Religious freedom to every one and prohibition of any exercise of force in this respect, in response to God's Sayings in the Glorious Koran: "Let there be no compulsion in religion," (II, 256) and "Wilt thou then compel mankind against their will to believe!" (X, 99). These sayings show how the use of pressure on man's religious freedom is denounced.

f) Prohibition of any attack on the property or the life of a man as expressed in the Saying of the Muslim Prophet: "You are forbidden to attack the property or the lives of others."

g) House immunity for the protection of man's freedom as mentioned in the following Koranic Saying: "O ye who believe! Enter not houses other than your own, until ye have asked permission and saluted those in them; that is best for you, in order that ye may heed (what is seemly)." (XXIV, 27).
h) Reciprocal responsibility among members of society, as to the right of every person to lead an honourable life, and to get rid of poverty and need, by levying a certain tax on the wealth of those who are financially able, so as to be paid to those in need, whatever their needs may be. This is in conformity with the words of the Glorious Koran: "And in their wealth the beggar and the deprived had due share" (LI, 19).

i) Imposing education on every Muslim in order to get rid of ignorance - this is being in response to the Saying of the Prophet: "Seeking knowledge is the duty of every Muslim; male and female," - while opening at the same time the horizons of Heavens and Earth for them to ponder them and pass through them, in compliance with the following verses of the Glorious Koran: "Behold all that is in the Heavens and on Earth" (X, 101), and "Ye can pass beyond the zones of the Heavens and the Earth, pass ye! Not without authority shall ye be able to pass!" (LV, 31). That is the authority of knowledge.

j) Enforcing penalty on all those refusing to be schooled or to do schooling. Such human rights which have not yet been attained by any State were observed, in abidance with the Sayings of the Prophet, prior to the construction of schools or Houses of Learning. "Let people learn from their neighbours and let others teach their neighbours, otherwise I will be fast in my punishment."

k) Imposition of health quarantines in the event of any epidemic outbreak. This has been an Islamic practice for the last fourteen (14) centuries. No other State at that time could even recognize such health measures and let them be part of their System of Law so as to serve as additional precautions for the protection of public health from disease. Islam has ordered this just as it has ordered the protection of society from poverty and ignorance, as mentioned before, according to the words of the Prophet: "If an epidemic breaks out in an area and you happen to be there, do not leave it, and if you happen to be away do not try to enter it."

1) There are countless other Islamic religious laws for the protection of those rights which are referred to above. They explain, on the whole, the basic inalienable Human Rights. They also deal in a comprehensive way with man's economic, social and cultural rights from the humanitarian and idealistic aspects which do not make any distinction or allow for any kind of distinction between one human being and another, particularly concerning the things provided for in the International Human Rights Declaration, namely sex or colour or language or religion or opinion or national or social origin or wealth or country. We also go farther than that and add things that were not recognized by the Drafting Body of Human Rights, such as those that appear in the following Koranic Verse: "O ye who believe! Stand out firmly for God, as witness to fair dealing, and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just: that is next to piety; and fear God, for God is well-acquainted with all that ye do." (V 8). We can infer from these holy words that no discrimination in human rights ought to be made because of hatreds or animosities. Likewise Islam declared that women are the sisters of men and that they have claims over others just as others have claims over them, excepting where men were given the right to be heads of the families and to look after their affairs, for men's constitutions are more strongly built and make them more fit to bear the heavy social burden. Truly, it is a heavy burden laid on their shoulders from which women were freed. However, this does not affect women's equality in dignity and rights. This is the highest level of justice between the two sexes.
7. It is quite clear from these religious Laws of Islam how much concern is given to the basic human rights and how much care is devoted to the economic, social and cultural rights of man. Islam has not used these laws for moral sermons but as legal order. It supported them with all the legislations that are needed to insure their implementation. Neither the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights nor the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have gone as far as that; they remained as moral recommendations not guaranteed by any legal safeguards whether on the international level or on the domestic level. It can be said that this is our first reservation on the Charter and the Covenant in a general manner.

For this reason the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is careful on not letting these rights fall to the level of unguaranteed recommendations. It shall continue to observe these rights on the basis of the Islamic Code, since our religion has guarantees and procedures which were implemented by us on the national (domestic) level with all our capacities, at all times and in a progressive manner every year.

SOME RESERVATIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS CHARTER AND COVENANT

8. It is necessary here to present other partial reservations from the Islamic point of view, after presenting the general reservation in the previous paragraph, without prejudicing the essence of those rights, as we saw in the legal provisions which we gave in brief. We shall sum up the partial reservations in the following:

a) What is taken by a foreigner to be a restriction on the part of Islam respecting prohibition of a Muslim woman to marry a non-Muslim and the consideration of this restriction as a violation of Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

b) What is taken by a foreigner to be a restriction on the part of Islam respecting the prohibition of a Muslim to change his religion, and the consideration of this restriction as a violation of Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

c) Finally, the views taken by a foreigner on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia respecting the latter's attitude of not allowing workers to form labour unions as stipulated in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, and which gave all workers the right to form labour unions without being subject to the regulations of their organizations! and stated that it is not permissible to lay any restrictions on the exercise of such right! Article 18 also gave the worker the right to go on a strike provided he does that within the bounds of the concerned State.

9. In connection with point (a) concerning the prohibition of the marriage of a Muslim woman to a non-Muslim and which is considered by a foreigner to be a restriction that violates Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which gives both man and woman who reach the marrying age the right to get married without restriction caused by religion, and on which the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia gave its reservations when the Covenant was drafted, we would like to say that the reasoning of Islam in this connection is that this is not a restriction on the freedom of
marriage because of religion but because of the need to save the family from disruption due to the difference in religion, for a husband may not respect the sacred beliefs of his wife because of different creed, and moreover, a woman is one of two members of the family and is the more sensitive one in view of her feelings of weakness in respect of man.

10. There branch out the following three cases which are different in their laws, but which have the same reasoning like the one we explained in the previous paragraph. These cases are:

I: The marriage of a Muslim husband to a paganistic woman or to a woman who does not believe at all in God has been prohibited by Islam because a Muslim husband will never respect in any manner the beliefs and practices of such a wife. This will expose a family to disputes and disruption. Islam considers divorce as the most hateful thing in the sight of God. Thus, it is not encouraged. Out of this reasoning, such a marriage in which a husband does not respect the beliefs and practices of his wife, ending thereby in disputes and disruption, had to be forbidden. Islam does not encourage the disruption of the family and for this reason it has been careful on letting the foundations of marriage be void of such faults that lead to disruption.

II: The marriage of a Muslim man to a Christian or a Jewish woman has been permitted by Islam, because Islam glorifies Christ for being a Prophet of God who was born by a supernatural miracle and glorifies his mother Mary and absolves her from the charges hurled against her by the Jews. Likewise, Islam glorifies Moses and considers him the Prophet sent by God to the people of Israel. Thus, a Christian or a Jewish wife who is concerned on keeping her religion does not find anything to estrange her from her Muslim husband or to expose the family to dispute and disruption. Thus, Islam has no objection to this kind of marriage despite the difference in religion.

III: The marriage of a non-Muslim whether he is a Christian or a Jew for instance, to a Muslim woman has been prohibited by Islam, because a Christian or Jewish husband does not believe in the sanctity of the creed of Mohammad, the Prophet of Islam, and that he is the Messenger of God. As a matter of fact he believes that the Prophet is wrong in his message and his sayings, and this may estrange a Muslim wife from her husband and may expose the family to Conflicts and disruption. For this reason, this marriage which ends in such a manner has been forbidden.

11. In connection with point (b) regarding the prohibition of a Muslim to change his religion and which is considered by a man alien to Islam to be also a restriction violating Article (18) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which gave every person the right to change his religion and on which the Kingdom also gave its reservations at the time of the drafting of the Charter, we say that according to the reasoning of Islam this is not a restriction on the freedom of every person to change his religion, but is the outcome of a historical incident. It was established to curb a Jewish conspiracy which was plotted in the early days of Islam when all the Arabs of the city of Al Madinah Al Munawwara united themselves after an armed conflict between them caused by the Jewish refugees. The Jews then craftily thought to let some of them join Islam then renounce it in order to make the Arabs suspect their religion and be misled. A law originated from that incident preventing a Muslim from changing his religion and threatening to penalize him so that nobody could join Islam excepting after making a rational and scientific study of its doctrines ending with his permanent acceptance of the Muslim creed. That was meant to cut off
the way for evil men and their like of superficial people, under the threat of punishment, from
joining Islam, for the sake of extirpating malicious elements who have been persisting in
spreading evil on Earth.

12. It is clear from the reasoning of Islam respecting this point also that it does not spring from
the logic of the restriction of freedom but rather from the logic of the curbing of the intrigues of
the plotters who are addicted to the spread of evil in the world. Thus, this matter is purely an
Islamic interpretation - *ijtihad* - which is one of the requirements of freedom of opinion. It
should not be opposed by a counter-interpretation, for every one has his own interpretation of
things, and we have our own interpretation which is supported by historical facts, and our
concern on not letting any one join Islam excepting those who believe in it in a positive and
decisive manner. This shows the extent of sacredness attached to the faith which Islam does not
allow to be superficial and subject to the misleadings of evil persons.

13. Concerning point (c) as to the failure of the Saudi Kingdom until now to adopt a policy
towards labour unions and their absolute rights as provided for in Article (18) of the Universal
Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which gave every worker the right not to
submit excepting to the laws of his union, forbade the imposition of any restriction on the
exercise of such right, and besides, gave the worker the privileged right to go on strike, we would
like to say openly that Marxism, which called for this during the nineteenth Century, is the one
which is depriving the workers of this right throughout the communist countries today. The
communist State does not acknowledge today except its own powers and it chokes every one
who threatens to go on strike or to exercise the right to strike. Likewise, the British Labour
Government complained in past years of the labour unions and their strikes which were not in the
interest of the country. According to their reports, ninety percent of those strikes were in
violation of the law. Similarly, the United States of America was in the fore among the States
which passed domestic legislations curbing these absolute rights. It issued a statute granting the
American President the right to dissolve any labour union if he finds it to be necessary for the
security and interest of the country.

14. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, with deep understanding, has given its reservations on this
point which combines odd and absolute rights including the right to strike, in order to prevent the
interests of the workers themselves, and the interests of the national economy from becoming a
tool in the hands of irresponsible subversive foreigners, particularly after issuing the Labour and
Social Security Codes in which it included all the international principles laid down for the
interest of work and workers. It has included in a special manner the right of equitable pay for
performed work, the right of payment for work done on weekends or holidays, the regulation of
working hours, the right of getting annual leaves with pays, health and sanitary conditions as
well as health security conditions, compensation for industrial accidents estimated on the basis of
the degree of disability, the right to be pensioned on reaching the valid retirement age. These
labour and social security statutes have placed the Kingdom, in as far as the field of labour rights
is concerned, in the fore among developing countries.

15. In addition to that, the Saudi Kingdom is still on the threshold of industrial planning designed
to promote economic development which is necessary for furtherance of the prosperity of
everyone. Thus, the Kingdom does not want its young and starting industry to suffer from what
the British industry is suffering now. The Associated Press Agency reported on August 26, 1970 AD saying: "The industry of Britain is plagued by strikes which are considered the worst ever known during the past sixteen years, and which had their worst effects on British economy." Referring to this, Chairman of the Board of Trade Mr. Michael Nowair warned by saying: "Britain is now on the verge of an economic depression," the Associated Press added in the same report: "We do not only have our reservations on such rights but are also surprised to see that they are issued by an international organization in an age in which everybody is concerned on the necessity of the spread of security for the sake of the success of the economic development projects everywhere."

OUR DOMESTIC PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

16. It is quite known that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is still young in its "civilizational" developments. Most of its establishments and organizations which are connected with our domestic procedures for the implementation of economic rights are not more than fifteen years old. But this does not mean that such rights were neglected before. What is meant, in fact, is that the material means for pushing the wheel of such procedures were not available. Credit goes only to the Islamic Religion which:

- made all Saudi citizens enjoy before the law, since the formation of the Kingdom, all their basic rights as human beings and get all their economic, social and cultural rights freely, without any distinction between one person and another;
- made every citizen also open his heart to every other person in the world, on the light of the Principles of the Islamic Religion (a summary of which was presented before). Islam acknowledges the right of every human being to dignity, freedom, equality, culture, and property ownership without any kind of distinction.

REGARDING CULTURAL MEASURES

17. As the exercise of basic rights, or even civil and political rights by man depends on the extent of his culture, the first thing which the Kingdom did was to turn its attention to the spread of knowledge and to provide the means for it, according to its potentialities and capacities and in compliance with the order of Islam which says that "The quest for knowledge is the duty of every Muslim; male and female'. We were short at the beginning of all the means for education; we needed teachers and schools for every one. Thus, our attention, in proportion to the development of our means, was concentrated on the recruitment of teachers from every corner on Earth and on the construction of schools in every part of the Kingdom. Construction of schools reached an average of one school every other three days in some of the past years. We should bear in mind that on some years the building of schools exceeded 120 per year.
18. The Kingdom feels proud because education is free at all its levels: elementary, intermediate, secondary and college, for both males and females. Not to mention also the hundreds of students who are sent abroad at the expense of the Government for specialization in higher studies whenever there is need for such studies.

19. Besides, a student gets his books and all educational facilities free of charge throughout the various levels of education. He also gets monthly pay when he enrolls for higher education. Each student gets the equivalent of thirty sterling pounds. The idea is to let him concentrate on his studies and to help his family members whenever there is a need for that. Not a single State in the world has adopted such measures to encourage education and to provide the means to a human being to enjoy cultural rights.

20. The Kingdom did not forget vocational training to which it devoted its greatest attention next to elementary education. It took care of its secondary and higher stages and allocated financial assistance to every student who joined it.

21. Finally, the Kingdom did not neglect the education of the illiterate whose age is above the formal school age. As a matter of fact, the Kingdom spent all it could for this type of education. Having known how well this education can assist them in improving their conditions and income the citizens took to it with surprising enthusiasm. Night schools specialized in teaching the illiterate have run up to 600 throughout the Kingdom this year.

22. Though the Kingdom takes good care of education, yet it has not nationalized it. As a matter of fact it encourages private schools and allocated all possible assistance to them for the sake of spreading knowledge.

REGARDING SOCIAL MEASURES

23. In accordance with the Laws of the Islamic Religion which hold to the principle of equality in human dignity and in the basic rights of man, which we outlined at the outset of this memorandum, the measures taken by the Kingdom in connection with the social rights of man began to be implemented since its formation, for it was based on the Laws of the Islamic Religion, without any kind of distinction and with the right of every person living in the Kingdom to be free of fear, hunger, sickness and particularly of ignorance, as we stated before, on the basis of complete social security.

24. The Muslim Religion did not recommend this type of security only but made it incumbent on those who are financially able to pay a tax which it considered to be the right of all needy people. It set up an independent Fund for all such needy people. The ones who are required to pay this tax make their payments voluntarily and willingly in fulfilment of their religious duty towards social security.

25. Thus, the Kingdom has been concerned, in accordance with the Laws of Islam, with the regulation of this tax since its very foundation. It set up lately a fund for these tax collections and
called it the Social Security Fund. The revenues of this Fund, drawn principally from the taxes imposed on the visible property are 2.5% of total ownership and annual profits. All commercial stores, companies and businessmen pay the tax, and a share of agricultural and livestock product throughout the Kingdom is added to it. As you may see, this is a legal measure carried out solely by the Muslim Religion and every State whose system is based on Islam for the protection of the right of every person to social security. Moreover, there is the Social Securities Fund which was established this year for the labourers and workers with view of raising their status and safeguarding them against emergencies of accidents, sickness and old age, as mentioned before.

26. The ones who benefit most from the Social Security Fund are the aged people, the widows who have no persons to support them, the sick, and the ones unable to work for one reason or another, as well as the orphans who have no source of income.

This Fund also shares in compensating those who have suffered from a fire or a flood disaster or from a house collapse, and assists the needy families of the sick and the prisoner families, whatever the reasons for imprisonment are, and uses modern scientific and technical means to prepare those who are fit to earn their living in a decent and honourable way.

27. We cannot forget to mention at this point that every person in the Kingdom has the right to enjoy the best medical care whether for himself or for his family, free of charge. However, medicine has not been nationalized. For this reason, the Government constructed hospitals and established clinics throughout the country and opened their doors for every one for free unconditional treatment and without any distinctions between one man and another or between a citizen or a foreigner.

REGARDING ECONOMIC MEASURES

28. Regarding the legal measures taken by the Kingdom for the protection of the economic rights of each Citizen without any kind of distinction, they are self-evident and self-explanatory, because the Muslim religion believes in freedom to own property and in freedom of work for every one. Thus, it provides all the conditions and means for the enjoyment of such rights and guards them against any encroachment, and does not restrict them excepting where public interest is involved.

29. As the enjoyment of economic rights by a citizen is for his welfare, and as his happiness is completely connected with the Economic Development Projects, the Kingdom set up a few years ago a Council to deal with Planning and Development in a general way, and with Economic Development in a particular manner, for it is useless to the citizen to be entitled to the enjoyment of all economic rights if there were no projects to increase economic development, national income and per capita income.

30. The Kingdom, within the bounds of its material revenue, gives great importance to the development of the resources of the country, the exploration of its hidden wealth, the encouragement of industrialization, the reliance on private sector and its support, within the
bounds of public interest, without any exploitation and with equitable remuneration for work performed, leaving no room for any class struggles or grudges. It considers the encouragement of individual incentive within these bounds as one of the most important factors to push the wheel of economic development and to safeguard human dignity. It is for the interest of the individual and the well-being of the group.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN OUR REGIONAL COUNTRIES ARE THE RESULT OF EXTERNAL FACTORS

31. We regret, at this particular point, in which we ought to explain our own problems that are connected a with Human Rights in our Regional Arab Countries that we have to refer to the only basic problem in which Human Rights were exposed to hostile acts. This problem had and will always have the greatest effect on regional and international peace and on the waste of the largest portion of the national and individual resources of more than thirteen Arab countries. This problem has hampered a lot their economic, social and cultural progress since they were seeking to let the groanings of the Arab people of Palestine be heard. The Palestinians were deprived of all their basic rights in their historical Fatherland in which they lived since the times of the Arab Canaanites six thousand years ago and before Israel came to life and resorted to Egypt together with his twelve children where they multiplied for hundreds of years. Then their descendants decided to free themselves from the slavery of the Pharaohs and fled to Palestine. They went there as aggressors and destructive elements in order to establish a homeland for themselves there through conquest against the Arab people who have the sole right to that historical land.

32. If the law of the jungle had dominated the ancient world when the Israelis conquered Palestine after fleeing from the slavery of the Pharaohs; that barbaric conquest in which the blood of the Arab Canaanites was shed, their lands burned, and their towns destroyed during that period of time as mentioned in the text of the Old Testament; it cannot be permissible in this era, which saw the birth of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of the Human Rights Charter by the United Nations, that conquest, killing, destruction, extermination and wiping out of people who did not submit during early conquest and at the time when the law of the jungle was prevailing, and who will not for a better reason submit during the time of the United Nations Charter, Human Rights and the Universal Charter connected with the implementation of such rights that have never been so badly violated in history by any race as they have been by the Israelis, for one single reason, namely their belief that they are the Chosen People of God and are thus superior to all other peoples; a thing which is unacceptable to anyone at all times. That was the first and the last reason for the persecution which had befallen the Israelis and which will always befall them because it is in complete disagreement with the Rights of Man.

33. Since we referred before to the history of their first and ancient conquest of Arab Palestine, which was taken falsely as a legal justification for their modern conquest and since we pointed out that the Canaanites refused to submit to them, we feel that it is useful to expand a little on the history of that barbaric aggression and the bad consequences it had on world peace at that time when the Canaanites were forced to seek the help of the Babylonians who rushed to their
support, ended the State of Israel and destroyed their Temple for the first time and expelled them from Palestine.

34. When the Babylonian State grew weak and collapsed under the thrashes of the Persian State at that time, the Persians considered those who were the enemies of their enemies as their friends. They restored the Jews and allowed them to rebuild their Temple, but under Persian Rule.

The Arab Canaanites sought anew the help of the Greeks, the enemies of the Persians. To meet their appeal Alexander the Great went to Palestine, destroyed their Temple for the second time and expelled the Jews from there.

35. But when the Greek Empire became weak and fell a prey to the Romans and the Romans entered Palestine, they behaved like the Persians and considered the enemies of their enemies as their friends. They restored the Jews and allowed them to rebuild their Temple for the third time, provided they did it under Roman Rule. But the Arabs did not despair and were able to handle the Romans. Thus, after a while the Romans became aware of the danger of the Israelis and ordered the destruction of their Temple for the third time, until the Muslim Arabs came over and liberated Palestine from the Romans. The Arabs did not find a single Jew there.

36. Thus, we see that the rise of the Israelis in Palestine in the past centuries and the murder of its people upset each time world peace and led to foreign intervention, once on the part of Babylon, then on the part of Persia, then on the part of Athens and finally on the part of Rome. This intervention did not happen at any time except for the interest of a new imperialist empire in this important area of the world, after weakening its Arab inhabitants. Thus, we see that history is repeating itself today due to the Israeli oppression itself, after the Jews were permitted to re-establish Israel and go back to their old aggressive actions. As a result, regional peace has been upset, and had its repercussions on world peace. In Palestine, Human Rights were violated by the Israelis, in a manner unprecedented in the history of mankind. So, can't we draw a lesson from the facts of history?

37. While we thank today the UN Human Rights Commission which emphasized to its Special Rapporteur Mr. Janji the necessity of studying the problems connected with the respect of the rights of man and his basic freedoms, their implementation and the implementation of his economic, social, and cultural rights, particularly the regional ones arising from external factors as indicated in paragraph (206) of the debate of the 26th Meeting of the Human Rights Commission, we feel that it is the duty of the Arab countries to give major importance to the sufferings of the Arab people of Palestine whose Human Rights have been violated as a result of aggression by the Israelis who have gathered from all over the world under the guise of return to their historical national homeland, while in fact this is no more than revival of the old barbaric invasion which took place thousands of years ago, we mentioned before, and which is known in their religions and historical books. They aim at changing the map of this area on the basis of aggression and the elimination of the Arab people of Palestine, which is contrary to Human Rights principles.
38. It is quite strange that the change of the map of this area in favour of an old Israeli aggression and an old form of imperialism is accepted, at a time when the United Nations is liquidating unanimously modern imperialism and aggression since it considers it against Human Rights.

If it is necessary to correct the map of the world on the basis of old conquest, then we would like to ask why the map is not corrected in favour of Old Athens and Old Rome in Europe today also?

---

**ISRAEL'S VIOLATION OF ARAB HUMAN RIGHTS**

39. We now present the different aspects of violation of Arab Human Rights in Palestine today as a result of the restoration of the Israeli presence in this Land which has been an Arab Land for thousands of years. We list the following flagrant violations to which we attract the attention of the UN Human Rights Commission:

I The creation of Israel in Arab Palestine where the Arabs used to own 96% of the land at the time of the Declaration of the Formation of the State of Israel, and without consulting the opinion of the people of the country respecting self-determination, which is acknowledged by the Universal Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its Article No. 1 in conformity with the terms of the UN Charter.

II Stripping the Palestinian Arabs daily of their property in an oppressive manner and expelling them from Palestine which is in violation of the terms of Article 17 of Human Rights.

III Prohibiting the remaining Arabs in Palestine of the right of movement and the selection of their places of residence within the State, which is contrary to Article 13 of Human rights.

IV Complete seizure by force of all the lands of the Palestinians and their expropriations from their Palestinian owners and the expulsion of Palestinians to live in camps either inside or outside the country, under certain living conditions which aim at the wiping out of these nationalistic Palestinians who are known since the dawn of history. This is in violation of the provisions of 'The Special pledge to Prevent Racial Extermination and Application of Penalties against it' issued in 1948 AD.

V Denying the people of Palestine their right in their historical lands and expelling them for replacement with ramblers from different citizenships. Besides, committing all sorts of barbaric acts like the killing of aged men and the cutting of the abdomens of women, the slaughter of children and the profanation of the place of worship for their expulsion from their country with the aim of terrorizing them and making them leave their lands in a permanent manner.

This is contrary to all the basic rights of man. As a matter of fact these new invaders are not Israelis, but most of them are Caspians, from the Caspian Sea area who adopted the Jewish faith eleven centuries ago and had no historical connection with Palestine.
40. For all these reasons, we draw the attention of the UN Human Rights Commission to this flagrant violation of Human Rights in the Arab Land of Palestine under the observation of the UN Organization, and the threat it poses to World peace. This problem cannot be solved excepting by eliminating its causes which lie in the foreign Israeli conquest, and by restoring the usurped rights of the Arabs who are the owners of the land, or else woe to Human Rights from the Israelis who believe, like the Nazis, that they are superior to all other races.
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