

## Review of *Virginia and United States History*, Pearson

<b>Topic:</b> 19: America in the 1980s and 1990s  <b>Lesson:</b> 4: A New Era in Foreign Policy – Subsection: America and the Middle East in the 1990s	
<b>Passage</b>	“In the 1990s, Israel’s military responded to attacks by Palestinians. The level of violence grew increasingly fierce. Meanwhile, instability had increased in the region as a whole. As Clinton worked to address it, violence originating in the region spread outward, with the United States increasingly a target.”
<b>Rewording</b>	“In the 1990s, Israel’s military and Palestinians engaged in ongoing violence. The level of violence grew increasingly fierce. Meanwhile, Clinton worked to address increasing instability in the region.”
<b>Rationale</b>	1) The first sentence does not explain why Palestinians attacked and also ignores Israeli aggression as well.  2) Much of the violence in the Middle East is related to global events and Western interference in the region.

<b>Topic:</b> 19: America in the 1980s and 1990s  <b>Lesson:</b> 4: A New Era in Foreign Policy – Subsection: America and the Middle East in the 1990s	
<b>Passage</b>	“Chronic violence continued even though Israel withdrew from much of the West Bank, and later from Gaza.”
<b>Rewording</b>	“Even after promising self-rule for Palestinians, Israel continued to control security and administration in almost 2/3 of Palestinian territory.”
<b>Rationale</b>	This sentence ignores the Areas A, B, and C that were set up under the Oslo Accords. Israel still had security and administrative control of almost 2/3 of the West Bank after the Oslo Accords ( <a href="http://www.itcoop-jer.org/sites/default/files/ocha_opt_area_c_map_2011_02_22_0.pdf">http://www.itcoop-jer.org/sites/default/files/ocha_opt_area_c_map_2011_02_22_0.pdf</a> )

<b>Topic:</b> 19: America in the 1980s and 1990s  <b>Lesson:</b> 4: A New Era in Foreign Policy – Subsection: America and the Middle East in the 1990s	
<b>Passage</b>	“In 2000, Clinton invited Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat and Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak to Camp David to work on a peace agreement. They came close to signing one, but Arafat was not satisfied with any of the proposals. Back in Israel, Barak was replaced as prime minister by Ariel Sharon, a “hawk” who once opposed any concessions to the Palestinians. In 2005, however, Sharon withdrew all Israeli settlers from Gaza. Nonetheless, Palestinian suicide bombings increased, and with them so did crackdowns by the Israeli military.”
<b>Rewording</b>	“In 2000, Clinton invited Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat and Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak to Camp David to work on a peace agreement. They came close to signing one, but Arafat was not satisfied with any of the proposals because he did not believe they gave adequate rights to Palestinians. Back in Israel, Barak was replaced as prime minister by Ariel Sharon, a “hawk” who once opposed any concessions to the Palestinians. In 2005, however, Sharon withdrew all Israeli settlers from Gaza but increased Jewish settlements in the West Bank. Meanwhile, violence between Palestinians and the Israeli military increased.”

## Review of *Virginia and United States History*, Pearson

<b>Topic:</b> 19: America in the 1980s and 1990s   <b>Lesson:</b> 4: A New Era in Foreign Policy – Subsection: America and the Middle East in the 1990s	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>1) By not explaining <i>why</i> Arafat was not satisfied by the proposals, the second sentence portrays Arafat as the uncompromising enemy of peace.</p> <p>2) In contrast final two sentences paint Sharon as a champion of peace for withdrawing Israeli settlers from Gaza. However, Sharon was not motivated by wanting peace, but rather moved these settlers to the West Bank to grab more land and limit Palestinians’ chances of establishing their own state (see Avi Shlaim’s “How Israel Brought Gaza to the Brink of Humanitarian Catastrophe”).</p>

<b>Topic:</b> 19: America in the 1980s and 1990s   <b>Lesson:</b> 4: A New Era in Foreign Policy – Subsection: America and the Middle East in the 1990s	
<b>Passage</b>	“Bin Laden had fought in Afghanistan in the 1980s on the side of Islamists who sought to expel the Soviet Union.”
<b>Rewording</b>	“Bin Laden had fought in Afghanistan in the 1980s on the side of Islamists (who were supported by the United States) who sought to expel the Soviet Union.
<b>Rationale</b>	In a US history textbook it is important to note the role of the United States in supporting the mujahideen in the 1980s.

<b>Topic:</b> 20: America in the Twenty-First Century   <b>Lesson:</b> 2: The George W. Bush Presidency – Subsection: Bush’s Second Term	
<b>Passage</b>	“Saddam’s brutal rule had kept fighting in check among Iraq’s three major groups: Sunnis, Shi’a, and Kurds. Now these groups fought bitterly for power. An American troop surge in 2007 lessened the violence.”
<b>Rewording</b>	“Saddam Hussein was removed from power, but that did not bring peace to Iraq. The US invasion destroyed much of Iraqi political and economic infrastructure. It also tore at the social fabric, opening up sectarian divides. Militia groups formed that put the lives and property of former neighbors in jeopardy.”
<b>Rationale</b>	The current language completely elides the United States’ role in <i>creating</i> sectarian violence in Iraq. Furthermore, the structure of this passage makes sectarianism seem inherent to Iraq. Rather, sectarian violence emerged from the US’s post-invasion creation of a political system along sectarian lines (See Ches Thurber’s “From Coexistence to Cleansing: The Rise of Sectarian Violence in Baghdad”). If students should learn analytical skills and multiple perspectives to historical events, they need to understand how sectarian violence emerged in post-invasion Iraq. (In line with VUS.1.f – “explaining how indirect cause-and-effect relationships impact people, places, and events”)

## Review of *Virginia and United States History*, Pearson

<b>Topic:</b> 20: America in the Twenty-First Century   <b>Lesson:</b> 3: The Barack Obama Presidency – Subsection: President Obama Takes Action	
<b>Passage</b>	“In August 2010, Obama announced, “The American combat mission in Iraq has ended.” When the final pull-out took place in late 2011, more than 4,000 Americans had been killed and more than 31,000 wounded. During the American troop surge, Iraq was significantly more stable, although acts of terrorism continued.”
<b>Rewording</b>	“In August 2010, Obama announced, “The American combat mission in Iraq has ended.” When the final pull-out took place in late 2011, more than 4,000 Americans had been killed and more than 31,000 wounded. Over 165,000 Iraqi civilians were killed.”
<b>Rationale</b>	1) The text should also include the number of Iraqis who were killed and wounded, which far outnumbers American casualties and injuries. ( <a href="https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians/iraqi">https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians/iraqi</a> ) 2) The term “stable” is unclear in the last sentence. Technically speaking, Iraq was most “stable” when Saddam was in power. Therefore, this sentence should be removed.