Course Description
This class will provide an in-depth understanding of the Arab-Israeli conflict and it evolution over time. Our goal is to develop an appreciation of the complexities and dynamism of this conflict through an examination of its origins, the actors involved, and the key historical and political factors that have shaped it.

Structure of the course
This is a seminar course. Most of our meetings will revolve around critical intensive discussions of the assigned readings. This means that the more you out into the course, the more you will get out of it. On occasion, there will be lectures oriented to providing contextual and introductory material for certain topics.

Course Requirements
There are no examinations in this course. Students are expected to attend each class ready to contribute to the discussion and to have done the readings assigned for each topic prior to class. To that end, students are required to submit a 1-2 page critical reaction to the readings each week. Reaction papers due in the dropbox folder in course’s Learn@UW site by 5 pm on Wednesdays.

In addition to the weekly response papers, each student will write a research paper that evaluates a general claim about Arab-Israeli relations or another relevant aspect of the conflict. Close consultation with the professor in the choice of topic and the development of research design is expected. Paper topic proposals with preliminary bibliographies must be turned in by February 28th. The final papers are due on May 13th. Late papers will be penalized half of one letter grade for every day they are late.

Grading Criteria
Final course grades will be assigned according to the following weights:

- Attendance and discussion participation: 20 percent
- Critical reaction papers: 20 percent
- Research paper: 60 percent

Critical reaction papers
Critical reaction papers are not simply summaries of the readings. I want you to demonstrate that you have read and given serious thought to the material for that week. To do so, in addition to
summarizing the arguments in the reading, include your own reactions to them, describe their implications in the context of the other readings we’ve done that week or previously and point out their limitations. An effective reaction paper demonstrates knowledge of all assigned readings, but may focus on one significant element (theme, argument, issue). You might consider the following questions as you write your reaction papers:

1) What are the principal arguments or points of view offered in the readings? What are they trying to explain? Are they successful?
2) What assumptions do the readings make? Are they plausible? How would you refute them?
3) Is the evidence offered by the readings to substantiate their argument relevant, effective, and convincing? What are its weaknesses?
4) What are the broader implications of the readings?
5) How does this reading compare/contrast to, or expand on, other material presented in this class, other classes, or your outside experience?
6) What questions remain unanswered once you’ve finished reading this week’s reading? What should have been addressed?

Regardless of the particular strategy you adopt for these assignments, your reaction papers should also be concise, well-written, and carefully proofread.

**Research Paper**

The research paper will provide you with an opportunity to explore an aspect of the Arab-Israeli conflict in significant depth. I am relatively open about the scope of topics that can be chosen. However, if you have trouble coming up with one, I would be happy to work with you to develop an appropriate topic.

The paper itself should be 8000-10,000 words long. Citations must be provided in footnotes using the Chicago Manual style. For information see, [http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/DocChicago.html](http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/DocChicago.html)

A good paper both informs and persuades; to do this it must be logically organized, clearly argued, and well documented. Avoid writing a paper that merely restates the readings or repeats the lectures or discussion sections. You need to do some original thinking, research, and analysis in this paper. Stay away from normative arguments or political polemics. This is hard work. You are strongly encouraged to meet with me to discuss the progress of your paper throughout the semester.

Style Counts! Spelling mistakes as well as errors of syntax and grammar are unacceptable. At best they are evidence of sloppy work. At worst they make your argument impossible to understand. While style does not replace substance, a poorly written or organized paper makes it difficult to get to your argument. I encourage you to consult the UW Writing Center’s “Writer’s Handbook” for more information about style, organization and references. [http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/index.html](http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/index.html)

There are also a number of excellent guides on the web that I encourage you to consult about how you could go about writing an analytical research paper. Some good sites include:
• How to Research a Political Science Paper, by Peter Liberman:  
http://qcpages.qc.edu/Political_Science/researching.html
• Writing Political Science Papers: Some Useful Guidelines, by Peter Liberman,: 
http://qcpages.qc.edu/Political_Science/tips.html
• Reading, Writing, and Researching for History: A Guide for College Students, by Patrick Rael:  
http://www.bowdoin.edu/writing-guides/
• Writing a Research Paper, by Sarah Hamid: 
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/workshops/hypertext/ResearchW/index.html
• An accurate summary of some things not to do, which (unfortunately) students commonly do, can be found at Advice on How to Write a Bad Paper.

Here is a rough explanation of how to understand the grading of the papers:
A: This is an outstanding paper. It is well organized around a clear and insightful argument that is logically organized and well-supported with evidence from the historical record and the scholarly literature. The paper considers alternative arguments, deals with countervailing evidence, and weighs their relative merits. It also convincingly shows that its main argument is better/more complete than the alternatives. This paper also shows how and why the question it pursues and the answer it offers are significant and important. There are few (or no) spelling or proofreading problems and the paper is well and appropriately documented.

AB: High quality in terms of style and content. The paper has a clear thesis statement, good organization and supporting evidence. It shows a solid grasp of the issues at stake and is well written. This paper shows evidence of original thought and planning. While it makes some reference to the scholarly literature it does not fully engage it.

B: The paper shows a decent understanding of the phenomenon and the overall argument is relatively clear although it may tend more toward summary than analysis. While the wider literature is acknowledged, the paper does not add its own insights. However, there may be significant grammatical and syntax errors, organizational problems, and the references to the literature may be perhaps a bit narrow, superficial or insufficient.

BC: The paper conforms to some of the requirements, but falls short on many, or is seriously marred by crucial shortcomings, including, but not limited to, poor organization, poor grammar or a poor understanding of the question. While there is some attempt to deal with the question, the argument is unclear and/or it is not adequately supported by appropriate evidence. There is little attempt to anchor the argument in the literature on the topic.

C: The paper attempts to pose and answer a question but does not actually do so. In other words, it has no argument. It may also be plagued by, among other problems, poor organization, poor writing, over-generality, lack of evidence or its inappropriate, selective or partial use.

F: The paper does not meet the requirements of the assignment and/or is so poorly written as to be unintelligible or has plagiarized from a published text or another student. Note also that an adequate paper that is not on an appropriate topic also falls within this realm
I will take into consideration papers whose final draft shows substantial and significant improvement over earlier drafts. Note, to take advantage of this you have to complete drafts of your paper early enough to get feedback. I require at least 3 weekdays to get a draft back to you with comments. In other words, don’t wait until the last moment to start your paper.

**Academic Conduct**

This class is geared to maximize our joint exploration of important topics in the history and politics of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Serious scholarly discussion becomes impossible when diatribe and invective displace scholarly analysis. As a result, when posing questions or responding to others, students are expected to demonstrate an appropriate level of respect despite what might be deep disagreements.

The paper you are required to write will require you to cite other people’s work. **Plagiarism will not be tolerated!** If you are caught turning in work that is not your own or using another author’s work without properly citing it, you will receive an F on the assignment. If you have any questions about what constituted academic dishonesty, please consult the Dean of Students Web page, at [http://www.wisc.edu/students/saja/misconduct/UWS14.html](http://www.wisc.edu/students/saja/misconduct/UWS14.html)

**Required Readings**

Many of the required readings for this course are in the course reader, which is available online at the course’s Learn@UW site. The books can be purchased at the University Book Store or found on reserve at the College Library.

The following books are required for the course:


The following recommended books have been placed on reserve at College Library:


COURSE SCHEDULE

January 24: Historical background and making sense of conflicting accounts
Gelvin, The Israel-Palestine Conflict, ix-x, 1-45.

January 31: Zionism and Israeli Nationalism
Gelvin, The Israel-Palestine Conflict, 46-75, 144-155.
Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion testimony before the Peel Commission

February 7: Palestinian and Arab Nationalism
Gelvin, The Israel-Palestine Conflict, 92-115, 196-212
February 14: The dynamic of the mandate and the logic of partition
Haj Amin al-Husseini’s testimony before the Peel Commission
Jabotinsky, Vladimir (Ze’ev). “The Iron Wall,” and “The Ethics of the Iron Wall” (13)

February 21: Triumph and Catastrophe: different understandings of the 1948 war
Gelvin, *The Israel-Palestine Conflict*, 126-143
Alterman, Nathan. “The Silver Platter”

February 28: The refugee question
Gelvin, *The Israel-Palestine Conflict*, 155-164
Jabra I. Jabra, “In the Deserts of Exile”


March 7: Arab-Israeli wars 1956-1982


Gelvin, The Israel-Palestine Conflict, 165-195.


Baath party, 1965. The Palestine problem in the political report and resolutions of the 8th all-arab Baath Congress.


March 14: The Intifadas

Gelvin, The Israel-Palestine Conflict, 212-228.


March 21: Impact of the conflict on Palestinian and Israeli society

March 28: No class spring break

April 4: No class: International Studies Association Conference

April 11: The Great Debates I: What to Do with the Occupied Territories in Israel?

April 18: The Great Debates II: Acceptance of Israel among the Arabs?
Arab (Saudi) Peace Initiative

April 25: Religion and the Arab-Israeli conflict

May 2: The role of the United States


May 9: Peace Processes past and future

Gelvin, The Israel-Palestine Conflict, 229-255.


Papers due May 13th
Recommended Readings for PS 631

Making sense of conflicting accounts
Silberstein, *The Post-Zionist Debates*.

Historical Background

Origins of Israeli and Palestinian national movements: Zionism and Israeli Nationalism

Origins of Israeli and Palestinian national movements: Palestinian and Arab Nationalism
Antonius, George. 1938. The Arab Awakening.
Dawisha, Adeed. Arab Nationalism In The Twentieth Century.
Furlonge, Geoffrey. 1969. Palestine is my country, the story of Musa Alami.
Khalidi, Walid Before Their Diaspora: A Photographic History of the Palestinians, 1876-1948.


Sela, Avraham and Moshe Maoz, eds. 1997. The PLO and Israel.


The dynamic of the mandate and the logic of partition


Triumph and Catastrophe: different understandings of the 1948 war


Handal, Natalie. “Mahmoud Darwish: Palestine's Poet of Exile” The Progressive May 2002


The refugee question


Dar Al-Fata Al-'Arabi and Jaffa Research Center (eds), Jaffa, the Perfume of a City (Jaffa, 1991) [Arabic].

Hitchens, Christopher “Broadcasts,” in Blaming the Victims, 73-83.
Kimche, Jon. “Deir Yassin and Jaffa” from Seven Fallen Pillars (London: Secker and Warburg, 1950)
Koresh, Taylor “The Silent Palestinian Refugee Crisis” Foreign Policy, July 2010
Morris, Benny. 1948 and After.


**Arab-Israeli wars 1956-1982**


Segev, Tom. 1967.


Yaacov Ro’i and Boris Morozov (eds.), *The Soviet Union and the June 1967 Six Day War*

**Palestinians under Israeli Rule: Arabs in the Occupied Territories…**


Slyomovics, Susan *The Object of Memory: Arab and Jew Narrate the Palestinian Village* (Philadelphia)


**Arab Citizens of Israel**


Forman, Geremy and Alexandre Kedar, “From Arab Land to ‘Israel Lands’: The Legal Dispossession of the Palestinians Displaced by Israel in the Wake of 1948”


Sa’di, Ahmad H. “National Identity, Conflict and Presentations: The Palestinians in Israel,” in Gottfried Brauer, Peter Fenn, Amos Hoffman, Izhak Schnell and Gerhard Stephan (eds), *Nationality—Identity—Education* (Hamburg)


**The Intifadas**


Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims*


**Impact of the conflict on Palestinian and Israeli Society**


Hasso, Frances, *Resistance, Repression, and Gender Politics in Occupied Palestine and Jordan*, (Syracuse, NY, 2005).


**What to do with the Occupied Territories?**


**Acceptance of Israel Among the Arabs?**

Ahmed, Muhammad Sayyid. 1976. *After the guns fall silent*.

Ajami, Fuad, *The Dream Palace of the Arabs*.


Sela, Avraham and Moshe Maoz, eds. 1997. The PLO and Israel., ch. 5


Woods, Kevin M., Murray Williamson, and Thomas Holaday. 2009. “Saddam’s War: An Iraqi Military Perspective of the Iran-Iraq War,” McNair Paper 70, National Defense University, pp. 1-3, 19-24, 93:- on Iraqi view of Israel as the real enemy until 1979 and (on pg. 23, the acceptance of Israel – goal was not to eliminate Israel, but to push it back to its original borders, or not as in 93-4)

Religion and the Arab-Israeli conflict


Eisenman, Robert H. 1978. Islamic law in Palestine and Israel, a history of the survival of tanzimat and Sharia in the British Mandate and the Jewish State.


Gopin, Marc. 2002. Holy War, Holy Peace: How religion can bring peace to the middle east


**Gender and the conflict**


Dajani, Souad. 1994. The Struggle of Palestinian Women in the Occupied Territories: Between National and Social... *Arab Studies Quarterly*. 16, no. 2: 13-26


Jad, Islah. 2011. Islamist Women of Hamas: Between Feminism and Nationalism. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*. 12, no. 2


Schweitzer, Yoram, ed. *Female Suicide Bombers: Dying for Equality?* (Tel Aviv: Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, 2006).

**US Role and mediation**
Princen, the disputants' decision problem- acceptance, initiation, role bargaining

**Peace Processes: past and future**
Bar-Siman-Tov, “The Arab-Israeli Conflict- Learning Conflict Resolution”
Benn, Aluf “Grasping for Peace,” Foreign Policy, January/February 2002, pp. 82-84.
Falaff and newman, state formation and the geography of Palestinian self-Determination
Frederiksen, a federation of Palestine and Jordan- a chance for peace?
Grossman, David Death as a Way of Life.
Heller, towards a Palestinian state
Kemp and Pressman, Point of No Return, 9-34,
Laura Z. Eisenberg and Neil Caplan, Negotiating Arab Israeli Peace (Bloomington, 1998.)
Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PSR) - Survey Research Unit: [PSR Polls among Palestinian Refugees](https://www.psr.org/polls), (Jan-June 2003), released 18 July 2003.
Parry, Nigel Misrepresentation of Barak's offer at Camp David as "generous" and "unprecedented"
Rabinovich, Itamar *Waging Peace: Israel and the Arabs 1948-2003*.
Ron Pundak, “From Oslo to Taba: What Went Wrong?”

Savir, Uri. 1000 Days
Sayigh, Armed Struggle and the Search for State, 638-662.
Slater, Jerome "A Palestinian State and Israeli Security," Political Science Quarterly 106, no. 3 (fall 1991): 416,

Polling organizations in Israel and the Palestinian Territories and other information sources
www.MIFTAH.org
Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, http://www.pcpsr.org
Jerusalem Media and Communication Center, www.jmcc.org/
http://www.pcpo.ps/polls.htm
http://www.arabbarometer.org/index.html
http://cbs.gov.il/reader/?MIval=cw_usr_view_Folder&ID=141