

Israel–Jordan: from agreement to action

Three learning paths about water, borders and security: what the treaty says, who needs to act, and how to check what happened. Choose one path for your learners.

An original teaching proposal; timings are estimates and the activities have not been classroom-tested.

These are educational paraphrases, not quotations or an official text. The sources document commitments and dated events; they do not verify the relationship today. Present-day claims require a current source and a check date.

The paths are alternatives, not a required sequence. The existing 25-minute activity can serve as an introduction; these paths move on to mechanisms and evidence. Assess accuracy, the link between source and claim, and recognition of what remains unknown.

Participation and discussion

Do not ask learners to represent a country, nationality or community, or require personal disclosure. Offer writing or individual work. Conclusions may be challenged; claims need support, generalisations should be avoided, and criticism of policy should be distinguished from attitudes towards people. Do not grade political positions.

How does a treaty become part of everyday life?

The Washington Declaration of 25 July 1994 preceded the treaty signed on 26 October, which entered into force on 10 November. Beyond the ceremony, rules, professionals and ways to handle disputes are needed. Three examples help us ask: what needs to happen the next morning?

Sources: [White House · Washington Declaration ceremony, 25 July 1994](#) · [UN Treaty Collection · Registration 35325](#)

Water: not just how much, but how

Article 6 and Annex II address water allocation, quality and information-sharing. The annex establishes a Joint Water Committee with three representatives from each country.

If two teams measure different quantities in the same river, which data and measurement methods should they compare before deciding who is right?

Sources: [Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty, 26 October 1994 · FAOLEX copy](#)

A border: a line, a map and a crossing

Article 3 and Annex I define the boundary; Article 13 addresses roads and crossings. The treaty does not settle the status of territories that came under Israeli military government control in 1967.

How does agreeing where a border lies differ from deciding who may cross it, and when?

Sources: [Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty, 26 October 1994 · FAOLEX copy](#)

Security: a channel of communication during disagreement

Article 4 includes commitments to refrain from force, prevent violence and terrorism, and cooperate. It also provides for a consultation mechanism including liaison, verification and supervision.

Why is an agreed way to establish the facts especially important when the parties disagree?

Sources: [Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty, 26 October 1994 · FAOLEX copy](#)

2018–2019: an arrangement ends, not a conclusion about the whole treaty

The special regimes at Naharayim/Baqura and Zofar/Al Ghamr were set for 25 years, with automatic renewal unless notice of termination was given a year in advance. The annexes recognised Jordanian sovereignty alongside private land rights. On 21 October 2018, the Royal Hashemite Court announced that Israel had been notified of the decision to terminate them; on 10 November 2019, the King announced their expiry.

What can the terms and announcements establish, and what else is needed to understand the effects on people?

Thinking pointer Distinguish sovereignty, ownership and use; and termination under an annex's terms from an allegation of breach. Ending the special regime does not itself establish that the peace treaty was cancelled, that every private right disappeared, or that nobody experienced hardship. The two announcements come from the same party, not an independent assessment of all effects.

Sources: [Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty, 26 October 1994](#) · [FAOLEX copy](#) · [Royal Hashemite Court · Notice on Baqura and Al Ghamr annexes, 21 October 2018](#) · [Royal Hashemite Court · Speech from the Throne, 10 November 2019](#)

Grades 4–6 · approximately ages 9–12 · 30 minutes

From a rule to an action

Learning goal Connect a human need, an agreed rule, an action and a way to check it.

Materials The three water, border and security cards; paper for writing or drawing. Read the adapted text aloud and show the article reference.

Before the lesson Choose just one card if reading time is limited. Independent reading of the source or water-allocation calculations are not required.

Activity steps

1. **Identify a need** (5 minutes)

Choose a card and identify a human need: water, safe passage or protection from violence.

2. **Plan an action** (10 minutes)

Suggest three actions that professionals would need to take. For each, write who is responsible and how you could check that it happened.

3. **Ask before blaming** (10 minutes)

A fictional practice scenario, not a historical event: two teams get different results when testing water. Write two questions to investigate and suggest one joint test.

4. **Sum up** (5 minutes)

Share one action and one way to check it. You may submit a written response instead of speaking to the class.

Questions to investigate

1. Is a promise enough if nobody is responsible for carrying it out?

Thinking pointer Ask for a role, an action and a way to check it, rather than simply saying that people should cooperate.

2. Do two different results immediately prove that somebody lied?

Thinking pointer Possible differences include the time, location or measuring equipment. These are hypotheses to test, not claims about a real event.

Evidence and answer pointers

- Water card: compare units, times and measurement locations. A figure without context is not enough.
- Border card: distinguish the location of the boundary from the rules for crossing it.
- Security card: communication can help establish facts; a mechanism written into a treaty does not prove that every incident was prevented.

Adapting the activity Read aloud, allow a drawing with an explanation, or offer individual work. Assess the link between need, action and evidence, not a political position.

Exit ticket In the treaty we found a rule about _____. To carry it out, someone needs to _____. To check whether it happened, we would want to see _____.

Grades 7–9 • approximately ages 12–15 • 45 minutes

An implementation-checking team

Learning goal Build a focused question and a research plan that distinguishes a commitment from its implementation.

Materials Choose a topic: water — Article 6 and Annex II; boundary and crossings — Articles 3 and 13; security — Article 4. Use the cards alongside the source.

Before the lesson Prepare a table: commitment | mechanism | possible evidence | period | limitation. A research plan is sufficient; learners need not claim to have found current information.

Activity steps

1. **Frame and locate** (10 minutes)

Ask about a specific action, not simply whether there is peace. Locate the commitment, the mechanism and the article number.

2. **Build a checking plan** (15 minutes)

List the evidence you would seek, the period it should cover and what it could not establish. If no source has been found, write ‘not yet checked’, not ‘not carried out’.

3. **Review each other’s plans** (15 minutes)

Another group asks: is this evidence of an action or only a promise? Does it cover the relevant period? Are the sources independent, or repeating the same announcement?

4. **State a bounded conclusion** (5 minutes)

Write what the treaty establishes, what further evidence is needed and what cannot yet be concluded.

Questions to investigate

1. Does a photograph of a ceremony prove activity over many years?

Thinking pointer It may provide evidence about a particular moment; checking continuity requires sources suited to the period and the action.

2. Is a government announcement worthless because the government has an interest in the issue?

Thinking pointer It matters for establishing what the government announced, but may not provide a complete picture of implementation. Assess its fit to the claim rather than applying a blanket label.

Evidence and answer pointers

- A dated measurement may test water quantity or quality at one location, not every year of the treaty.

- A boundary map does not prove that a crossing was open on a particular day; that question needs a dated operational source.
- Do not seek non-public security information. Learners can analyse the treaty's consultation mechanism and identify the limits of available information.

Adapting the activity Allow pairs or individual work. Assess the article reference, the fit between evidence and claim, and an identified limitation—not support for or opposition to the treaty.

Exit ticket The document requires _____. To check implementation, we would look for _____. We still could not conclude _____.

Grades 10–12 • approximately ages 15–18 • 45 minutes

One treaty, different kinds of disagreement

Learning goal Distinguish disagreement, an allegation of breach, and termination under agreed terms; separate facts from judgements.

Materials The 2018–2019 case; Annexes I(b) and I(c), especially paragraph 6 in each; Article 29 of the treaty; the two Jordanian announcements.

Before the lesson Provide both annexes, not just a news headline. Identify ownership rights at Naharayim/ Baqura and rights of use at Zofar/Al Ghamr without merging the categories.

Activity steps

1. **Map the sources** (10 minutes)

For each source, record its creator, date, what it documents and what it cannot establish alone.

2. **Read the terms** (10 minutes)

Find the duration, renewal and termination conditions, and the distinction between sovereignty and private rights. Identify dispute-resolution methods in Article 29.

3. **Find the leap in reasoning** (15 minutes)

Test two claims: 'If an arrangement was not renewed, the whole treaty was cancelled'; 'If termination was allowed by the text, it imposed no costs on people'. What is missing in each?

4. **Write a short memo** (10 minutes)

Write 120–150 words: a sourced fact, an interpretation labelled as such, a consideration affecting someone who may be impacted, and an open question.

Questions to investigate

1. How does checking an action against the treaty's terms differ from judging whether it was desirable?

Thinking pointer Checking the terms and evaluating outcomes are different tasks; a permitted decision can still be contested.

2. Could two measures lead to different assessments of the same treaty?

Thinking pointer Choose, for example, prevention of violence and contact between people; define evidence and a period for each. Do not assume they changed in the same direction.

Evidence and answer pointers

- Paragraph 6 in each annex sets 25 years, automatic renewal and termination with one year's prior notice, while distinguishing the arrangement from private rights. If either party requests it, consultations are to be held.

- Article 29 provides for negotiation and, if unresolved, conciliation or arbitration. This does not establish that a particular dispute reached any given stage.
- An official statement records a position and a declared action; understanding effects on farmers or residents requires further documentation.

Adapting the activity For a 15-minute extension, compare two measures of success. Offer writing instead of discussion. No ruling on a current legal dispute is required.

Exit ticket Label statements in your memo: F = fact, I = interpretation, V = value judgement. Add one further source needed to investigate the effects on people.

Sources and locations

Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty, 26 October 1994 • FAOLEX copy

Articles 3, 4, 6, 13, 29; Annexes I(b), I(c), II. Text of the agreed terms and annexes.

<https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/bi-17463.pdf>

UN Treaty Collection • Registration 35325

Signed on 26 October 1994; entered into force on 10 November 1994 through exchange of instruments of ratification. UN registration in 1998 is a different event.

<https://treaties.un.org/Pages/showDetails.aspx?clang=en&objid=080000028009bc5b>

White House • Washington Declaration ceremony, 25 July 1994

Official transcript: ending the state of belligerency and continuing negotiations towards a peace treaty.

<https://clintonwhitehouse6.archives.gov/1994/07/1994-07-25-president-king-hussein-pm-rabin-at-signing-ceremony.html>

Royal Hashemite Court • Notice on Baqura and Al Ghamr annexes, 21 October 2018

One treaty party's statement of its decision and notification to Israel.

<https://rhc.jo/en/news/king-we-have-decided-terminate-peace-treaty-annexes-baqura-and-al-ghamr-israel-informed>

Royal Hashemite Court • Speech from the Throne, 10 November 2019

Announces expiry of the Baqura and Al Ghamr annexes; includes an official English translation of the King's speech.

<https://rhc.jo/en/news/king-inaugurates-18th-parliaments-fourth-ordinary-session>