Views of the Holocaust in Arab Media and Public Discourse

BY STEPHEN WICKEN

In early December 2005, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad claimed that the Nazi Holocaust was a “myth” perpetuated by Zionists. Days later, Muhammad Mehdi Akef, the leader of the Egyptian opposition group the Muslim Brotherhood, echoed the Iranian president’s claim. Both announcements were received with a mixture of shock and fury by the international community. Heads of state and foreign ministers lined up to condemn the comments unreservedly. Few paid any attention to Ahmadinejad’s attempted justification for his claim: that if the Holocaust was a crime committed by Europeans against other Europeans, the Palestinian nation should not be the one to pay the price.

Ahmadinejad’s proposal that the Jewish homeland be relocated to North America or Europe invited further ridicule. But in responding only with fury to his comments, the international community may be missing an opportunity to try to understand an important aspect of the enduring conflict between Israel and the Arab world. For Israeli Jews, 1948 was the year of homecoming. It was the year of deliverance from the evil of the Nazi Holocaust, the extermination of six million Jews, alongside millions of Roma, Sinti, Slavs, and many others. For Palestinian Arabs, however, 1948 was the year of the nakba (catastrophe), when, according to Edward Said, “750,000 of us who were living there—two-thirds of the population—were driven out, our property taken, hundreds of villages destroyed, an entire society obliterated.” The Holocaust has, of course, become one of the most analyzed events in human history. Thousands of books and essays have dealt with different aspects of
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the Holocaust, while academic programs in Holocaust studies have begun recently to spring up in Europe and the United States, as well as in Israel. The suffering of the Arab peoples in the Palestinian territories and elsewhere as a result of the nakba has been little documented in comparison.

Two trends exist within Arab public discourse that shed light on President Ahmadinejad’s comments. The first is that of Holocaust denial and normalization, sometimes the product of vicious antisemitism and other times a response to perceived Israeli human rights abuses during wars with Arab states. The second trend is the work of intellectuals, journalists, and politicians who have sought to understand the broader landscape of tragedy laid before them. The specter of the nakba looms large within both trends, either as supposed evidence that Israeli Jews were as guilty of mass murder as the Nazis, or as proof that reciprocal sympathy is called for to resolve the current problems afflicting the Middle East. Understanding the roots of these views of the nakba and the Holocaust is essential to creating an atmosphere where Israelis and Palestinians can establish a peaceful and workable understanding of each other’s tragedy in order to bring much-needed empathy to the peace process.

**Denial and Diminution in the Arab Media**

One of the major claims to emerge from Holocaust deniers in the Arab media is that the Holocaust is a myth concocted and used by Jews for their own gains. An article by Seif ’Ali Al-Jarwan titled “Jewish Control of the World Media,” printed in 1998 by Palestinian daily newspaper *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida* is typical. In it Al-Jarwan argues that Jews have manipulated the world media to take advantage of Nazi “persecution” by concocting “horrible stories of gas chambers which Hitler, they claimed, used to burn them alive.” The truth, the article claims, is that “such persecution was a malicious fabrication by the Jews. It is a myth which they named ‘The Holocaust’ in order to rouse empathy.” However, in typical pattern, Al-Jarwan’s Holocaust denial is not total. Performing something of an about-face, the author in one section admits that Hitler may have “facilitated the persecution of Jews to some degree...[even if] Jews certainly benefited from its aftermath.” Similarly, a 1999 article in the Palestinian newspaper *Al-Manar* about the Canadian trial of a Holocaust denier in 1988 argued that “the fictitious Nazi Holocaust” was a legend forged by the victors of World War II “to extort the entire world, using the face of the ugly Nazi.”

The idea that the Holocaust constitutes a myth has also been used with reference to Israeli atrocities committed against Palestinians. On January 27,
2005, as the world commemorated the liberation of Auschwitz, the Tehran Times, which the U.S.-based Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI) describes as “Iranian Foreign Ministry-affiliated,” published an op-ed piece by Hossein Amiri titled “Lies of the Holocaust Industry.” Amiri claimed that “strange conceptions about the killing of Jews at Nazi camps” had been “conjured up” by the Allies and Zionists, and these images, he claimed, were being exploited “to cover up Israel’s crimes in Palestine.”

Another strain of denial claims that the Nazis could not have killed six million Jews. Such arguments are occasionally made without reference to any corroborating evidence whatsoever. One such example, written by Mahmoud Muhammad Khadhr, a cleric from Cairo’s Al-Azhar University, and published in the Egyptian government newspaper Al-Akhbar, declared, “Even if we cross off one zero from the six million and are left with a tenth of this number, it would still seem exaggerated and would have to be investigated.” However, Khadhr did not elucidate the reasons why this figure appears “exaggerated.”

Where evidence is cited in support of the idea that numbers of murdered Jews have been exaggerated, it is often drawn from the work of discredited Western academics who have been vilified in their own countries. The author of the aforementioned 1999 Al-Manar article wrote approvingly of a U.S. “expert” who claimed to have proved that, even if all of the Nazi camps had been operating at full capacity, the total number of victims “would not have exceeded a hundred thousand, and certainly could not have reached the one million mark.” In the same publication, Muhammad ’Abd Al-’Azim argued against Israeli attempts to “remind Europe and the United States of the crematoriums in which, according to Israeli claims, six million Jews were killed,” asserting that, “in their historical research, scholars emphasize that this figure is greatly exaggerated....[R]ecords published by Jewish organizations in the United States mentioned that during Hitler’s time, there were only three million Jews in Europe.” However, ’Abd Al-’Azim drew his evidence from the work of widely discredited French Holocaust denier Roger Garaudy.

Claims that the Nazis could not have killed six million Jews are often based on the false assertion that Nazi concentration camps were simply prison camps. Israeli historian Joseph Nevo has described how during the 1950s, many of those who had cooperated with the Nazis collaborators attempted to normalize the events of the Holocaust by referring to concentration camps as “refugee camps.” This tactic of “normalization” has survived to this day. Writing in the Tehran Times in January 2005, Hossein Amiri argued that while
the Nazi concentration camps “were not holiday resorts” and “imposed various difficulties on the prisoners,” they were “just like any other detention camps in other wars,” in which the inmates “died of hunger, illness, and other causes.” According to Amiri, the extermination of the Jews by use of the poison gas Zyklon-B “was not possible at the time.”

Official acceptance of Holocaust denial extends throughout the Arab world. In September 2000, the Syrian English language daily *Syria Times*, which MEMRI identifies as an official paper of the Syrian government, printed an article by Mohammad Daoud titled, “Holocaust!!!?? Again,” in which Daoud drew on the unpublished and widely discredited doctoral dissertation of French historian Henri Rocques to claim that extermination camps existed for the extermination of lice. For reasons of public health, Daoud argued, the Nazis were compelled to use “de-lousing procedures” to combat the onset of typhoid, cholera, and malaria. “Burning bodies was the best way to prevent the further spread of epidemic diseases,” Daoud wrote. Explaining the existence of gas chambers, the author argued that “no one doubts that they existed at concentration camps, but there are grave doubts that they were used to kill. Apparently, these gas chambers only existed for purification....[C]lothes and personal tools were put in to sterilize them.” In a common misunderstanding among Arab journalists, Daoud assumed that gas chambers were used “for burning Jews” rather than killing them by use of gas.

Perhaps the most vicious strand of thought on the Holocaust voiced in the Arab press in recent years is the deification of Hitler, coupled with a criticism that he did not do enough to destroy the Jews. This particular strand may be suggestive of entrenched and barbaric antisemitism, and is particularly troublesome in light of the current popularity of virulently antisemitic works such as Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* and the czarist fabrication *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in certain Islamic countries. This spirited embrace of Hitler’s genocidal antisemitism was expressed most succinctly in a brief column in the Egyptian government-sponsored *Al-Akhbar* in 2001. Columnist Ahmad Ragab wrote, “[t]hanks to Hitler, of blessed memory, who on behalf of the Palestinians, revenged in advance, against the most vile criminals on the face of the earth. Although we do have a complaint against him, for his revenge on them was not enough.” Ragab’s praise of
Hitler turns the accepted Western view of the Holocaust on its head, with its peculiar notion of “revenge in advance,” and presentation of Jews, rather than Hitler, as notoriously “vile” criminals.¹⁴

A similarly confused logic permeates other examples of praise for Hitler in the Arab press. Mahmoud Muhammad Khadhr of Al-Azhar University, writing in Al-Akhbar, stated in one column that Hitler and his colleagues were forced to take their own lives for fear of being accused of crimes that they “did not commit,” and, at the same time, that the Nazis were forced to punish the Jews for “stabbing Hitler in the back.” With an astounding lack of historical evidence, Khadhr argued that antisemitism only came to be considered a motivating force for Nazi policy after the onset of the Second World War. Given that Hitler’s antisemitic beliefs were made explicit in the 1920s with the publication of Mein Kampf—a translation of which has been a bestseller in the Arab world in recent years—it is difficult to imagine what, beyond pure vitriol, could motivate such an argument.¹⁵

While Khadhr sought to persuade readers that European Jews collaborated with the Allies against Hitler, others have claimed that Zionists within the Jewish community in fact allied themselves with the Nazis to convince allied powers of the need for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. This claim was also propagated in 2000 by the editor of the Syrian regime’s daily newspaper, Tishrin, which alleged that Zionist leaders collaborated with the Nazis “to escalate the Jewish Problem.” The author went so far as to assert that some Zionists “did not hesitate to commit murders and direct terror attacks [against Jews] in order to encourage Jewish immigration to Palestine. This, of course, in full cooperation with the German Nazi leaders.”¹⁶ The same year, in the Egyptian government daily Al-Gumhuriya, Lutfi Nasef attributed “the massacres in a detention camp in Budapest in which thousands of Jews were killed” to Zionist cooperation with the Nazi S.S. “in order to increase the terror against the Jews.”¹⁷ A 2004 review of the movie Exodus by Mojtaba Habibi, published by the Iranian news agency Mehr, claimed that during World War II, the Zionist leadership collaborated “extensively” with the Nazis by handing Jews over to them.¹⁸

Some sources have gone as far as alleging that the Holocaust was only one part of a broader pattern of evil perpetrated by Zionists in the twentieth century. The drama series Al-Shatat originally aired on Hezbollah’s Al-Manar channel and subsequently broadcast on the Iranian Sahar channel, blamed a lengthy list of “crimes”—essentially all of the major historical incidents and catastrophes of the twentieth century—on a secret Jewish world government. These crimes included starting World War II, helping Hitler annihilate the
Jews of Europe, sinking a boatload of Jewish refugees en route to the United States, and murdering emigrating Jews who tried to return to Europe.\textsuperscript{19}

A final strain of rhetoric within the Arab media returns to the problem of mutual recognition by way of equating the crimes of the Nazis directly with acts committed by Israel against Arabs. MEMRI notes that the equation of Zionism with Nazism is particularly prevalent in Syria, where it is “a consistent thread running through the articles of...the editors of the regime’s newspapers and the elite of Syrian writers.”\textsuperscript{20} Similar comparisons are also prevalent in Egypt. In 2000, writing in \textit{Al-Ahram}, Muhammad Al-Sammak equated the horrors of the Nazi death camps with those established by the Israelis in southern Lebanon: “The Treblinka camp may have been real, but the Al-Khiyam camp in South Lebanon is also real. It is possible that the Auschwitz camp witnessed a great massacre, but so did Qana in South Lebanon.” Columnists in the Egyptian government-sponsored \textit{Al-Akhbar} and \textit{Akhbar Al-Youm} claimed that Israel had “a clear Nazi basis,” and operated “by the same Nazi logic that they are above everyone else and they have a right to rob peoples, exploit their treasures, force their will on others.”\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{Toward Reconciliation and Understanding}

While many elements among the Arab media in a number of countries continue to deny the extent of the suffering caused by the Nazis, important efforts have been made to reconcile Arabs with the history of the Holocaust. Thinkers and scholars such as Naim Stifan Ateek, Azmi Bishara, George Catan, and Edward Said have urged reconciliation with the collective memory of the Jews, just as Israeli intellectuals such as Ilan Gur-Ze’ev and Ilan Pappé have argued that the Israelis must come to terms with the history of Palestinian Arab suffering.

Naim Stifan Ateek, a Palestinian Christian theologian, was perhaps the first to connect the need for Palestinian acknowledgement of the Holocaust to the possibility of Israeli recognition of the dispossession suffered following the nakba. Ateek openly admitted that “Palestinians have refused to accept, much less internalize, the horrible tragedy of the Holocaust. We have resisted even acknowledging it....Many Palestinians have doubted that the Holocaust even occurred.”\textsuperscript{22} Nonetheless, he argues, to lay foundations for peace, “Palestinians need to become really conscious of and sensitive to the horror of the Holocaust.”\textsuperscript{23} In adopting this new attitude, he suggests the Palestinians could “face Israel quite candidly and state that the only justification that the Palestinians will accept for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine is the Holocaust...not because they had any right to it, not because of the Balfour Declaration, and
not even because of antisemitism, but because of the Holocaust.” Echoing Ateek, George Catan, a Palestinian liberal intellectual living in Syria, argued in May 2005 that the nakba and the wars that followed it “do not justify the denial of the first tragedy, but rather demand humane solutions to the second, Palestinian, tragedy, which is still an open wound.”

The clearest and most persistent intellectual voice on the subject of the need to overcome Holocaust denial has been that of the late Edward Said. While never losing sight of the wrongs suffered by the Palestinians in Israel following 1948, Said argued repeatedly that this is no reason to deny that the Holocaust itself took place, and that “such outrages have to be understood as affecting every human being.” Said’s writings function as humanitarian counterpoints to the wholesale denial and belligerent cultural insensitivity in parts of the Arabic media. Said recognized that some of this denial was rooted in ignorance. “As Palestinians and Arabs,” he notes, “we have not even tried to study this enormous subject, nor in any serious way have we tried to see how it impinges on the Jewish, and indeed Western, conscience as something all too real.” U.S.-based Palestinian Professor Nadim Rouhana has echoed the importance of this attempt at investigation and understanding. “Until somebody really tries to understand the Holocaust and the Jewish experience,” he states, “it is very hard for him to observe and understand this justified preoccupation—Jewish preoccupation—with that long history of oppression.”

Admittedly, such a task is far easier, or perhaps harder to avoid, for an Arab in the West such as Said. As Said wrote in Al-Hayat in 1995, “One of the most important differences between Arabs in the Arab world and those who live in the West is that on a daily basis the latter are forced to confront the Jewish experience of antisemitism and genocide.” Nonetheless, Said suggests that the chance to gain a close look at the extent of Jewish suffering “was afforded Arab commentators during the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Israel early in the 1960s.” Of course, noted Said, Lebanese Phalangist commentators “claimed that the whole business was baseless propaganda,” but, he found, “elsewhere in the Arab press of the time (in Egypt and in the mainstream Lebanese press) the Eichmann affair was reported with due consideration.” Ultimately, Said concludes that the Eichmann trial was used by Arabs less “as an attempt to acquaint Arab readers with details of the Jewish experience,” and more “as a way of exposing Israeli callousness to the Arabs” during “the psychological battles of the 1960s.”

Said has suggested that Palestinians “demand consideration and reparations from [Israelis] without in any way minimizing their own history of suffering and genocide.” Indeed, Said contends that the Palestinians could learn
from the “persistence of the World Jewish Congress in pressing the case for reparations to Jewish Holocaust victims.” Ultimately, the most important cause that would be advanced is that of “understanding what is universal about a human experience under calamitous conditions...compassion, human sympathy, and utter recoil from the notion of killing people for ethnic, religious, or nationalist reasons.”

As a result of Said’s writings, attempts have been made outside the intellectual world to engage the history of the Holocaust. In the late 1990s and early part of this decade, Arab members of the Israeli Knesset and other public figures have made visits to sites of the Nazi death camps in Europe. In 1996, Israel’s deputy health minister, Nawaf Masalhah, participated in a remembrance ceremony at Birkenau. In 2000, Knesset member Hashem Muhammad visited camps as part of a sojourn organized by Israel’s Foreign Affairs and Defence Committee. That year another member, Sheikh Tawfiq Al-Khattib, joined the “March of the Living” from Auschwitz to Birkenau. Perhaps more significantly, in 2003 a group of Arab Israelis signed a communiqué titled “Remembering the Pain For the Sake of Peace,” which accorded strongly with Said’s argument:

We the undersigned, a group of Arab citizens in Israel, fear the deterioration of relations between Arabs and Jews in our land...relations that have been characterized largely by great fear of the other and by nationalistic seclusion. Out of human responsibility, and in the belief that it is possible to change the atmosphere of Jewish-Arab relations in Israel, we are initiating this human initiative. We seek to feel the pain of the other side. The two peoples cannot abandon the path of bloodshed unless each understands and internalizes the pain of the other, and the fears of the other that pushed them to the line of fire, conflict, and war. Understanding this principle, we have decided to delve deeply into history and swim in the Jewish past. We wish to learn and know the suffering, difficulties, torment, and destruction...to identify with and to express, with all our strength, solidarity with the Jews.
The statement, written as part of a plan for the group to visit Auschwitz, was not well received in the Arab world. Attallah Hanna, former spokesman of the Jerusalem Orthodox Church, proclaimed angrily that the initiative ignored “the pain of its own people and its suffering in the shadow of the occupation.” Many, such as journalist Emir Makhoul, feared that such an initiative would serve “to reinforce the victim psychology in Israeli society much more than we can use it to bring about openness in Israeli society, or any change [toward Palestinians] at all in it.” Writer Antoine Shalhat suggested that a better method of aiding understanding would be for the Holocaust to be taught “in an historical framework, without connecting it to the establishment of the Hebrew state, as this connection is Zionist and must be discussed [independently], morally, politically, and historically.”

The visit by Israeli Arab lawmakers to concentration camps in Europe strongly echoed the debate on strengthening peace through the introduction of the Holocaust into the Arab and Palestinian school curriculum. In a symposium in Cyprus in April 2000, Anis Al-Qaq, Palestinian Authority undersecretary of planning and international cooperation, told representatives of Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia that he was interested in “teaching the history of the Holocaust in Arab and Palestinian schools.” Al-Qaq claimed, “I believe that Palestine and the entire Arab world need to learn about the Holocaust, and therefore this subject should be included in the school curriculum….We cannot be proud of anything, until we know about the subject [of the Holocaust].”

The media response in the Palestinian territories and most of the Arab world was muted, but Palestinian intellectuals were deeply angered. The chairman of the education committee of the Palestinian Legislative Council, Musa Al-Zu’but, argued that the Holocaust had been “exaggerated in order to present the Jews as victims of a great crime, to justify [the claim] that Palestine is necessary as a homeland for them, and to give them the right to demand compensation.” If the subject were to be taught in Palestinian schools, he added, it “must be explained to the students that the Holocaust was inflated and that we, the Palestinians, had to live with the results. Our country, Palestine, was lost and was occupied by Israel. It is better to teach the students about what is happening to our people.” Fatah leader Hatem Abd Al-Qader exclaimed that teaching the Holocaust in Palestinian schools would “undoubtedly ruin the Palestinian dream and aspirations. It will entirely obliterate the past, present and future of the Palestinians.” Palestinian intellectual Abdallah Horani also claimed that Al-Quq should ignore the Holocaust and focus on “the massacres perpetrated by the Israelis against the defenseless Palestinian people, who, wherever they are found, still suffer
from the cruel Zionist terror.” In the end, the Palestinian initiative to teach the history of the Holocaust was scrapped.43

The response to the debate, however, signals some hope for understanding and reconciliation. Sheik Jamal Mansour, a Hamas leader, has argued, “It is not fair to deny the Holocaust or to diminish the importance of the persecution that the Jews have suffered. We must clearly condemn it and stand by the oppressed—whoever they may be—and against the oppressor.” He added that it is important to avoid turning such history into an axiom that could be used to force others to forget “all of the massacres, the tens of thousands of victims, the millions of exiles, our confiscated land, our occupied land, and our blood which continues to be spilled.”44 A more unequivocal voice is that of Jihad Al-Khazen, editor-in-chief of Al-Hayat. Al-Khazen openly stated that

Personally, I think the Holocaust occurred and I have no reason to doubt the number of victims. Therefore, the Jews have no problem with me and I have no problem with them. However, although I dispute [British Holocaust denier David] Irving’s opinion on this subject, I see no reason to prevent him from expressing his position....If Irving claims that the Holocaust did not occur, he exposes his stupidity and the shallowness of his thought. But anyone who prevents him, or any other human being who doubts the occurrence of the Holocaust or the number of its victims [from expressing this opinion], is hostile to the [principle of] freedom of speech.45

Responding to vehement criticism of his standpoint, Al-Khazen argued that the “reciprocal massacres between Arabs and Jews throughout history, including the past fifty years, were very limited and cannot be compared with the murder of the Jews by the Nazis.”46 Al-Khazen demonstrates a full and nuanced understanding of the historiography of the Holocaust. He notes that even in heated debates among “respected historians who are knowledgeable on this subject,” most agree with the estimate of six million victims, and none “go[es] beneath the number of five million victims.” The only serious “scientific dispute between credible Western historians,” Al-Khazen notes, is whether the “final solution” was a decision made by the Nazis right from the beginning or if the order was issued when they started losing the war. Either way, Al-Khazen argues, Arabs should not deny the occurrence of the Holocaust. Rather, they should recognize it and point out the irony that a people once saved from the Holocaust now persecutes and deports another people.47
On a more public level, Muhammad Al-Zarqani was forced to resign as editor-in-chief of Egyptian weekly *Al-Liwaa Al-Islami* following the publication of an article by Rif’at Sayyed Ahmad, director of the Jaffa Research Center in Cairo, which claimed that the Nazi use of gas chambers was a myth invented by Zionists. Egyptian Information Minister Mamduh Al-Beltagi subsequently wrote an article, printed on the front page of the newspaper, claiming that

The National Democratic Party, which is the party of the majority in Egyptian society, does not believe that suffering and human tragedies of a nation or of another people can be lies. It is impossible to downplay the Nazi atrocities and the tragedies of the Second World War that hurt the Jews and other peoples. The things that Dr. Rif’at Sayyed Ahmad wrote in the *Al-Liwaa Al-Islami* have nothing to do with the worldview of the [average] Egyptian nor with the ideology and policy of the National Democratic Party.48

Although U.S. State Department involvement was attributed as a key influence on proceedings, the sacking and apology certainly heralded a new and important development in the debate over the Holocaust in the Arab world.

The specter of the Holocaust haunts the Arab world as it does Europe and the United States. From the debates in the Arab media and among the intelligentsia it is evident that, as elsewhere, references to sites like Auschwitz continue to elicit powerful emotions. Yet such a debate has added relevance to, and has received added impetus from, the intertwined nature of Arab and Israeli histories since 1948. Arabs feel keenly the blows of 1948, and Palestinians have suffered immeasurably since then. At the same time, denial of the sheer horror of the Holocaust against Jews, Roma, Sinti, Slavs, Poles, homosexuals, and many others represents a remarkable level of insensitivity and brute historical ignorance. While a number of scholars and intellectuals have fought to establish a workable and broadly accepted perspective on this most horrendous of crimes, it seems evident that denial of the Holocaust is used frequently and cynically by elements of the Arab media to foment anti-Western and anti-Israeli sentiment.

Edward Said clearly described the futility of such a viewpoint:

[T]here is a link to be made between what happened to Jews in World War II and the catastrophe of the Palestinian people, but it cannot be made only rhetorically, or as
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an argument to demolish or diminish the true content both of the Holocaust and of 1948. Neither is equal to the other; similarly, neither one nor the other excuses present violence; and finally, neither one nor the other must be minimized. There is suffering and injustice enough for everyone.49
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