

THE SICKNESS BEQUEATHED

Islamic anti-Semitism, Nazi Fascism and Ethno-Centric Nationalism Continuity in the
Muslim Middle East

By

Andrey S. Kulikov

Submitted to the International Studies Program and the
Faculty of The Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master's of Arts

Chairperson

Committee members

Date defended: _____

The Thesis Committee for Andrey S. Kulikov certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

THE SICKNESS BEQUEATHED

Islamic anti-Semitism, Nazi Fascism and Ethno-Centric Nationalism Continuity in the Muslim Middle East

Committee:

Chairperson

Date approved: _____

ABSTRACT

Present day analysis of the relations between Muslim and Jews almost automatically presumes a history of antagonism and animosity. This history is often addressed as primal and stretching back to the beginnings of Islam as a religion. Such postulations trickle into the contemporary political discourse constricting policy achievements for a constructive solution of the current geo-political stalemate in the Middle East.

Muslims and Jews, in fact, have a history of co-existence. Anti-Semitism in the Middle East and hostility between Muslims and Jews increased toward the end of the Ottoman rule and moved further toward enmity by World War II. European anti-Semitism of the Middle Ages and Enlightenment period could be viewed as harsher, more violent and brutal than its examples in the Muslim Middle East.

Anti-Judaism as a concept in the context of Islam did not always equate to the racial anti-Semitism of Europe and Russia. Anti-Semitism based particularly upon racial or ethnic grounds and involving false suppositions and accusations came to the Muslim Middle East from Europe. The discrimination against the Jews in Europe culminated in the highest form of persecution – Hitler’s Holocaust. The Muslim Middle East was contaminated with the ideas of Mein Kampf in the early stages of formation of the independent Arab states out of the remains of the Ottoman Empire.

After 1919, Germany, stripped of any role in the region by victorious Britain and France, became only a remnant of the Ottoman-German Alliance. The rise of

German power under the Nazis in the 1930s fostered new hopes of alliance across the Muslim Middle East, which could have meant a removal of the British and French colonial powers then present in the region. Many Muslim Arab leaders saw the new Germany of the 1930's as the potential force poised to counter-balance the power distribution in parts of the Arab world governed by Britain and France. The new anti-Jewish ideology, conducive in building a common ground between the occupied Arab states and Germany as the new contender for the world domination, was injected into the religious thought of the day and later woven into the interpretation of the Qur'an.

The evolution of religion alone was not responsible for the formation of anti-Semitic sentiment and the Jew-hatred preached today by some Islamic leaders. The term "Islamofascism"¹, used in the political discourse in 2005, evoked an outburst of condemnation and protest. However, while it is not applicable to the Muslim world universally, some Muslim groups not only seek to bring about a totalitarian empire, but have their roots in Nazi ideology and genocide.

Honest acknowledgment of the past propensities in the Muslim Middle East to embrace Nazi ideology and propaganda is a necessary step for understanding the phenomenon of the Islamic terrorism and racial anti-Semitism. Accurate historical background is essential for enacting effective policy decisions.

Lastly, in light of the increasing number of comparisons made in the Arab media to equate Israel itself to Nazi Germany and some United Nations diplomats

¹ George W. Bush, "President Discusses War on Terror at National Endowment for Democracy ", ed. The White House (Washington, DC: Office of the Press Secretary, 2005).

today publicly espousing similar views,¹ there is urgency in the need to publicize an undistorted historical record on the subject of Islamic anti-Semitism and the Nazi ideological influence in the Middle East.¹

¹ Tim Franks, "The next UN investigator into Israeli conduct in the occupied territories has stood by comments comparing Israeli actions in Gaza to those of the Nazis," *BBC World Service* (2008), http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/middle_east/7335875.stm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my wife for supporting my academic aspirations.

I must extend special thanks to Prof. Rose Greaves for her encouragement to search deeper within myself to embrace the highest academic standards.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Introduction	1
I. Mohammad's Relations With Non-Muslims and the Early Conflicts With the "People of the Book"	4
a. Post-Mohammad theoreticians on relations with non-Muslims and Jews	
II. Nazi Ties in the Muslim Arab Middle East	18
a. Germany's Political Anti-Semitism and Alternative Imperialism	
b. Direct Nazi connections in the region	
III. Escalation of anti-Semitism as a Legacy of the WWII Period	68
Conclusion	89
REFERENCES	98
ENDNOTES	106

Introduction

Militant Islamic Jihad and the anti-Semitism of the Muslim Arab world are often blamed on poverty, rejection of Muslims by the modern society, lack of opportunity, and the colonial past of their lands. While Jihad has undergone many evolutions and interpretations from the times of its original conception by Muhammad in the seventh century, racial anti-Semitism is a much newer construct in Islam that gained momentum since the exposure of the Arab world to European culture. The modern form of Arab anti-Semitism materialized only in the 19th century. Prior to the Damascus affair in 1840, accusing Jews of ritual murder, for example, was unheard of in the Islamic world.¹ The present state of Arab anti-Semitism in the Middle East is among the most dangerous dynamics subverting its religious and sociological discourse, and setting it on a collision course against the pluralistic world societies.

Particularly after the Second World War, many Muslim Arab countries became centers of support for xenophobia, barbarism, violent anti-Semitism and militant Jihad. Radical Islam emerged to represent a threat to the Western democracies incorporating within itself some of the basic features of fascism. It has been able to suppress and silence the voices of moderate and progressive Muslims who seek to revive the ways of grace and humanism in their religion.

Publications, such as 1993 The Clash of Civilizations by Professor of Political

¹ Walter Laqueur, *The Changing Face of Antisemitism* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006), 194.

Science Samuel P. Huntington, have generated debates, but have not brought us closer to understanding the contributing sources in contemporary Muslim religious radicalism endorsing anti-Semitism and xenophobia. Some of the historical facts have been ignored and some very important questions have been omitted in the political as well as public discourse. Did the nature of anti-Semitism change after dealings between Hitler's Germany and the leaders of the Middle Eastern communities? Why was the Muslim Arab world readily susceptible to the European racism? Was anti-Zionism purposely interspersed with anti-Semitism by an unscrupulous radical minority interested in the escalation of both? More importantly, if we allow Islam to be accused as the sole culprit behind turning its followers into warmongers, we will do a disservice as historians, sociologists and policy makers. Islam is a word, a concept, and a religious framework for interpreting ethics. It can be a building block or a destructive weapon depending on the hands that hold it. As Bernard Lewis, quite thought provokingly, concludes in What Went Wrong, it is "...not "What has Islam done to the Muslims?" but rather "What have the Muslims done to Islam?"¹ His answer to the question lays the blame on specific teachers, preachers, doctrines and groups.

Islamism and German National Socialism shared some common ground on a very fundamental level. Nazi ideology nominated the Aryans as a master race or Herrenvolk. As such, Aryans as a people had to be not only superior to the other races, but also invincible. However, if that had to be the case, the blunders in the

¹ Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong?: Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002), 156.

military conflicts and economic crises begged a palatable explanation. The humiliating treaty of Versailles after the defeat in WWI, soaring inflation and economic stagnation were conveniently pinned on the external enemy that penetrated within – the Jews. At the same time, the downfall of Germany as a European power at the end of WWI coincided with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire. If we were to substitute the “master race” in this context with the chosen people, the “followers of the last prophet”, the instinctive affinity between the National Socialist movement and Global Islamism begins to emerge.¹

Nazi Germany’s policy makers sought to benefit from nationalistic aspirations in the Middle East. They studiously established an artificial link between German anti-Jewish policies and Arab anti-Zionism, though the two had little in common. Moreover, the enduring practices of Muslims to subject non-Muslims to a humiliating sub-standard social treatment provided the basic ground for absorbing Nazi Germany’s racist policies toward minorities in general. German anti-Semitism itself was not the reason, or even the first thing in common, for the parties to seek connections. Rather, once connected, the ideology and the key policies of the partner state exacerbated the compulsive anti-Zionist conceptions and social superiority left by earlier history. Political anti-Semitism continues to feed the trends of the violent Jihad and ethno-centric nationalism in the Muslim Middle East.

¹ Meghnad Desai, *Rethinking Islamism: The Ideology of the New Terror* (New York, NY: I.B. Tauris & Co., Ltd., 2007), 151.

I

The ink of the scholar is more sacred than the blood of the martyr
(Prophet Muhammad, 630 C.E.)

Jihad is a precept of Divine institution... They [infidels] have the alternative of either converting to Islam or paying the poll tax (jizya), short of which war will be declared against them.
(Ibn Abu Zayd al-Qayrawani (d. 996), Maliki jurist)¹

The conquest of the Filastin (Eretz Israel)ⁱⁱ and Syria by the Muslim Bedouins around 641 C.E. connected the people of the desert to the European culture. The raids reaching to Syria through the Land of Israel led by the Muslim Arabs during Muhammad's life did not differ from the attacks carried out by the Arab tribes out of Hejaz against the border settlements in the pre-Muslim periods. The new religion of Islam, arriving by early 600 C.E., did not incite any more specific violence or expulsion of a particular population than the region has seen earlier from Romans, Persians, Greeks, Byzantines and nomads. The Arab conquerors did not significantly change the administrative system already in place in the Filastin settled by Jews and Christians. Other than dividing the land into provinces or Jundsⁱⁱⁱ ruled from their respective outposts predominantly for defensive and military purposes, they followed the prescriptions of Muhammad for co-existing with Jews and Christians or the "People of the Book". Detailed descriptions of the political events and the socio-economic environment, largely ignored by the Muslims, are documented in the

¹ Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qayrawani, "Epitre sur les elements du dogme et de la loi de l'Islam selon le rite malikite," in *The Legacy of Jihad: Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims* by Andrew G. Bostom, ed. Leon Bercher (Algiers: 1960), 27.

contemporary letters found in Cairo's public record depository Genizah.¹ By the 10th century after long decades of military campaigns, the economic life in the Arab ruled lands was reduced to local markets having been deprived of maritime trade with the other cultures around the Mediterranean. After the earthquakes of 1016 and 1033, trade and farming declined even more, compounded by loss of populations and the lack of interest among the Bedouins to settle the land. Muslim population was comprised of both Sunni and Shi'ia with Arabic as a common language. Jerusalem geographer al-Maqdisi wrote in 985 that it was difficult to find a Muslim intellectual in Levant in that time. Christians held most of the government positions followed by Jews and Samaritans. More ambitious members of Arab society moved to Syria, Egypt and East of Jordan where chances of success were better.² Jewish population was considerable not only along the coastal plane, but in the Negev south of the Dead Sea, Tiberius in the North and to the East of the Jordan river. Records exist documenting Jewish delegations traveling to Arabia to conclude protective treaties with Muhammad. Judging by the description of the gifts brought by them, they had come from wealthy and thriving communities. In fact, first recorded disintegrations of the Jewish populace are tied to the Crusades in the 11th-13th centuries, when they had to flee the war torn region escaping alongside of Arabs, Samaritans, Zoroastrians and other non-Christian inhabitants of the environs.³

¹ Haiim Z'ev Hirschberg, *History Until 1880*, ed. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem Prof. Menahem Stern; Professor of Jewish History, Israel Pocket Library (Jerusalem, Israel: Keter Publishing House, 1973), 177.

² *Ibid.*, 171-73.

³ *Ibid.*

In general, Christian and Jewish communities have been known to thrive during the early Muslim rule. For a modern historian, it is quite challenging to determine conclusively the exact nature of Muhammad's character and the true meaning of his intentions toward the non-Muslim neighbors. The contemporary sources criticizing his actions could very well be as biased as the ones exonerating him. However, the historical events documented by both sides can be scrutinized for possible answers as to Muhammad's legacy as to the relations with non-Muslims. Ultimately, what matters more than the authentic portrait of the founder of the faith is the rendition of the Muslim way of life that shaped so many minds for centuries.

Accounts of the Muslim conquest in the Arabian Peninsula, the Levant and Syria include merciless warfare, appropriation of the spoils of war, execution of the defeated foes, slave trade, as well as protection treaties. Jews, Christians and other non-Muslims paid heavily for the choice to keep their respective faiths. Since the times of Muhammad, who professed and bequeathed, "Make war on those who believe not in Allah and the Last Day; ... make war on them until they pay tribute and are humiliated"¹, the Muslim rulers on the Near Eastern lands had only "Islam, tribute or sword" to offer to non-Muslim inhabitants.² An equitable peace with the unbeliever, at least in theory, was a sin.³

When the hostilities of war would subside the economic and social oppression

¹ William Sterns Davis, *A Short History of the Near East: From the founding of Constanople (330 A.D. to 1922)* (New York, NY: The MacMillan Company, 1923), 122.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

of Dhimmi persisted. Because of heavy land taxes imposed on the Dhimmi, Jews ceased to cultivate the soil and flocked to the towns flourishing with trade and crafts.¹ The Dhimmi are defined as the native infidel populations subjugated by Jihad. They must recognize the Muslim ownership of their land, submit to Islamic governance and accept the imposition of a poll tax, jizya. One of the Islamic jurists al-Mawardi stipulated on the nature of the Dhimmi obligation to the Islamic authority in 1058 as "...enemy makes a payment in return for peace and reconciliation. It does, however, not prevent a Jihad being carried out against them in the future."² Worthy of noting is the further detailing of the jizya procurement by the tax collectors. A thirteenth century Shafi'ite jurist an-Nawawi instructed:

The infidel who wishes to pay jizya must be treated with disdain by the collector: the collector remains seated and the infidel remains standing in front of him, his head bowed and back bent. The infidel personally must place the payment on the scales, while the collector holds him by the beard, and strikes him on both cheeks.³

The early confrontations of Muslims and Jews, albeit violent, lacked the underpinnings of irreconcilable elemental hate leading to perpetual war. For example, the battle of Ahzab fought near Medina between the Mohammad's followers and the Jewish tribe Banu Qaraiza concluded with a victory for the Muslims. The last

¹ Hirschberg, *History Until 1880*, 172-73.

² al-Mawardi Abu al-Hassan, "El-Ahkam es-Soulthaniya (A Treatise on Muslim Public Law)," in *The Legacy of Jihad: Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims* by Andrew G. Bostom, ed. Count Leon Ostorrog, The Laws of Islamic Governance (London: 1996), 29.

³ Bat Ye'or, *Islam and Dhimmitude: Where Civilizations Collide*, trans. Miriam Kochan and David Littman (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2002), 70.

remaining three hundred males of Banu Qaraiza were put to death after defeat, while women and children were taken as slaves. Terrifying and ruthless as this verdict by Muhammad and one of his generals Sa'ad was, it may not have been the norm according to the other accounts of the warfare in the first years after the onset of Islam in the peninsula. Thus, at least two other Jewish tribes Banu Qainuqa' and Banu Nazir had been exiled after having been defeated in a military confrontation sparing the lives and freedom of the survivors.¹ Yet in other examples, the Jews were allowed to retain possession of the land they held before the fighting ensued, although in most cases the victorious Muslims levied a special tax on those who did not choose to convert to Islam. In 629 C.E., the conquest of the Jewish village Khaybar ended with an execution of the tribe's leaders, taking their treasures as spoils of war and, oddly enough, a marriage of Muhammad to the daughter of one of the Jewish tribal leaders Safiyya.²

How can we account for these contradictions? One plausible explanation is that in the ancient Muslim Arabia, the treatment of foes – be they Jewish, Christian or Bedouin – was decided on an individual basis. It varied by commanders leading the battle, circumstances preceding the armed conflict, sources from the religious scriptures cited to decide on any given judgment or ultimate objective of the battle.

However, the same early conquests laid the foundation for the concepts of dhimma and jihad. The extermination and expulsion of the Medina Jews in 624-627

¹ Maulana Muhammad Ali, *Muhammad The Prophet*, ed. and writer of an *Urdu Rafsir* Translator of the Holy Qur'an into English (Lahore, India: Ahmadiyya Anjuman-I-Isha'at-I-Islam, 1924).

² Ibid.

enriched and emboldened the umma. The property of the Jewish tribes was shared among the conquerors, Muhammad himself receiving a fifth. Then with an inflated war chest and reassured by the non-aggression treaty with the Meccans, Muhammad massacred the Khaybar community and imposed his agreement, dhimma, upon the survivors of the nearby villages. The Prophet allowed them to farm their lands only as tenants, in exchange for a half of their harvest, and reserved the prerogative to drive them off the land whenever he would wish.¹ The dhimma of Khaybar inspired similar treaties with other conquered populations outside Arabia. These episodes of the Prophet's life fundamentally determined the relationships between Muslims and infidels that later made their way into the Qur'anic revelations.² By the eighth century, Islamic juris-consults formulated the policy regarding the People of the Book, Jews and Christians, based on the decisions decreed by Muhammad with respect to the Jews of Arabia such as Khaybar community.³ Later in history, in seventeenth century's India, Islamic teachers put forth that "a non-Muslim therefore cannot be a citizen of the State; he is member of a depressed class; his status is modified form of slavery. He lives under a contract with the state: for the life and property grudgingly spared to him by the commander of the faithful, he must undergo political and social disabilities, and pay a commutation money."⁴ Moreover, the establishment of the dhimma indirectly assigned a certain status to the position of a

¹ Ye'or, *Islam and Dhimmitude*, 37.

² *Ibid.*, 38.

³ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁴ Jadunath Sarkar, "The Islamic State Church in India," in *History of Aurangzib: Northern India, 1658-1681*, ed. K. S. Lal (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1920), 283-97.

harbi, or an individual beyond the rule of Islam. A harbi resided in dar al-Harb, or outside of the land of Islam, dar al-Islam, and was not a party to any contracts with the Prophet. Harbi was automatically a subject to one choice and one choice only – conversion or submission.¹ The pursuit of jihad until this objective is achieved – be it morally (bi-al-nafs), militarily or financially (bi-al-mal) – has been deemed a sacred obligation of every Muslim.² Hostility and contempt for the infidels were essential elements for waging the war of Jihad. This (state of mind) was elemental in its appeal to envy, hate, and, ultimately, violence, and was integral part of paving the way for Jihad.³ Henceforth, the first works of propaganda to incite the sentiments of intolerance were expressed in poems, teachings, and literature of the Islamic world.⁴

These approaches to the treatment of conquered subjects may have been the first manifestations of the national divisions based on race and the onset of intolerance for minorities in Islamic societies. They also may be fully considered the grounds for hatred, as it must be necessary for Jihad.

¹ Ye'or, *Islam and Dhimmitude*, 41.

² Gilles Kepel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*, trans. Anthony F. Roberts, First English ed. (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 146.

³ Bernard Lewis, *Islam in History: Ideas, People, and Events in the Middle East*, Second ed. (Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing, 1993), 173.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 172.

The most vehement of mankind in hostility be the Jews...the greediest of mankind desire nothing, but your ruin...Alah hath cursed them for their disbelief. Taste ye the punishment of burning.
(The Hadith of the Holy Qu'ran)¹

Throughout history, some individuals have been known to affect the social cognition of large numbers of people, compelling them to embrace their particular interpretation of the ideal future and the necessary means to achieve it. We may only wonder what Islam would be like today, if there had been no Ibn Taymiyya, al-Wahhab or Saiyyd Qutb. A few theoreticians indeed played an important role in shaping the subsequent schools of Islamic thought, as it pertains to the relations between Muslims, Jews and other non-Muslims.

Through the ages, Islamic ideologues called upon the Islamic community (umma) to purify and purge itself of jahiliyya, or the corrupting abhorrence, and to follow the teachings of Muhammad literally, while they wove in a few teachings of their own. Some of their teachings and actions are a part of a foundation, upon which contemporary Islamist movements have built further.²

Ibn Taymiyya (1268-1328) is referred to by many as the spiritual father of Sunni Islam. Precariously, contemporary Islamists^{IV} draw on his teachings to authorize genocidal murder. Ibn Taymiyya lived during one of many disorderly periods of Muslim Asia. In 1258 the Mongol Hordes captured Baghdad and conquered the Abbasid Empire. Taymiyya's family was forced to flee to Damascus

¹ Joan Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine* (Chicago, IL: J. KAP Publishing, 2000; reprint, 2000).

² John L. Esposito, *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*, Paperback ed. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002), 45.

and was subjected to a difficult life as refugees in a strange land. The painful experience of homeless wander may have shaped his decisive and radical stances on the interpretation of Hanbali Islamic law. As a religious scholar and political activist, he called for rigorous and exact following of the sacred sources – Qu’ran and Sunnah.¹ He insisted that a replication of the earliest Islamic community was crucial to restoring Allah’s grace toward Muslims. The Medina community during the times of Muhammad represented to him a prime example of such social order. He believed that the return of the pristine and uncompromised religious purity of that period was necessary to rebuild the power and greatness of Islam for its believers. Ibn Taymiyya’s fury was particularly directed at the Mongols, who ruled the Asian lands East of Egypt at that time. However, therein was a dilemma – Mongols were Muslims. The separation between Islamic and non-Islamic had to be further defined to justify jihad against them. The Mongols were converts to Islam who continued to follow some of their pre-Islamic traditions of the Khans. Ibn Taymiyya made use of these flaws to render them as unbelievers or kafirim.² Furthermore, he declared them to be excommunicated from faith and issued a fatwa, a sanction for persecution, calling for jihad against them. It became one of the precedents in recorded history of Islam, of a religious scholar justified killings on the grounds of non-Islamic roots and practices alone. The other Muslim citizens were reminded of their right, and even a duty of true subjects of Islam, to revolt against the kafirim in order to extinguish the apostasy from their midst.

¹ Esposito, *Unholy War*.

² Ibid.

Later generations of Islamic theoreticians built extensively on the Ibn Taymiyya's concepts of dar al-Islam and dar al-Harb, or the land of Islam and the land of war. His school became an epitome of the logic used to distinguish between Allah-pleasing Islam and jahiliyya, or deviant immorality. Ibn Taymiyya's viewpoint accented another peculiar angle. If it was as righteous as it was venerable to persecute and kill even self-proclaimed Muslims as apostates, what chance was left to the Jews, Christians and other non-Muslim dhimmi in dar al-Islam? To invoke a few names, Ibn Al-Qayyin Al-Jawziyya (d.1350), a disciple of Ibn Taymiyya and an author of Qur'an exegesis and Hadith commentary, Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Qurtubi (d. 1273), a Hadith scholar and famous Koran exegete, Yahya Ibn Sharaf Al-Nawawi (d.1277) well-known Hadith scholar and author of a famous Hadith collection and Muhammad ibn Ali Al-Shawkani (d. 1839), a Yemenite religious scholar whose writings influenced modern Islamist thought, are in unison in their renditions of Islam based on Ibn Taymiyya's teachings. They maintain that "anyone who peruses his sources reaches a single conclusion: The ulama, or Islamic religious authorities, have agreed that the reciprocal punishment to which the verses referred to is not limited to a given specific instance. It is a valid rule for the punishment of the infidels, sinful Muslims, and all other unjust".¹

Muhammad ibn Adb al-Wahhab (1703-1791) is another scholar of Islamic law who took Ibn Taymiyya's philosophy fervently. Once again, a self-proclaimed

¹ MEMRI, "Contemporary Islamist Ideology Authorizing Genocidal Murder," in *ANTISEMITISM DOCUMENTATION PROJECT* (Middle East Media Research Institute, 2004).

Islamic theologian called upon the Muslim community to reject some popular beliefs and practices of the preceding four centuries as idolatry and jahiliyya. He called upon the faithful to discard any innovations in the oral law that may have been adopted since the Muhammad's times by the religious authorities (ulama), as bida or heresy; and, analogously to his predecessor five hundred years prior, called for jihad against them.¹ Centuries later the world has observed the implications attributed to his iconoclasm and religious fanaticism, when the Wahhabi-inspired Taliban destroyed ancient Buddhist monuments in Afghanistan. The jihad they carried out was directed at the deviant and the profane in their view.

Many present day Islamic radicals try to support the state sponsored anti-Semitic propaganda by attributing the supposed prescriptions for the hatred of the Jews to the patriarchs of faith such as al-Wahhab and ibn-Taymiyya.²

¹ Esposito, *Unholy War*, 47.

² Ibid.

Yes, the existence of a separate Palestinian identity serves only tactical purpose. The founding of a Palestinian state is a new tool in a continuing battle against Israel. (Zuheir Muhsin, late Military Department Head of the PLO and a member of its Executive Council. (Dutch daily “Trouw”, March 1977))¹

The rhetorical balance between the traditional anti-Judaic prejudices and the fundamental anti-Semitism evolved further before the end of the nineteenth century. Muslim ideologues such as Hassan al-Banna (1906-1949) and Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966) became the prime models of the neo-fundamentalism for new activist organizations across the Muslim Arab world. They did not take long to connect Zionism, Western Imperialism, Colonialism, Communism and anti-Semitism as the factors of the same matrix.

Al-Banna drew a direct connection between the failed liberal nationalism in Egypt and continuing British occupation, unemployment, poverty, corruption and the creation of the state of Israel.² In his view, the Jews were no longer merely benefiting from the weakness of the Muslims, as in the times of al-Wahhab, but actively crafting it. The much-despised colonialism now acquired a new extended name – Jewish Zionism. A spiritual or non-violent jihad would no longer suffice. The Muslim lands were being invaded, he said; and every good Muslim is to repel the invaders just as one is to eradicate the Muslim rulers who block the establishment of Islamic governments.³ Hassan al-Banna became the founder of the Society of the Muslim Brothers, which grew to be an international Sunni Islamist movement and the world’s

¹ As found in Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine*, 137.

² Esposito, *Unholy War*, 51.

³ Ibid.

largest and the most influential political Islamist group.

Saiyyd Qutb further expanded upon the concepts of Hassan al-Banna. If al-Banna was viewed as the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, Saiyyd Qutb was regarded as the Godfather and Martyr of Islamic Radicalism.¹ As al-Banna, Qutb was educated in the contemporary educational institutions with modern curriculum. However, the knowledge of Western thought did not preclude his formation of extremist opinions in the late 1940s. The rhetoric in his writings directly and aggressively condemned the West and the United States in particular. Hassan al-Banna, having already rejected the preference of a spiritual jihad over military one, called to repel the invaders in a broad, perhaps even ambiguous, spectrum of enemies.² Qutb identified specific and attainable targets. In his manuscript Milestones he pointedly called America anti-Arab and pro-Jewish blaming it for injecting the capitalism into the Middle East by the proxy of Israel.³ An official in the Ministry of Public Instruction, a literary critic and a poet, Qutb grew to be an incredibly prolific author publishing over forty volumes translated into English and Farsi. His fiery style was said to stimulate profound anger and revulsion. As an interesting coincidence, his manuscript of Milestones was written during his imprisonment in Egypt and later became nothing short of his own personal *Mein Kampf*. A devout Muslim who memorized Qur'an in his childhood,⁴ Saiyyd Qutb also attempted to establish himself as a religious authority. He wrote of Islam's own social teachings and justice.

¹ Ibid., 56.

² Ibid., 51.

³ Ibid., 57.

⁴ Ibid.

Describing his followers as a small special group of true Muslims and a righteous minority – “I have written *Milestones* for this vanguard, which I consider to be waiting reality about to be materialized”¹ – he moved to implore all Muslims to join the armed struggle of jihad. Ultimately, he counted those Muslims who declined to participate among the enemies of God and blasphemous apostates, takfirim.²

¹ Sayyid Qutb, *Milestones* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Printers, 1978), 17-18.

² Esposito, *Unholy War*, 60-61.

II

Deutschland Über Allah!
(Peter Hopkirk)

In the letter dated October 24 of 1915, Sir Henry McMahon wrote to the Sherif Hussein of Mecca about Great Britain's intentions with respect to the future Arab Muslim world then still enveloped within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. He issued assurance to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs in all regions demanded by the Sherif. Among the assurances were the guarantee of protection of the Holy Places against all external aggression and the promise to provide the Arabs with a counsel and assistance in establishing the most suitable form of government in the outlined territories. The language contained explicit assertions such as:

I am convinced that this declaration will assure you beyond all possible doubt of the sympathy of Great Britain towards the aspirations of her friends the Arabs and will result in a firm and lasting alliance, the immediate results of which will be the expulsion of the Turks from the Arab countries and the freeing of the Arab peoples from the Turkish yoke, which for so many years has pressed heavily upon them. (From the correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon and the Sherif Hussein of Mecca, July 1915 – March 1916, London, England)¹

Indeed with Turkey's entry into the war the Middle East became an area of high concern for Great Britain. Not all the Arabs were united in the idea of shaking off the Turkish yoke, and many chose to fight on the side of Turkey defending the

¹ T. G. Fraser, ed., *The Middle East 1914-1979*, Documents of Modern History (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1980), 13.

Caliphate and Dar Al-Islam (the domain of Islam). As a whole province, Yemen, for example, remained loyal to the Empire till its last day.¹ The political maneuvers of Britain also became more complicated by the Zionist movement, which, coincidentally, started gaining a real momentum at the same time. The promises made to the Arabs had to be altered by the new promises of independence and self-governance made to the Jews. The Memorandum by Arthur Balfour referring to Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia dated August 11th of 1919 stated:

...Zionism be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long traditions, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desires and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land. (DBFP 1919-1939, First Series, vol. IV, no. 242)²

The Balfour declaration in favor of a Jewish national home in Palestine came out of wartime calculation and a positive commitment of many British officials in support of Zionism. In its essence the declaration was a promise to the world Jewry of a national home of refuge. The concessions to Jewish Diaspora were partly made in hopes to create an appeal for the American and Russian Jews at the time when the war outlook for the alliance looked dim.³ However, with Adolf Hitler's ascent to power in Germany in 1933, the landscape became much more complex.

From 1933 to 1939, the Jewish population in British Palestine increased dramatically as refugees fled the persecution in Europe and reached a third of the total

¹ Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (New York, NY: I.B.Tauris & Co. LTD, 2004), 105.

² Fraser, ed., *The Middle East 1914-1979*, 21.

³ Winston S. Churchill, ed., *Never Give In!*, The Best of Winston Churchill's Speeches (New York, NY: Hyperion, 2003), 189.

population West of Jordan River.¹ The rapid change in demographics became one of the contributing reasons for the civil unrest among the local Muslim Arabs, which resulted in uprisings and violence. By 1938, Britain altered its official position on creation of Jewish National Home in British-mandated Palestine, and, shortly after, halted the Jewish immigration into the region altogether.

Having emerged as a strong player on the European stage, Nazi Germany insisted on the need for hegemony over Europe and an alternative to the imperialism in the North Africa and Middle East. Many Arab nationalists looked to Germany for inspiration and saw National Socialism as a working model for state and nation building. Coupled with the history of German involvement with the Ottoman Empire, the rise of the powerful ally may have been pleasantly reminiscent of the past.

German Kaiser Wilhelm II standing next to the Ottoman Emperor Abdul-Hamid inside the great Mosque in Istanbul solemnly declared himself a “protector of all Muslims” on October 18th of 1898.² During the same visit, the Kaiser proposed to build the Baghdad-Berlin railroad connecting Germany to the Persian Gulf and Persia. Even though Abdul-Hamid was suspicious over the German motives, Wilhelm’s promises and rhetoric were reinforced by certain actions such as the sale of German-made rifles and other small arms to the Ottoman army.³ Consequently, Turkish soldiers were among the first troops in the twentieth century warfare to be

¹ Carla L. Klausner and Ian J. Bickerton, *A Concise History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Fourth ed. (New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002), 53.

² Peter Hopkirk, *On Secret Service East of Constantinople: The Plot To Bring Down the British Empire* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2001), 21.

³ *Ibid.*, 14.

equipped with new automatic fire weapons, such as the German Maschinengewehr. The German army itself deployed over 12,000 of these machine guns to the Western front. Similar actions and overtures by Germany helped to mask Germany's political and economic exploitation of the Ottoman Empire and provided sufficient incentives for the Ottomans to view Germany as a very motivated ally if not a close friend.¹ Hence, the railway construction project was seen as both the proof and a product of the Turko-German friendship.

To commemorate the second anniversary of the German Emperor's visit to Turkey an architectural structure known as The German Fountain (in Turkish Alman Çeşmesi) was erected in 1900 across from the mausoleum of Sultan Ahmed I. It was made in Germany and then transported in pieces to be assembled on site in Istanbul.

The blunt fact that a Christian sovereign encouraged and funded Muslims to remain on a warpath against those of his own faith did not seem to trouble anyone in the Middle East. Rumors of Kaiser Wilhelm secretly converting to Islam and incognito making a pilgrimage to Mecca were circulating in the mosques and bazaars. Some Islamic scholars even found mysterious passages in the Qur'an, which revealed that Wilhelm had been ordained by God to free the faithful from the infidel rule.²

The history of cooperation between the Ottoman Empire and Kaiser Germany firmed up the ground for Germany's bi-lateral relations with the Middle East.

¹ Jonathan S. McMurray, *Distant Ties: Germany, the Ottoman Empire and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 2001), 5.

² Hopkirk, *On Secret Service East of Constantinople*, 4.

Germany's subtle approach to extending its imperial influence, as compared to the approaches of the other European powers, was favored by the Turks. In truth, this collaboration, probably, was nothing more than a marriage of convenience based on self-interests.

Germany's example of economic recovery in 1930s and political self-determination, indeed, became alluring to the underdeveloped Arab nations, who were, like Germany, also unhappy with the stipulations of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles. Under Hitler, Germany came out of the financial and industrial crisis having adopted policies that ignored free market liberalism. Nazi Germany re-armed, which was done in defiance of the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, further assisted the economic boost. In short fifteen years, Germany came to represent the success of bold and rebellious political play and self-ensured sovereignty. Hitler himself was admired by many in the Muslim Middle East for his dynamic rise to power, skill of leadership, ability to balance religious and political authorities, and, especially, for the enthusiasm and determination to repair the inequities of the post-war settlement.¹ The Hitler's regime's anti-Jewish policies also generated considerable popularity.² Most Arabs did not recognize the fact that it was Germany they revered and its anti-Semitism that were directly responsible for the dramatic increase in Jewish immigration in Palestine.

Concurrently, anti-Semitism played a permanent role in German politics by

¹ Francis R. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question* (Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press, 1985), 85.

² Ibid.

the nineteenth century. The leaders of Germany including the legendary Chancellor Otto von Bismarck could not avoid addressing the “Jewish problem” in front of their constituencies. Adolf Stocker, the founder of the Christian Social Workers’ Party, said in 1879: “Germans must protect themselves from Jews through wise legislation”. When the “Anti-Semites’ Petition” demanding to free Germany from Jews was presented to Otto von Bismarck in the April of 1881, it already had over two hundred and twenty-five thousand signatures.¹ The Jews were named as one of the principal adversaries of the new order. By contrast, the old world was viewed as desperately corrupt and something which must be destroyed in order to clear the way for the new reality. The concept of this antagonism between the impeding parasite and the nemesis is important in the philosophy of both German Nazism and Militant Islam for understanding the parallels between the policies of both extremist regimes.

By 1930s, anti-Semitism in Germany expanded to a full-scale selective persecution no longer based on only religion or any particular political views. Anti-Semitism reached its worst manifestation in a form of a racial Jew-hatred. This point of time, when a change in religion could no longer protect a Jew from anti-Semitism, marked the lowest step² on the downward descent toward hatred endorsed by the government. When ethno-centric nationalism erupted with enmity toward cultural communities of Gypsies or Jews in Europe, political anti-Semitism rendered itself useful in drawing artificial divisions between the presumably entitled and cunningly

¹ Lucy S. Dawidowicz and David A. Altshuler, *Hitler's War Against the Jews* (West Orange, NJ: Behrman House, Inc., 1978), 30-31.

² Peretz F. Bernstein, *Jew-Hate As A Sociological Problem*, trans. David Saraph (New York, NY: Philosophical Library, 1951), 232.

parasitic populations. A similar paradigm always existed within the Islamic society, and political anti-Semitism would take it one step farther – the dhimmi would no longer be assured survival even through a conversion to Islam.

In the imperialistic division of the world, Germany did not end up as rich with controlled territories as did her rivals. Unlike Britain, France, Germany had no colonies in the Middle East and North Africa. Her colonies in Africa, East Asia and Pacific were distant and separated by the territories not controlled by Germany's allies. In fact, German colonies not only did not bolster German imperialistic standings, but were perhaps more taxing on the state than they were profitable. As such, they did not significantly improve Germany's access to seaports, raw materials and markets. The African land holdings in the territories of Namibia, Botswana, Rwanda, Burundi, Cameroon, Togoland, and a few colonized Pacific islands along with Chinese Kiautschou province, required more resources for their development and security than they were able to return. Ironically, New Swabia (Neu-Schwabenland), the newly claimed German colony in Antarctica, was more defensible and presented a higher strategic value for the war than other colonies held by the Third Reich. New Swabia was never recognized as a German property or a protectorate by the world powers; but, even if it had been, it would not have pacified Germany enough to sit on the sidelines during the Great Game for the Middle East. Historians reflected on the aspirations of Germany, France, United States, Great Britain, and Russia¹ to attract and retain partners in the Middle East and Central Asia.² Aleksey Nikolayevich Kuropatkin, the Russian Imperial Minister of War 1898-1904, said in 1900, for example:

¹ Peter Hopkirk, *Setting The East Ablaze: On Secret Service in Bolshevik Asia*. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1986).

² ———, *The Great Game: the Struggle for Empire in Central Asia* (New York, NY: Kodansha International, 1994).

When we gain control over the Bosphorus and the entrance to the Mediterranean, we shall be able to tackle the Egyptian question with energy and make the Suez Canal our thoroughfare. When we have won this entry into the Indian Ocean, we can constantly threaten India. Russian competition on the world market will intimidate the highly developed countries of Europe and America . . . and we shall extend our tentacles towards the Atlantic.¹

These policies of expansionism often exploited financial incentives and nationalistic appeals. In cases of some Muslim Arab provinces courted by Germany, anti-Semitism rendered itself a useful tool of propaganda for alienation of the local populace from their masters. In its consequences this multi-level game for influence led to the prevailing ethno-centric nationalism, suffering minorities, deteriorating social fabric and the isolation of the affected societies.

The spike in nationalism on the brink of WWI in Europe coincided with the intensified national aspirations in the Middle East. Benjamin Lieberman masterfully described how nineteenth century nationalism created antagonisms between people previously co-existing in the Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires. The accentuated differences between the majority and the minorities became incorporated into a notion of a threat.² Quite accurately, other historians as well have called the sharp rise in nationalism and the subsequent war “the Suicide of the Empires”.³ Self-determination based on ethnicity played a major role in creating a sustaining propensity toward racism. Conversely, American President Woodrow Wilson

¹ Irving Sedar and Harold J. Greenberg, *Behind the Egyptian Sphinx: Nasser's Strange Bedfellows - Prelude to World War Three?*, First ed. (Philadelphia, PA: Chilton Company, 1960), 25.

² Benjamin Lieberman, *Terrible Fate: Ethnic Cleansing In the Making of Modern Europe* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006).

³ Alan Clark, *Suicide of the Empires: The Battles on the Eastern Front, 1914-18*, Second ed. (Winter Park, FL: American Heritage Press, 1971).

denounced and excluded ethnic differentiation from his vision of one people under the flag of the United States. If we could learn a lesson from this historical example, it would be one of ethno-centric nationalism vs. pluralist nation building. National pride is not a destructive force when it is used to foster unity not segregation. On the contrary, it can be one of the first building blocks of a strong, diverse and pluralistic civil society.

Individuals and whole societies coped with and reconciled their stances on Nazi Germany in their own way. In retrospect, let us not forget that the whole truth about genocide and the full extent of the war atrocities committed by the Nazis did not become broad public knowledge until after 1943. The Nuremburg trial had not yet taken place to equate the Nazi swastika with its abhorrent reality; therefore, individual conjectures of one's position on Nazism might have been mostly inferential. Individuals, societies and their leaders adopted various levels of an acceptance, or necessary tolerance, of Hitler's Germany. Myopic and shallow worldviews coupled with indifference and low moral standards were troubling if not dangerous lenses to view Nazi fascists and their policies. Immature social awareness with an impaired sense of equality, pluralism and humanism made for an environment ripe for the Nazi ascent.

Such may have been the dispositions of some individuals in the Muslim Arab Middle East as well. However, for some Muslim Arab leaders considered in this text, the truth about the true intentions of Hitler and his ilk was known all along even before 1943. Not only did it not contradict their radical religious and political

conventions, but rather complemented them. These leaders chose the alliance with Hitler even beyond the exposure of the Nazi crimes to the world community, ultimately dragging their followers deeper into the pit of hate and prejudice. Generations of their constituencies still live in a world where the Holocaust is denied, and Hitler's henchmen are mere defeated combatants falsely accused and excessively punished by the unchallenged justice of the victors.

An international conference denying the occurrence of Holocaust organized by the Iranian Foreign Ministry's Institute for Political and International Studies could serve as an insight into that world. Sixty-seven foreign researchers from thirty countries attended this conference. Fitting the tone of the conference, one of the presenters to the assembly was David Duke, an American white-supremacist, white nationalist, neo-Nazi, former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, and a former Louisiana State representative.¹ The United States condemned the conference emphasizing that the Iranian regime "perversely seeks to call the historical fact... into question and provide a platform for hatred."²

Thus, the Nazis saw the Arab resentment of the French and British colonial powers as a backdoor to the Middle Eastern theater. The Middle East had a high strategic value and could potentially decide the outcome of the war on the Western fronts. Sir Winston Churchill observed in retrospect, "If General Wavell... had

¹ Nazila Fathi, "Holocaust Deniers and Skeptics Gather in Iran," *The New York Times*, December 11, 2006.

² George W. Bush, "Statement on Holocaust Denial Conference Sponsored by Iranian Regime," ed. The White House (Washington, DC: Office of the Press Secretary, December 12, 2006).

broken under the intense strain to which he was subjected by events and by our orders, the whole future of the war and of Turkey might have been fatefully altered.”¹

Conversely, Nazi Germany appeared as a world power that was promising the Arabs liberation from the infidels, who were ruling them, asking little in return. All that was required was to join in the struggle against the very infidels whom they both wanted to expel from the Middle East. Hitler ardently repudiated the colonial policy of Great Britain and France not only in private meetings with Hajj Amin al-Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem, but openly in the international forum. During the visit of Swedish official Sven Hedin in October 1939, the Fuhrer decisively rejected any criticism of annexation of lands in Europe and pompously exclaimed, “What is meant by “redress of the wrong done to Bohemia and Moravia?” I might by this token demand that England redress the wrong done to India, Egypt, and Palestine!”²

Under the nationalistic ambitions for independence from the colonial powers, an alliance with Hitler’s Germany may have been perceived as a remedy with minimal if any side effects. German diplomacy of a selfless benefactor left a favorable long-lasting impression, and later generations of the Muslim Arab leaders spoke of Germany in glowing terms. In June of 1955, during the visit of Herr Eugen Gerstenmaier, the President of the Bundestag and the head of the German-Africa Society, President of Egypt Gamal Abdel Nasser regarded Germany as the “Savior of

¹ Sir Winston Churchill, *The Second World War: The Grand Alliance*, vol. III (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985), 297.

² German Foreign Ministry and the Reich Chancellery, "Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945: Series D (1937-1945)," ed. United States Department of State, Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945 (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1954), 295.

Egypt and Islam” and “...liberator of the Nile Valley from the imperialistic designs of Britain and her American and French allies, and the one symbol of international virtue, which has never subjected Egypt to domination or colonial exploitation.” He asserted then, "I especially love Germany, because this country has never demonstrated imperialistic dispositions toward the Arab world..."¹

In the postwar times, the pro-Nazi past of the Muslim Arab world became "... a source of pride, not shame."² The Muslim Arabs saw the failure of the Allies to prosecute the Grand Mufti and other Nazi collaborators as "not only a weakness of the Europeans, but also an absolution for the past and future occurrences," Simon Wiesenthal commented in 1947.

¹ Sedar and Greenberg, *Behind the Egyptian Sphinx*, 45.

² Bernard Lewis, *Semites and anti-Semites: An Inquiry Into Conflict and Prejudice*, Paperback ed. (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1999), 160.

Perfection we may hope to find in individuals. Among the nations of the world,
perfection is unknown.
(William Haas, New York, September 1945)

The case of Iran serves as a good example of the deep reach by the Third Reich in absence of any significant direct links with Hitler's Germany. A never colonized autonomous state, Persia still did not escape the storm of the powerful belligerents; and, before the end of WWI, Persia was invaded from the North and South by the Russian and British armies respectively.

Since the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 Great Britain enjoyed a secure access to the Persian Gulf for the transport of Persian oil for its navy,¹ which became dependent on this new fuel by the onset of WWI.² A few years later, the Constantinople Agreement of 1915 essentially sanctioned Great Britain's control in Persia, now including the neutral zone rich with oil reserves. Simultaneously, Russia was afforded the control over the Constantinople and the straits uncontested by Britain and France.³ London requested that the southern half of Persia be recognized as a British sphere, while Paris asked for an outright annexation of Syria.⁴ Such hasty

¹ Parliament of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, *Fourth Series: Third Session of the Twenty-Eighth Parliament of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. His Majesty's Stationary Office, Authorised Edition ed., vol. Fifth Volume of Session, The Parliamentary Debates (Fetter Lane, London: Wyman and Sons Limited, Under Contract with His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1908), 52, 88.

² Cyrus Ghani, *Iran and the Rise of Reza Shah: From Qajar Collapse to Pahlavi Power* (New York, NY: I.B.Tauris & Co. LTD, 2001), 28.

³ P. Toye, ed., *Palestine Boundaries 1833-1947*, 4 vols., vol. 2, Near & Middle East Titles (Slough, England: Archive Editions Ltd., 1989).

⁴ Timothy J. Paris, *Britain, the Hashemites and Arab Rule, 1920-1925: The Sherifian Solution* (London, England: Frank Cass, 2003), 27.

mutual appeasement or “simply compulsive gestures of self-preservation”, as later characterized by Sir Winston Churchill,¹ may have been not indirectly prompted by the recently installed German mission in Turkey in 1913.² Perhaps to perpetuate the notion of good will among the Muslims or to establish some barriers for a potential Russian expansion further, London requested that the holy Muslim places and Arabia shall “under all circumstances remain under independent Mussulman dominion.”³

However, the Constantinople Agreement was never fulfilled, as the collapsed Tsarist Russia exited from the war before the terms went into effect. The status quo was disturbed again by the upsurge of the revolutionary activities along the southern borders of the former Russian Empire.

Former components of the Ottoman Empire, Egypt, Transjordan, and Iraq, were formed by Britain into a block of controlled clients, partially to ensure secure routes to Persia, India, and East Asia. Meanwhile, Persian territory was suspended in a power vacuum left by the collapsing Tsarist Russia. The 1919 Anglo-Persian Treaty was drawn in an attempt to stabilize the now weak link in the chain. According to the accord, British military would assist the Persian army through its modernization. It also included provisions of the arms sales and financing loans.⁴ However, the political accord, while seemingly mutually prudent by Western standards, was not received

¹ Sir Winston Churchill, *The World Crisis, 1911-1918* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 2005), 130.

² Robert J. Kerner, "Russia, the Straits, and Constantinople, 1914-15 " *The Journal of Modern History* 1, no. 3 (1929).

³ Paris, *Britain, the Hashemites and Arab Rule, 1920-1925: The Sherifian Solution*, 27.

⁴ George Lenczowski, *Russia and the West in Iran, 1918-1948: A Study in Big Power Rivalry* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1949), 45-46.

well in Persian circles. The public outcry in Persia against what most Persians saw as the patronizing British Imperialism was followed by the formal protests from France, the Soviet Revolutionary Government, and the United States; who feared impending difficulties in open trading and other dealings with Persia. Soviet Foreign Commissar Chicherin used such strong terms as “English beast of prey”, “shameful Anglo-Persian treaty”, “a noose of final enslavement” and “sold you to the English predator” in expressing the Soviet position.¹ The Persian sentiment against the foreign imperial domination elevated to the highest yet from its historical levels. In this political environment, Colonel Riza Khan carried out a bloodless coup d’etat in February of 1921. London denied any involvement. Later publication of the diaries of a British military officer Sir Edmund Ironside suggested connections to at least some of her Majesty’s government’s officials,² although historians viewed the account as controversial.³ Considering the international reaction to the Anglo-Persian accord and particularly the vivid diplomatic language used by Persia’s reckless and volatile neighbor to the North to describe the feeble treaty, the change in the ruling body had to be received by the British as a relief, even if only temporary. The depth of foreign involvement in governmental performance is still debated by the historians; nonetheless, it is safe to say that the new government of Persia was compelled to be

¹ F. Kazemzadeh, "Iranian Relations With Russia and the Soviet Union, to 1921," in *The Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. 7: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, ed. P.W. Avery, G.R.G. Hambly, and C.P. Melville, *The Cambridge History of Iran* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 345.

² Gavin Hambly, "The Pahlavi Autocracy: Riza Shah, 1921-1941," *Ibid.*, ed. P.W. Avery, G.R.G. Hambly, and C.P. Melville, *The Cambridge History of Iran* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 213.

cooperative with the West. However, Reza Shah's idea of Persian independence did not match the British views on the same. Realizing that it would be impossible to monopolize Persia, London decided on building up Persia as an independent power under a capable ruler.¹ Hence, Reza Khan found himself more able to choose international partners by the mid 1920s. The American interests in Persia were limited to missionary activities before the war, although they grew by mid-1930s with the growing importance of oil.² The French observed mostly cultural interests; and the Soviets openly renewed their strategies to spread the "Revolution in the East", having perceived Great Britain becoming less of an obstacle to their ambitions in Asia.³ Meanwhile, Germany was also ready to step up as a solid economic and political ally by the end of 1930s.

During the time of the Third Reich, Germany was one of the world's most advanced nations in technology, science, medicine, and military arts. More importantly, it had capital and products to export. The centralized economy of Germany was poised to offer Iran trade facilities, which the other Western democracies could not afford to grant. Teheran employed more and more German experts and engineers; and Germany quickly moved to first place in the industrialization of Iran.⁴ By 1941, foreign trade with Germany was valued at 813,714,000 rials^{VI} (\$25,037,980), as contrasted with Russian 200,803,000 rials

¹ William S. Haas, *Iran* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1946), 141.

² *Ibid.*, v.

³ Hopkirk, *Setting the East Ablaze*, 210.

⁴ Haas, *Iran*, 222.

(\$6,178,708), and American 196,641,000 rials (\$6,050,644).¹ The Imperial Company, The Central Company and The Cotton Goods Company led the way in industrialization. Founded in 1931, The Imperial Company, for example, represented holdings of 5,000 shares of stock, 1,000 shares of which belonged to German firms.²

The propaganda apparatus closely followed economic expansion; and every German specialist sent to Iran could be surely counted on being a ready Nazi propagandist.³ Such state visits as that of the head of Nazi Youth Movement Baldur von Schirach alongside of the Reichsbank President Dr. Schacht became a common occurrence.⁴ In a very short time, German methods and institutions were mimicked as benchmarks. Among the new initiatives were the militarization of education and the Office for the Direction of Public Opinion.⁵ Before the end of his reign, the Shah established the Department of Press and Propaganda. It was modeled in a European fashion and pursued institutionalization of nationalistic spirit based on historical content.⁶

Despite the grave concerns of Britain and Soviet Union over Iran's pacifist stances toward Hitler's Germany, the Shah refused to join the allies, deport the German nationals living in Iran and refused to permit the Trans-Iranian Railway to be used for transporting of desperately needed war supplies into Russia. By the end of

¹ Ibid.

² Donald N. Wilber, *Iran: Past and Present* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1948), 130.

³ Haas, *Iran*, 222.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ A. Reza Arasteh, *Education and Social Awakening in Iran, 1850-1968*, Second ed. (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1969), 145.

August 1941, an American diplomat in Iran relying on his intelligence reported that there were around twenty five hundred Germans living in Iran. Around seven hundred of them were not only in the direct employ of the Iranian government, but were strategically placed in the radio station, railway, commercial organizations, and other public services.¹ Contrary to these estimates, Iran's minister of foreign affairs Javad Ameri assured the Allies that the number of Germans "was not so great as pretended."² Could this and other subtle acts of defiance against the Allies at war with Germany have been a political move emboldened by the Hitler's tanks surging toward the Caucuses? Perhaps an answer may further be revealed in the remarks of Iranian ambassador to his American counterpart in Moscow on August 23, 1941. After referring to the Soviet and British notes as "impertinent", he stated in part that "...Iran would defend itself as best as it could against any attempted violation of its sovereignty by either the Soviet Union or Britain or both."³

Sir Winston Churchill personally expressed a deep concern over the German presence in Iran. He urged the War Office and the Chiefs of Staff to "...give Persians an ultimatum from Britain and Russia to clear out the Germans without delay or take the consequences."⁴ Given the extreme strategic importance of Iran's position with

¹ Rouhollah K. Ramazani, *Iran's Foreign Policy 1941-1973: A Study of Foreign Policy in Modernizing Nations* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975), 28.

² Ibid.

³ United States Department of State, "Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, 1941: The British Commonwealth, the Near East and Africa," ed. United States Department of State, *Diplomatic Papers* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959), 412-13.

⁴ Churchill, *The Grand Alliance*, 424.

respects to the oil fields, the Persian Gulf and the land shipping routes, nothing could be left to chance. In August of 1941, Winston Churchill wrote to the British Minister of Information “Do try to blend in without causing trouble the word Persia instead of Iran.” In the same month, he also wrote with similar propositions to the Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Bridges and General Ismay suggesting that “in all correspondence it would be more convenient to use the word ”Persia” instead of “Iran”; while diplomatically agreeing that “formal correspondence with the Persian government should of course be conducted in the form they like.”¹ Churchill’s anxiety over a possible destabilization of Persia in favor of Nazi Germany was conveyed repeatedly in 1941 and 1942. He insisted on a formation of a special committee to ensure the success of the Persian operation. He stressed the necessity to allocate strong enough available military forces “to occupy Ahwaz oilfields in the face of local and official Persian opposition.”²

Was this level of anxiety about Persian-German alignment unfounded or irrational? To the contrary, the Nazi propaganda machine was not to be underestimated. Soon after NSDAP’s ascent to power in 1933, the number of journals in Farsi such as *Iranshahr*, *Mehr-e Iran* (the Love of Iran), *Partow-e Iran* (the Light of Iran), *Anahita* and *Takht-e Jamshid* (the seat of Jamshid – legendary ancient Persian king) rapidly increased and came to dominate the Persian literary scene in Berlin. Major von Viban of the Political Department of the NSDAP directly edited at least

¹ Ibid., 426.

² Ibid., 425.

one of the periodicals titled Iran-e Bastan (the Ancient Iran).¹ Its pages were filled with appeals to awakening of Persian nationalism and exaltations for the past virtues and glories of the nation.² The journal perpetually looked for common grounds between the Pahlavi regime in Persia and the fascism in Nazi Germany. It explored every horizon including compelling Iranian women to embrace the European progress and German achievements in particular. Images of the prominent women in the Third Reich emphasized their ability to affect the society on the same footing with their husbands. Mrs. Goebbles herself was once featured helping her husband, the Nazi Propaganda Minister, in recording a radio appearance.³ Uniformed girls forming Hitler Youth Groups were shown alongside the popular writer Gabriella de Reuter. German women parachutists, athletes and motorcyclists painted a picture of a brave new Jahan-e Zanan (Women's World) in the women's sections of Iran-e Bastan, Iranshahr, Iran-e Emruz, and other popular magazines published in Germany.⁴

In their scholarly and editorial writings, the Nazis highlighted the spiritual affinity between the Aryans of the North and the nation of Zoroaster traceable to the ancient past.⁵ Some similarities in pagan religious practices and language conceptions may exist, but cannot go beyond general observations. However, factual evidence of

¹ Miron Rezun, *The Soviet Union and Iran: Soviet Policy in Iran From the Beginning of the Pahlavi Dynasty Until the Soviet Invasion in 1941*, Collection de Relations Internationales (Geneve: Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales via Brill Archive, 1981), 319.

² Ibid.

³ Camron Michael Amin, *The Making of the Modern Iranian Woman: Gender, State Policy, and Popular Culture, 1865-1946* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2002), 172.

⁴ Ibid., 171-72.

⁵ Rezun, *The Soviet Union and Iran*, 334.

ancient Aryans appearing in Mesopotamia in the seventh century B.C.E. and forming an empire called Mitanni has been found in cuneiform records.¹

The Nazis saw Persia as a country with profoundly non-Islamic traditions and distinct from the Arab culture in the Middle East.² Regardless of whether or not the leaders of the Nazi movement genuinely believed that the emblem of the swastika was derived from the mythology of the Caucasus area of Persia, the Nazis studiously fed the hopes of a Greater Iran among the Persian nationalists and exploited all available angles to subvert the influence of the Allies. The Reich Cabinet even issued as formal decree in early 1936 that exempted Iranians from the restrictions of the Nuremburg Racial Laws as pure-blooded Aryans.³

Prince von Reuss, the German Minister in Tehran, was diligently working on strengthening the “National Government” established at Qum and Kermanshah by nationalistic leaders, while applying every influence on the Shah.⁴ The German aspirations persistently outlived the Russo-British invasion and expulsion of the German nationals. The inquiries into the Qashqa’i revolt in the south of Iran in May of 1943 revealed covert Nazi activities in collaboration with the southern tribes.⁵ The full account of the conspiracy came to light by 1954 and exposed some high-ranking Persian military commanders including General Zahidi, Nasir Khan and Deputy

¹ Richard N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia*, First ed., The World Histories of Civilization (Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company, 1963), 20-21.

² Rezun, *The Soviet Union and Iran*, 334.

³ *Ibid.*, 333.

⁴ Rouhollah K. Ramazani, *The Foreign Policy of Iran 1500-1941: A developing Nation in World Affairs* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1966), 278-79.

⁵ Ramazani, *Iran's Foreign Policy 1941-1973: A Study of Foreign Policy in Modernizing Nations*, 54-55.

Nobakht. Nazi spies, led in part by the expelled German diplomat Franz Mayer, penetrated the Persian territory to incite the Kurds and other receptive tribes to revolt, once the German troops reach the Persian frontiers. The sabotage was supposed to launch after the impending fall of Stalingrad in 1943.¹

Shah Reza Khan himself reportedly viewed the propagandistic activities of the Nazis with caution.² Although he did not allow Germany to found an open fascist party in Iran, the Monarch apparently was not able to deter the German influence among his people.³ Mohammad Reza Pahlavi was a man of a few words. The true extent to which he personally endorsed or admired Hitler's character traits and political success remains debatable. However, the Shah's policy of procrastination and his declared neutrality in WWII cost him his status and his country even more of its autonomy.

Overall lack of decisive action and an ambiguous position on the war went beyond the comfort levels of the British and Russian war cabinets. Observing a renewed popular interest in the swastika as an essential Indo-European (Aryan) symbol among the public of Iran's cities^{VII} was more than they could bear.⁴ Sighting the possibility of German take-over, Soviet and British military forces invaded Iran and occupied the country for the duration of the war. The United States ambassador in Tehran reported to the Secretary of State Cordell Hull "the Iranians have arrived at

¹ Ibid.

² Rezun, *The Soviet Union and Iran*, 334.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Rezun, *The Soviet Union and Iran*, 334.

this predicament by their failure to recognize and face realities.”¹ In turn, the Secretary of State responded to the Iranian Foreign Minister’s request for intervention to prevent the occupation by stating that “the United States had no intention of listening to Hitler discuss the merits of neutrality while conquering all other areas and eventually attacking the United States.”² He also asserted that he “must warn Iran against Hitler’s stealthy approach, which is always based on a pledge of his supposed honor that he would not for the world attack a neutral country.”³

¹ United States Department of State, "Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, 1941: The British Commonwealth, the Near East and Africa," 422.

² Ibid., 433.

³ Ibid.

The ties between Hitler's Germany and the Mediterranean neighborhood of the Muslim Arab world were much more direct and explicit. Between 1931 and 1935 many Jews migrated to the British Palestine to escape the growing fanaticism of the Nazi regime in Germany. The new arrivals were met with resentment and anger from the local Arab population. Local Arabs feared that the increasing number of European Jews would add another obstacle to their economic and political struggle at the national level. The Arabs were divided politically and lacked a representative body like The Jewish Agency to work with the British authorities. Even though the British suggested forming such an institution, the Arab community failed to agree on the terms and rejected the notion of acquiescence to the Balfour Declaration and any cooperation with the Zionist movement. Although the opposition to Zionism was not unanimous, the more reactionary faction headed by Hajj Amin al-Husseini, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem appointed by the British in 1921, gained the upper hand and secured significant political support and allegiance from several Muslim Arab political parties. The coalition formed a government body called the Arab Higher Committee in 1936. Not coincidentally, the subsequent political development in British Palestine took a different course than in Lebanon, Transjordan, and Iraq, where constituent assemblies, parliaments, constitutions and other democratic practices of Western governments were tried to be implemented.

Under the leadership of al-Husseini, the Arabs in British Palestine refused to legitimize the situation and rejected the principal of compromise. With the Jewish

population in British Palestine numbering 400,000¹ by 1936 and increasing, intolerance toward the Jews resulted in one of the most violent Arab uprisings lasting up to 1939. Britain sent in 20,000 more troops, but accomplished little to contain the upheaval. The Mufti's followers intimidated and killed the Arabs who were reluctant to take part in the armed rebellion.² The Arab Guard Squads employed sporadic raids to sabotage the farm settlements of Jewish agricultural pioneers and communities where Jews, Christians and Arabs coexisted on friendly terms.³ Arson, bombings, and assassinations continued despite the strong British military presence, which was increased to 25,000⁴ servicemen in Palestine alone. In September of 1937, the British District Commissioner of Galilee was murdered, and England at last took its first significant action against the Arab Higher Committee. The British Colonial Office dissolved the body and arrested most of its higher-ranking members. Al-Husseini escaped to Lebanon, and eventually made his way to Berlin through Iraq, Iran, Turkey and Rome.⁵ Prior to 1937, he masterfully led the British to believe that he was their best candidate for an advisor on the British affairs in the land amidst other political entities.⁶

The subsequent political course taken by British colonial government turned

¹ Klausner and Bickerton, *A Concise History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 53.

² *Ibid.*, 55.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Philip Mattar, "The Mufti of Jerusalem and the Politics of Palestine, 1917-48: An Overview," in *The Middle East and North Africa: Essays in Honor of J.C. Hurewitz*, ed. Reeva Simon (New York, NY: Columbia University Press for the Middle East Institute of Columbia University, 1990), 128.

sharply toward appeasement of Arabs for fear of further destabilization. The Palestine Royal Commission Report issued in July of 1937, known as the Peel Report, proposed the partition of the British Palestine into Arab and Jewish states citing the “irrepressible conflict”¹ between Arabs and Jews and the desire of the Arabs for national independence coupled with their hatred and fear of the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Peel Report was followed by the White Paper issued by the British Government in May of 1939, which effectively declared that British Palestine was to imminently become an Arab state and that there would be no more Jewish immigrants allowed to enter the country. More over, according to the Peel Report, the status of every Jew who had emigrated since 1918 was to be reviewed and assessed for legitimacy.² Despite the efforts by the Foreign Office to present the policy as not an appeasement of the Arabs and, to lesser extent, of the Nazis, the Muslim Arabs must have seen this as an outcome of Britain caving in under the pressure of force. In fact, this interpretation by the Muslim Arab leaders was confirmed later in 1944. Musa Alami, a representative of the Palestinian parties at the Arab Congress meeting in Alexandria in the autumn of 1944, advised the assembly that the reason the British retreated from the 1939 White Paper stipulations was “without any shadow of doubt their feeling that the Arabs are pusillanimous... and that therefore there is no danger

¹ Fraser, ed., *The Middle East 1914-1979*, 22.

² Walter Laqueur and Barry Rubin, eds., *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*, Sixth ed., Israel-Arab Reader (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2001), 41-50.

in incurring their anger.”¹ The analysis suggested by Alami during that meeting of the Arab Congress became the basis for the Arab League actions, at least up to the end of 1947.²

In a larger picture, Britain was in a difficult negotiating position with little to offer. As in the previous period of standoffs preceding the First World War, the Colonial Office could not give up land despite its most openhearted rhetoric. Contrasted with Germany, which was promising the Ottomans and, later, the Arabs authority over their own domains, Great Britain could not afford to surrender any of the holdings. In a grandiose gesture of endowing the Muslim Arab leaders with autonomy, Germany had nothing to lose and much to gain. For Britain, on the other hand, bargaining with land chips in the Middle East could lead to very undesirable consequences such as antagonizing the Russians or French.

There were also other external factors such as Iranian oil fields, the Persian Gulf, India, Southeast Asia, and the shipping routes. Thus, while Churchill advocated Britain’s non-acquisitive and non-expansive ambitions in North Africa after landing of British troops there in 1942, he unequivocally stated: “...in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King’s First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.”³

¹ Walid Khalidi, "The Arab Perspective," in *The End of the Palestine Mandate*, ed. William Roger Louis and Robert W. Stookey (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986), 107.

² Ibid.

³ William Roger Louis, *Imperialism at Bay: the United States and the Decolonialization of the British Empire 1941-1945* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1978), 200.

At the same time, the pressure on Britain and France to placate the local populations of the Middle East was greater than ever before. Before 1942, even their ally United States was voicing an opinion that holding on to mandated territories in the region could be more troublesome than beneficial. Mr. Engert, The US Consul General in Beirut, remarked to the Secretary of State in November 1941, "I agree that all unnecessary limitation of Lebanese independence merely to serve French vanity is undesirable and will not only be criticized locally but will be used by Nazi propaganda."¹ Some officials in the Foreign Office may have been ready to relinquish the mandated lands before 1942. Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs of Great Britain Mr. Murray, for example, found the statement of the British Government that the present plans for the independence of Syria did not involve a termination of the mandate "surprising".²

London eventually realized that Hajj Amin al-Husseini aimed higher than just upsetting Jewish plans for making a home in British Palestine. However, the British authorities still did not see, or ignored the full extent of his malice potential, as they did not even ask the French authorities to extradite him from Lebanon in 1937. As late as 1940, the British Intelligence was still of the opinion that the general fear of a German invasion and occupation of the Arab lands held by many Arab notables in Iraq and Transjordan extended to the Mufti and his following. In reality, the Mufti's fear of a German occupation was a concern that the Germans would start "using

¹ United States Department of State, "Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, 1941: The British Commonwealth, the Near East and Africa," 801.

² Ibid.

Palestine and the nearby Arab countries as a dumping ground for all Jews who come within their domination.”¹

On the other hand, the expulsion of the Mufti and cracking down on the Arab Higher Committee did not defuse the Arab nationalistic movement. On the contrary, it seemed to spread it beyond British Palestine. By 1938 the unrest rocked most of rural Arab population. Arabs inside the occupied territory began receiving aid from those in neighboring Arab countries. Thus, the Syrian militia leader Fawzi al-Qawuqji entered the area from the north and together with Syrians and Iraqis attacked British installations.

In this atmosphere in mandated Palestine, Great Britain arrived at the next stage of escalation of hostilities with Germany. As the global conflict became more imminent, the British were anxious to have secure bases in North Africa and the Middle East. More importantly, they could not afford to alienate the Muslim populations in India and in the other corners of the Empire. The Peel Report of 1937 and White Paper of 1939 reflected those concerns restricting Jewish immigration and charting the forthcoming Arab autonomy.²

The Arabs may have seen the policy of appeasement as a victory of armed and decisive resistance – a victory of Jihad. However, it was not a victory attained by Arab resistance alone. Jihad acquired a new powerful friend – Adolf Hitler. Previous

¹ ———, "Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, 1940: The British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, the Near East and Africa ", ed. United States Department of State, Diplomatic Papers (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958), 706.

² Fraser, ed., *The Middle East 1914-1979*, 22-24.

years of fighting the British had gotten the Muslim Arabs nothing more than imprisonment and exile; and, as little as, a hint of an alliance with Nazi Germany produced an outcome nearly resolving two most burning issues for the Muslim Arabs – Jewish immigration and independent statehood. In reality, the cause and effect relationship between the facts was not direct at all; but, for the inhabitants of the land familiar only with the language of power, the takeaway message seemed loud and clear.

By the end of 1939, having been deported from the British Palestine, al-Husseini escaped from French occupied Lebanon disguised as woman and arrived in Baghdad, where he was welcomed as a pan-Arab hero and a defender of the faithful.¹ Not coincidentally, a well-organized pro-Nazi coup d'etat installed General Rashid Ali el-Gailini in power in Iraq on April 1, 1941. In a swift response the British suppressed the uprising by the end of May before the German and Italian paratroopers could assist it. At the same time, Rashid Ali's attempted coup triggered another immediate consequence. To stop the transport of arms into Iraq by the Vichy French government, the British were prompted to invade Lebanon and Syria. The Free French, who assisted the assault, gained the official political control in Syria and increased the pressure against the Arab nationalist movement.² De Gaulle was

¹ Zvi Elpeleg, *The Grand Mufti: Haj Amin al-Hussaini, Founder of the Palestinian National Movement*, ed. Shmuel Himelstein, trans. David Harvey (London, England: Frank Cass & Co., LTD, 1993), 56.

² Loyd E. Lee and Robin D. S. Higham, *World War II in Europe, Africa, and the Americas, with General Sources: A Handbook of Literature and Research*, ed. Loyd E. Lee (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997), 442.

adamant that crushing Arab nationalism was vital to the national existence of France.¹

The Mufti and his Iraqi supporters wasted no time to blame the failure of the coup on the ancient and indigenous Jewish population of Iraq, and called for murderous pogroms against them. This time their rhetoric sounded much more formulated and shrewdly tied to the current events, as if someone had counseled them. Hajj Amin and the deposed Iraqi leaders accused the Jews in being loyal servants and spies of Great Britain in exchange for the Balfour Declaration and establishment of Jewish home in British Palestine.²

In 1932, newly independent Iraq signified its formal status by joining the League of Nations under the leadership of king Faisal bin Hussein. However, hostility toward Britain did not subside; and, in the subsequent years, the ideology of Arab nationalism sprung up fanned by the Nazi propaganda.

The anti-Jewish pogroms of 1941 in Iraq resembled the infamous Kristallnacht in Nazi Germany in November of 1938. The 48 hours of murder, mutilation, rape, pillaging and burning marked the end of 2,600 years of Jewish life and culture in Mesopotamia.³ With nearly six hundred Jews murdered and the violence reaching all corners of Iraq, this carnage was the first hostility of its scale in the region in centuries. This event would be forever burned in Iraqi Jewish memory as Farhud – a cataclysm beyond chaos in Arabic.

¹ Ibid.

² Edwin Black, *Banking on Baghdad: Inside Iraq's 7,000-Year History of War, Profit, and Conflict* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004), 332.

³ Ibid.

Nazism acquired followers in the rest of the Middle East as well. The notions of supremacy fed the invigorated flames of ethno-centric nationalism. In Egypt a youth militia was formed under the name of Young Egypt. It was later known as The Green Shirts. In the mid 1930s it included young Gamal Abdel Nasser among its ranks. The Green Shirts adopted a slogan that sounded very close to a slogan chanted by the Hitler-Jugend – “One People! One Party! One Leader!” In addition to the paramilitary uniforms, martial boasting and cult of leadership, the Mizr al-Fatat, or Young Egypt, espoused the same Judeo-phobia as their German heroes. Ahmad Husayn, the founder and leader of Mizr al-Fatat, wrote in the movement’s journal, “They (Jews) are the secret of this religious and moral decay, to the point that it has become correct to say – search for a Jew behind every depravity”¹ Well into the 1960s, Green Shirts collaborated with the American neo-fascist National Renaissance Party, founded in 1949 as a spin-off from the German American Bund, on the grounds of the inescapable overlap in beliefs and views on international policy.² The 1939 upsurge in Axis Nazi propaganda against Anglo-Jewish imperialism calling for “Egypt for the Egyptians”³ outlived the costly victory in the war and the Nuremburg justice.

Lieutenant-Colonel Anwar al-Saddat himself expressed his admiration for Hitler in a public forum. In 1953 responding to a question from a prominent Egyptian weekly *Al-Mussawar* on what he would offer to the Fuhrer should he return, he stated

¹ Norman A. Stillman, *The Jews of Arab Lands in Modern Times*, First Paperback ed. (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 107.

² Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the Politics of Identity* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 2001), 79.

³ Phillip J. Baram, *The Department of State in the Middle East 1919-1945* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), 102.

this:

Dear Hitler, I welcome you back with all my heart. You have been defeated, but in fact one should regard you as the real victor. There will be no peace in the world until Germany again takes first place. Your principal mistake was in opening too many fronts, but everything has been forgiven, for you are a shining example of belief in one's fatherland and people. You are eternal, and we shall not be surprised, if we see you again, or a second Hitler, back in Germany.¹

Lower ranking Egyptian ministers and preachers praised Hitler just as loudly throughout the post-war period. The Minister of Hygiene Dr. Nouredine Tarraf openly declared Hitler a “man of his life” and an “ideal leader.”² Egyptian Army officers welcomed Otto Remer, who had saved Hitler’s life in the General’s Plot in 1944, as the expert who would structure the Arab military after General Rommel’s Afrika Korps.³ Colonel Otto Skorzeny became a personal military and geopolitical advisor to Colonel Nasser. As the mastermind of the network of the evacuation routes for the Nazi criminals escaping persecution in post-war Europe, Skorzeny hit the jackpot in Egypt. Otto’s father in-law and Hitler’s former personal financial wizard Dr. Hjalmar Schacht advised him to relocate there as the most welcoming place to the ideology of National Socialism close to Europe. By 1959, Skorzeny, with full support and encouragement from the Egyptian military regime, worked under the facade of an export-import company in Cairo. For years he traded illegal arms, manned the Muslim Arab armies with former Wehrmacht soldiers, promoted anything anti-

¹ Sedar and Greenberg, *Behind the Egyptian Sphinx*, 59.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

American, anti-British or anti-Israeli.¹ He continuously insisted that Gamal Nasser had to be accepted as the new Egyptian Fuhrer by all members of the military. From the European branch of the Muslim Brotherhood, he set up recruitment centers in Europe. Those on the territory of Soviet occupied Eastern Europe operated with a full knowledge of Moscow.² Some of the famous personalities of the Nazi SS and Gestapo found their second birth in the new neo-Nazi world. Known as the “Butcher of Warsaw”, General Dirlwanger became Nasser’s special advisor in guerilla warfare.³ Adolf Eichman, the coordinator of logistics behind the mass extermination of Jews, joined him as a military advisor before he moved on to Argentina.⁴ The list of names of the Nazis living under assumed identities or passing through the Middle East is estimated to be in the thousands, although official numbers vary. All of those who settled in Arab countries accepted new Arab names and many converted to Islam. Hitler himself, for an example, was known in the Muslim Arab world under his given Arab name of Abu Ali⁵. In Egypt alone, the numbers of arriving and residing former Nazi and Gestapo veterans were numerous enough to form a military unit named The Arab Foreign Legion by the early 1960s.⁶ In 1953, Sir Winston Churchill spoke to the House of Commons about the troublesome trend in the Arab militaries being aided and trained by the Nazi staff officers “in unusual numbers”.⁷ Those

¹ Ibid., 61-62.

² Ibid., 62.

³ Ibid., 63.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., 59.

⁶ Ibid., 64.

⁷ Ibid., 67.

political observers who were rather surprised at Nasser's daring and decisive actions preceding the 1967 war with Israel should have known better.

Syria broadly collaborated with the network of former Nazi and SS officers granting asylum to any former Nazi affiliate wishing to call it home. Among them was SS Hauptsturmführer Alois Brunner, one of the key figures in planning and execution of the Final Solution. He was confirmed to be still alive at the turn of the 21st century living in Damascus under the name of Georg Fischer. Being a valuable advisor to the Syrian secret police, he was well protected by the Syrian government who denied all demands for his extradition.¹ The leader of the Ba'ath party in Syria Sami al-Jundi wrote in his memoirs: "We were racialists. We were fascinated by Nazism, reading its books and the sources of its thought, especially Nietzsche's... We were the first who thought of translating *Mein Kampf* into Arabic."² By 1950s, *Mein Kampf*, with anti-Arab passages carefully expunged, landed among the bestsellers in the Arab countries being prominently displayed in the windows of bookstores in Egypt and Syria.³

At the same time as the favoritism toward Hitler's Germany in the Muslim Middle East grew, one could observe the amalgamation of the religious radicals and political demagogues. After 1941, Muslim Brotherhood members solemnly said

¹ Louis Bülow, "The SS Men: Master of Death - Alois Brunner," http://www.deathcamps.info/Nazis/page_9.htm.

² Stillman, *The Jews of Arab Lands in Modern Times*, 106-07.

³ *Ibid.*, 107.

prayers for an Axis victory in Europe at the opening of their meetings.¹ The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem Hajj Amin al-Husseini issued a fatwa of Jihad against the British and the Jews as “the greatest foes of Islam”.² A fatwa is a religious edict or ruling on an Islamic conduct issued by an Islamic scholar or a person of a spiritual authority. Hajj Amin al-Husseini may have been a prominent communal figure, but not a spiritual patriarch or an Imam. The same charlatan of self-nomination could be observed later in history, when Osama bin Laden, an impostor in a religious and spiritual hierarchy of Islamic religious authority (umma), declared Jihad against the Americans, British and Israelis after the first Gulf war of 1990.³ If Hassan al-Banna did not reach enough of the fanatical disciples East of Jerusalem by this point in time, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem amplified the Muslim Brotherhood’s sentiment, officially making it a part of his political agenda.

Historically never having been comprehensively separated, the religious obligations, tribal commitments and political duties of the Muslim Arabs now appeared aligned under the flag of Muftism by the onset of the World War II.

¹ Amir Taheri, *Holy Terror: Inside the World of Islamic Terrorism*, 1st ed. (Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1987), 50.

² Hajj Amin al-Husseini, "Summons to a Holy War Against Britain," in *A Fatwa issued in May, 1941*, ed. Iraqi and Axis Radio Broadcasts (British Palestine: American Christian Palestine Committee, 1946).

³ Osama bin Laden, "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places," in *Radio Broadcast*, ed. Al-Quaida (Lodon, England: Al Quds Al Arabi Newspaper, 1996).

In August 1940, Hajj Amin al-Husseini's German-speaking secretary, Uthman Kamal Haddad, smuggled al-Husseini's correspondence personally addressed to Hitler into Germany. Under an assumed alias, Haddad stopped in Ankara for a meeting with Franz von Papen, German Ambassador to Turkey. Then he entered Berlin with papers in the name of Max Muller to meet with the foreign minister of Germany Joachim von Ribbentrop.¹ In his writing, the Mufti presented himself as the most popular and the only Arab Muslim leader who enjoys the position to negotiate with Hitler on behalf of all Arabs. The independence of the Arab lands was not the exclusive theme of the approach. The address included an appeal for recognition of the Arab independence, to which Nazis agreed under the conditions of economic relations, continued Iraqi resistance, and the continued Palestinian revolt against the British. Nevertheless, the written correspondence contained strong-versed anti-Semitic language outlining anti-Semitism as the basic foundation for the alignment between the followers of the Mufti and Hitler. It said in part "full of unvanquished faith, the Arabs of Palestine fought with the most elementary mutual hatred of the English and the Jews..."² It should be noted that an overt Nazi commitment to Arab independence was an intricate matter at the time, as it could irritate Italy and France, each having imperialistic claims in the region.³

The Grand Mufti himself arrived in Rome in October 1941. Immediately upon

¹ Philip Mattar, *The Mufti of Jerusalem: Al-Hajj Amin Al-Husayni and the Palestinian National Movement* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1988), 101.

² Nation Associates, "The Arab Higher Committee: Its Origins, Personnel and Purposes: The Documentary Record Submitted to The United Nations," (New York, NY: United Nations, 1947).

³ Baram, *The Department of State in the Middle East 1919-1945*, 102-03.

his arrival he presented himself as head of the Arab National Party with clandestine branches throughout the Middle East.¹ He requested a principal recognition of the independence and sovereignty of the Arab states including Iraq, Syria, and Palestine by Germany and Italy.² Al-Husseini proposed cooperation between the fascist bloc and the aforesaid territories, which were already fascist in nature according to him.

Hajj Amin al-Husseini hardly needed an introduction. German and Italian leadership already knew of his reputation. Mussolini himself extended large sums of money and luxurious accommodations to the Mufti.³ During their meeting in the Venezia Palace on October 27, Mussolini reportedly assured Hajj Amin, “The number of Italian Jews is not more than 45,000 out of an Italian population of 45 million... each and every one of them is a spy and propagandist against us... They are our enemies... and there will be no place for them in Europe.”⁴ Hajj Amin al-Husseini’s hatred of Jews was the common ground for his cooperation with the Nazis. His later claims that the only reason for his collaboration was the struggle against the British is groundless.⁵ Germany was the embodiment of the anti-Jewish sentiment; and the destruction of the Jewish National Home was a chief idea and one of the guiding principals of al-Husseini’s path.⁶ In his written communication to Ribbentrop dated July 25, 1944 in Berlin, the Mufti insisted that “the destruction of the so-called

¹ Elpeleg, *The Grand Mufti*, 65.

² Daniel Carpi, *The Mufti of Jerusalem: Amin El-Husseini, and His Diplomatic Activity During World War II*, vol. 7, Studies in Zionism (s.n., 1983), 104-05.

³ Elpeleg, *The Grand Mufti*, 65.

⁴ Carpi, *The Mufti of Jerusalem: Amin El-Husseini, and His Diplomatic Activity During World War II*, 105-07.

⁵ Elpeleg, *The Grand Mufti*, 179.

⁶ Ibid.

Jewish National home in Palestine is an immutable part of the policy of the greater German Reich” and asked for “new practical example of the policy of the naturally allied and friendly Germany towards the Arab Nation.”¹

After obtaining assurances from Ribbentrop and Himler personally^{VIII} to destroy the idea of the Jewish National Home and annul the Balfour Declaration, al-Husseini appealed to Hungarian, Bulgarian and Romanian governments to end their Jewish problem by closing all other emigration routes and deporting the Jews to Poland, if other means were not readily available locally.² In his correspondence with the Nazi officials and their European figureheads, he pressed for personal assurances to ensure a punctual evacuation of European Jews to “... other countries where they would find themselves under active control, for example, in Poland...”³ Adolf Eichmann’s deputy Dieter Wisliceny stated in his testimony at the Nuremburg Trial the following:

The Mufti al-Husseini was one of the proponents of the systemic extermination of European Jewry and had been a collaborator and advisor of Eichmann and Himmler in the execution of the plan... he was one of Eichmann’s best friends and had constantly incited him to accelerate the extermination measures. I heard him say he visited incognito the gas chamber

¹ Nation Associates, "The Arab Higher Committee: Its Origins, Personnel and Purposes: The Documentary Record Submitted to The United Nations." As found in Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine*, 371.

² Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine*, 363.

³ Nation Associates, "The Arab Higher Committee: Its Origins, Personnel and Purposes: The Documentary Record Submitted to The United Nations." As found in Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine*, 372.

of Auschwitz accompanied by Eichmann.¹

The Saudi Kingdom was also found to be in active cooperation with the proxy of Nazism in the Middle East. The documents of the cooperation between the Axis and the Middle Eastern Muslim leaders was presented to the US Department of State by the Office of US Chief of Counsel For Prosecution of Axis Criminality from evidence collected in 1945. The summary of relevant points of the document numbered 792-PS contained the following lines:²

1. Only through the funds made available by Germany to the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem was it possible to carry out the revolt in Palestine. (Page 1)
2. Germany will keep up the connection with the Grand Mufti. Weapons will be stored for the Mufti with Ibn Saud in Arabia. (Page 2)
3. Ibn Saud himself has close connections with the Grand Mufti and the revolting circles in Transjordan. (Page 2)
4. To be able to carry out our work one of Germany's agents will be placed in Cairo. (Page 3)
5. The document is undated, but obviously written before the outbreak of the war in 1939. (Analyst Landmann)

Neither were any of these documents brought up for discussions in the forums of the United Nations since the end of World War II. They may have been filed away in light of the impending oil production boom of the Saudi-USA co-owned ARAMCO, and due to territorial competition with the Soviet Union. Realpolitik held its sway.

Having defeated Nazi Germany in the war the victor states seemed to quickly

¹ Chuck Morse, *The Nazi Connection to Islamic Terrorism: Adolf Hitler and Hajj Amin al-Husseini*. (Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, 2003), 67.

² Nation Associates, "The Arab Higher Committee: Its Origins, Personnel and Purposes: The Documentary Record Submitted to The United Nations." As found in Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine*, 435.

have forgotten the Grand Mufti's allegiances. On the contrary, they may have started to entertain possibilities of the political asset that this widely known Muslim Arab leader could hold. On the explicit orders of General de Gaulle, the Mufti was released from Cherche-Midi prison and quartered in a villa on the outskirts of Paris.¹ The British feared a new eruption of anti-British sentiment in the Arab countries; and, therefore, did not support the demands for his extradition, while the Americans did not express any interest in the Mufti at all.² In May of 1946, with a false Syrian passport and a genuine American military travel pass, he boarded a TWA plane in Paris.³ He landed in Egypt welcomed by his Nazi friends, also washed up on Egyptian shores. Yugoslavia repeatedly demanded extradition of the Mufti to be tried for war crimes and crimes against humanity with no results.⁴ Hajj Amin al-Husseini was lavishly hosted by King Farouk of Egypt. The Mufti settled in the Alayh resort and immediately sent a coded telegram to his followers in Jerusalem – "Papa has returned."⁵ The man who appealed to Muslim volunteers⁶ under the Nazi military command: "Kill the Jews!.. This pleases Allah, history and religion..,"⁷ was not tried in Nuremberg as a Nazi accomplice. He died from natural causes in 1974 leaving

¹ Michael Bar-Zohar and Eitan Haber, *Massacre in Munich: The Manhunt for the Killers Behind the 1972 Olympics Massacre* (Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press, 2006), 72.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., 73.

⁶ Antonio J. Munoz, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945* (Bayside, NY: Europa Books, Inc., 2007), 8.

⁷ Morse, *The Nazi Connection to Islamic Terrorism: Adolf Hitler and Hajj Amin al-Husseini.*, 67.

behind a strong endorsement for a vile Jew-hatred, which Hence von Leers celebrated as "... the immortal contribution of the religion of Islam."¹ During his political career, the Mufti was named a local leader of the Muslim Brotherhood after its establishment in Jerusalem in the mid-1940s by followers of Hassan Al-Banna, elected President in absentia of the Arab Higher Executive (Fourth Higher Committee of the Arab League), was declared President of the All-Palestine Government set up by the first Palestinian National Council on October 1, 1948 in Gaza, headed the World Islamic Congress in Karachi in February 1951, participated in the NAM conference in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955 and served as President of the 1962 World Islamic Congress.² No Muslim Arab leader since has repudiated him nor renounced his teachings and actions.

The acceptance of Muslim Arab support was a calculated political move for Hitler. Earlier in his *Mein Kampf*, he wrote passages that revealed his real disposition toward the peoples of the Middle East. In his own words, for example, as a man of Germanic blood, he would, in spite of everything, rather see India under the English rule than any other.³ He wrote, "... as a nationalist who appreciates the worth of the racial basis of humanity, I must recognize the racial inferiority of the so-called "Oppressed Nations", and that is enough to prevent me from linking the destiny of my

¹ Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 181.

² Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs, "Palestinian Personalities," PASSIA, <http://www.passia.org/>.

³ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. James Murphy (London, New York, Melbourne: Hurst and Blackett Ltd., 1942), 535.

people with the destiny of those inferior races.”¹ One of the leading Nazi theoreticians, Alfred Rosenberg, explicitly warned the white races to beware of “... the united hatred of colored races and mongrels led in the fanatical spirit of Muhammad.”²

Conversely, SS chief Heinrich Himmler held more of a pragmatic view of the volunteers from the Muslim Middle East. In Himmler’s view, Muslim men would make perfect SS soldiers particularly in the ideological struggle against Judaism and Communism.³ He articulated, “Muslims are already opposed to Judaism. Their religion taught them that if they die in battle, they would immediately be sent up to heaven where their needs would be taken care of by a harem of beautiful women. What better religion a soldier could have?”⁴ Himmler was also known to remark that he regretted that Germany had adopted Christianity rather than war-like Islam.⁵ Himmler complimented Islam’s attributes of blind obedience and readiness for self-sacrifice in the relentless pursuit of its enemies – all SS qualities held by Himmler in highest regard.⁶ Comments like this may have been in jest, but the practical implications of having fans on the other side of the British front lines must have been extremely alluring. Indeed, if General Rommel crossed the sands of El Alamein in 1942 with his Afrika Korps, the outcome of the WWII would undoubtedly look quite different. Himmler and Hitler quickly agreed that their racial theory could afford a

¹ Ibid.

² Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythos des XX. Jahrhunderts*, 44th ed. (Munich, Germany: s.n., 1934), 665.

³ Munoz, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*, 33.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Serge Trifkovic, *The Sword of the Prophet. Islam: History, Theology, Impact on the World* (Boston, MA: Regina Orthodox Press, Inc., 2002), 187.

⁶ Ibid.

few exceptions in light of the circumstances. Hitler was not enchanted with Himmler's neo-pagan mysticism, but readily agreed to let Islam be one of the SS religions.¹ Each battalion had its Imam and Mullahs graduated from one of the two special Islamic religious schools established by the Nazis in Gottingen and Dresden respectively.² The school in Dresden received the official blessing from the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, where the term Grand had been added by the Nazis to embellish his status, Hajj Amin al-Husseini himself.³

Waffen-Gebirgs Division der Waffen-SS Handschar was one of the SS divisions formed in Spring 1943 of Bosnian Muslim volunteers.⁴ The Division was over-subscribed – so much was the enthusiasm of the Bosnian Muslim to take up arms. The unit gained a reputation for brutality, especially among the Balkan Christian community, immediately after it had gone into action in 1944.⁵ One of the first actions of another Balkan Muslim division, 21 Waffen-Gebirgs Division der SS Skanderbeg, was gathering Kosovo's Jews for deportation.⁶ The unit was implicated in atrocities against the civilian population in the area, was not a viable combat formation, and eventually was disbanded partly due to a high desertion rate.⁷

Reichsfuhrer-SS Heinrich Himmler and the head of Waffen SS recruiting

¹ Ibid., 187.

² Munoz, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*, 37.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Gordon Williamson, *German Security and Police Soldier 1939-45* (Oxford, England: Osprey Publishing, 2002).

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ ———, *Gebirgsjager: German Mountain Trooper 1939-45* (Oxford, England: Osprey Publishing, 2003), 58.

⁷ Ibid.

office, General Gottlob Berger, formed SS units wherever they could exploit local nationalistic, anti-Semitic, and anti-Communist sentiments. The Ostturkischen Waffen Verbände der SS was ordered for formation personally by Himmler in October 1944.¹ Originally it was intended to be formed of Tatars and Turks of South Russia. Later the unit was renamed Ostmuselmanische Division der SS (East Muslim Division of the SS) and supplemented by volunteers from Turkestan, Azerbaijan, Kirgizstan, Uzbekistan and Tadzhikistan.² During the suppression of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising in July of 1944, the remnants of this division were attached to the infamous 21 thousand men strong³ Dirlewanger SS Penal Brigade, known for its gruesome atrocities.⁴

Limited information is available about Lebanese volunteers during the same period. However, at least one account suggested that numbers of them might have been assigned to the Brandenburg 287th Special Purpose Regiment, comprised of non-Germans and operating in North Africa.⁵ By September 1944, all the Brandenburg Division's commando units were placed under command of Hitler's soldier-extraordinaire the legendary Colonel Otto Skorzeny.⁶

In the end, Muslim recruits in the ranks of SS were never treated as equals by their German SS NCOs and officers, who referred to them in demeaning terms like

¹ Antonio J. Munoz, *Forgotten Legions: Obscure Combat Formations of the Waffen SS* (Bayside, NY: Axis Europa Books, 1991), 168.

² Williamson, *Gebirgsjäger: German Mountain Trooper 1939-45*, 59.

³ Munoz, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*, 40.

⁴ Williamson, *Gebirgsjäger: German Mountain Trooper 1939-45*, 59.

⁵ Munoz, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*, 100.

⁶ ———, *Forgotten Legions: Obscure Combat Formations of the Waffen SS*, 202.

Muselgermanen (mud-German). Hundreds of them ended up in concentration camps and penal battalions, while dozens were executed by the firing squad for disobedience and desertions.¹ Still, even in September 1944, the Handschar SS Division counted over eight thousand Muslim recruits within its formations.² Meanwhile, Jews were enlisting in the armed forces as volunteers as well. Over thirty thousand Palestinian Jews fought in the ranks of the British army with thousands more in local garrison duty throughout the mandated Middle East.³

Concurrently, the plight of the European and Middle Eastern Jewish population elicited some sympathetic response from the Muslim rulers of Tunisia and Morocco in the earlier periods of the war. They did not hide their distaste for the anti-Semitic decrees being implemented in the surrounding them North Africa and Algeria. In 1942, The Sultan of Tunisia Munsif Bey declared his solicitude for “all the population of the Regency.”⁴ He went out of his way to restore the royal order of merit upon the Jewish population under his jurisdiction. The Sultan of Morocco Muhammad V also criticized any changes to the status of his population as illegal and proclaimed that in his view Jewish and Muslim subjects alike were equal.⁵ He vowed to the local leaders of Jewish Community that he himself would never lay a hand “upon either their persons or their property.”⁶

There were other instances of Muslims offering help and assistance to their

¹ _____, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*, 40.

² *Ibid.*, 45.

³ Baram, *The Department of State in the Middle East 1919-1945*, 256.

⁴ Stillman, *The Jews of Arab Lands in Modern Times*, 128.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 129.

⁶ *Ibid.*

Jewish neighbors amidst of the anti-Semitism upsurge, but the overall atmosphere of spiritual and political leadership of the Muslim Arab world at the time was overwhelmingly pro-German and indifferent to the persecution of the Jews within and outside of their lands.¹ On the background of individual examples of help and compassion for the Jewish neighbors among the Muslims of North Africa, thousands of local Arabs fought on the side of either Vichy French forces or directly under the Nazi flag. In 1942-1943 and before desertions ensued toward the end of the war, Vichy French Arab formations counted fifty five thousand men in Morocco, fifty thousand in Algeria, and fifteen thousand in Tunisia.² For most of them, the primary reason for their participation in the Nazi cause was not about what the Nazis had to offer them in return, but what would be destroyed in the outcome of the Nazi victory.³

Ultimately, the more progressive Muslim leaders were made to sign German occupation agreements, as North Africa, including Tunisia and Morocco, fell under solid Nazi control by November of 1942.⁴ Winning the popularity among the local Arabs with ease, the Gestapo commenced the round up of the Jewish community members on November 23, 1942.⁵ By 1943-1944, the politics of al-Husseini and al-Quwatli with Philippe Petain^{IX} of Vichy France appeared to have the upper hand.

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the World War I anti-Semitism became a driving political force for pan-Arab Muslim nationalism. By the

¹ Ibid.

² Munoz, *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*, 29.

³ Ibid., 27.

⁴ Stillman, *The Jews of Arab Lands in Modern Times*, 130.

⁵ Ibid.

time Jewish immigration to British mandated Palestine accelerated in the early 1930s, the hatred and xenophobia overshadowed any rational thinking in a political dispute over territory, borders or nationality.

Persecution of Jews was not a new concept to the Muslim inhabitants of the Middle East. Hitler's Nazism validated it further by placing it on a racist and pseudo-scientific ground beyond the exclusively religious context. The recognition of German power and Nazi Jew-hatred echoed deep into the Muslim Arab Middle East. In the words of one of the first leaders of the Syrian Ba'ath party Sami al-Jundi, "... Nazism was the power, which could serve as its champion..."¹ When the Nazi party announced their laws on seizure of Jewish business and property in 1934, telegrams of congratulations were sent to Hitler from all corners of Arab world.² The official foreign policy of the Third Reich recognized "... the right of Palestine and other Arab countries to solve the question of the Jewish elements in Palestine and in the other Arab countries as required by national Arab interests, and in the same way as the Jewish question in the Axis lands is being solved"³ – an old idea with a modern element for the psyche of the proponents of violent Jihad. Since 1948, the formation of the Jewish state in the heart of the Middle East is universally referred to as al-nakba, or "the catastrophic disaster", among the Muslim Arabs.^x The anti-American and anti-Semitic propagandists strategically portray the State of Israel as the foot of American imperialism on the Dar al-Islam (Domain of Islam). Vehement anti-

¹ Lewis, *Semites and anti-Semites*, 148.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., 158.

Semitism is an instrument that helps to maintain Jihad at a boiling point. The historians and politicians cannot afford to dismiss the catalyzing role of those communal and political Muslim Arab leaders who shaped the legacy we are facing today. Furthermore, this legacy may very well be engulfing the future Muslim political leaders and military officers who will be engaged in shaping the world affairs. Hajj Amin al-Husseini, Rashid Ali, Sami al-Jundi and Antun Sa'ada^{XI} were not rogue mavericks, whose politics happened to coincide with those of Nazi Germany at the time. They were both, the products of their respective societies and the portals for the Nazi ideology back into the Muslim societies that would produce larger and more influential political Islamic groups in then future – now our present.

III

... in the big lie there is always a certain force of credibility; because the broad masses of a nation are always more easily corrupted in the deeper state of their emotional nature than consciously or voluntarily, and thus in the primitive simplicity of their minds they more readily fall victims to the big lie than the small lie, since they themselves often tell small lies in little matters but would be ashamed to resort to large-scale falsehoods. It would never come into their heads to fabricate colossal untruths, and they would not believe that others could have the impudence to distort the truth so infamously.¹
(Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*)^{XII}

In 2003, the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development published an article under the auspices of its Racism and Public Policy project directly pointing to the persistent xenophobia in the Middle East as experienced by the migrant workers in the region.² What begs the question is how much the present day xenophobia in the Muslim Arab world was influenced by the late Nazi racist ideology.

The military is an integral part of the Islamic political society. Military officers quite often make up the administrators, ambassadors, diplomats and attaches for the Arab regimes in the Middle East. By training young officers of the Arab armies, Otto Skorzeny's network of the masters of Nazi propaganda left a lasting legacy. Many of them advanced to positions in information and education ministries

¹ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 134.

² Ray Jureidini et al., "Migrant Workers and Xenophobia in the Middle East," in *Racism and Public Policy project*, ed. Conflict and Cohesion (2000 - 2005) program Identities (Geneva: United Nation Research Institute for Social Development, 2003).

in Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Libya and other Gulf states. Not coincidentally, the textbooks for schools and Universities in the region are full of explicit anti-Semitism. The state sponsored radio and television stations such as al-Manar, or The Beacon, broadcast hate-filled programming to millions of viewers.¹ The Egyptian Radio Cairo during the times of Nasser's government poured out volumes of anti-Western, anti-Christian, anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic invective in every conceivable language and dialect of the land.² The vocabulary employed in such broadcasts left nothing for the imagination. "Blood suckers", "descendants of apes and pigs", "white dog", "human garbage" are only a few examples of the public discourse in the national radio waves over the Middle East.³ Statements such as, "The United States is made up of the refuse of the world molded together into a solid mass of crime, graft and corruption" and "American Middle Eastern foreign policy is one of political prostitution and vagrancy of those gathered in the United States from the scum of the earth" were issued as axioms of the popular political perspective.⁴

The Nazi propaganda advisors living in the region since 1945 encouraged the development of radio and television media with a particular emphasis. They pointed out that the message should not have to wait for new literate generations, but should be reaching the uneducated Bedouin and other tribal communities starting

¹ Avi Jorisch, *Beacon of Hatred: Inside Hizballah's Al-Manar Television* (Washington, DC: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2004).

² Sedar and Greenberg, *Behind the Egyptian Sphinx*, 99.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

immediately.¹ One of the high-ranking Nazi propaganda officials at the Nazi Foreign Ministry Johann von Leers himself headed the operations and content of the Radio Cairo and its affiliates in the 1950s. By then, a convert to Islam, he was known under an assumed Arab name of Oman Amin von Leers.² From Egypt von Leers fiercely attacked the Protestant Confessional Church for its opposition to Hitler in the neo-Nazi publications of the 1950s and glorified the natural similarities between the German and Arab peoples. He wrote that this explains “the moving humanitarian reception, which... thousands of German refugees found after the war among the Muslims of the Middle East. Islam’s simple all God doctrine, which is not tied to Judaism, and its enmity against the Jews won the allegiance of many of these refugees.”³

Meanwhile, the sales of Kifahi, an Arabic edition of *Mein Kampf* distributed by the former Nazi chief of Deutsche Press Agentur, Louis Heiden, known in Egypt under his Islamic name of Louis al-Hadsch, reached 911,000 copies between 1956 and 1958 alone.⁴

At the end of 1949, amidst this atmosphere of Pan-Arab nationalism pierced with former Nazi racist demagoguery Rahman Abdul Rauf al-Qudwa al-Husseini, matriculated to the University of Cairo.⁵ The new student would become known to the world as Yasser Arafat, the front man of the Palestine Liberation Organization or PLO. Arafat held Hajj Amin al-Husseini in the highest regard, referring to him as a

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 76.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., 78.

⁵ Barry M. Rubin and Judith Colp Rubin, *Yasir Arafat: A Political Biography* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2003), 18.

hero and a martyr, when it was politically expedient.¹ The mission statement of the PLO was defined as destruction of the State of Israel and ridding the liberated Palestine of the Zionist occupants.² It eerily resembled the Mufti's goal in the 1940s. Although this time, the language used to describe the nature of the Zionist enemy comparing it to the Christian crusaders and Tatar invaders was more sophisticated.³ Just as the Grand Mufti al-Husseini, Arafat objected to Israel's right to exist in principal. He insisted that even if Israel withdrew from all the West Bank and Gaza, "the alien Zionist presence in our land" would remain as "the source of the aggression".⁴

PLO hordes left a blood trail everywhere they passed – Jordan, Lebanon, Israel, Syria, and Iran. After years of playing a destabilizing role in the Middle East, Arafat was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in 1994 merely for having signed the Declaration of Principles with the Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin a year prior. PLO's ties with ex-Nazis, such as Walter Baumann known as Ali Ben Khader and Erich Altern known as Ali Bella,⁵ to name only a few, were once again omitted. The association with the infamous proponent of Arab nationalism terrorist Carlos the

¹ Elpeleg, *The Grand Mufti*, 162.

² Muhammad Muslih, "Changing PLO Positions Toward Peace with Israel," in *The Middle East and North Africa: Essays in Honor of J.C. Hurewitz*, ed. Reeva Simon (New York, NY: Columbia University Press for the Middle East Institute of Columbia University, 1990), 138.

³ Y. Alexander and H. Foxman, "The Chapter of Allah: The Platform of Islamic Resistance Movement Hamas," ed. Palestinian Authority of Gaza and West Bank (Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990), Article 35.

⁴ Rubin and Rubin, *Yasir Arafat: A Political Biography*, 38.

⁵ Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* (Lancaster, England: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), 42.

Jackal was not remembered either. Nonetheless, Carlos the Jackal, in turn, had a very close personal and professional connection to the “Black Banker,” Francois Genoud, a Swiss banker and a Nazi financier. Reportedly the principal finance manager of the hidden Nazi Swiss assets, he bankrolled the legal defenses of Adolf Eichmann, Klaus Barbie and Carlos the Jackal.¹ Genoud was a father figure to Carlos and, not surprisingly, anti-Semite and a Holocaust denier.² He stated in his interview with a French journalist Pierre Pean, who was writing his biography, “I absolutely do not believe that there was a will for the Final Solution to eliminate the Jews...”³ Peculiarly, Francois Genoud also bankrolled Ayatollah Khomeini’s exile in France before his return to Iran in 1979.⁴ By mid-1990s Nazi money within Genoud’s reach could no longer pay for PLO’s jihad, as Genoud died in 1996 while being under investigation himself. Such a close match in dates leaves in question at least some of Arafat’s underlying motives for agreeing to accept the Declaration.

By signing the Declaration, Arafat presumably acknowledged and annulled the previous PLO articles of intolerance of Jews and Israel and recognized the right of Israel to exist. Following the accord, the emblem on the PLO flags depicting the state of Israel in green, as an undivided Palestinian entity under PLO’s authority, remained unchanged. The same could not be said of Arafat’s standings amongst his constituency. Since the signing of the declaration, his popularity as a leader of the

¹ John Follain, *Jackal* (New York, NY: Arcade Publishing, 1998), 241.

² *Ibid.*, 239.

³ *Ibid.*, 294.

⁴ Jay Bushinsky, "Swiss probe anti-U.S. neo-Nazi Suspected financial ties to al Qaeda," *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 12, 2002.

Arab nationalist movement in the region plummeted. The anti-Semitism, violence and hate did not. The semi-annual report on PLO's compliance with the Declaration submitted to US Congress on March 30, 2001 documented the Palestinian Authority's failure to take steps to ratify the accord. It detailed numerous violations of Palestinian commitments made in agreements with Israel. The report echoed many preceding and subsequent submissions in pointing out that the PA governed PLO factions had reneged on their pledge not to use violence, had failed to confiscate illegal weapons and protect holy sites, had released terrorists from Palestinian jails and had continued to incite the Palestinian public, including children, to use violence.¹

There was no separation between Church and State in classical Islam, unlike in the nations who became early adopters of Christianity. In Christendom, the co-existence of two authorities sacerdotium and regnum, or God and Caesar, is accepted and validated by the supreme sanction of the founder of the religion. The heaven-sent kingship is obliged to observe the things that God's and the things that are Caesar's. In classical Islam there are not two powers, but one; and the question of separating them is fundamentally unnecessary. In traditional Islam, at least prior to the Ottoman Empire, there was no Muslim term for "the Church" as a virtual organization or

¹ Committee on International Relations and Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, "Report Pursuant to Title VIII of Public Law 101-246 Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000-2001," in *Title VIII of Public Law 101-246 (the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 - PLOCCA)* (Washington, DC: United States Congress, 1999), Summary.

domain. All the different terms for Mosque denoted a physical place for prayer or a building, but not an abstract institution.¹

This is a distinct difference between the Islamic peoples and those who profess other religions. The danger of this predicament is that nationalistic prejudices may infiltrate the religious interpretation trickling across a thin or non-existent membrane between the secular and religious lives of the society. The same possibility is true for the religious prejudices being readily available for infiltrating the ideology of the nationalistic movement. In the context of Northern Ireland, it has been observed in Steven Bruce's 1993 publication, "Only when religion does something other than mediate between man and God does it retain a high place in people's attentions and in their politics."² When does religion do anything other than mediate between man and God? Graham E. Fuller suggests that religion steps in to play a prominent role in politics when existing political forces do not effectively meet the public's needs.³ The Iranian Revolution, the Muslim Brotherhood, Hizb ut-Tahrir al-Islami, Al-Qaeda, Jamaat-e-Islami, Fatah, Hamas and Hezbollah parties are the examples of such a void being filled with radicalism and extremism. The area of their overlap is where xenophobia, anti-Americanism, anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism converge to feed one another's vigor.

¹ Bernard Lewis, *The Political Language of Islam* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 3.

² Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, "Fundamentalism and the State: Remaking Politics, Economies and Militance," in *Fundamentalism, Ethnicity and Enclave*, ed. Steven Bruce (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

³ Graham E. Fuller, *The Future of Political Islam* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 13.

A case study of the formation and evolution of Hamas (Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiyya fi Filastin) may serve as one of the contemporary examples of sprouting seeds of hate from the surviving Nazi style xenophobic anti-Semitism. It appeared as a wing of the Muslim Brothers in Palestine in 1988. Financed by Saudi money, future Hamas members already controlled 40 per cent of mosques in Gaza and the largest in the territories Islamic University by 1986. Ironically, the Israeli occupation authorities supported Hamas, at its inception, as a useful political tool in counterbalancing the Palestinian nationalism of the PLO. The former Israeli military governor of Gaza, General Yitzhak Segev, was quoted in “A Special Report on Religious Fundamentalism” in 1988 stating “We extend some financial aid to Islamic groups via mosques and religious schools in order to help create a force that would stand against the leftist forces which support the PLO.”¹

In August of the same year, reacting to the erupting Intifada, the Muslim Brothers published “The Covenant of the Islamic Resistance Movement”. The Covenant blended within itself a puritanical version of Islam, an accommodation to PLO’s Nationalism and a recital of European anti-Semitism. Territorial nationalism, by itself previously rejected by the Muslim Brothers as idolatry, became combined with a religious claim. The document did not observe any distinctions between anti-Zionism, religious strife and anti-Semitism. Jews were named responsible for the

¹ Joel Beinin and Joe Stork, eds., *Political Islam: Essays from Middle East Report* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997), 340.

murder of the prophets, the Second World War, the League of Nations, and instigating the corruption in the Muslim society.¹

Subsequent to the issue of the Covenant, which practically mirrored the PLO's political manifesto, Hamas pledged unity with their "PLO brothers" rudely awakening the Israeli military authorities, who persistently assumed that the Islamic social conservatism must be the same as the secular political one. The crystal ball approach to policy-making resulted in a painful recoil for the Israeli administration.

One must appreciate the optimism in the peace making efforts of the Israeli administration. In the summer of 1988, then Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin personally met with prominent Islamists including Mahmud Zahar and Ibrahim Yazuri for peace talks, despite the prolific Hamas propaganda labeling the Jews as the sons of apes and swine. Before the end of 1989, after Israeli intelligence confirmed that Hamas had been behind kidnapping and killing of Israeli soldiers, Israeli administration moved to the diametrically opposite end of the spectrum and proclaimed the movement illegal.²

Essentially, Israeli policy makers made the same miscalculation at the negotiation table as their British predecessors – they offered peace in hopes to mitigate hate. Hate, in this context, is not a consequence of the conflict, but rather a reason for one. Contempt for one's foe can be tamed, once hostilities are restrained or concessions extended. However, when hate is the ideology of one's foe, a gift of peace will do little to revise it. General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq, Saddam Hussein al-

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 341.

Majid al-Tikrit, Mullah Mohammed Omar, Sheikh Ahmed Ismail Yassin, Hassan Nasrallah and Yasser Arafat are only a few names of Islamists whose conventions were not affected by granted concessions intended to pacify them. The same could be observed about Mohammad Hajj Amin al-Husseini, who received Palestine from the British, or Adolf Hitler, who received Czechoslovakia from Chamberlain.

... the conflict with the Zionist enemy has never been a border issue, nor an interstate conflict but rather a total confrontation concerning the survival of our [Arab] nationalism . . . against threats posed by the Israeli entity. (Syrian columnist Khayri Hama in Syrian daily Al-Ba'th, 1994)¹

The psychological position of Nazi Germany in the Middle East was much stronger during the Second World War than that of the Allies. There was a significant anti-British sentiment in the Arab countries, which was skillfully stimulated and exploited by the Nazi propaganda. While the Allies were confined within certain moral principals, the Axis unscrupulously used any preposterous lie to their advantage.² In the post WWI period, British colonial power was more equitable and more humane than any foreign rule in the past,³ and the Axis propaganda could not subvert the known facts about British governance. For example, the Arabs were very well aware that Britain did not levy tributes, but, instead, often paid subsidies; that she did not make requisitions, but made purchases paid for in cash; and that London provided humanitarian relief, which helped Arabs to avoid many shortages and inconveniences especially during war time. Furthermore, instead of using the Middle Eastern countries, Britain enabled them to thrive and accumulate considerable financial wealth in British banks.⁴ Henceforth, Nazi propaganda focused on the

¹ As found in Hilal Khashan, "The Levant: Yes to Treaties, No to Normalization. Polling Arab Views on the Conflict with Israel," *The Middle East Quarterly* II, no. 2 (1995), <http://www.meforum.org/article/248>.

² George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs*, Fourth ed. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1953), 370.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., 370-71.

intractable Islamic anti-Semitism in the region, and exploited it to its fullest. Hitler's war against the Jews may have supplied an additional validation to the traditional Islamic anti-Judaic prejudices.

Present day discourse in the Muslim Arab media and academia remains full of anti-Semitic rhetoric. The Muslim Arab society has never judged the deeds of the Nazi criminals as inhumane and hateful. While European and American societies learned the consequences of hate or racist propaganda, in the Middle East no debate of the lessons of WWII ever really took place. The absence of public forum, within which the behavior of a nation could be discussed and critiqued, lead to a collective blindness to the subject matter. In contrast to the United States and Europe, where public debates about slavery and civil rights, among other issues, helped the societies heal and advance toward reconciliation; the Muslim Arabs do not criticize or condemn the actions of their past Islamic leaders. This may be because for most Muslims, as Nonie Darwish^{XIII} suggested, "... criticizing jihad, martyrdom or terrorism seems in their minds – rightly or wrongly – to be equivalent to criticizing Islam itself."¹ Bernard Lewis wrote this on the topic:

... we may, indeed, must study the history of Atlantic slavery and expose this great shame in the history of the Western world and the Americas north and south, in all its horror. This is a task, which falls upon us as Westerners and in which others may, and should, and do, join us. In contrast, however, even to mention – let alone discuss or explore – the existence of slavery in non-Western societies is denounced as evidence of racism and

¹ Darwish, *Now They Call Me Infidel: Why I Renounced Jihad for America, Israel and the War on Terror*, 199.

imperialistic designs. The same applies to other delicate topics as polygamy, autocracy, and the like. The range of taboos is very wide.¹

The alliances with Nazi criminals and persecution of ethnic minorities fall securely within that range. Bernard Lewis masterfully outlined the dangers and consequences of stifling public debate about a nation's health when he pointed out,

We live in a time when great efforts have been made, and continue to be made, to falsify the record of the past and to make history a tool of propaganda; when governments, religious movements, political parties, and sectional groups of every kind are busy rewriting history as they would wish it to have been, as they would like their followers to believe that it was. All this is very dangerous indeed, to ourselves and to others, however we may define otherness – dangerous to our common humanity. Because, make no mistake, those who are unwilling to confront the past will be unable to understand the present and unfit to face the future.²

Eerie as it may be to observe such a prophecy unfolding presently at the Muslim Arab societal frontier, the words and images on the pages of academic publications, religious sermons and journalistic media of the Muslim Middle East leave no room for second guesses.

Children's educational books from as early as third grade already contain references to Jews and Western Imperialists being the primary enemies of Arabs. It starts with simple statements establishing that Jews suffered persecution throughout history for their wickedness and evil conspiracies; and culminates with religious sermons that call the faithful to not compromise in fighting the enemies of Allah. The idea of martyrdom has become so ingrained in Palestinian social development that it is not only a major theme in religious practice, television broadcasting, posters and

¹ Bernard Lewis, "Other People's History," in *Islam and the West* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994), 123.

² *Ibid.*, 130.

pre-suicide eulogies, but a large part in programming of summer camps, children's trading cards, movies, music and games. Palestinian newspapers report that the number of children who express a willingness to become martyrs exceeds 70 percent.¹ In 2006, Palestinian psychiatrist Dr. Shafiq Massalha estimated that more than half of Palestinian children between 6 and 11 years of age dream of becoming suicide bombers.² According to him, the next generation of Palestinians would be a very murderous population full of anger and hatred.

Such social statistics in the Palestinian territories beg the question of whether or not assistance and unilateral foreign aid at all mitigate the rising hatred. Between 1993 and 2006, the U.S. Agency for International Development in the West Bank and Gaza programmed an estimated \$1.7 billion in financial aid coming from the United States alone.³

Hate indoctrination played a critical role in mobilization of the cadres for violence and jihad particularly in Palestinian territories.⁴ The German hate propaganda machine intensified and emboldened the pre-existing prejudice and animosity in the region.

Most of the adult oriented journalistic editorials, religious sermons, media, entertainment programming, and academic instructional materials closely resemble

¹ Justus Reid Weiner and Noam Weissman, " Hamas' Determination to Perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The Critical Role of Hate Indoctrination," *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, no. 545 (August, 2006), <http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp545.htm>.

² Ibid.

³ USAID, "West Bank and Gaza: Country Profile," (Washington, DC: U.S. Agency for International Development, 2007), 1.

⁴ Weiner and Weissman, " Hamas' Determination to Perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The Critical Role of Hate Indoctrination."

the elements used to vilify the Jews by the Nazi propaganda machine. A few examples follow below as a very abbreviated sample set:¹

Al-Azhar Sheikh Muhammad Sayyid Tantawi, the highest-ranking cleric in the Sunni Muslim world, called the Jews "the enemies of Allah, descendants of apes and pigs." "Read history," called Al-Sudayyis in another sermon, "and you will understand that the Jews of yesterday are the evil fathers of the Jews of today, who are evil offspring, infidels, distorters of [others'] words, calf-worshippers, prophet-murderers, prophecy-deniers... the scum of the human race 'whom Allah cursed and turned into apes and pigs...'" These are the Jews, an ongoing continuum of deceit, obstinacy, licentiousness, evil, and corruption..."

April 2002, weekly talk show on the Al-Jazeera satellite television station, "The Opposite Direction", which claims to have tens of millions of viewers across the world. The moderator, Dr. Faisal Al-Qassam, included in the discussion the opinion of a viewer who wrote in from the station's website: "The sons of Zion, whom our God described as the sons of apes and pigs, will not be deterred unless there is a real holocaust, that will destroy all of them at once, together with the traitors – those who collaborate with them, the scum of this [Islamic] nation."

With regard to the fraud of the Holocaust... Many French studies have proven that this is no more than a fabrication, a lie, and a fraud!! That is, it is a 'scenario' the plot of which was carefully tailored, using several faked photos completely unconnected to the truth. Yes, it is a film, no more and no less. Hitler himself, whom they accuse of Nazism, is in my eyes no more than a modest 'pupil' in the world of murder and bloodshed. He is completely innocent of the charge of frying them in the hell of his false Holocaust!! The entire matter, as many French and British scientists and researchers have proven, is nothing more than a huge Israeli plot aimed at extorting the German government in particular and the European countries in general. But I, personally and in light of this imaginary tale, complain to Hitler, even saying to him from the bottom of my heart, 'If only you had done it, brother, if only it had really happened, so that the world could sigh in relief [without] their evil and sin. (Al-Akhbar (Egypt), April 29, 2002)

We have ruled the world before, and by Allah, the day will come when we will rule the entire world again. The day will come when we will rule America. The day will come when we will rule Britain and the entire world –

¹ As found in MEMRI, "Contemporary Islamist Ideology Authorizing Genocidal Murder."

except for the Jews. The Jews will not enjoy a life of tranquility under our rule, because they are treacherous by nature, as they have been throughout history. The day will come when everything will be relived of the Jews - even the stones and trees, which were harmed by them. Listen to the Prophet Muhammad, who tells you about the evil end that awaits Jews. The stones and trees will want the Muslims to finish off every Jew. (Palestinian Authority TV, May 13, 2005)

... for the second time, thanks 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. (Al-Akhbar (Egypt), April 25, 2001)

In an article in the Egyptian government daily Al-Ahram, Egyptian Mufti Sheikh Dr. 'Ali Gum'a expressed his support of the resistance in Lebanon and stated that the lies of the "Hebrew entity" expose "the true and hideous face of the blood-suckers... who prepare [Passover] matzos from human blood". (Al-Ahram (Egypt), August 7, 2006)

The continuous Anti-Semitic barrage in the contemporary Muslim Arab media is well documented by MEMRI – The Middle East Media Research Institute, a project that is presently monitoring the discourse. Their online archives can be found at www.memri.org.^{XIV} Even the limited examples chosen herein paint quite an explicit picture of the content in the public media forum of the Muslim Arab states.

Political cartoons in totalitarian states could be an insight into what the governments of those states want their citizenry to embrace. For example, in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany no wartime political cartoon expressing dissenting opinions could be printed.¹ Of course, one of the leading themes in Nazi German press of the period was anti-Semitism paving the way for the policy of genocide.

¹ Roy Douglas, *The World War, 1939-1943 [i.e. 1945]: The Cartoonists' Vision* (London, England: Routledge, 1990), xi.

Virulently hateful, the cartoons depicted Jews and Gypsies as not merely non-Aryans, but sub-human.¹ This propaganda strategy is not difficult to understand. The publications containing such cartoons mostly targeted uninformed, undereducated readership that could be conditioned to support policies based on preposterous racial claims. Abundant propagandistic caricatures in the present Islamist anti-Semitic publications serve essentially the same principle. In addition to that, they observably lack originality. Arab and Iranian Cartoonists draw Jews as dominating the world, manipulating world governments, subverting international justice and scheming to indulge their greed. Most of the images appear as hardly changed copies of drawings circa 1939-1943.²

Hate speech directed at either Americans, British or Jews can be found in virtually every medium of the Muslim Arab world. Some of the most prominent networks specifically located in the Middle East are Lebanese Media Group, al-Nour and al-Manar. Concurrently, operations of new Palestinian Muslim media networks grew since the Hamas victory in Gaza in 2007.

Al-Manar (The Beacon), for instance, reaches ten to fifteen million viewers per day with around the clock coverage; while it enjoys the access to the international network of 12 satellite providers and advertising sponsorship of multinational corporations. Established in 1991 by Hezbollah, it was designed to play a role of an

¹ Ibid., 61.

² See enclosed audio-visual materials.

operational weapon to incite hatred toward the United States and Israel.¹ Its operational budget, comprised mostly of Iranian money, has grown from one million dollars in 1991 to fifteen million dollars by 2002.² Viewers and listeners of al-Manar are constantly being reminded of the most sacred way to fulfill one's divine obligations – Jihad.³

Blatantly anti-Semitic and anti-Christian, al-Manar is more than just a propaganda tool. It is regularly advertising for the benefit of those organizations that seek to recruit suicide bombers, raise money and enlist new agents for the covert operations against United States interests and Israel. In 2006, Al-Manar has been deemed a Specially Designated Global Terrorist Entity (SDGT) by the United States Treasury Department.⁴ The Treasury highlighted the role of al-Manar in recruiting and fundraising for Hezbollah, as well as its function in the surveillance and intelligence for the terrorist attacks and suicide bombings. Subsequent to that, and largely due to the illumination of the network's background by the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, many prominent corporations including Coca-Cola, Pepsi and Western Union has withdrawn millions of dollars in their corporate advertising with the network. However, thanks to the proxy of major satellite

¹ Jorisch, *Beacon of Hatred: Inside Hizballah's Al-Manar Television*.

² Jeanne K. Giraldo and Harold A. Trinkunas, *Terrorism Financing and State Responses: A Comparative Perspective* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 139.

³ Jorisch, *Beacon of Hatred: Inside Hizballah's Al-Manar Television*.

⁴ Treasury Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, "U.S. Designates Al-Manar as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist Entity. Television Station is Arm of Hizballah Terrorist Network.," ed. United States Department of the Treasury (Washington, DC: United States Government Press Room, 2006).

providers like Arab League-owned Arabsat, a subsidiary of France Telecom GlobeCast, and the Egyptian government-owned Nilesat, al-Manar continues to broadcast messages of incitement and violence to Muslim population in the Middle East and Europe.¹ Al-Manar is widely popular among the Muslims living in Europe and particularly among those who speak only Arabic. Despite a sharp increase in acts of violence and extremism among Europe's Muslims, European officials have not taken any decisive steps to act against incitement of hate sponsored by the Middle Eastern partners.²

After conquering Gaza in 2007, Hamas initiated its own broadcasting of hate and Jihadi martyrdom via its television station al-Aqsa TV. Bankrolled by the same Saudi and Egyptian sponsors, even the comparatively miniature al-Aqsa TV in a narrow Gaza strip has access to the European airwaves.

Concerns should be raised over reports that the Muslim schools in Europe, United States and Canada teach the hatred of Jews and anti-Americanism. The young Muslim community in several Islamic schools in the leading world democracies is being subverted to acquire a sense of alienation from their own country.

In his 2005 expose in the New York Sun, Daniel Pipes highlighted various reports from the cities including New York and Washington DC about practices of hate speech, vilification of other religions and denigration of the American

¹ Mark Dubowitz, "Terrorist TV in Eurabia," *inFocus* (2007), <http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/article/92>.

² Ibid.

citizenship.¹ The initial reaction from the leaders of Muslim community has been reported as “shocked”; however, any further pressure by local politicians, journalists and activists on the schools to scrutinize their instructors and curriculum and to become transparent came up short.

Interestingly enough, one event organized by the student association of the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) in 2004 featured William W. Baker, who was internationally known as a neo-Nazi.² Since these event and their details are not publicly advertised, similar examples could be much more numerous than only a few.

According to PEW Research Center’s “Muslim Americans” study published in May of 2007, nearly half of Muslims in the US (47%) think of themselves first as Muslim, rather than an American. When asked whether they believed that groups of Arabs carried out the attacks against the United States on September, 11, 2001, 28% said they did not believe it, and 32% said they did not know or declined to answer. 38% of Muslims under the age of 30 reject the possibility that the 9/11 attacks were carried out by a group of Arabs. Could this be relevant to the reports on predicaments in Islamic education and the unbridled barrage of hate speech in Muslim media?

Still, the data sets gathered in the United States leaves us with more hope than the ones collected in Europe or the Middle East. Much more so than their European and Middle Eastern counterparts, the American Muslims are concerned about the rise

¹ Daniel Pipes, "Anti-Semitism in Muslim Schools," *New York Sun*, March 29, 2005.

² ———, "CAIR Promotes and Hosts William W. Baker, Neo-Nazi," *Daniel Pipes Blog* (2004), www.danielpipes.org/blog/195.

of Islamic extremism around the world (76%), concerned about the rise of Islamic extremism in the United States (61%) and believe that a solution can be found for Israel to exist so that the rights and needs of Palestinian Arabs are met (61%) – a view not shared by Muslim in the Arab countries.¹

Why is such background information indispensably important for the Western policy makers? Because when refusing to observe the facts, as uncomfortable as they may be, politicians are bound to suffer from narrow-sightedness. Such narrow-sightedness leads to empowering those who undermine cooperation and pluralism. British, American and Israeli policy makers backed numerous governments in South America, Africa and Middle East, whom they had to face later in a military confrontation paying high tolls with the lives of their soldiers and civilians. Such governments and organizations include the PLO, Ba'ath Party, Hamas and the Taliban, to name only a few. The presumed pragmatism of striking an accord with an ideological adversary did not produce desired results. Similar parallels in appeasement of the raging hate monger could be traced in history back to concessions of Chamberlain and Stalin to Hitler and the British Colonial Office to Hajj Amin al-Husseini. While choosing the high road of integrity may seem as an idealistic utopia, the alternative of playing the multi-level game of real politik has not gotten the Middle East any closer to peace or cooperation.

¹ PEW Research Center, "Muslims Americans: Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream," ed. Richard Morin (PEW Research Center, 2007), 49.

CONCLUSION

Peace with Jews is Blasphemy
Political slogan of Hamas

... when they will love their children more than they hate us...
Golda Meir, Prime Minister of the State of Israel 1969-1974

The world media and political circles have not sufficiently acknowledged Nazi Germany's ties and influence in the Muslim Arab world. Hitler's *Mein Kampf* remains among the top sellers in the region even at the cost of \$10^{XV}.¹ Luis al-Haj, the translator, wrote in his preface, "National Socialism did not die with the death of its herald. Rather, its seeds multiplied under each star."² Virulent anti-Semitism is one of the similarities National Socialism, or ethno-centric nationalism, and Global Islamism continue to share in common.³

Whether the aforementioned Arab Muslim leaders looked up to Nazi Germany because of their religious beliefs, or because they had propensity for despotism, nationalistic domination, and thirst for power is less important to us than what the present generation knows and makes of it. Those who followed their lead reinforce the front along the fault lines of cultural, religious, political, and economic frictions in the Middle East and beyond. The way of the Hajj Amin al-Husseini is alive today

¹ Sean O'Neill and John Steele, "Mein Kampf for sale, in Arabic," *Telegraph.co.uk* (2002), <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1388161/Mein-Kampf-for-sale,-in-Arabic.html>.

² Ibid.

³ Desai, *Rethinking Islamism: The Ideology of the New Terror*, 151.

through the likeminded individuals who choose to carry on his views.

Nazi style anti-Semitism has adversely impacted Muslim-Jewish relations, leaving behind long lasting fallout. Vilification of Jews and anti-Semitism is as much a state-sponsored article of faith today in most of Muslim Arab nations as it was in Nazi Berlin. The racist and nationalistic legacy of Hajj Amin al-Husseini and his contemporaries remains a burden on the Arab conscience.

Hugh Trevor-Roper, a British historian sent to Jerusalem by the Sunday Times to cover the 1961 Adolf Eichmann trial wrote this in his editorial:

Nazis are far more alive to Israel than to us. Like the Jews, their enemies too have now gone East. If several Nazi war-criminals escaped to South America, to lie low, many more have escaped to the Arab countries, to put their Nazi anti-Semitism and their German efficiency at the disposal of the new nationalist rulers of the Near East, who also have their “Final Solution” for the Jews who have settled in their midst.¹

This malignancy was allowed to go on to further penetrate political, religious and social forces of the Muslim Arab states. Turning away from the history and selectively closing our eyes to its facts will not help the world erase the divides between the Islamic and the non-Islamic, the West and the East or the democratic and the monarchial.

After 1945, the United States Department of State concentrated its efforts on more global goals of foreign policy. It demonstrated great insight and efficiency in preventing the Soviets from gaining footholds in the Middle East in 1945 and thereafter; while Moscow, feeding its own ambitions to make inroads into the Near

¹ Idith Zertal and Chaya Galai, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, trans. Chaya Galai (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 100.

East,¹ issued its renewed endorsement of Hajj Amin al-Husseini after the end of the war.² Realpolitik lead the Soviet policy makers to the same Arabs who were striking deals with the Nazis during the war. Without gravely alienating USSR, the State Department was able to neutralize Soviet interests in Lebanon, Syria and Palestine, kept USSR away from the Persian Gulf, defused the Soviet anti-imperialist and pro-nationalist propaganda, while accepting USSR as an authoritative regional power in a large part of the Mediterranean basin.³ Concurrently, Washington diminished Britain's ability to act unilaterally, while making her a junior partner in the Anglo-American front in the Middle East.⁴ The State Department's skill at the balancing game in the post war period was second to none. Unfortunately, it did not encompass initiatives to cleanse the region of the hate elements and organizations.

In the end, the State Department's selective pseudo pluralism hurt the interests of minorities in the Middle East. The Department opposed geo-political aspirations of Jews, Maronite Christians, Kurds and Assyrians – paradoxically all those who did not align with the Axis during the war – out of fears for inadvertently creating power vacuums and alienating the Sunni Arabs.⁵ In the view of State Department, endorsing pluralism in perpetuity was a practice of bad imperialists, who conspired to divide and rule.⁶ Moreover, Washington postulated that deep-rooted minorities, despite their

¹ George W. Breslauer, *Soviet Strategy in the Middle East* (London, England: Routledge, 1990), 10.

² Baram, *The Department of State in the Middle East 1919-1945*, 108.

³ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 327-28.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 328.

communal and cultural differences with the rest of the populace, were supposed to be absorbed within the native majority, just like they were absorbed in the United States.¹ At the very same time, Sir Winston Churchill and many in the British Foreign Office believed that Jewish and Arab dreams of statehood were reconcilable and partition was a viable course.² In very basic terms, the US Administration fell short of distinguishing a national independence movement from its destructive shadow – ethno-centric exclusionary nationalism.

In retrospect, the wartime wishes of US Navy and the State Department's counterpart Department of War to build a pipeline independently from ARAMCO and, perhaps, establish a protected enclave at Dhahran³ might seem healthier than elevating Ibn Saud, a Third Reich sympathizer and an avid anti-Semite,⁴ from a wealthy local sheik to a dominion over the life blood of the world economy.

The heritage of hate will continue to morph and metastasize if left unchallenged. A constructive critique of this chapter of Muslim Arab history should not be viewed as purely anti-Arab or as a demeaning attack on Islam. To see it as such would be the same as to suggest that a criticism of Lenin's Communism is anti-Russian, criticism of Napoleonic conquest is anti-French or criticism of Hitler's National Socialism is anti-German.

The educational publications in the Arab world are full of indictments against

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 258.

³ Ibid., 324.

⁴ John Loftus and Mark Aarons, *The Secret War Against the Jews: How Western Espionage Betrayed the Jewish People* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1997), 68.

the supposed Western and Jewish conspiracies, no matter how contemptible those teachings may be. Concurrently, the majority of Western academics are shy of any meaningful acknowledgement of the facts relevant to the subject derived from the modern history of the Middle East. Among many possible examples, A Concise History of the Middle East (2005), by Arthur Goldschmidt and Lawrence Davidson, is a 559-page volume. Frequently referenced and selected as a text source for many university courses across the United States, it covers the periods of both world wars, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and details the profile of Hajj Amin al-Husseini; while saying absolutely nothing about his involvement with Hitler. On the contrary, it directly advocates that "... it is historically incorrect to regard him as a Nazi".¹ It goes on to assert: "He was the leader of a nationalist movement fighting against British Imperialism and Zionist colonialism."² It does, however, depict the Mufti – the man who was personally received by Hitler and recruited hundreds of Muslim volunteers for the Nazi SS Brigades – as "a hero to the Palestinian Arabs".³

Regrettably, most of the leading publications, including those cited in this paper, do not challenge the pacified rendition of the calamitous alliance of the Muslim Middle East with one of the principal enemies of the modern civilization – Nazism. Could this be why anti-Americanism is measured at its highest levels since the nineteenth century in the Arab world?

Dr. Akbar Ahmed, Ibn Khaldun Chair of Islamic Studies at the American

¹ Arthur Goldschmidt Jr. & Lawrence Davidson, *A Concise History of the Middle East*, Eighth ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2005), 282.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

University in Washington DC, is one of the world's leading authority on contemporary Islam.^{xvi} Dr. Ahmed is a former Pakistani Ambassador to Great Britain and the author of several books including Journey Into Islam: The Crisis of Globalization and Islam Under Siege. In order to stimulate a dialogue promoting a Muslim-Jewish-American understanding, he embarked upon a cross-country initiative teaming up with the father of the murdered American journalist Daniel Pearl, Dr. Judea Pearl. Citing his personal surveys and research for Journey Into Islam, Dr. Ahmed expresses a concern that xenophobia and anti-Semitism are at their highest particularly among the younger population of the Muslim Arab world.¹ A collective amnesia with respect to the Nazi ideological presence in the region will not help to reverse the trend. Withholding a component of the historical matrix could only lead to a biased historical perspective. In the words of Golda Meir, "One cannot and must not try to erase the past merely because it does not fit the present."

Could this be why the progressive Muslims like Nonie Darwish are labeled infidels and blasphemous traitors of Islam by the Islamists? Perhaps, that is why Syria – the cradle of the Ba'ath party, which was inspired by and copied after Hitler's National Socialist German Workers' Party² – has been allowed to be a permanent member and a chair of the U.N. Security Council? Could this be why Western intellectuals regressed to equate the only democracy in the stifling theocratic climate

¹ Akbar S. Ahmed, *Journey Into Islam: the Crisis of Globalization* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2007).

² Michael Curtis, ed., *Proceedings of the annual conference of the American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East, People and Politics in the Middle East* (New Brunswick, NJ: transaction Books, 1971), 135-37.

of the Middle East with apartheid and blame Israelis for their own demise?^{xvii} Is it due to looking at the Middle East history through a dimmed prism, President Carter was determined to see Yasser Arafat as a man of peace in the 1970s? Fifteen years later in 1994, Yasser Arafat, the heir of hate and a master terrorist, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize by the international community. Another five years later, PLO under the command of Yasser Arafat unleashed the worst yet reign of terror (intifada) upon Israeli civilians. The dimmed prism will continue to render visions similar to those seen through a kaleidoscope, if history is ignored.

If there is an ongoing conflict between the antagonists on the collision course to war, as we are lead to believe vis-à-vis the concept of the Clash of Civilizations, it very well could be the conflict between irreconcilable general entities of “chauvinism” and “pluralism,” rather than specifically between Chino-Islamic and Judeo-Christian civilizations, as Samuel Huntington might have proposed. Bigotry, racism, anti-Semitism and xenophobia are very likely symptoms of this hate-induced divide.

However, entering the twenty first century, American policy makers still tended to follow the old playbook. At the Wye Plantation Summit in 1998, Yasser Arafat, then the chairman of the PLO, conceded to delete the section calling for the destruction of Israel from the Palestinian Charter. Subsequently, upon leaving the conference room, the Israeli delegation was approached by one of the closest advisers to President Clinton, who reportedly shouted at them: “Are you out of your minds!.. he is going to be killed because of that! He is too weak for dramatic steps like that -

first he needs to be strengthened!”¹ Even near his disappearance from the political landscape, politically bankrupt and rejected by most of the Palestinian Arabs as corrupt and no longer relevant, Arafat needed to be strengthened according to United States leadership at the time.

The Annapolis Conference of 2007 exhibited very similar ill-guided approach to negotiations by the Western powers. When a representative of the US agency engaged in building up the destroyed Palestinian economy was approached with a question of why the US is not making the aid to Palestinian Authority strictly contingent on halting the anti-Israeli and anti-American incitements on the official television channels and in the education system, he answered with this: “Abu Mazen is so weak now, and this is such a not popular step. First of all, it is necessary to strengthen him and then afterward it will be possible to demand something of him.”²^{XVIII} An argument is begging to be made that the old paradigm of making peace with the strongest is not the best policy any more. Perhaps, it needs to be reworded into “making peace with the likeminded.”

Knowing and owning the historical facts about their political and religious leaders may help the new generations of Muslim Arabs to examine their own position on the international matters and choose a corrected vector on the course to reconciliation. The relation of the Islamist anti-Semitism and late Nazi Fascism in the

¹ Natan Sharansky, "Distorted Reasoning at Annapolis: Why the Conference is Doomed to Failure," *Jewish World* (2007), http://www.aish.com/jewishissues/middleeast/Distorted_Reasoning_at_Annapolis.asp

² Ibid.

Muslim Arab Middle East does not lack documentation - it lacks acknowledgement.

The Muslim Arab world must become competent in its whole history without selective omissions, not to parade it for the sake of shaming the present generation by the past of their fathers, but to gain an insight into factors contributing to the conflict and prejudice.

REFERENCES:

- Ahmed, Akbar S. *Journey Into Islam: the Crisis of Globalization*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2007.
- al-Hassan, al-Mawardi Abu. "El-Ahkam es-Soulthaniya (A Treatise on Muslim Public Law)." In *The Legacy of Jihad: Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims* by Andrew G. Bostom, edited by Count Leon Ostrorog, 29 as cited, 60, 77-8, 200-01 in original. London, 1996.
- al-Husseini, Hajj Amin. "Summons to a Holy War Against Britain." In *A Fatwa issued in May, 1941*, edited by Iraqi and Axis Radio Broadcasts. British Palestine: American Christian Palestine Committee, 1946.
- al-Qayrawani, Ibn Abi Zayd. "Epitre sur les elements du dogme et de la loi de l'Islam selon le rite malikite." In *The Legacy of Jihad: Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims* by Andrew G. Bostom, edited by Leon Bercher, 165 in original, 27 as cited,. Algiers, 1960.
- al., Ray Jureidini et. "Migrant Workers and Xenophobia in the Middle East." In *Racism and Public Policy project*, edited by Conflict and Cohesion (2000 - 2005) program Identities, 17. Geneva: United Nation Research Institute for Social Development, 2003.
- Alexander, Y., and H. Foxman. "The Chapter of Allah: The Platform of Islamic Resistance Movement Hamas." edited by Palestinian Authority of Gaza and West Bank. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990.
- Ali, Maulana Muhammad. *Muhammad The Prophet*. Edited by and writer of an *Urdu Rafsir* Translator of the Holy Qur'an into English. Lahore, India: Ahmadiyya Anjuman-I-Isha'at-I-Islam, 1924.
- Amin, Camron Michael. *The Making of the Modern Iranian Woman: Gender, State Policy, and Popular Culture, 1865-1946*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2002.
- Arasteh, A. Reza. *Education and Social Awakening in Iran, 1850-1968*. Second ed. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Baram, Phillip J. *The Department of State in the Middle East 1919-1945*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978.
- Beinin, Joel, and Joe Stork, eds. *Political Islam: Essays from Middle East Report*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.
- Bernstein, Peretz F. *Jew-Hate As A Sociological Problem*. Translated by David Saraph. New York, NY: Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Bienkowski, Piotr, and Alan Millard. *Dictionary of the Ancient Near East*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Black, Edwin. *Banking on Baghdad: Inside Iraq's 7,000-Year History of War, Profit, and Conflict*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004.
- Breslauer, George W. *Soviet Strategy in the Middle East*. London, England: Routledge, 1990.
- Bülow, Louis. "The SS Men: Master of Death - Alois Brunner." http://www.deathcamps.info/Nazis/page_9.htm.

- Bush, George W. "President Discusses War on Terror at National Endowment for Democracy ", edited by The White House. Washington, DC: Office of the Press Secretary, 2005.
- . "Statement on Holocaust Denial Conference Sponsored by Iranian Regime." edited by The White House. Washington, DC: Office of the Press Secretary, December 12, 2006.
- Bushinsky, Jay. "Swiss probe anti-U.S. neo-Nazi Suspected financial ties to al Qaeda." *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 12, 2002.
- Carpi, Daniel. *The Mufti of Jerusalem: Amin El-Husseini, and His Diplomatic Activity During World War II*. Vol. 7, Studies in Zionism: s.n., 1983.
- Chancellery, German Foreign Ministry and the Reich. "Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945: Series D (1937-1945)." edited by United States Department of State, 295 (974). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1954.
- Churchill, Sir Winston. *The Second World War: The Grand Alliance*. Vol. III. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985.
- . *The World Crisis, 1911-1918*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 2005.
- Churchill, Winston S., ed. *Never Give In!* Edited by Winston S. Churchill, The Best of Winston Churchill's Speeches. New York, NY: Hyperion, 2003.
- Clark, Alan. *Suicide of the Empires: The Battles on the Eastern Front, 1914-18*. Second ed. Winter Park, FL: American Heritage Press, 1971.
- Curtis, Michael, ed. *Proceedings of the annual conference of the American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East, People and Politics in the Middle East*. New Brunswick, NJ: transaction Books, 1971.
- Darwish, Nonie. *Now They Call Me Infidel: Why I Renouced Jihad for America, Israel and the War on Terror*. USA: Penguin Group, 2006.
- Davidson, Arthur Goldschmidt Jr. & Lawrence. *A Concise History of the Middle East*. Eighth ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2005.
- Davis, William Sterns. *A Short History of the Near East: From the founding of Constanople (330 A.D. to 1922)*. New York, NY: The MacMillan Company, 1923.
- Dawidowicz, Lucy S., and David A. Altshuler. *Hitler's War Against the Jews*. West Orange, NJ: Behrman House, Inc., 1978.
- Desai, Meghnad. *Rethinking Islamism: The Ideology of the New Terror*. New York, NY: I.B. Tauris & Co., Ltd., 2007.
- Douglas, Roy. *The World War, 1939-1943 [i.e. 1945]: The Cartoonists' Vision*. London, England: Routledge, 1990.
- Dubowitz, Mark. "Terrorist TV in Eurabia." *inFocus* (2007), <http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/article/92>.
- Elpeleg, Zvi. *The Grand Mufti: Haj Amin al-Hussaini, Founder of the Palestinian National Movement*. Translated by David Harvey. Edited by Shmuel Himelstein. London, England: Frank Cass & Co., LTD, 1993.

- Esposito, John L. *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*. Paperback ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Fathi, Nazila. "Holocaust Deniers and Skeptics Gather in Iran." *The New York Times*, December 11, 2006.
- Follain, John. *Jackal*. New York, NY: Arcade Publishing, 1998.
- Franks, Tim. "The next UN investigator into Israeli conduct in the occupied territories has stood by comments comparing Israeli actions in Gaza to those of the Nazis." *BBC World Service* (2008), http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/middle_east/7335875.stm.
- Fraser, T. G., ed. *The Middle East 1914-1979*. Edited by A.G. Dickens, Documents of Modern History. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1980.
- Frye, Richard N. *The Heritage of Persia*. First ed, The World Histories of Civilization. Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company, 1963.
- Fuller, Graham E. *The Future of Political Islam*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- Ghani, Cyrus. *Iran and the Rise of Reza Shah: From Qajar Collapse to Pahlavi Power*. New York, NY: I.B.Tauris & Co. LTD, 2001.
- Giraldo, Jeanne K., and Harold A. Trinkunas. *Terrorism Financing and State Responses: A Comparative Perspective*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. *Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the Politics of Identity*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2001.
- Haas, William S. *Iran*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1946.
- Haber, Michael Bar-Zohar and Eitan. *Massacre in Munich: The Manhunt for the Killers Behind the 1972 Olympics Massacre*. Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press, 2006.
- Hambly, Gavin. "The Pahlavi Autocracy: Riza Shah, 1921-1941." In *The Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. 7: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, edited by P.W. Avery, G.R.G. Hambly and C.P. Melville, 213-43. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Herf, Jeffrey. *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Hirschberg, Haiim Z'ev. *History Until 1880*. Edited by The Hebrew University of Jerusalem Prof. Menahem Stern; Professor of Jewish History, Israel Pocket Library. Jerusalem, Israel: Keter Publishing House, 1973.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. Translated by James Murphy. London, New York, Melbourne: Hurst and Blackett Ltd., 1942.
- Hopkirk, Peter. *On Secret Service East of Constantinople: The Plot To Bring Down the British Empire*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *Setting The East Ablaze: On Secret Service in Bolshevik Asia*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . *The Great Game: the Struggle for Empire in Central Asia*. New York, NY: Kodansha International, 1994.

- Intelligence, Treasury Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial. "U.S. Designates Al-Manar as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist Entity. Television Station is Arm of Hizballah Terrorist Network.", edited by United States Department of the Treasury. Washington, DC: United States Government Press Room, 2006.
- Ireland, Parliament of United Kingdom of Great Britain and. *Fourth Series: Third Session of the Twenty-Eighth Parliament of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*. Edited by His Majesty's Stationary Office. Authorised Edition ed. Vol. Fifth Volume of Session, The Parliamentary Debates. Fetter Lane, London: Wyman and Sons Limited, Under Contract with His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1908.
- Jorisch, Avi. *Beacon of Hatred: Inside Hizballah's Al-Manar Television*. Washington, DC: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2004.
- Kazemzadeh, F. "Iranian Relations With Russia and the Soviet Union, to 1921." In *The Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. 7: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, edited by P.W. Avery, G.R.G. Hambly and C.P. Melville, 314-49. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Kepel, Gilles. *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*. Translated by Anthony F. Roberts. First English ed. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Kerner, Robert J. "Russia, the Straits, and Constantinople, 1914-15 " *The Journal of Modern History* 1, no. 3 (1929): 16.
- Khalidi, Walid. "The Arab Perspective." In *The End of the Palestine Mandate*, edited by William Roger Louis and Robert W. Stookey, 181. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Khashan, Hilal. "The Levant: Yes to Treaties, No to Normalization. Polling Arab Views on the Conflict with Israel." *The Middle East Quarterly*, no. 2 (1995), <http://www.meforum.org/article/248>.
- Klausner, Carla L., and Ian J. Bickerton. *A Concise History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Fourth ed. New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- Kramer, Martin. "Coming to Terms: Fundamentalists or Islamists?" *Middle East Quarterly* (2003): 65-77.
- Laden, Osama bin. "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places." In *Radio Broadcast*, edited by Al-Quaida. Lodon, England: Al Quds Al Arabi Newspaper, 1996.
- Laqueur, Walter. *The Changing Face of Antisemitism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Laqueur, Walter, and Barry Rubin, eds. *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*. Edited by Walter Laqueur. Sixth ed, Israel-Arab Reader. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Lee, Loyd E., and Robin D. S. Higham. *World War II in Europe, Africa, and the Americas, with General Sources: A Handbook of Literature and Research*. Edited by Loyd E. Lee. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997.

- Lenczowski, George. *Russia and the West in Iran, 1918-1948: A Study in Big Power Rivalry*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1949.
- . *The Middle East in World Affairs*. Fourth ed. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1953.
- Lewis, Bernard. *Islam in History: Ideas, People, and Events in the Middle East*. Second ed. Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing, 1993.
- . "Other People's History." In *Islam and the West*, 123, 30. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . *Semites and anti-Semites: An Inquiry Into Conflict and Prejudice*. Paperback ed. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1999.
- . *The Political Language of Islam*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- . *What Went Wrong?: Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lieberman, Benjamin. *Terrible Fate: Ethnic Cleansing In the Making of Modern Europe*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006.
- Loftus, John, and Mark Aarons. *The Secret War Against the Jews: How Western Espionage Betrayed the Jewish People*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1997.
- Louis, William Roger. *Imperialism at Bay: the United States and the Decolonialization of the British Empire 1941-1945*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Marty, Martin E., and R. Scott Appleby. "Fundamentalism and the State: Remaking Politics, Economies and Militance." In *Fundamentalism, Ethnicity and Enclave*, edited by Steven Bruce, 51. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Mattar, Philip. "The Mufti of Jerusalem and the Politics of Palestine, 1917-48: An Overview." In *The Middle East and North Africa: Essays in Honor of J.C. Hurewitz*, edited by Reeva Simon, 119, 28-29, 31. New York, NY: Columbia University Press for the Middle East Institute of Columbia University, 1990.
- . *The Mufti of Jerusalem: Al-Hajj Amin Al-Husayni and the Palestinian National Movement*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- McMurray, Jonathan S. *Distant Ties: Germany, the Ottoman Empire and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 2001.
- MEMRI. "Contemporary Islamist Ideology Authorizing Genocidal Murder." In *ANTISEMITISM DOCUMENTATION PROJECT: Middle East Media Research Institute*, 2004.
- Morse, Chuck. *The Nazi Connection to Islamic Terrorism: Adolf Hitler and Hajj Amin al-Husseini*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, 2003.
- Munoz, Antonio J. *Forgotten Legions: Obscure Combat Formations of the Waffen SS*. Bayside, NY: Axis Europa Books, 1991.
- . *Hitler's Muslims: Muslim Volunteers in Hitler's Armies, 1941-1945*. Bayside, NY: Europa Books, Inc., 2007.

- Muslih, Muhammad. "Changing PLO Positions Toward Peace with Israel." In *The Middle East and North Africa: Essays in Honor of J.C. Hurewitz*, edited by Reeva Simon, 138. New York, NY: Columbia University Press for the Middle East Institute of Columbia University, 1990.
- Nation Associates. "The Arab Higher Committee: Its Origins, Personnel and Purposes: The Documentary Record Submitted to The United Nations." 9. New York, NY: United Nations, 1947.
- Nicosia, Francis R. *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press, 1985.
- O'Neill, Sean, and John Steele. "Mein Kampf for sale, in Arabic." *Telegraph.co.uk* (2002), <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1388161/Mein-Kampf-for-sale,-in-Arabic.html>.
- Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs. "Palestinian Personalities." PASSIA, <http://www.passia.org/>.
- Paris, Timothy J. *Britain, the Hashemites and Arab Rule, 1920-1925: The Sherifian Solution*. London, England: Frank Cass, 2003.
- Peters, Joan. *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict Over Palestine*. Chicago, IL: J. KAP Publishing, 2000. Reprint, 2000.
- PEW Research Center. "Muslims Americans: Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream." edited by Richard Morin, 102: PEW Research Center, 2007.
- Pipes, Daniel. "Anti-Semitism in Muslim Schools." *New York Sun*, March 29, 2005.
- . "CAIR Promotes and Hosts William W. Baker, Neo-Nazi." *Daniel Pipes Blog* (2004), www.danielpipes.org/blog/195.
- Qutb, Sayyid. *Milestones*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Printers, 1978.
- Ramazani, Rouhollah K. *Iran's Foreign Policy 1941-1973: A Study of Foreign Policy in Modernizing Nations*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975.
- . *The Foreign Policy of Iran 1500-1941: A developing Nation in World Affairs*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1966.
- Relations, Committee on International, and Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. "Report Pursuant to Title VIII of Public Law 101-246 Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000-2001." In *Title VIII of Public Law 101-246 (the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 - PLOCCA)*, 103. Washington, DC: United States Congress, 1999.
- Rezun, Miron. *The Soviet Union and Iran: Soviet Policy in Iran From the Beginning of the Pahlavi Dynasty Until the Soviet Invasion in 1941*, Collection de Relations Internationales. Geneve: Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales via Brill Archive, 1981.
- Rosenberg, Alfred. *Der Mythos des XX. Jahrhunderts*. 44th ed. Munich, Germany: s.n., 1934.
- Rubin, Barry M., and Judith Colp Rubin. *Yasir Arafat: A Political Biography*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Sarkar, Jadunath. "The Islamic State Church in India." In *History of Aurangzib: Northern India, 1658-1681*, edited by K. S. Lal, 283-97. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1920.

- Sedar, Irving, and Harold J. Greenberg. *Behind the Egyptian Sphinx: Nasser's Strange Bedfellows - Prelude to World War Three?* First ed. Philadelphia, PA: Chilton Company, 1960.
- Sharansky, Natan. "Distorted Reasoning at Annapolis: Why the Conference is Doomed to Failure." *Jewish World* (2007), http://www.aish.com/jewishissues/middleeast/Distorted_Reasoning_at_Annapolis.asp.
- Stillman, Norman A. *The Jews of Arab Lands in Modern Times*. First Paperback ed. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003.
- Taheri, Amir. *Holy Terror: Inside the World of Islamic Terrorism*. 1st ed. Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1987.
- Toye, P., ed. *Palestine Boundaries 1833–1947*. 4 vols. Vol. 2, Near & Middle East Titles. Slough, England: Archive Editions Ltd., 1989.
- Trifkovic, Serge. *The Sword of the Prophet. Islam: History, Theology, Impact on the World*. Boston, MA: Regina Orthodox Press, Inc., 2002.
- United States Department of State. "Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, 1940: The British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, the Near East and Africa ", edited by United States Department of State, 706 (1028). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.
- . "Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, 1941: The British Commonwealth, the Near East and Africa." edited by United States Department of State, 412, 13, 22-33, 800-01 (998). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
- USAID. "West Bank and Gaza: Country Profile." 3. Washington, DC: U.S. Agency for International Development, 2007.
- Weiner, Justus Reid, and Noam Weissman. " Hamas' Determination to Perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The Critical Role of Hate Indoctrination." *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, no. 545 (August, 2006), <http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp545.htm>.
- Wilber, Donald N. *Iran: Past and Present*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1948.
- Williamson, Gordon. *Gebirgsjager: German Mountain Trooper 1939-45*. Oxford, England: Osprey Publishing, 2003.
- . *German Security and Police Soldier 1939-45*. Oxford, England: Osprey Publishing, 2002.
- Ye'or, Bat. *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis*. Lancaster, England: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005.
- . *Islam and Dhimmitude: Where Civilizations Collide*. Translated by Miriam Kochan and David Littman. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2002.
- Zertal, Idith, and Chaya Galai. *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*. Translated by Chaya Galai. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey: A Modern History*. New York, NY: I.B.Tauris & Co. LTD, 2004.

ENDNOTES:

^I As one of the most recent examples, Princeton professor emeritus Richard Falk was scheduled to take up post for the UN Human Rights Council in the 2008. Previously, Mr. Falk publicly accused Israel of Nazi-like atrocities and racism, insisting that they are fully comparable to the genocide crisis in Darfur, Sudan.

^{II} Eretz Israel is translated as “the Land of Israel”. Since using one of the names of the land exclusively throughout the article might have been found biased toward one of the sides of the political conflict involving the land, I used the name appropriated to the geography by the historical period in context. (Canaan, Levant, Filastin, Philistines, Transjordan, British Palestine, Palestine, Eretz Israel, Israel are some of the names rotated through the recent history)

^{III} Hence there were the Junds of Damascus, Urdunn and Filastin stretching from North to South of Levant.

^{IV} “Islamism” as a term first is believed to have appeared in French in the mid-eighteenth century. Oxford English Dictionary lists the term Islamism as early as 1747. At first synonymous with Islam itself as a religious movement, later it gained an association with a political ideology. Presently, it often represents expressions suggesting that Islam fundamentally is not only a religion, but also a political system. {Martin Kramer, "Coming to Terms: Fundamentalists or Islamists?," Middle East Quarterly (2003).}

^V The personal diary of the Field Marshall Ironside was published by his son after his death. See also Ghani, Iran and the Rise of Reza Shah: From Qajar Collapse to Pahlavi Power, 107-16.

^{VI} One rial equaled 3.077 cents of a US dollar during the times estimated

^{VII} The swastika or its various incarnations could be found throughout Mesopotamia and Asia on prehistoric painted pottery and artisans’ crafts. It completed the array of other geometric motifs in the ancient Mesopotamian art. The ornamental signs closely resembling Nazi swastika were found on some ancient structures including the limestone slab of the Neo-Assyrian Temple facade in Ashur, as one example. {Piotr Bienkowski and Alan Millard, Dictionary of the Ancient Near East (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 282.} Swastika is believed to have come from the ancient Sumerian civilization and lost its significance by the end of Mesopotamian period. It is plausible that it was further forgotten with the Islamic conquest and diminishing of Paganism.

^{viii} Copies of official correspondence on the subject written between April 1942 and November 1943 are cited by Joan Peters in “From Time Immemorial”. She has served as White House consultant on the Middle East during the Carter administration.

^{ix} Also see Gen. Henry Fernand Dentz, a Vichy French General during the WWII sentenced to death in 1945 for aiding the Axis powers. {Baram, *The Department of State in the Middle East 1919-1945*, 101.}

^x A customary term among the Muslim Arabs to describe the tumultuous year of 1948 for the Muslim Arabs of British mandated Palestine; some academics and historians also use the term al-nakba. The use of the term in the academic literature can be quite ambiguous as to the implied fault or responsibility for the disaster that it refers to such as in this example: “... the ultimate cause of the Palestinian tragedy was a process that began with the Balfour promise to the Zionists in 1917 and ended in the nakba of 1948. British and, eventually Zionist and Hashemite policies, actions, and forces overwhelmed a weak society with a traditional and ineffective leadership and organization.” {Mattar, “The Mufti of Jerusalem and the Politics of Palestine, 1917-48: An Overview,” 131.}

^{xi} Antun Sa’ada was the founder of the Syrian Popular Party or the Syrian National Socialist Party (later renamed Social Nationalist Party), which had a powerful influence on the Arab youth of Syria and Lebanon during the 1930s. {Lewis, *Semites and anti-Semites*, 148.}

^{xii} Originally accusing Jews and Communists in concocting massive deceits, Hitler himself engaged in the described practice quite extensively in his pacts and promises to the German citizens and world community [R.E. Murphy et al., *National Socialism* (US Government Printing Office, 1943), pp. 232- 43]

^{xiii} Nonie Darwish was born in Cairo and spent some of her childhood in Gaza. In 1955, her Egyptian-born father, head of intelligence operations in Gaza, was entrusted by Gamal Abdel Nasser to launch covert and overt attacks by Palestinian fedayeen “to cause as much death and destruction as possible” against the Jews. An eight year-old girl, she herself was encouraged to avenge her father’s death by killing Jews, which she declined and renounced. In her book *Now They Call Me Infidel*, Nonie Darwish decisively speaks against contemporary xenophobia and anti-Semitism among the Muslim Arabs. She writes: “Scapegoating... serves Muslim egos and governments. Instead of taking responsibility for [its] problems, Arab culture lays the blame on someone else. As an Arab, I often feel deep sadness and shame over what my people have done and are still doing to Israel... Our cousins needed protection after World War II.” {Nonie Darwish, *Now They Call Me Infidel: Why I Renounced Jihad for America, Israel and the War on Terror* (USA: Penguin Group, 2006).}

^{XIV} Additional audio and visual materials including films, cartoons, posters and advertisements cited for this work have been observed and attached in the appendix to this paper

^{XV} \$10 is not a bargain by the local economic standards. Average annual income per person in 2006 in West Bank and Gaza, for example, was recorded to be \$1,120 in CIA World Factbook {USAID, "West Bank and Gaza: Country Profile."}

^{XVI} As of 2007, Dr. Ahmed is a member of the "Incident Management Team" for the Department of Homeland Security and a trustee of the World Faiths Development Dialogue, set up by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the president of the World Bank. He is a trustee on the Board of the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions and a Distinguished Senior Fellow of the Hasan Family Foundation. Dr. Ahmed received the 2004 Professor of the Year Award in Washington DC by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, the first Gandhi Center Fellowship of Peace Award, the First Annual Bridge Builder's Award from the Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington, and the Humanitarian Award by the Chapel of Four Chaplains. He and Dr. Pearl were finalists in the "Most Inspiring Person of the Year 2005" poll conducted by BeliefNet. In 2006, Dr. Pearl and Dr. Ahmed were awarded the first ever "Purpose Prize" honoring people over 60 who have taken on society's biggest challenges.

^{XVII} "Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid", a book by Jimmy Carter published in 2006 by Simon and Schuster, was received by many as the desktop reference for the answers to the roots and causes of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Criticized as historically and factually incorrect, the book was embraced by many intellectuals as a testament coming from one of the highest authorities in the realm of the Middle Eastern politics.

^{XVIII} The first person experience was shared by Natan Sharansky, the head of the Adelson Institute for Strategic Studies at the Shalem Center.