Facebook and Holocaust Denial

Raphael Cohen-Almagor

Introduction

In this article, I take issue with Facebook's policy that allows Holocaust denial on its web pages because its directors believe that Holocaust denial is not hateful per se. I aim to show that it is hateful and that Facebook and other networking sites should reconsider their position in line with their own terms of conduct. All Internet providers and web-hosting companies whose terms of service disallow hateful messages on their servers should not host or provide forums for such hate-mongering. This is of paramount importance as Holocaust denial is prevalent in Europe, in the United States, and across Arab and Muslim parts of the world. While some countries, mainly in Europe, prohibit Holocaust denial by law, other countries have no such prohibitions. The question, however, is not only legal. It is also ethical and a matter of social responsibility for Internet service providers (ISP) and Web-Hosting Services (WHS) to decide whether or not they wish to host this kind of hate speech on their servers.

Background

January 27 has been designated by the United Nations as International Holocaust Remembrance Day. On this day, Auschwitz-Birkenau was liberated. On this day, we remember the six million Jews who were murdered by the Nazi regime.

Despite clear historical evidence, some people deny the Holocaust. The Internet has become a very handy platform for spreading those claims and for making a case for what the deniers term "revisionist history." Among the major social networking sites that allow Holocaust denial on their platform, Facebook is the most prevalent.

Facebook prohibits posting content that is hateful or threatening. Facebook disabled a group called "I Hate Muslims in Oz." Barry Schnitt explained: "We disabled the 'I Hate Muslims in Oz' group… because it contained an explicit statement of hate. Where Holocaust-denial groups have done this and been reported, we've taken the same action."[1] In May 2010, Facebook took down a page titled "Kill a Jew Day," which urged Netusers to violence "anywhere you see a Jew" between July 4 and July 22.

Facebook distinguishes between an "explicit statement of hate" and Holocaust denial. Its directors believe that Holocaust denial is not hateful per se and does not therefore contravene the company's terms of service. The terms of service state: "You will not post content that is hateful, threatening, pornographic, or that contains nudity or graphic or gratuitous violence."[2]

Many of the gatekeepers of the large IT companies – Google, Facebook, Yahoo and Twitter-- are young Americans who were brought up on the values of the First Amendment.[3] For them, freedom of expression is the most important principle that guides their actions. So much so that Facebook at first did not have rules on what speech violated its terms of service,[4] and Twitter's only exception to free speech stipulates that "You may not publish or post direct, specific threats of violence against others."[5] Consequently, hate speech is legitimate, protected speech. But the role of gatekeepers, which gives them great powers, also requires great responsibility. A balance needs to be struck between freedom of expression and social responsibility, between rowdiness and civility, between the desire to have an open wide marketplace of ideas, and ascertaining that the marketplace of ideas does not facilitate violence and lawlessness.

Holocaust Denial

What do we mean by "Holocaust denial"? Why does this form of speech constitute hate? If you ask a person on the street what he or she knows about the Holocaust, and the answer is that he or she has never heard of it, this cannot be considered as Holocaust denial. Ignorance and denying reality are not forms of hate. Even if the person

---

1. Chris Matyszczyk, *Facebook disables 'hate Muslims' group*, CNET, June 10, 2009, available *at* news.cnet.com/8301-17852_3-10262136-71.html (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

2. *See* www.facebook.com/terms.php (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

3. http://constitution.findlaw.com/amendment1.html

4. Jeffrey Rosen, *The Delete Squad*, New Republic (April 29, 2013), available *at* www.newrepublic.com/article/113045/free-speech-internet-silicon-valley-making-rules (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

5. The Twitter Rules, support.twitter.com/articles/18311-the-twitter-rules (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

appears to know, this does not necessarily constitute a form of hate. The content of the speech and the intention of the speaker should always be taken into account.

Disputing certain historical facts is not a form of hate either, and I doubt whether it can be considered Holocaust denial. If one argues that five million, not six million, were murdered during 1938-1945, based on a study of sorts done on Jewish demography in Europe, this is an issue that can and should be discussed in the open in order to discover a possible new facet of the truth.[6] If one brings evidence showing that an alleged massacre did not happen, or happened on a different date, or more people were killed than we know, or that an alleged war criminal was not at an alleged place at the alleged time, then these are all issues that should be probed and discussed. All this does not constitute Holocaust denial or a form of hate.

Moreover, generally speaking, people are entitled to hold and express vilifying and outrageous views, to voice their dislike of other people and to use derogatory words and discriminatory adjectives against others. While we do not enjoy such expressions, we feel it is wrong, and we feel outraged confronting such statements, some liberals believe that such speech is protected under the **free speech principle**. The way to fight against such discriminating and damaging opinions is through more speech, not by silencing or censoring. This, indeed, is the essence of tolerance.

Nevertheless, Holocaust denial constitutes a special category of speech that does not necessarily merit protection, certainly not in all places. Consideration needs to be given to the historical context and circumstances of the utterance. Holocaust denial is far from being innocent. It is a propaganda movement that seeks to deny the reality of the Holocaust, the systematic mass murder of six million Jews and millions of others deemed "inferior" by the Nazi regime. Misrepresenting their propaganda as" historical revisionism," Holocaust deniers attempt to disseminate their extremist ideas by offering unsupported arguments against the well-established historical facts of the Holocaust. Their beliefs include accusations that Jews have falsified and exaggerated the tragic events of the Holocaust in order to exploit non-Jewish guilt. Holocaust denial groups have uploaded thousands of web pages, filled with distortions and fabrications, designed to reinforce negative stereotypes.[7] Among the most visited sites promoting Holocaust denial are the Institute for Historical Review, originally and intentionally established for this purpose,[8] Bradley Smith and his Committee for Open Debate of the Holocaust (focusing largely on U.S. college campuses),[9] and sites sponsored by David Irving,[10] Ahmed Rami,[11] and Ernst Zundel.[12] All portray themselves as hubs, even paradigms, of unbiased, unorthodox, gutsy historical research.

Holocaust denial is a form of hate speech because it willfully promotes enmity against an identifiable group based on ethnicity and religion. It is designed to belittle the tragedies of the Holocaust while providing a justification for murder, genocide, xenophobia and evil. Holocaust denial assumes a form of legitimacy for racism in its most evil manifestation to date, under the guise of a pursuit of "truth." It speaks of an international Jewish conspiracy to blackmail Germany and other nations, and to exploit others in order to create Israel. It depicts a scenario in which Jews conspired to create the greatest hoax of all time. Specifically, deniers claim that Adolf Hitler did not plan genocide for the Jews but wished instead to move them out of Europe. They claim that no gas chambers ever existed as if they were an invention of the Jews to dramatize the mere "fact" that in every war there are casualties, and World War II was no different. People from many countries were killed, many of them Germans. And yes, Jews were killed. But so were people from other religions.[13]

6. For discussion of J.S. Mill's Truth Principle and its importance in generating a tolerant atmosphere for unconventional expressions, *see* R. Cohen-Almagor, *Why Tolerate? Reflections on the Millian Truth Principle*, 25 PHILOSOPHIA, Nos. 1-4, at 131-152 (1997); Eric Barendt, FREEDOM OF SPEECH 8-14 (2005); R. Cohen-Almagor, *John Stuart Mill*: Utilitarianism, in ETHICAL COMMUNICATION: MORAL STANCES IN HUMAN DIALOGUE, 25-32 (C. G. Christians and J. C. Merrill eds., 2009).

7. Anti-Defamation League, Hate on the Internet (2003), at 14.

8. www.ihr.org/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

9. www.codoh.com/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

10. www.fpp.co.uk/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015); www.fpp.co.uk/online/index.html (last visited Oct. 19, 2015); Andrew Walker, *Profile: David Irving*, BBC, Feb. 20, 2006, available *at* news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4449948.stm (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).For further discussion, *see* Ruth Wodak, *Saying the unsayable: Denying the Holocaust in media debates in Austria and the UK*, 3(1) JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AGGRESSION AND CONFLICT 13-40 (2015).

11. Jews and the Black Holocaust, available *at* radioislam.org/islam/english/toread/jewslave.htm (last visited Oct. 19, 2015); Statement of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) Before the US Senate Committee of the Judiciary, Sept, 14, 1999, available *at* radioislam.org/adl/net.htm (last visited Oct. 19, 2015); Ahmed Rami, Holocaust Denial, ADL, available *at* adl.org/poisoning_web/rami.asp (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

12. www.zundelsite.org/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

13. www.hdot.org/en/learning/myth-fact (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

According to the deniers, the Holocaust is the product of partisan Jewish interests, serving Jewish greed and hunger for power. Some Jews disguised themselves as survivors, carved numbers on their arms and spread atrocious false stories about gas chambers and extermination machinery. It was not Germany that acted in a criminal way. Instead, the greatest criminals are the Jews. The Jews are so evil that they invented this horrific story to gain support around the world and to extort money from Germany. For their extortion and fabrication, for creating the greatest conspiracy of all times, they deserve punishment, possibly even death. Jews are demonic and crooked people who deserve to die for making up this unbelievable tragedy. In effect, the ultimate purpose of Holocaust denial is to legitimize another Holocaust against Jews. Accordingly, Holocaust denial can be seen as the last stage of the Holocaust and it is the inception of a second stage of a vile bigotry that undermines Jewish existence in the world.

Those who deny the Holocaust are antisemitic. It is demeaning to deny the Holocaust, for it is to deny history, reality, and suffering. Holocaust denial might create a climate of xenophobia that is detrimental to democracy. It generates hate through the rewriting of history in a vicious way that portrays Jews as the anti-Christ, as destructive forces that work against civilization. Furthermore, hateful messages desensitize members of the public on very important issues while silencing others. Hate speech builds a sense of possible acceptability of hate and resentment of the other that might be more costly than the cost of curtailing speech. And hate speech, in its various forms, is harmful not only because it offends but because it potentially silences the members of target groups and interferes with their right to equal respect and treatment. Hateful remarks might reduce the target group members to speechlessness or shock them into silence. The notion of silencing and inequality suggests great injury, emotional upset, fear and insecurity that target group members might experience. Hate might undermine the individual's self-esteem and standing in the community.[14]

Drawing the Line

Deciphering what constitutes hate is not always simple. In my book, *Confronting the Internet's Dark Side: Moral and Social Responsibility on the Free Highway*,[15] I argue that on the one hand, statements that assert "Jews are money hungry," "gays are immoral," "Israel is an apartheid state" and calls to boycott Israel[16] are all unpleasant, yet legitimate speech. On the other hand, calls that provoke violence against target groups fall under the definition of incitement; here the context is harmful speech that is *directly linked* to harmful action. By "hate speech" I refer to malicious speech that is aimed at victimizing and dehumanizing the targets, who are often (but not always) vulnerable minorities. Hate speech is fuzzier than incitement and concretely more damaging than advocacy, which is speech designed to promote ideas. Hate speech creates a virulent atmosphere of "double victimization": the speakers are under attack/misunderstood/ marginalized/delegitimized by powerful forces (governments, conspiratorial organizations), and the answer to their problem is to victimize the target group. Their victimization is the speakers' salvation.

In 1996, the United States accounted for 66% of the world's Internet users, while in 2015 the American market was reduced to 9.3 percent.[17] Still, the American influence on the Internet is very significant. As the United States is taking the most liberal view in the world on the scope of freedom of expression, hate speech is shielded under the First Amendment. There is no basic disagreement that hate speech is vile and offensive. Most people believe it is. Still, it is a price that Americans are willing to pay to preserve and protect free speech.

Generally speaking, hate is derived from one form or another of racism, which has facilitated and caused untold amounts of human suffering. It is an evil that has acquired catastrophic proportions in all parts of the world. Notorious examples include Europe under Nazism, and since then Yugoslavia, Cambodia, South Africa and

14. *See* Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (1954); Richard Moon, The Constitutional Protection of Freedom of Expression, at 127 (2000); Phyllis B. Gerstenfeld, Diana R. Grant and Chau-Pu Chiang, *Hate Online: A Content Analysis of Extremist Internet Sites*, 3(1) Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy 29-44 (2003); Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, Understanding Words That Wound (2004); Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *Harm Principle, Offense Principle, and Hate Speech*, in Raphael Cohen-Almagor, Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression, at 3-23 (2005); Jessie Daniels, Cyber Racism: White Supremacy Online and the New Attack on Civil Rights (2009); Abraham H. Foxman and Christopher Wolf, Viral Hate (2013).

15. Raphael Cohen-Almagor, Confronting the Internet's Dark Side: Moral and Social Responsibility on the Free Highway (2015).

16. Boycott Israeli Apartheid page, available *at* www.facebook. com/kaiser.hafeez1?fref=ts (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

17. World Internet Users and 2015 Population Stats, http:// www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Rwanda. Elsewhere I have argued that in hate messages, members of the targeted group are characterized as devoid of any redeeming qualities and as innately evil. Banishment, segregation and eradication of the targeted group are proposed to save others from the harm being perpetrated by this group. By using highly inflammatory and derogatory language, expressing extreme hatred and contempt, and through comparisons to and associations with animals, vermin, excrement and other noxious substances, hate messages dehumanize the targeted groups.[18]

Hate messages undermine the dignity and self-worth of the targeted group members and they erode the tolerance and open mindedness that should flourish in democratic societies committed to the ideas of pluralism, justice and equality. Hate messages undermine the targets' equal status in their community, their entitlement to basic justice and to the fundamentals of their reputation. Hate speech might lead to mental and emotional distress, racial discrimination and political disenfranchisement.[19] Furthermore, hate speech might lead to hate crimes. Hate should not be taken lightly. Internalizing hatred can motivate and push bigots into action. Violent speech may lead to violent action. **When a direct link can be established between hate speech and hate crime, this is where we draw the line**. Freedom of speech is of vital importance but it must be confined. Freedom of speech is not a license to inciting people to lawless action that results in loss of life. The Southern Poverty Law Centers' (SPLC) two-year study shows that nearly 100 people in the last five years have been murdered by active users on one notorious hate site, Stormfront.org.[20] Christopher Wolf, Chair of the Internet Task Force of the Anti-Defamation League, argues while providing pertinent reports: "The evidence is clear that hate online inspires hate crimes."[21] ISPs and Web-Hosting Services (WHS) should be aware of the connection between speech and action.

Responsibility on the Net

The Internet plays an instrumental role in spreading hate and in translating speech into action. *Confronting the Internet's Dark Side* is the first comprehensive book on social responsibility on the Internet. The book aims to strike a balance between the free speech principle and the responsibilities of the individual, corporation, state, and the international community. This book brings a global perspective to the analysis of some of the most troubling uses of the Internet: cyberbullying, cybercrime, terrorism, child pornography, hate and bigotry. It urges net users, ISPs and liberal democracies to weigh freedom and security, finding the golden mean between unlimited license and moral responsibility. This judgment is necessary in order to uphold the very liberal democratic values that gave rise to the Internet and that are threatened by an unbridled use of technology.[22]

Cyberhate produces a "permanent disfigurement" of group members.[23] Responsible organizations should always weigh the consequences of their conduct. They should not say "I did not know." Ignorance cannot absolve them of responsibility. They should know. Society cannot treat lightly calls for the murder of persons because of their race.[24]

18. Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *In Internet's Way*, in Ethics and Evil in the Public Sphere: Media, Universal Values & Global Development 93-115 (Robert S. Fortner and Mark Fackler eds., 2010).

19. Words that Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment, at 89-93 (Mari J. Matsuda, Charles R. Lawrence III, Richard Delgado and Kimberly W. Crenshaw eds., 1993); Ishani Maitra and Mary Kate McGowan, *On Racist Hate Speech and the Scope of Free Speech Principle*, 23 Canadian J. of Law & Jurisprudence, at 364 (2010); Jeremy Waldron, The Harm in Hate Speech (2012); Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *Is Law Appropriate to Regulate Hateful and Racist Speech: The Israeli Experience*, 27 Israel Studies Review, 41–64 (2012).

20. Heidi Beirich, Frazier Glenn Miller, Longtime Anti-Semite, Arrested in Kansas Jewish Community Center Murders, Southern Poverty Law Center, April 13, 2014; Caitlin Dickson, *Where White Supremacists Breed Online*, The Daily Beast (April 17, 2014), available *at* www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/04/17/where-white-supremacists-breed-online.html?utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&utm_campaign=cheatsheet_afternoon&cid=newsletter%3Bemail%3Bcheatsheet_afternoon&utm_term=Cheat%20Sheet (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

21. Christopher Wolf, Needed: Diagnostic Tools to Gauge the Full Effect of Online Anti-Semitism and Hate, OSCE Meeting on the Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes (Paris, June 16, 2004); Discussion with Wolf, Berkeley (June 5, 2009).

22. Raphael Cohen-Almagor, Confronting the Internet's Dark Side (July 21, 2015), available *at* www.cambridgeblog.org/2015/07/confronting-the-internets-dark-side/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

23. Jeremy Waldron, *Dignity and Defamation: The Visibility of Hate*, 123 Harvard Law Rev., at 1601-1607 (2010).

24. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination Dec. 21,1965, available *at* www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

What ISPs and web-hosting companies could certainly do is to provide a uniform channel for user complaints. Such a channel (which could be as simple as a link to the CyberTipline) could easily be placed on the complaints or customer service page of the service provider.[25] In France, where there is a legal requirement for ISPs to inform officials, this method could work quite efficiently. In other countries, voluntary participation is to be encouraged.

From an ethical perspective, ISPs and WHSs can and should have codes of conduct explicitly stating that they deny service to hate mongers who clearly incite violence against certain target groups. This is not a free speech issue, as we are not free to inflict harm on others. It is about taking responsibility for stopping those who abuse the Internet for their vile purposes. ISPs and web-hosting companies should strike a balance between freedom of expression on the one hand, and principles of social responsibility on the other. At the very least, responsibility requires them to adhere to their own terms of service. If their terms of service prohibit the posting of hateful and threatening content, then they should ensure that such content is not present on their servers.

This is stressed because Facebook, despite what is said above, still hosts the National Association for the Advancement of White People.[26] In October 2015, I conducted a simple search on Facebook: "Holocaust denial" and found among the results: "Holocaust is a Myth," a few "Holohoax" pages, two "Holocaust denial" groups, and one "Against Holocaust Denial Laws." In response to pleas to remove those pages, Facebook said that "We think it's important to maintain consistency in our policies, which don't generally prohibit people from making statements about historical events, no matter how ignorant the statement or how awful the event."[27] How can this stance be reconciled with Facebook's prohibition on posting content that is hateful or threatening is something for Facebook managers to reconcile and answer.

Anti-hate speech advocates should explain to ISP managers the nature of the contested hate, its potential harms, and why corporate responsibility means taking the content off their servers. This may lead ISPs to take proactive steps, so as to avoid entertaining hate sites on their servers.

In this context, it is noteworthy that the United States Congress passed the "Good Samaritan provision," included in the 1996 Communication Decency Act (section 230-c-2), which protects ISPs that voluntarily take action to restrict access to problematic material:

> No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be held liable on account of— (A) any action voluntarily taken in good faith to restrict access to or availability of material that the provider or user considers to be obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable, whether or not such material is constitutionally protected.[28]

ISPs and web-hosting companies should develop standards for responsible and acceptable practices for internet users. ISPs' terms of service usually grant ISPs the unilateral right and ability to block service to those who violate the terms. ISPs are reluctant to do this, as they wish to maintain business. They are for profit. However, there were instances in which ISPs denied service, commonly due to violation of copyrights. Following complaints about copyright violation, ISPs took the material off their servers.

An example of cooperation between an Internet monitoring organization and an ISP concerns the Anti-Defamation League (ADL).[29] Brian Marcus, who headed the ADL Internet division, explained that private companies may decide not to post messages containing hate speech because this might be bad for their business. The ADL approached a CEO of a Texas web hosting company, asking him where he would draw the line between legitimate and illegitimate speech. The CEO answered that hate is protected speech, but threats are not. Marcus indicated that one of the sites the company had hosted claimed all members of minorities should be

---

25. YOUTH, PORNOGRAPHY, AND THE INTERNET, at 380 (Dick Thornburgh and Herbert S. Lin eds, 2002); interview with Herb Lin, Washington DC (May 15, 2008).

26. The National Association for the Advancement of White People   www.facebook.com/pages/The-National-Association-for-the-Advancement-of-White-People/102208269835141   www.facebook.com/pages/The-National-Association-for-the-Advancement-of-White-People/102208269835141 (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

27. Miriam Grosman, Facebook firm on Holocaust denial pages, despite survivors' letter, JTA (July 28, 2011), available *at* www.jta.org/news/article/2011/07/28/3088748/facebook-firm-on-holocaust-denial-pages-despite-survivors-letter (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

28. 47 U.S.C. §230, available *at* www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/47/230.html (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

29. www.adl.org/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

hanged from street lamps. The CEO was surprised. For him, this was a threat even though it is not considered a threat according to American law.[30] For this CEO, however, it was too much and when Marcus showed him another 150 problematic sites, the company, after deliberation, decided to close some 110-120 of them.[31]

Ethics is not only a question of dealing morally with a given world. It is also a question of shaping the world for the better. This suggests a proactive approach that perceives agents as world owners, creators, game designers, producers of moral goods and evils, providers, hosts.[32] Accordingly, ISPs should be able to plan and initiate action responsibly, in anticipation of future events, in an attempt to control their course by making or preventing something from happening.

Moreover, while the Internet is a form of new media, it is still a media. It is not reasonable to prohibit certain expressions in print and allow the same objectionable expressions electronically. We cannot be neutral with regard to certain conduct that falls within the parameter of harming others as then the dangers to democracy, to our fellow citizens, to the moral basis of society, to values that we hold dear, might be too grave.

Against content neutrality, I propose adopting a promotional approach. ISPs and WHSs should adhere to basic ethical principles necessary to maintain a civilized environment, first and foremost Do No Harm. Ethics require all of us to care about the consequences of our actions and to take responsibility for them. The promotional approach holds that ISPs and WHSs should not be neutral regarding different conceptions of the good. They should safeguard the basic tenets of democracy that enable and facilitate their operations. It is within ISPs and WHSs interest to adhere to them in their daily operation.[33]

Lasting social change needs a combination of solid governmental support and committed corporate action. A comprehensive look at the movement for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) shows that market forces often jumpstart responsibility. Consumer demand for responsibility may push companies to produce certain products and abandon others; actual (or threatened) consumer boycotts influence decision-making processes; "naming and shaming" practices by non-governmental organizations, pressure from socially responsible investors, and values held by employees and management are all influential. Yet there is no guarantee that a company will sustain its efforts past a marketing campaign if practices and standards are not enshrined in law. Corporations will only participate for the long-term in CSR if it is good for their business. While profitability may not be the only reason corporations will or should behave virtuously, it

is the most influential one. CSR is sustainable only if virtue pays off.[34]

---

30. Anna S. Andrews, *When Is a Threat 'Truly' a Threat Lacking First Amendment Protection? A Proposed True Threats Test to Safeguard Free Speech Rights in the Age of the Internet*, The UCLA Online Institute for Cyberspace Law & Policy (1999).

31. Interview with Brian Marcus, former ADL Director of Internet Monitoring, Washington DC (April 16, 2008). *See also* Jessica Henry, *Beyond Free Speech: Novel Approaches to Hate on the Internet in the United States*, 18(2) Information & Communication Technology Law 235-251 (June 2009).

32. Luciano Floridi, *Ethics after the Information Revolution*, in The Cambridge Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics (L. Floridi ed., 2010). *See also* L. Floridi, The Ethics of Information (2013).

33. R. Cohen-Almagor, *Content Net Neutrality – A Critique*, in Luciano Floridi's Philosophy of Technology: Critical Reflections, 151-167 (Hilmi Demir ed., 2012) and Confronting The Internet's Dark Side: Moral and Social Responsibility on the Free Highway (2015). *See also* Ugo Pagallo, *ISPs & Rowdy Web Sites Before the Law: Should We Change Today's Safe Harbour Clauses?* 24 Philosophy & Technology 419-436 (2011).

34. Ki-Hoon Lee and Dongyoung Shin, *Consumers' Responses to CSR Activities: The Linkage between Increased Awareness and Purchase Intention*, 36 Public Relations Review 193-195 (June 2010); David Vogel, The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility (2005); Philip Kotler and Nancy Lee, Corporate Social Responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and your cause (2005); Human Rights and the Moral Responsibilities of Corporate and Public Sector Organizations (Tom Campbell and Seamus Miller eds., 2004); Stewart Lewis, Reputation and Corporate Responsibility, 7 Journal of Comm. Management, No. 4, 356-394 (2003).

Conclusion

Those who deny the Holocaust deny history, reality, and suffering. Holocaust denial might create a climate of xenophobia that builds a sense of possible acceptability of hate and resentment of the "other," that might be more costly than the cost of curtailing speech.[35] At best, they show a strong form of ignorance. At worse, they intend to express bigotry and hate.[36]

Facebook and other web-hosting and IPSs should reconsider their position on Holocaust denial, as it often does violate their own general terms of service. Don't keep silent in the face of hate. We learned that silence is conducive to the spread of hatred and bigotry, and that incitement might lead to harmful action. There is a direct link between inciting hate speech and conducting hate crimes. Hate messages deserve our full attention. They should be condemned and delegitimized before they create ripe circumstances for murdering the targets of hate. ∎

Raphael Cohen-Almagor holds a DPhil in political theory from Oxford University (1991). He is an educator, researcher, human rights and peace activist as well as Professor and Chair in Politics, University of Hull, where he directs a think-tank on Middle Eastern affairs. His most recent books are Confronting the Internet's Dark Side (2015) and ed. with Ori Arbel-Ganz and Asa Kasher, Public Responsibility in Israel (2012, Hebrew).

35. Raphael Cohen-Almagor, Holocaust Denial Is A Form of Hate Speech and *id.*, Countering Hate on the Internet – A Rejoinder, 2 AMSTERDAM LAW FORUM 125-132 (2010). *See also* Brian Cuban, *Facebook At Odds With Obama On Holocaust Denial*, THE CUBAN REVOLUTION, available *at* www.briancuban.com/facebook-at-odds-with-obama-on-holocaust-denial/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015); Ian Paul, Facebook Boots Holocaust Denial Groups, PC WORLD (May 12, 2009), available *at* www.pcworld.com/article/164765/facebook_boots_holocaust_denial_groups.html (last visited Oct. 19, 2015); Chris Matyszczyk, Facebook: Holocaust denial repulsive and ignorant, CNET (May 6, 2009), available at news.cnet.com/8301-17852_3-10234760-71.html (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).

36. Some examples are vho.org/aaargh/engl/engl.html (last visited Oct. 19, 2015), www.adelaideinstitute.org/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015), www.toben.biz/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2015), and holywar.org (last visited Oct. 19, 2015).