

Appendix G

Mr Kupka's submission to the review

Subject: Re: Kupka Case Review

Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 08:13:06 +1000

From: Hans J Kupka

To: Renwick

Ann, 03.03

Dear Sir,

Although the subject heading leaves me puzzled, since in my view it shouldn't be me who is put on trial but those who have constantly made defamatory statements and have spread lies about me, I really do appreciate the opportunity of being invited to submit to you my views on the complex issues. To date, I was hardly ever given the opportunity to be listened to in an impartial setting.

Fact is, that my reputation has been severely damaged as I have been publicly labelled a "Holocaust denier", an "Anti-Semite", a "Neo-Nazi" and that I have more or less been forced out of my PhD studies at the University of Waikato. Yet, wouldn't it make sense, before judging me, to actually read in context what I have written? How can I defend myself if all the accusations are merely endless repetitions of claims that have never been verified by anybody but those few who are prepared to give me a fair go and who are silenced by the sheer power of the accusers and the press? The question whether or not the accusations against me are true can not be judged without reading what I have written.

Personal Statement

Let me begin my submission by saying what I have stated time and again:

· I have never, in public or privately, in writing or verbally denied the Holocaust.

· I have never, in public or privately, in writing or verbally made comments that are Anti-Semitic.

It must, however, be possible to discuss topics as difficult and loaded as the Third Reich, the Holocaust and genocide in general, wherever it occurs, and it must be possible (even for a PhD student) to discuss these matters publicly, openly and without the thread of being labelled a Holocaust-denier and an Anti-Semite. Regrettably however, according to Dr Norman Finkelstein, a humanities professor at Columbia University in New York, political correctness has become so extreme on some campuses that even to relate the Nazi death camps to atrocities such as the slaughter of 10 million Africans in the Congo as a result of the Belgian ivory and rubber trade, is considered to be an expression Holocaust denial. Finkelstein: "So entrenched is the belief in the uniqueness of Hitler's crimes against the Jews that even to challenge it, according to some powerful academics such as Deborah Lipstadt - victor over David Irving in the libel courts - amounts to Holocaust denial", which is exactly what has happened to me.

The Background

Between March 1995 and July 1999 I participated regularly in "newsgroups" discussions on the "usenet", a public forum of the Internet. More often than not the subject of such discussions was politics. Unfortunately, it proved to be virtually impossible to discuss contemporary German politics without being permanently reminded of Germany's Nazi past, whether the subject discussed was "foreigners in Germany", "election results" or "Germany's role in the European Union". Moreover, writers holding conservative views were expected to shut up immediately whenever others used the ultimate argument: the Holocaust. If one did not instantaneously comply, one was called a "Holocaust denier".

This was the atmosphere, in which those discussions took place. My personal views can be seen in the following citations from original articles. For each paragraph I quote the posting's date, time,

sender's address and the message identification number, by which the respective article can be found on the Internet. The originals are all in German, that's why I supply (my own) English translation as well.

23 Dec 1996 01:38:04 GMT hansk@wave.co.nz (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <32bed528.5944138@news2.wave.co.nz>:

Langowski versucht doch offensichtlich den Beweis zu fuehren, dass ich zu den Holocaust-Leugnern gehoere. Warum? Der Himmel weiss es.

Langowski tries obviously to prove that I belong to the Holocaust deniers. Why? Heaven knows.

Fact is, that more than once I wrote about the Holocaust making it clear that my opinion on the Holocaust in no way differed from that held by the majority of historians.

21 May 1997 06:50:59 GMT hansk@wave.co.nz (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <339a8739.3240749@news2.wave.co.nz>:

Hast Du keine Meinung dazu, weil Du mich fragst, was ich mit Holocaust

[...] meine? Ich meine mit Holocaust wohl nichts anderes als Du - solange wir uns beide in der Definition auf ein gaengiges deutsches Lexikon stuetzen.

Don't you have an opinion since you ask me what I mean by Holocaust [...]? With Holocaust I do not mean anything else than you - as long as we both support our definition by means of a common German dictionary.

Finkelstein argues that no historical event is unique. The conviction is in itself irrational. And, dangerously, it leads to myth making and distortion.

At no time have I ever denied the Holocaust - but asked for a fair treatment of those who want to discuss the Holocaust.

03 Jun 1997 19:59:14 GMT hansk@wave.co.nz (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <33b3765d.2845803@news2.wave.co.nz>:

Das kommt darauf an, ob man die "Partei der Holocaust-Leuger" in der Sache ergreift, was ich nie getan habe, oder ob man auch fuer die "Partei der Holocaust-Leuger" ein faires Verfahren fordert. Letzteres tue ich immer wieder. Allerdings habe ich den Eindruck, dass manche hier es bereits als Holocaust-Leugnung verstehen, wenn man nachweist, dass ein Linker die Unwahrheit gesagt hat.

It depends on whether one supports the "party of the Holocaust deniers", which I never did, or whether one demands a fair trial for the "party of the Holocaust deniers". The latter I always do. Although, I am of the opinion that some people here already see it as Holocaust denial if one can prove that a left-winger has been lying.

I explicitly wrote:

07 Nov 1997 20:38:57 GMT hansk@wave.co.nz (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <346e7306.3119209@news2.wave.co.nz>:

ich habe bisher hier noch keine einzige Meinung gelesen, in der die Ermordung von Juden in der Zeit des Dritten Reiches pauschal geleugnet wurde.

so far I have here not read one single opinion in which the killings of Jews during the times of the Third Reich have been generally denied.

More explicitly:

12 Jan 1998 19:25:13 GMT hkupka@usa.net (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <34c66785.2695023@news2.wave.co.nz>:

ich halte den "Holocaust" nicht für eine Erfindung jüdischer Geschäftemacher.

I do not maintain that the "Holocaust" is the invention of Jewish business people.

30 May 1998 21:19:19 GMT hkupka@usa.net (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <35766307.4059276@news.wave.co.nz>:

das unter Hitler nicht nur Juden umgekommen sind, ist auch mir nicht verborgen geblieben.

it has not been hidden from me that under Hitler not only Jews were killed.

Does this constitute Holocaust denial?

Mon, 26 May 1997 05:54:41 GMT hansk@wave.co.nz (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <33ad1927.3266707@news2.wave.co.nz>:

[...] fehlt Dir zum wiederholten Male der Blick dafuer, dass nicht nur Juden umgebracht wurden, sondern auch (s.o.) Kommunisten.

[...] you do not seem to see that not only Jews were killed, but also communists.

28 Jun 1999 20:08:43 GMT hkupka@MailAndNews.com (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <3777d31e.300192@news.nzwide.ihug.co.nz>:

Eine von der offiziellen Linie abweichende, geäußerte Meinung konnte im Einzelfall bereits ausreichen, um benachteiligt, geschlagen, gefoltert oder sogar getötet zu werden.

A view which departed from the official line, could in certain cases already be enough for those who expressed it, to be disadvantaged, beaten, or even killed.

Is it "Holocaust denial" to call the Holocaust a crime?

17 Mar 1999 03:10:15 GMT hkupka@ihug.co.nz (Hans J Kupka) wrote in <36f1012d.4002715@news.nzwide.ihug.co.nz>:

[Der Holocaust] ist eben eines jener Verbrechen, die es in der Vergangenheit zuhauf gab und die es in der Zukunft wohl leider immer wieder geben wird.

[The Holocaust] is one of those crimes that happened frequently in the past and that are unfortunately likely to happen in the future again and again.

Is this the language of a "Holocaust denier", an "Anti-Semite" and a "Neo-Nazi"?

The office of the Race Relations Conciliator, which was consulted and which was asked for an opinion on the material published by myself on the Internet, did not consider it appropriate to investigate the matter under the race grounds of the Human Rights Act. The Office acknowledged that the views held by myself could constitute a political opinion.

This, however, is not enough for those who have found a target and do not intend to let go merely because of facts. Proof that I am a "Holocaust Denier" and an "Anti-Semite" consists largely of falsified quotations or statements, which have been taken out of context. An

interesting admission of some of the group's 'experts' in the field is, that I do not deny the Holocaust as such, but that instead I use coded language. In essence this claim means that regardless of what I say or write, my statements can always be claimed to be an expression of "Holocaust Denial" or "Anti-Semitism": The group in question clearly understands my code, while unfortunately the Campus Mediator or the Race Relations Office do not.

The Role of the Media

It was claimed on the Internet that in New Zealand alone more than 300 articles concerning the "Kupka case" were published over the past six months. And as it seems to be common practice in journalism to simply copy articles rather than to research the facts personally, all of these articles were based on the same flawed information leaked to the press by a very few people at Waikato University that used dubious resources to discredit a non-complying being.

Interestingly, the only few "hard facts" contained in every article (my age, the year I came to NZ, the location of my home until autumn 2000) where all wrong, without exception. It is clear evidence that no serious inquiry by the media had taken place or was even intended.

And while on the subject of truth: the major claim made by my opponents, that I intended (and needed) to talk to the Jewish community in order to complete my PhD thesis is wrong and nothing but a blatant lie, made knowingly. Neither my proposal nor any activities I conducted during my studies were heading this way. None of my three supervisors suggested such interviews. Neither Professor Ammon nor Professor Clyde nor any other scholar who wrote on a similar subject ever interviewed the Jewish community or other ethnic groups.

I have never been an extremist, was socially engaged in the SPD (Social Democratic Party of Germany) in the late 60's and early 70's during the leadership of Willy Brandt. I am a listener rather than a talker, mentally balanced, have never been convicted of any crime, I am married for 31 years. I live in a foreign country, my daughters have foreign partners and friends, my wife and I are of Jewish descent, we have friends in NZ, Australia, Britain, France, the US, Brazil, South Africa and many more countries. Does this sound like a xenophobic, neo-nazi, anti-Semitic personality?

My Academic History

Between March 1991 and November 1994 I studied at Massey University. On 18 March 1995 I was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Arts after - as the certificate states - satisfying the course requirements. Being in contact with a possible future supervisor at Massey, Dr Patricia Lopdell, I was asked if I would like to further my studies and if so what subject of a Master Thesis I would prefer. I suggested two possible topics, one political ("Right-wing tendencies in Franz Schoenhuber's writings") and one classical ("Karl May as a subject of literary enquiry"). Both topics were introduced by myself and discussed at a meeting with the staff of the German Department at Massey University. A few days later Dr Lopdell rang me to tell me informally that the "Karl May" topic would be approved and that I should enrol as the deadline for enrolment was approaching quickly. My wife, one of our daughters and I travelled to Palmerston North to find acceptable accommodation for me. It was during this trip that my daughter asked me why I would travel from the Bay of Plenty to Palmerston North rather than to study at a university nearer by such as in Auckland or in Hamilton.

As both our daughters had studied at the University of Waikato, I made some enquiries and found that my previous studies at Massey would be fully credited and that I could enrol into the Masters course. On enrolment day I filed the required papers with the Enrolment Office, spoke with Professor Peter Oettli (then Dean of the Humanities Faculty) and introduced myself to Assoc. Prof. Volker Knüfermann (then Head of the German Department). Several weeks later I received written confirmation of my enrolment.

Summary

The harassment against me (as far as I was personally affected) began shortly after my enrolment as a PhD student, around October 1998. Since then, the allegations raised against me have ever been changing and have become ever more comprehensive. Once one avenue had been exhausted, a new allegation was fabricated or new obstacles to my study were raised. By now I have not only been accused of being a Nazi and a Holocaust-Denier: My academic qualifications have been called into question, the personal and academic integrity of my chief supervisor were questioned, approaches to the Ethics Committee have been misused, resulting in me being forbidden on 1 December 1999 to continue with my research until such time when I had complied with procedures which appeared to be an arbitrary interpretation of Ethic Procedures.

Despite suggestions by several people, not least by Bethea Weir, the Campus Mediator, to try and resolve the matters in face-to-face meetings of all parties concerned, I was not given this opportunity. In fact it seems that my opponents deliberately avoided a personal meeting with me.

I hope this enquiry leads finally to disciplinary procedures against those harassing others and myself for the past years.

Yours sincerely

Hans-Joachim Kupka
8 March 2001

P.S. I would appreciate your acknowledgement of this e-mail.