

## **Appendix H**

**Translations of some of Mr Kupka's Internet postings  
made by Professor Hans Werner Nieschmidt**

## SOME OF THE FREUDENBERG COLLECTION OF KUPKA'S INTERNET POSTINGS

**Translated by Professor Hans Werner Nieschmidt**

Ms. Luise Freudenberg, a Research Scholar at the University of Berlin, was approached in late 1999 by Dr. Douglas Pratt, Chairperson of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Waikato, with a request for an opinion on the nature of Hans-Joachim Kupka's internet postings. Ms. Freudenberg selected a number of Kupka's internet postings and forwarded them as an email attachment to Dr. Pratt, together with her opinion of them. Dr. Pratt in turn made the Freudenberg opinion and attached excerpts available to Professor Dov Bing, who emailed them to Associate Professor Knüfermann and to Ms. Bethea Weir, who at that time was University Mediator. Copies of these emails are attached.

---

The following quotations are excerpted from the Nizkor site:

<http://www.nizkor.com/ftp.cgi/people/k/kupka.hans.joachim/1997/kupka.9711>

CORRESPONDENT: Friday, 14 November 1997, Thorsten Bauer wrote:

'Scholem alejchem!'

KUPKA WRITES: 'Heil und Sieg!'

[*Comment:* 'Scholem alejchem' is Yiddish for 'Peace to You', a well known Hebrew greeting. Kupka responds to Mr Bauer with an inverted version of the Nazi salutation 'Sieg Heil'.]

CORRESPONDENT: Saturday, 15 November 1997, Albrecht Kolthoff wrote:

'Have you actually considered that you are using an only slightly amended version of the Nazi greeting 'Sieg Heil'?

The following quotations are excerpted from the Nizkor site:

<http://www.nizkor.com/ftp.cgi/people/k/kupka.hans.joachim/1997/kupka.9712>

KUPKA WRITES: 'I call it "Holocult", this utterly disproportionate and irrelevant theatre about an outrageous crime, which however is certainly not unique in world history in its meaning, magnitude and enormity.'

KUPKA WRITES ( 16 December 1997): 'As we all at last know from "Schindler's List", there were certainly enough naughty SS people who greatly enjoyed it if they got the opportunity to rid the regime of witnesses to their misdeeds.

We remind ourselves: only without witnesses does the destruction for the purpose of covering up traces of the extermination installations that were reconstructed after the war make any sense. But no, just these 'few' concentration camp inmates who were witnesses to the entire terrible crime, they were spared. In fact the installations had already been destroyed, so that there is not a single one left in its original condition, in fact in many cases the building plans had been destroyed, so that today we have to rely on a few lousy blueprints - but most important, the human witnesses who were left alive, stupid and confused as only the German SS can be. Therefore I find this argumentation... well, not very convincing!'

CORRESPONDENT (Roessler): 'Were there then still inmates of the concentration camps after the autumn of 1944? Yes, in Auschwitz and Auschwitz-Birkenau there were still more than 40,000 - part-evacuations began at this time.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'But there's still something there that interests me. Why did they take upon themselves the trouble and costs of an evacuation if in their daily routine they still killed a few hundred or thousand Jews? Yes yes, I know very well, the need for workers. But what that does not explain is this: that in Auschwitz alone so it's said a hundred or a thousand Jews were murdered daily. Apparently they were not needed as workers. Only the relatively few witnesses of the extermination processes, who could not be led into the "Final Solution", precisely because they were needed for the "Final Victory". So really... that doesn't convince me either.'

CORRESPONDENT (Roessler): 'At about this time the final attempt to kill a great number of the relatives of the Sonderkommandos by the SS takes place - they needed fewer and fewer transports and fewer inmate-workers in the places of destruction.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'About "the first attempt" you mean to say, don't you, that there was more than one attempt, but not all of them were very successful. Thus, many witnesses survived the mass exterminations. So weren't these SS people fools? First they kill - how many were there? - about 12 million people; and then you tell yourself they were actually too stupid to get rid of the few remaining alive, those who of all people were actually eyewitnesses of the mass exterminations! Well, I don't know, but somehow that does not sound very plausible.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'If one has dismantled the respective parts of the buildings [of the concentration camps], then [one would expect] these parts should be somewhere, isn't that so?'

CORRESPONDENT: 'I don't know exactly.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'Well, but now it's turning around! He doesn't know if the most important pieces of evidence concerned with the mass exterminations still exist or not? Yes, man, but with that the whole argument stands or falls, that of the "Revisionists" and that of the "Holocausters". And our learned man from the steel industry [the correspondent] who, yearly and daily, plays the part of an amateur historian, at least as far as the "Holocaust" is concerned, he pauses and asks: "I don't really know whether the building parts, the true evidence of the killing of 12 million people, still exists or not"! That's the sensation of the year!'

CORRESPONDENT: 'There are statements that crematoria have been taken to Gross-Rosen. Whether they were there later, I don't know. Parts were also stored in the surroundings of Krakow, the medical institute has, e.g. in 1945, examined window bars which belonged to the gas chambers of the crematoria and they have found traces of Zyklon B gas.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'In other words, you base your entire lecture on a chain of arguments which hardly appear logical. You base it on witnesses who have survived in a wondrous way, where no stone was left one upon another [to destroy them]. You base it on a few suppositions which you only know from hearsay. You cannot remember or don't know the exact details. Apart from that there are a few gas-chambers and crematoria, which have all been found to have been built later - falsifications. Don't you think that is somewhat too little? (No, I am sorry, I cannot accept "Schindler's list" as proof).'

CORRESPONDENT: 'The crematoria could not be transported away. For that reason, in the summer of 1944, with the approach of the Red Army, the destruction of these buildings was of course most important. Finally when the concentration camps were evacuated, they were blown up. Why were only these buildings blown up and not the most valuable industrial plants in Auschwitz-Monowitz?'

KUPKA WRITES: 'You take the question out of my mouth. Why does one leave valuable industrial plant to the enemy, allow eye-witnesses of the mass extermination to survive and even escape (of course this had to happen in the chaos), but the few crematoria, the existence of which one could have easily explained as a necessity to get rid of bomb and disease victims, they were blown up, no effort was spared, neither material, labour or transport costs. Are you convinced? I am not!'

KUPKA WRITES: 'Oh yes, the question has to be legitimate, why on the one hand building plans and gas-chambers, which could have been explained away, were destroyed...'

CORRESPONDENT: 'Well, according to Mr.Kupka the building plans and gas-chambers could be explained away. I haven't yet seen anyone who could do this.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'Building plans can be produced retrospectively. With gas-chambers, this was done often, according to Jurgen Langovski. If one knows that, then one can produce building plans and gas-chambers - in their present condition - and argue them away as produced retrospectively.'

CORRESPONDENT: 'Mr.Kupka works here with a motif beloved by the "Revisionist" [Holocaust Denier]: one maintains what the "Revisionists" call official history, that is to say, that the Nazi murder apparatus was a perfectly-functioning, highly secret machine. With this absurd claim about the findings of history, an argument against the existence of reports and sources for this mass-murder apparatus is constructed.'

'And now Mr.Kupka tries to argue away the existence of the eyewitnesses.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'Argue them away? No, under no circumstances! I want to learn to understand how all this was possible that a band of no-hopers with a painter for a leader, who act irrationally, who take the word morality to be a foreign word, who wash their hands with soap made of Jews, and who decorated their lamps with Jewish skin, who ate little children for breakfast, how these 'sub-humans' of the most despicable kind, these personifications of the satanic, had managed to assume leadership of 60 million with democratic legitimacy, and to bring fear to three-quarters of Europe and a great part of the world, to dominate large parts of it, and then in the final sprint to fail so badly, that at best when bits of circumstantial evidence like usable building parts and plans were removed in order to cover up the traces, but eyewitnesses were left alive.'

CORRESPONDENT: 'Indeed, the systematic destruction, e.g. of the Polish Jews, lasted two years. Mr.Kupka does not know this, but he wishes to know it at this stage very precisely. However, he also tries to avoid dealing with the sources.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'I find it beautiful to have such a private instructor, who explains everything. I would like to thank you for your trouble, but I also want to add a word of criticism. You have a certain inclination to become a story-teller, with embellishments and so on. Strictly speaking, the contents of your discourse consists nearly always of such embellishments. Hard facts you don't seem to like.'

CORRESPONDENT: 'From Belzec there were after the war only two survivors who fled unnoticed. On the other hand, there were enough witnesses [guards who were prepared to testify] of the guards who have attested in the Law Courts of the Federal Republic to the

mass murders. From Treblinka and Sobibor, there were concentration camp inmates who escaped and survived in the Polish underground, after the revolts of the Sonderkommandos. The SS could not change that.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'Good, that of course adds to the truthfulness of the inmates, doesn't it? Yes, how have they actually treated a case like this, if a former SS man has said: there had been no mass exterminations, then one could have certainly not believed him, because this was an evil SS member and they always lie. I mean, pray, one simply knows that. But if a SS person has said that such mass exterminations were really true then one has of course believed him, because if something like that is said by somebody of the SS then it must be truthful, mustn't it?'

CORRESPONDENT: 'No, if one feared that some documents would fall into the hands of the enemy, then even Mr.Kupka must have heard that troops should destroy secret documents which could not be sent away.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'But witnesses were allowed to survive? You really believe that these stupid Nazis when destroying secret documents (why do we in fact talk about "Secret Documents"? It is said that nearly everybody knew what happened, including most grandmothers of those who read these lines) acted rationally? But when it came to destroying eyewitnesses they were as if under the influence of drugs and were simply driven along until the Reich collapsed. How would it be if one were to use here the argument of the Nazis' "losing touch with reality"?''

CORRESPONDENT: 'Agreed - but apart from that some perpetrators have very clearly stated what happened and how they were involved.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'What great luck, that these stupid Nazis suffered from "losing touch with reality" and let witnesses of the mass murders survive in sufficient numbers. The Communists are quite different in their make-up, aren't they? It has taken decades till the murders under Stalin became known. Even today when Stalin has been dead for forty

years, one does not know exactly whether he had 40, 50 or more millions killed. Indeed, even in terms of inhumanity, the Communist is decidedly superior to the stupid Nazi!

KUPKA WRITES: 'A witness is not a fact, but a reporter, which you ought to know. A fact would be, e.g. a gas-chamber which is still intact, or a crematorium. But what a pity, what a pity, everything is either destroyed or transported away. And in order to make your bad luck complete, you don't know if there are still any original parts of the gas-chambers. Well, one just can't help that.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'A recurrent problem of the facts that can be established and documented is that they are not based on proof that can be checked, but on sources which again relate to sources in which yet more sources are mentioned, so that in the end, a circle of sources is established, so that one is copying from the other, so that mistakes, errors and lies are copied as well.

'The next writer copies only the mistakes, errors and lies, and in this way we arrive at a work which can be traced to its sources and still has nothing more to do with the real facts. But this work will again be used as a source and who would dare to be critical of a book which is based on so many well-known sources?'

CORRESPONDENT (Dr.Roessler) 22 December 1997:

'My observation is based on the constant observation of the phenomenon called "Revisionism" (Holocaust Denial); one of the constantly recurring motifs, why witnesses for the Nazi crimes have survived.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'My observation is based on long-lasting observation of the phenomenon which I call "Holocauster". One of the constantly recurring motifs is indeed that to question critically is criminalized. Anyone who is not prepared to believe without questioning is placed as a Denier next to criminals.'

CORRESPONDENT: 'That is to say that a particularly despicable form of "What would be if...?" form of history is practised, which is no longer interested in what has happened, but rather how a suppressed identification with the perpetrators is presented. One reflects how all this could have been better achieved. For example, how unwanted witnesses could have been shoved out of this world.'

KUPKA WRITES: 'It does not matter what one could have done better, but rather that the evil Nazis killed 12 million people in concentration camps, were clever enough to destroy the particular buildings in which these crimes were committed in order to leave no traces. Only a few witnesses of the crimes were left to survive. A certain inconsistency in their action can hardly be denied. But then that much I have learned. Roessler uses his final argument, the Nazis' "losing touch with reality". That is to say, the Nazis reacted quite logically to the danger of losing the war, by destroying the traces of their crimes. But exactly at the moment when the gas-chambers and crematoria were destroyed, they fell victim to a collective "losing touch with reality", which prevented them from finishing their "work" by killing witnesses in a logical way.'

KUPKA WRITES ( 29 December 1997): 'Now, I will tell you something which strictly speaking should remain between the two of us. It is totally without interest to me whether Langovski, you, Kleinsborg or I are right. What I know is this, I was born after 1945 and have therefore not killed a single Jew, communist, gypsy or homosexual, I have raped no girl, have eaten no child for breakfast, I have stolen from nobody and have burned no one's house down. My lamp shades are made from paper and glass. Soap I buy carefully at Woolworths. In the past 10 years or so, I have not even managed to be caught parking wrongly or driving too fast. I am, if you like, an honourable citizen. I have never been indicted, arrested, or sentenced or jailed. Apart from this, I am philosophically concerned to be responsible for my own actions. Therefore, I decline to carry responsibility for anybody else or to be forced to pay for this with the smallest possible coin. It is as simple as that!'