

Appendix J

**Assessment of a selection of Mr Kupka's Internet postings
by Emeritus Professor of Anthropology,
Dr Rolf Brednich, University of Gottingen, Germany**

Assessment Report on the Internet Postings of Hans Joachim Kupka

By Rolf W. Brednich, Prof. Dr. em. of Anthropology, University of Göttingen (Germany)

10 June 2001

Hans Joachim Kupka: Biographical background

Born 1951 in Berlin, Hans Joachim Kupka started his political career as a „Saalordner“ (assembly room organizer/bouncer) of the right-wing Party „Die Republikaner“ founded by Franz Schönhuber. (In 1995 Kupka proposed to Massey University in Palmerston North, as one possible topic for his doctoral dissertation, „Right-wing tendencies in Franz Schönhuber’s writings“). Later on, during the 80s, he served this party as a district chairman for Lower Bavaria, and as a deputy chairman for Bavaria from 1985-1988. At the end of 1988 he emigrated to New Zealand. It seems that he left Germany because of a false claim to hold an academic title and because of a million marks debt accumulated in his „Institute for Cellular Therapy“.

(Source: Margret Chatwin, IDGR. Informationsdienst gegen Rechtsextremismus. Web address <http://www.idgr.de/lexikon/bio/k/kupka-hj/kupka.html>, last updated 6 April 2001, see attachment).

Availability of Kupka’s Internet Postings

During the time he spent in New Zealand Hans J. Kupka was a regular contributor to the Internet Newsgroup de.soc.politik.deutschland. This assessment is based on Kupka’s postings from 1 October 1997 to 31 January 1998 available from the Shofar FTP Archive File: people/k/kupka.hans.joachim/1997kupka 9710, 9711, 9712, 9801. An additional file with the postings of January 1999 was received as printout (Franke Collection) and has also been used. These files comprise a total of ca. 700 pages. As Kupka has contributed for a much longer period of time to the Usenet chatgroup, the total amount of statements which he has posted would be much larger, and might reach an estimated sum of some thousand pages. Nevertheless the texts analysed for the current purpose seem to constitute a sufficient random selection. During the periods analysed, Kupka used a New Zealand based email address hansk@wave.co.nz which in 1999 was changed into hkupka@usa.net.

About the Usenet ChatGroup

During the first period under review, there was an average number of ca. 20 participants engaged as discussants in the Newsgroup. The Newsgroup is clearly male dominated. Among the postings of the four months there are only two women represented (Stefanie Teufel and Nele Abels-Ludwig). Most contributors have German email addresses, one of the discussants is Austrian, and three out of 20 have a clearly defined university background. The majority seem to have completed a secondary education. Most of the contributors are concerned young men interested in German history and politics.

General remarks on Kupka's Postings

For most of the time Kupka has been posting his contributions during the evening hours from 8 pm to 1 am. He was participating in a number of discussion ‚threads‘ with different chat partners. In the Shofar documentation these threads are recorded accumulatively, and so the general line of the discussions can be followed in detail, but the continual reiteration of statements makes it a major task to assess.

In the context of the Newsgroup, Hans J. Kupka must definitely be regarded as an outsider whose points of view are clearly contradictory to almost all of those corresponding with him. It is certainly justified to call him a ‚provokateur‘. As a contributor to the discussion of political matters, his standard procedure is as follows: to initiate a thread, he posts a provocative statement from himself or a message taken from the media (especially German TV News or popular journals); then he vigorously comments on these statements, and challenges the group members to contradict him. His main topics in the four months investigated comprised:

1. The increasing number of *criminals* among immigrants or ‚guest-workers‘/Gastarbeiter in Germany and the possible dangers that flow from this. (In 1994 every third occupant of a Berlin jail was an immigrant. In the same year every second person in custody was a ‚foreigner‘).
2. The *policies* of the government of the German Federal Republic towards immigrants, especially Turks. For example, the German Chancellor Helmut Kohl stated that immigrants have lesser rights. Kupka denies the right of the Chairman of the Central Jewish Council, Ignaz Bubis, to criticise Kohl for this. According to Kupka, being Jewish is an attribute inherited by birth and cannot be acquired or disposed of later on. A Jew belongs to a different race and has not the right to intervene with German traditions.

3. All gas chambers at Holocaust sites are reconstructions and must therefore be considered as fakes; the operators of these sites are ‚coin forgers’. He names those people who – he thinks - make a business out of the Jewish genocide as ‚Holocausters’. He claims that, in the last year of the war, the concentration camps had been blown up, and that the evidence is therefore problematic as it depends on eyewitnesses alone.

4. Kupka believes in the truth of the content of the ill-reputed Fred Leuchter Report. On the basis of this he therefore denies the existence of mass murders in gas chambers. He defends the author of the report against the reproach that he had insufficient scholarly qualification to undertake the investigations at Auschwitz.

5. In opposition to his discussants (who claim that Hitler was a secondary post-card painter and a ‚grand loser’ [grandioser Versager]) Kupka defends him as a gifted politician. He thinks that although in 1939 Hitler did cast the first stone, he is not the only politician responsible for the outbreak of World War II. The other nations – he thinks - had all been ready to enter into the war.

6. The crimes of the National Socialists can and should be compared with the crimes of other dictators, he claims, and should therefore not be regarded as unique.

7. The ongoing discussions about the Nazi crimes in Germany and the perpetual presentation of the image of the ‚ugly German’ in the media, are especially – he believes - kept alive by the fact that the victims and their descendants receive compensations and Germany is still willing to pay.

The style of the discussion

To the honour of the other contributors to the chatgroup, it can be said that Hans J. Kupka, specially because of his arrogance and his extreme views, always experiences a great deal of opposition, if not repulsion, from the discussants. Whenever Kupka is confronted with the repugnance of his antagonists, he changes to aggressive attacks and even slanders. He seems to be well informed about the biographies of his opponents, and uses details of them to insult the contributors. He always asks for the proof of the statements of others or for definitions („What is a Jew?”), and inclines to say that his discussants are liars. He always has the last word in the discussions, and ends them with phrases such as ‚You don’t understand that’, ‚You are unable to comprehend’, ‚You never contribute anything new to our discussions’ etc. At this stage of the dispute some of the discussants end their participation and no longer respond to him. Others stay in touch with Kupka for a longer time. It is not easy to

understand why Kupka always found partners for a new thread. They presumably want to dissuade him from his right-wing thinking, but it appears from his postings that he is so self-assured of the truth of his opinions that he must be regarded as unmovable. On some occasions some of the discussants were able to corner Kupka, so that very extreme points of view or uncontrolled outbursts emerged.

I give a few examples:

One of Kupka's adversaries, Thorsten Bauer, opened his statement of 14 November 1997 with the Jewish peace greeting *Scholem alejchem*. Kupka disapproved of this greeting because it is Jewish, and started answering the postings of Mr. Bauer by the fascist greeting *Heil und Sieg*, which he justified as being his personal blessing („Everybody is allowed to wish ‚Heil‘ [well-being] to himself, and to apply ‚Sieg‘ [victory] to any institution, business or event“).

On 3 January 1998 Nele Abels-Ludwig characterised Kupka's defence of Fred Leuchter's qualifications as „typical revisionist scholarship“, to which Kupka responded that her argumentation was „typical holocauster scholarship“.

On 25 November 1997 Thorsten Bauer reproached Kupka for telling a lie, to which Kupka answered: „Jewish quibbling, isn't it?“ („Jüdisches Geplänkel eben?“). [He is careful enough to add a question mark].

Some significant reactions of discussants in the Newsgroup

Those users of the chatgroup who no longer wanted to tolerate the hatred, cynicism and aggression of Kupka's postings summarised their views before signing out:

Achim Scheve on 30 December 1997:

„You cannot converse in an ordinary fashion with people who aim for a new Auschwitz-Birkenau“.

Achim Scheve on 2 January 1998:

„Unfortunately this discussion group is suffering severely from the participation of (mostly) insane Nazis“

Jan Perlwitz on 5 November 1997:

„Jesus, can anybody sink lower than HJ Kupka?“

Jan Perlwitz on 14 November 1997

„Hans Kupka is speaking of a ‚Race of the Jews‘. He is reproducing the race-antisemitism of the Nazis“.

Albrecht Kolthoff on 26 November 1997:

„I am personally convinced that he [Kupka] is an instigator of hatred against foreigners [„Ausländerhetzer“] and a racist“.

Albrecht Kolthoff on 27 November 1997

„I do not insist that you should not classify the above quote as ‚Jewish chatter‘ (‚jüdisches Geschwätz‘). If this is your opinion, then may it be so. This is certainly another opinion from mine. It is indeed an antisemitic opinion, and you are an Antisemite“.

Margret Chatwin on 5 January 1998:

„As Kupka’s premise the following is discernible: The crimes of the National Socialists were not so evil as has always been pretended [...] For two decades the so-called neo-conservative circles, together with the extreme right wingers, are collaborating to turn round (‚umdeuten‘) National Socialism to finally make it presentable again.“

Summary of Kupka’s political views

1. His attitude is clearly *racist* and *antisemitic*. According to his opinion, being Jewish is an inherited characteristic of blood, and he therefore defines the Jewish people as belonging to a unique ‚race‘. He strongly denies the right of Ignaz Bubis to criticise the German government because Bubis has nothing to do with German traditions. He answers the Jewish peace greeting (‚*Scholem alejchem*‘) of a discussant with the fascist greeting „*Sieg und Heil*“. He questions the arguments of a discussant as „Jewish babbling?“ He plays a detestable punning game with Jewish family names (Wiesenthal and Schmul Itzigheim, p. 2 of the Nieschmidt translations; Moshe Schlabumski and Myste Mauschel in the ‚satirical‘ statement about the Maggi soup cube in my translation p. 2).

2. He has a very clearly defined opinion of the *Holocaust*. First of all, he always uses the word in ‚quotation marks‘ to show his distance from the term. He does not deny the fact of the mass killing of Jews by the Nazis, but always stresses that Gypsies, homosexuals, and communists had been killed in the concentration camps as well. He constantly repeats his opinion that the gas chambers at the Auschwitz site in Poland are a fake, on grounds that the original buildings had been blown up by the Nazis before the invasion of the Red Army and

were reconstructed later on, and there is no clear indication that the buildings are reconstructions. He classifies the managers of museums of this type as ‚coin forgers‘. He uses the two words ‚fake‘ and ‚Holocaust‘ in close connection as often as possible. In terms of the Justice Gray judgment in the Irving v Lipstadt case (London, April 2000), Kupka can be definitely regarded as a Holocaust denier in terms of the words of the 4th paragraph of the judgment „that the Holocaust is [...] sustained after the war by Jews in order to obtain financial support for the newly created state of Israel“. Kupka has coined (or adapted?) the three terrible terms ‚Holocaustery‘ (‚Holochausterei‘) for the attempt to keep the memory of the events alive, ‚Holocauster‘ for those who make a business out of it, and ‚Holocult‘ for the ‚myth‘ which surrounds the Holocaust discussions in the form of books, media reports, films, etc.

A similar effect of systematic playing down of the Nazis‘ mass killings occurs when Kupka insists that the crimes of the Nazis are not unique in history and can be compared with similar or even worse crimes of other dictators. This caused Jürgen Langowski to put in his statement of 7 November 1997: „The denying of the Holocaust and the playing down („Kleinreden und Schönreden,“) of the mass murders of the Third Reich are the first step towards their repetition“.

Kupka is also a supporter of some prominent German Holocaust-deniers such as Horst Kleinsorg, Günter Lelarge, Manfred Koch, and Claus Dietwald. He makes a special effort to support the findings of the well-known American Fred Leuchter, who is often cited by the Holocaust deniers. In December 1997 and January 1998 there is an convoluted debate in the Usenet about the scholarly prerequisites of Leuchter for undertaking his investigations in the Auschwitz-Treblinka gas chambers. Kupka insists that a Master’s degree from an American university is a sufficient qualification for someone undertaking such complex research.

3. There is absolutely no doubt that Kupka has a special *hatred against immigrants* in Germany. On different occasions his postings make it clear that he wants to have all immigrants removed from the country, believing that this would solve Germany’s problem of a high rate of criminals and unemployed people. This thinking is not far from the Nazi conviction that all ‚foreign‘ elements should be expelled from the country. He is even thinking about the re-introduction of torture to be applied to ‚foreign criminals‘.

Comparison between the Freudenberg and Franke Selections of Kupka's Postings

If there was a suggestion to Mr. Kupka in 1998 warning him against antisemitic, racist, and Holocaust denying statements, this had no obvious effect on the postings represented in the Franke Selection for the month of January 1999. In fact I detected an increasing amount of aggressive antisemitic statements (see eg. the Maggi soup cup ‚satire‘ in my translations p. 2).

Kupka's Letter of Defence of 8 March 2001

In his letter to Mr. W. L. Renwick, Kupka has acknowledged his long participation in the newsgroup discussion of the Usenet from 1995 until 1999. During this time he posted and received thousands of statements to and from a great number of discussants. In an attempt to white-wash himself, he selects only nine excerpts from his postings as proof of his ‚harmless‘ political points of view. This is very unconvincing, especially because most of the texts in his letter of defence lack any context of discussion. Because of the limited availability of postings in the Shofar Archive Files, I was only able to re-contextualise one significant example of his statements in the letter of defence.

On p. 3 of his letter he is quoting himself from a statement posted on 12 January 1998:

„ich halte den ‚Holocaust‘ [note the quotation marks!] nicht für eine Erfindung jüdischer Geschäftemacher“.

„*I do not maintain that the ‚Holocaust‘ is the invention of Jewish business people.*“

The complete context of his posting to Jürgen Langowski reads as follows:

„Um Dir Deine Phantasien zu erleichtern: ich halte den »Holocaust« nicht für eine Erfindung jüdischer Geschäftemacher. Allerdings sage ich, daß es Juden gibt, die mit dem Elend ihrer Glaubensgenossen Geschäfte machen. Diese Meinung habe ich übrigens mehrfach hier gepostet und Du hast darauf auch mehrfach geantwortet (z.B. in 34ea228d.24000870@personalnews.germany.eu.net). Nun bleibt es unserem »Goebbels des Usenet« überlassen, zu erklären, warum ich mehrfach davon spreche, daß Juden mit dem Elend ihrer Glaubensgenossen Geschäfte machen - und Langowski mit jener Formulierung zu beweisen versucht, ich hielte eben jenes Elend für ‚eine Erfindung jüdischer Geschäftemacher‘“.

„*In order to facilitate your fantasies: I do not maintain that the ‚Holocaust‘ is the invention of Jewish business people. However I say that there are Jews who make a business out of the*

misery of their fellow-believers. I have several times posted this opinion here and you answered it repeatedly (eg. in 34ea228d.24000870@personalnews.germany.eu.net). Now it is up to the ‚Goebbels of the Usenet‘ to explain why I repeatedly speak about the fact that Jews make a business out of the misery of their fellow-believers, and Langowski is trying to prove with his statement that I regard this misery precisely as ‚an invention of Jewish business people‘“.

Even Kupka's letter itself contains a good indication that he is still advocating his basic convictions as analysed in the assessment. I quote from his posting of 17 March 1999, repeated two years later in his letter of 8 March 2001:

„[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“.

In conclusion, what was meant to be a defence, turns out therefore to be another manifestation of his adherence to his basic views about the Holocaust.

In regard to everything I have read from and about him I am convinced that Hans Joachim Kupka is an ideologue of extreme right-wing views rather than a scholar; and that instead of scholarly debate his style is that of unsubstantiated assertion and at times abuse.

During a conversation on the Usenet, Stefanie Teufel once asked Kupka (1 October 1997):

„Darf ich Dich davon ausgehen, dass Du Dich selbst als Mitglied der Rechten bezeichnest, ja oder nein?“

„*Can I assume that you define yourself as a member of the [extreme] Right, yes or no?*“

Kupka answered:

„Nicht im Sinne einer Mitgliedschaft in einer existierenden Organisation, aber durchaus im Sinne einer weltanschaulichen Orientierung, ja.“

„*Not in the sense of a membership in an existing organisation, but definitely yes in the sense of world view orientation.*“

Hans J Kupka

Texts and Translations of Selected Postings of and to Hans Joachim Kupka

14 January 1998 (HJK)

„[...]ich halte den »Holocaust nicht für eine Erfindung jüdischer Geschäftemacher. Allerdings sage ich, daß es Juden gibt, die mit dem Elend ihrer Glaubensgenossen Geschäfte machen.“

[...] I don't think that the ,Holocaust' is an invention of Jewish businessmen. However I say that there are Jews who make a business out of the misery of their fellow-believers.

(Jürgen Langowski)

„Dann führe doch mal den Beweis, daß es so ist und nenne ein paar Namen.“

Would you furnish the proof that this is true and name some names.

(HJK)

„Z.B. »Schindlers Liste«, Steven Spielberg. Solche Machwerke addieren nichts zur historischen Wahrheit.“

For instance ,Schindler's List', Steven Spielberg. Those bungles don't add anything to the historical truth.

26 January 1998 (Jürgen Langowski)

„Hat Hitler gelogen, als er das alles [zum Stand der Kriegsvorbereitungen 1939] gesagt hat, Herr Koch?“

Did Hitler tell a lie when he was talking [about the preparations for the war in 1939], Mr. Koch?

(HJK)

„Wohl kaum, nur geht daraus nicht hervor, daß Hitler der große und alleinige Kriegstreiber war. Auch wenn er den ersten Stein warf, so warteten die anderen nur darauf und waren vorbereitet. Überfall? Dass ich nicht lache!“

Well hardly, but this does not show that Hitler was the big and only war instigator. Even if he was the one to cast the first stone the other ones just waited for it and were prepared. Surprise attack? I burst out laughing!

31 January 1998 (HJK)

„Wenn es nicht so traurig wäre, müßte man darüber lachen, daß [Fred] Leuchters Qualifikation, wissenschaftlich arbeiten zu können, angezweifelt wird mit der Begründung, er habe nur einen Bachelor Grad (was übrigens falsch ist, er ist Magister)“.

If it were not so sad one should laugh about the fact that [Fred] Leuchter's qualification for scholarly work is under doubt using the argument that he had just a Bachelor degree (that is wrong by the way; he has an M.A.).

2 January 1999 (HJK)

„Deutschland ist im Gegensatz zu Kanada kein Einwanderungsland. Während Einwanderungsländer sich (zu Recht) die Rosinen herauspicken (Ausbildung, Vermögen, Gesundheit, Sprachkenntnisse, Alter usw. sind da die entscheidenden Faktoren), bekommt Deutschland im wesentlichen eine Negativauswahl ins Land - nämlich jene, die unter normalen Einwanderungsbedingungen kaum eine Chance hätten“.

Different from Canada, Germany is not an immigrant nation. While the immigration countries (and rightly so) are picking the raisins out of the cake (education, wealth, health, language skills, age etc. are the main ways of selecting), Germany essentially receives only a negative selection into the country, namely those who under normal immigration conditions hardly had any chance.

„Tatsächlich gibt es keinen einzigen faktischen Beweis dafür, daß es in Deutschland mehr Rassismus, mehr Ausländerhaß, mehr Antisemitismus gibt als in vergleichbaren anderen Ländern. Nur wird der Rassismus, Ausländerhaß und Antisemitismus in Deutschland lauter publiziert und beweint von jenen, denen es nicht eigentlich um eine bessere Welt geht, sondern darum, Deutschland und den Deutschen wieder einmal eins auszuwischen“.

As a matter of fact, there is not a single proof for the fact that there is more racism, more hatred of foreigners, more antisemitism in Germany than in other comparable countries. It's just that racism, hatred of foreigners and antisemitism in Germany is published more noisily and deplored by those who are not so much interested in a better world but in dealing a blow to Germany and the Germans once more.

4 January 1999 (HJK) [Caution: Satire!]

„Herr Kleinholz behauptet in einem Artikel, der Mensch ernähre sich von der Erde und diese sei rund: ‚Die Erde ist rund... Sie ernährt den Menschen‘.“ [...]

Das stimmt so nicht. Im Gegensatz zu Kleinholz habe ich mir die Arbeit gemacht, und mir die relevante Literatur zum Thema besorgt und auch gelesen, was Herr Kleinholz wohl nicht hat.

Wie bereits 1947 der weltberühmte und renommierte Nahrungsmittel-experte Moshe Schlabumski in seinem intergalaktisch ver[t]iebener von monumentaler Bedeutung' Maggi in der Vor-, Während- und Nachkriegsernährung' nachgewiesen hat, ist der Suppenwürfel nahrhaft.

Wenn also Herr Kleinholz unterstellt, der Mensch ernähre sich von der ‚Mutter Erde‘, so liegt darin ein Widerspruch, ganz einfach deswegen, weil nach Herrn Kleinholz die Erde rund ist, wir aber durch die von Schlabumski geleistete Forschung wissen, daß der Mensch sich in Wirklichkeit vorwiegend vom (quadratisch aufgebauten) Maggi (-Suppenwürfel) ernährt oder zumindest ernähren könnte. Die am häufigsten verwendete Form von Maggi ist, war und wird für alle Zeit sein, und wird Schlabumski auch von der Maggi-immanenten Religionsforscherin Myste Mauschel zitiert, der Suppenwürfel“.

Mr. Kleinholz claims in an article that men feed on the earth and the earth is round: ‚The earth is round... It nourishes mankind‘...

That is incorrect. In opposition to Kleinholz I made the effort and provided the literature relevant to the topic [of nourishing mankind], which Mr. Kleinholz obviously has not.

As early as 1947 the world famous and renowned food expert Moshe Schlabumski showed in his intergalactically available work of monumental significance, Maggi in the nourishment of pre-war, war and post-war times', that the soup cube is nutritious.

When Mr. Kleinholz insinuates that mankind is living off ‚Mother Earth‘, there is a contradiction in that, simply because according to Mr. Kleinholz the earth is round and we know from the investigations of Schlabumski that mankind feeds predominantly on the (square formed) Maggi (soup cube) or at least could do so. The most frequently used form of Maggi is and will for ever be the soup cup, and in this respect Schlabumski is even quoted by the Maggi-immanent historian of religion, Myste Mauschel.

7 January 1999 (HJK)

„Dürfte man nicht auch zeigen, um wieviel schrecklicher andere Verbrechen waren?“

Should we not be allowed to show how much more horrible other crimes [than the Holocaust] have been?

(Alexander Stein)

„Ich wüßte nicht, wozu das nützlich sein sollte“.

I have no idea why this would be useful?

(HJK)

„Wozu ist es denn nützlich, ein Verbrechen als einmalig darzustellen?“

For what purpose then is it useful to describe a crime as unique?

(Alexander Stein)

„Die Verbrechen der Nationalsozialisten waren nicht nur wegen der Zahl der Ermordeten, sondern auch wegen Art der Ausführung und der Wahl der Opfer die schlimmsten Verbrechen in der Geschichte.“

The crimes of the National Socialists were the worst crimes in history not only because of the number of persons killed, but because of the way they had been executed and the way the victims had been selected.

(HJK)

„Das ist eine mögliche Meinung. Es gibt aber auch andere, z. B. nämlich die, daß die Verbrechen der Kommunisten weitaus mehr Opfer gefordert haben. Um dies allerdings zu erkennen, muß man vergleichen. Und wenn man dann die Verbrechen der Nationalsozialisten im Vergleich sieht, dann weiß man auch, wozu es nützlich ist, zu zeigen, um wieviel schrecklicher die Verbrechen anderer waren: Es eröffnen sich dann völlig neue Perspektiven, wie z. B. die Frage, warum trotz anderer Verbrechen ähnlichen oder größeren Ausmaßes nach wie vor die Verbrechen der Nazis als einzigartig dargestellt werden [...]

Sicherlich käme niemand auf den Gedanken, die Verbrechen von Meier und von Lehmann mit denen Hitlers, Stalins, Maos, Pol Pots etc. zu vergleichen. Aber Meiers mit Lehmanns schon - oder? Denn die Dimension ist vergleichbar. Und wenn mir jemand sagt, daß Hitler sechs, zehn oder 20 Millionen Menschen auf dem Gewissen hat, dann ist die Dimension dieses Verbrechens vergleichbar mit denen eines Stalin oder eines Mao, der Umfang der Morde im Namen des Nationalsozialismus vergleichbar mit dem der Morde im Namen des Kommunismus. Warum verharmlost man, wenn man eine Beziehung herstellt?“

This is one possible opinion. But there are also others; for instance, the crimes of the communists produced many more victims. But to be able to comprehend this, one certainly must make comparisons. And if you see the crimes of the National Socialists comparatively, then you will also know how useful it is to show how much more frightful the crimes of others had been: Totally new perspectives will then open, for instance the question of why, despite there being crimes of similar or even larger range, the crimes of the Nazis are still presented as being unique.

I am sure, nobody would have the idea of comparing the crimes of [ordinary people like] [Mr.] Meier and of [Mr.] Lehmann to those of Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot etc. But the crimes of Meier with that of Lehman, that's possible, isn't it? Because the dimension is comparable. And if there is somebody who wants to tell me that Hitler has six, ten or twenty million people on his conscience, then the dimension of this crime is comparable to those of Stalin or Mao. The proportion of the homicides committed in the name of National Socialism is comparable to those homicides in the name of communism. Why do people say [Hitler's crimes] are played down by establishing such comparisons?

8 January 1999 (HJK)

„Würdest du mir bitte mitteilen, was Du konkret unter der ‚Aufarbeitung‘ solchen Unrechts verstehst?“

Would you please tell me what you understand by ‚facing up to‘ such evils?

(Alexander Stein)

„Unter Aufarbeitung von Unrecht verstehe ich, die Hintergründe zu erforschen, über die Schuld daran nachzudenken und die Erkenntnisse der Nachwelt zur Verfügung zu stellen“.

By ‚facing up to‘ the evils I understand: investigation of the background [of the Holocaust], thinking about our guilt, and making knowledge available to posterity.

(HJK)

„Du meinst also, die sei, unseren Fall betreffend, bisher in noch nicht ausreichendem Maß geschehen? Wieviele Bücher müssen geschrieben, wie viele Filme gedreht werden, [wie]viele Generationen vergehen, bis Deiner Meinung nach die Aufarbeitung abgeschlossen ist?“

„Brauchst Du wirklich ein ganzes Menschenleben, um über die Schuld wildfremder und längst toter Leute nachzudenken? Ich glaube, daß manch einem Israeli Dein Geld lieber wäre. Und das Produkt des Nachdenkens über anderer Leute Missetaten willst Du der Nachwelt zur Verfügung stellen. Wie uneigennützig!“

You therefore mean that this, in respect to our case, has not been sufficiently done? How many books have to be written, how many films to be shot, how many generations will it take until according to your opinion the ‚facing up to‘ is accomplished?

Does it really need a whole lifespan to meditate upon the guilt of unknown and long-dead people? ... I believe that many Israeli would prefer to get money out of [the Germans]. You want to present to future generations the results of meditating on other people's guilt? How enlightened!

8 January 1999 (Alexander Stein)

„Die Verbrechen der Nationalsozialisten stellen in ihrer Schrecklichkeit eine Einmaligkeit in der bekannten Geschichte der Menschheit dar, selbst wenn es noch irgendeinen anderen Diktatoren gegeben haben sollte, der für mehr Morde verantwortlich ist.“

(HJK)

„Du wiederholst gebetsmühlenartig (mit kleinen Variationen) den ersten Teil des Satzes, nach dem die ‚Verbrechen der Nationalsozialisten [...] in ihrer Schrecklichkeit eine Einmaligkeit in der bekannten Geschichte der Menschheit dar[stellen]‘. Ein Argument, was diese Einmaligkeit ausmachen soll, habe ich bisher allerdings noch nicht zu Gesicht bekommen. Die schiere Menge der Opfer kann es ja nicht sein, denn die liegt bei den Nationalsozialisten unter der der Kommunisten.“

Sicher: man kann natürlich eine Einmaligkeit konstruieren und sagen, daß die Nazis systematisch z. B .Juden, Zigeuner, Schwule und Kommunisten umgebracht haben, was auf die Kommunisten nicht zutrifft. Damit aber werden auch die kommunistischen Massenmorde einmalig, denn der von ihnen ermordete Personenkreis ist wiederum nicht mit dem der von den Naziverbrechen Betroffenen identisch. So, was nun? Haben wir es nun mit zwei einmaligen, in dergleichen Epoche und aus gleichen (nämlich ideologischen) Gründen verübten Verbrechen zu tun? Zweimal einmaliges?“

„[...] so sicher, wie es von New York bis Auckland ‚Holocaust‘-Museen, Gedenk- und Forschungsstätten gibt, so wenig beschäftigt man sich Dererorts mit den anderen großen Verbrechen an der Menschheit“.

„Ich kenne niemanden, der ‚die Verbrechen der Nationalsozialisten [...] für harmlos erklärt und sie einfach vergißt‘. Ich kenne auch niemanden, der Juden, Zigeuner, Kommunisten und Schwule vergasend durch die Lande ziehen würde, und davon nur durch seinen täglichen Fix mit Antinazi-Propaganda abgehalten wird. Ich kenne aber eine ganze Reihe von Menschen, z. T. der zweiten Nachkriegsgeborenen-Generation angehörend, die die Schnauze voll haben von der ewigen Anti-Deutschen Hetze. Daß da möglicherweise ein Schwelbrand entsteht, scheint derzeit noch niemanden zu kümmern. Erst wenn es dann zu Ausschreitungen kommt, werden wieder Lichterketten organisiert statt zu sagen: laßt es jetzt genug sein mit den ewigen Schuldvorwürfen.“

„Das [Entschädigung für Massenmorde] aber ist bei den Morden durch das Regime Hitlers anders. Da klingelt es ganz kräftig im Beutel. Und jetzt nähern wir uns langsam dem Grund für die ‚Einmaligkeit‘ dieser Verbrechen: zum ersten Mal schaut für die Opfer bzw. die Hinterbliebenen etwas heraus. So lange aber die Kuh Milch gibt, wäre man dumm, von ihr abzulassen. Mit anderen Worten: ich stelle zur Diskussion, ob es nicht gerade die Zahlungswilligkeit Deutschlands ist, die dazu führt, daß die erste, die zweite und wohl auch die dritte Nachkriegsgeneration zur Kasse gebeten wird. Und damit man das erfolgreich tun kann, muß natürlich das Bild des ‚häßlichen Deutschen‘ weiterhin in den Medien verbreitet werden, der Schuldkomplex darf nicht zur Ruhe kommen.“

[Jetzt warte ich in Ruhe auf das Geschrei, das einsetzen wird, nachdem ich gesagt habe, was viele denken].“

(Alexander Stein)

The crimes of the National Socialists are a unique event in the known history of mankind because of their terribleness, even if there was another dictator who is responsible for more homicide.

(HJK)

Like a prayer, you are repeating (with small variations) the first part of the sentence that the crimes of the National Socialists (...) are unique in their terribleness in the known history of mankind. But I have not yet come across any argument that would prove their uniqueness. It cannot be the mere numbers of victims because those of the National Socialists are smaller than those of the communists.

Well, of course one can construct a uniqueness by saying that the Nazis systematically for instance killed Jews, Gypsies, Homosexuals and Communist's, which does not apply to the Communists. But by the same token the communist mass homicide will appear unique, because on the other hand the range of people killed by them is a different selection to those affected by the Nazi crimes. So, what now? Do we have to deal with two unique crimes committed in the same period of time for the same (namely ideological) reasons? Twice a uniqueness?

„[...] as surely as there are ‚Holocaust‘ museums, memorial places and research institutes from New York to Auckland, it is certain that there is no interest in the other big crimes of mankind.“

I do not know of anybody who would declare the crimes of the National Socialists as being harmless and would forget about them. Also, I know of nobody who would want to roam around the country gassing Jews, Gypsies, Communists and Homosexuals but who would be prevented from doing so by his daily allotment of anti-Nazi propaganda. But I know a certain amount of people, including members of the second post-war generation, who are sick

of the ongoing anti-German accusations. That this could well represent a slow burning fuse (Schwelband), obviously nobody cares about as yet. However when riots occur, there will again be organized groups of people carrying candlelights, instead of people saying preemptively: ,end the ever lasting labelling of guilt'.

That [compensation for mass homicide] is different from the homicide committed by the Hitler regime. There the bell is heavily ringing in the collection box. And now we are slowly approaching the reason for the ,uniqueness' of those crimes: for the first time the victims or their decendants have been rewarded. As long as the cow can be milked, it would be stupid to let her go. In other words: I bring into the discussion the question of whether it is the willingness of Germany to pay which is leading to the fact that the first, second and even the third post-war generations have to pay cash. And in order to be able to be successful at this, the image of the ,ugly German' has certainly to be ongoingly propagated by the media; the guilt complex is not allowed to diminish.

(and now I am silently waiting for the uproar which will start after I have said what many are thinking).