

## **Appendix Z**

### **Statements of four Holocaust survivors to the Review**

- (a) Mr Robert Narev**
- (b) Mrs Ruth Filler**
- (c) Mr Fred Silberstein**
- (d) Mrs Maru Bing-Kulka**

## **SUBMISSIONS OF ROBERT NAREV**

My name is Robert Narev. I would ask your leave to present my brief submissions in three sections.

First to give you some information which is perhaps equivalent to a Curriculum Vitae summary of my 50 years in New Zealand and which will point to the likelihood of my being an interviewee had the thesis research of Mr Kupka proceeded.

Secondly to summarise in shortened form my early years and experiences in Germany and Czechoslovakia during the Nazi era.

Thirdly to indicate what would have been my reaction had I been interviewed for the thesis either by Mr Kupka in person or by means of a questionnaire prepared by him without my knowing what I now know of his anti-semitic and Holocaust denial attitudes and finding out subsequently that these were in fact his frequently expressed views.

I am a Barrister and Solicitor of the High Court of New Zealand and a Notary Public and have practised in Auckland for over 40 years. I was President of the Auckland Hebrew Congregation in the 1990s and am currently the Chairman of the United Synagogues of New Zealand.

I am the Chairman of Directors of a Unit Trust listed on the New Zealand Stock Exchange with assets of over \$700 Million, a Director of a number of other companies and a Trustee of several charitable organisations, including the Christian Healthcare Trust, the Dental Research Foundation and the Home and Family Trust of which I am Chairman.

I am a member of the New Zealand Order of Merit and President of the Auckland Society of Notaries. I hold degrees in Arts and Law from Auckland University and

was Senior Scholar in German and French in 1956. German is my mother tongue, I am still a fluent German speaker and have a number of German and Austrian clients in my practice.

I was born in Germany in 1935. Shortly after my birth my father, a secondary school teacher, was dismissed from his position because he was Jewish and we moved to Frankfurt where he was for a period able to work in a school for Jews only, but this was also closed in due course by the Nazis.

In August 1942 my father, my mother, my two grandmothers (one of whom was nearing her 90th birthday) and I were transported to the Concentration Camp of Theresienstadt in Czechoslovakia. My most vivid memory of that event as a six year old child was that my father was beaten by Nazi officers because he had failed to disclose a coin, the equivalent of a 10-cent piece, which he still had in his pocket.

My father and both grandmothers died in the Concentration Camp, but my mother and I were fortunate to survive and came to New Zealand in 1947.

An uncle of mine with his wife and young son were deported from Berlin and were never heard from again. The meticulous records kept by the Nazis on their victims would seem to indicate that they perished in Auschwitz.

My wife, also Jewish, was born in Poland in 1937. Her father was shot by Nazi sympathisers early in the Holocaust period because he happened to be one of the leaders of his small local Jewish Community. Her mother and a sister perished somewhere in Eastern Europe, possibly in Concentration Camps, but their actual fate remains unknown.

My wife survived in hiding with a sympathetic Catholic family and came to New Zealand in 1949. We have three children all now adults, who as a result of the activities of the Nazis never knew three of their four grandparents and lost virtually all of what should have been normal family history, mementos and experiences.

The foregoing perhaps provides some background to what would have been my reaction if I had been interviewed for the thesis of Mr Kupka without knowing of his many statements typical of those who deny the occurrence of the Holocaust and of his derogatory comments about Jews.

Given that the research for Mr Kupka's thesis would have involved him in enquiry into the business, cultural and general life of German-speaking persons in New Zealand and their contribution to this country, with specific focus on immigrants, a significant number of whom were Jewish, it would I feel sure have been essential to include Jewish persons in such research.

I understand that in a project such as his a University would have among its prime requirements for an interview process informed consent from and cultural safety for the subjects of the research, so as to free them from the risk of harm and in this case from the re-opening of painful wounds of the past. This would hopefully have the effect of protecting them from deceptive research.

I believe that there may have at some stage been a suggestion that for these reasons Jews should be excluded from the research, but given their significant contribution to life in this country, this would obviously have diluted the value of the project.

Although both my wife and I have been able to cope reasonably well on a personal level with our experiences and memories of the Holocaust, I would have been absolutely appalled to have discovered after the interview process that the researcher had, among many other statements of a like kind, suggested that:

- a. Publication of Holocaust material involved profiteering.
- b. Crematoria in Concentration Camps were explainable as a necessity to get rid of bomb and disease victims.
- c. Because gas chambers and plans for them had not been found, their existence must be in doubt.
- d. The well-known Holocaust survivor and Nobel Prize winner Eli Wiesel was "a revanchist of the worst kind" and a malicious agitator.
- e. Historical lies were invented to prove that the Holocaust occurred.

- f. The number of victims of the Holocaust was a matter of technical accountancy and was more likely to have been 340,000 ( including those who died of natural causes or were executed for crimes) rather than the real number, of whom members of my family were but a minute proportion.
- g. Verification of the existence of Concentration Camps can be compared to proof of sightings of UFOs.

Had these and many statements using terminology reminiscent of the worst Nazi calumnies of Jews been known to potential Jewish interviewees, I am certain that revulsion rather than co-operation would have been the outcome.

One would have to have serious concern about the agenda and motivation of a person holding the views on Jews and of the Holocaust which clearly emerge from the writings of Mr Kupka and to me it is disturbing that a number of influential staff members of Waikato University were not only prepared to ignore this background but actively supported Mr Kupka in his endeavours to proceed with his research.

I am sure that the effect on others, whose wounds run deeper than mine, of discovering the views and positions adopted by Mr Kupka would have been even more disturbing and the possibility that a reputable University in a country as liberal and as right-thinking as New Zealand might have permitted the project to proceed without proper disclosure and informed consent and despite the representations which were made to it is to my mind simply unthinkable.

For University of Waikato Inquiry – RUTH FILLER

My name is Ruth Filler, and I was born in Hildesheim, Germany. I grew up there in the 1930's and through extraordinary luck and foresight, my family was able to emigrate to New Zealand in 1938, where I have lived ever since. My late husband's name was Sol Filler, who was in Auschwitz and other concentration camps for more than 3 years during World War II, and was liberated in Terezin, (Theresienstadt) in Czechoslovakia by the Russians in May, 1945. More than 80 members of my husband's family, including his parents, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc. lie buried in a mass grave containing over 1000 Jewish men, women and children in the forest on the outskirts of the small town in South Poland from whence he was so brutally taken by the Nazis, to suffer unspeakable torture, starvation and beatings. In January, 1945, he was one of those forced to go on one of the infamous Death Marches, from Auschwitz, and for 4 ½ months had to walk, without food or water, finally ending up in Terezin. Of the approximately 20,000 who left Auschwitz originally, in his group alone, around 200 arrived, having subsisted on grass, raw roots, snow, and anything they could dig out of the ground on the way. There were many of those Death Marches, and only a pitiful few arrived at their destination, where many of them succumbed to typhoid fever and other diseases, even after liberation.

I was awarded the QSO, Queen's Service Order, in the last New Year's honours, mainly for the work I have done with regard to commemorating, remembering and educating people about the Holocaust. I say this not to show off or praise myself, but to underline my passionate commitment to eradicating – like a malignant cancer – Holocaust revisionists, deniers and neo-Nazis.

Then along comes a man calling himself Hans Joachim Kupka, who is intent, under the respectable umbrella of the Waikato University, on getting his doctoral degree, based on interviews with "German-speaking people" in this country. I have read Kupka's proposal, and am appalled to think that I might have been one of those interviewed by him, given him my trust and confidence, because I would have been fooled by the credentials he would have presented, cloaked by the approval and support of the faculty of this University. Imagine, then, finding out subsequently that Joachim Kupka is a neo-Nazi, a revisionist and Holocaust denier. I have read, in German, and the English translation, just how virulent that anti-Semitic doctrine is which he follows.

It is obvious that the University has not followed its own regulations on Human Research Ethics. I give the University the benefit of the doubt that they did not know this man's intentions and underlying agenda to begin with, but thanks to the vigilance of the Waikato Jewish Association, and the Jewish

members of the faculty in this institution, steps were soon taken to reveal and expose the dissemination by Kupka of scurrilous material on the internet. What utter balderdash and cover-ups there have been spread by the high-ranking members of some of the faculty of this University. Instead of supporting, sympathizing with and sharing the outrage felt by all the Jewish faculty and students of this university, Jews in Hamilton City, and indeed throughout the country, and – I might add – not only Jews, but many, many of our non-Jewish friends, the most mind-boggling and incredible actions have been taken by these same people to stifle any protest, to frustrate any decisive action, resulting in showing this University up in the most damaging and unflattering way possible. I do hope your enquiry will uncover the reasons behind all these Kafka-esque events, which are very reminiscent of the Dreifuss affair in France, and Nazi modus operandi in Germany in the 30's and 40's of the last century. I am myself, outraged, insulted and very angry at the stance the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor and others supporting them have taken in this sorry matter, and hope the enquiry will administer a severe reproof to them when it has heard all the evidence.

I have lived in New Zealand for almost 63 years now, secure, I thought, in the knowledge that this is a safe haven for Jews from persecution and the kind of discrimination my family and I lived under in Nazi Germany, so it has come as a terrible shock and caused great distress to me to find what are blatantly anti-Semitic sentiments so rife in the academic world, so obviously shown by the support and approval given to a person of Joachim Kupka's ilk. May the findings of this enquiry show that these sentiments do not find a welcoming place in which to grow and proliferate.

*Fred Silberstein,  
64 Terry Street,  
Auckland 1007.  
Ph. 627-8073*

Mr Renwick,  
Ladies and gentlemen,

Teena koutou, teena koutu and Shalom!

I have the privilege of telling you the story of my own experience of the Holocaust. Please do not look on me as a special person or a hero just because I am alive today. I don't see it like that. I was born to the right parents at the right time, but in the wrong country. I speak a lot about freedom but I do not speak with hate. Hate breeds hate. I hold no hostility beyond the generations that were guilty. The children and grandchildren cannot be blamed for the crimes of their forefathers.

I was less than nine years old when I learned my first lessons. In 1936, the Berlin Olympics. Then in 1938, the Kristallnacht - the night of broken glass, 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> November. One never forgets the sight and smell of burning scrolls and prayerbooks and a burning synagogue. Our father was arrested and we lost our shop, our apartment and all our furniture.

1<sup>st</sup> September 1939, the war broke out. It was a Sunday. I was on my way to Hebrew school and all I had with me was my satchel and prayer books. The German Nazis yelled out at me that I, the Jew, had started the war. From 1941 we wore the yellow star at all times. 20<sup>th</sup> January 1942, the conference of Nazi officials at the Wannsee approved the Final Solution, not just resettlement but elimination of all Jews. A few months later I was arrested after school on my way home to my parents and sister. I was never to see my parents again. I was sent to a hard labour camp, Am Grossen Wannsee. I remember well the visits there by Adolf Eichmann.

AS



On the 28<sup>th</sup> February 1943 we were taken to a railway station to go to Auschwitz. I had no idea where Auschwitz was or what it was. I soon found out. The train journey took about two and a half days, 150 or 160 people jammed into goods wagons, standing room only, no food or water, no toilet facilities, just like animals going to the slaughterhouse. When we arrived early in the morning we were told to jump out and split up, women to the left and men to the right. At this moment a stranger told me to tell the officials I was older. I did lie about my age, I told the SS officer I was 15½, and I went with the men to Auschwitz-Buna.

I was given a number, 106792, and managed to keep going day by day. For two years we never saw any soap or toothbrush or toothpaste. We were so dirty and smelly, covered in rashes from spotted fever - typhus, caused by lice and fleas. Our hands were always dirty so when we scratched our skin we got infections. We were like subhumans or cockroaches, as the Nazis called us.

One Saturday in September 1944, we were standing naked - normal practice - about 10,000 prisoners. The Angel of Death, Dr Josef Mengele, selected me for medical experiments. I will not go into details, but in about November 1944 I attempted suicide. I did not succeed, I was found by other prisoners and they helped me back to life, rightly or wrongly is not for me to judge.

18<sup>th</sup> January 1945, we began the death march back to Germany. It was very cold. I was very sick - no proper clothing, no shoes, no hair - and the death toll was about 60% by the time we arrived in Germany in the first week of February. We arrived in Nordhausen. I was taken to a slave-labour camp called Dora, outside the city next to a German airfield. Dora was worse than Auschwitz. There were about 51,000 prisoners. In March 1945 food was very scarce in Germany, and there for the first time in my life and I hope the last, I witnessed cannibalism. I assure you I did not take part, but I could have been the next one to be eaten.

AS

About 5<sup>th</sup> April 1945 the US Air Force mistakenly bombed our camp, which was next to the German airfield, and in more than two hours of heavy bombing, 2500 of our prisoners were killed. I survived, but was badly injured and taken to hospital. A strange thing happened to me. My friends told me afterwards that the Nazi officials thought I was dead. They thought they had identified me by my number and buried me. My death was recorded by the officials because the war was still going on. Our camp was not liberated till 11<sup>th</sup> April, and the war ended on 8<sup>th</sup> May 1945. Many years later in April 1993 I made my first visit back to Nordhausen. It was on their records that I was dead and I was shown the place of my grave - spooky!

I was liberated but at first it had no meaning to me. I had to learn to be civilized and trust people again. In 1946 I worked for the American prosecution team at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, and it was a bonus to me to see the top twenty Nazis brought into the courtroom every day. I remember well Saturday 16<sup>th</sup> October 1946, the day the guilty were hanged. Goering missed out, he had committed suicide during the night.

In 1947, two years after the war had ended, I found my sister alive. I also learned at last what had happened to our parents. They had been together in Theresienstadt. Then in 1944 they were sent to Birkenau and on 10<sup>th</sup> October they were gassed and incinerated.

In 1948 I came to New Zealand. In June 1995 I was invited to go to Berlin as a guest speaker from New Zealand to help unveil a Holocaust monument. After I had given my address in German to those present, I found to my horror that my name was listed on the monument as one of the dead. You can imagine my feelings! In April 1996 the officials in Nordhausen sent me a photo of my grave, where every year on the 11<sup>th</sup> April German people lay flowers! In 1997 on Holocaust Day in Auckland I showed this photo for the first time to my wife and our children and my sister.

In November 1997 I received a letter from a lady in Remuera, Auckland. She was writing a book about her family history, and she thought I would like to know - why, I wonder? - that she was a third cousin of Dr Mengele! I told her, who cares?

You know now why I ask you - do not forget! Remember what happened!

Again I thank you all. Shalom, sei mir gesuend!

RS

To: Mr.Bill . Renwick, Wellington.

From: Maru Bing-Kulka

Date: 12 March 2001

Subject: Human Research Ethics at the University of Waikato

### **Introduction.**

My name is Maru Bing-Kulka and I was one of the four Holocaust survivors who addressed you yesterday. This is the revised account of my oral submission re: the thesis of Kupka. I will look at the fact that informed consent was not sought from the Jewish community. That the University was either just blind or worse, willfully blind, to the need to apply Human Research Ethics rationally. That when warned it took no heed.

As a person present at the reading of the submission of 3 others on the same morning, I would like endorse what Auckland Barrister and Solicitor Robert Narev wrote in his written submission of 12 March 2001, and which he read to us. His observation that it is obvious that 'given that the research for Mr. Kupka's thesis would have involved him in enquiry into the business, cultural and general life of German speaking persons in New Zealand and their contribution to this country with specific focus on immigrants, a significant number of whom were Jewish, ...it would have been essential to include Jewish persons in that research'. This is also my opinion. If questionnaires were to be used it would have been necessary to test if the questionnaires had been correctly formulated, by approaching people, of whom a proportion would have been Jewish.

The book of Bade, called 'The German Connection: In the Shadow of War', emphasises the rich contribution of the German speaking Jewish community, and how their contribution coloured the linguistic, business, medical, scientific and technological scene in New Zealand. The significant contribution of the Jewish German speakers has been pointed out in this widely read book.

My view is that even if just a few Jewish persons had been approached by the Holocaust Denial student Kupka, had it been by proxy through one of the Goethe Society branches, which, in many instances were founded by Jews and promoted by Jews, or through schools, where Jewish children form a part of classes studying the German language, and where Jewish teachers teach, or in business circles where a significant number of Jews, for example Robert Narev, make their contribution, this would have been unseemly. It would have been deeply disturbing to the whole Jewish community and their friends.

It would have been more unseemly if Jews were deliberately avoided in order to by-pass a potential problem. This avoidance would have been morally questionable, and academically unsound.

**This submission has three sections.**

a) I would like first to explain my identity as a speaker of the German language who is Jewish, and who as a child survived a situation of extinction.

b) Secondly, I would like to point to some subjective aspects that are part of the Holocaust survivor condition: the call for the need to be vigilant and to have a sense of responsibility for the mental safety of the Jewish Community. As this falls close to discussions about victim rights which have recently been the focus of press attention, the subject is current.

c) Thirdly, the remainder of this submission is given to the subject of Human Research Ethics and the procedures relating to research done by the student J. Kupka, who is a known Holocaust Denier, and who has since February 1998 been known to have been active in his task of vilifying Jews in web-site discussion groups. The question is asked: how could this problem have been avoided?

a) Identity

I am a retired teacher who was educated in New Zealand. I have a science degree from Otago University. I am Jewish and I was born in Vienna in 1937. My family fled to Czechoslovakia at the time that the Nazis walked into Austria on 13 March 1938. My family were German speaking as well as Czech speaking. My father was an architect of repute, my mother a business person. They reached the shores of New Zealand in March 1940. Many members of the German speaking Jewish community in Auckland were our friends. They were conspicuously talented and took pride in making a great contribution to this country, feeling a sense of gratitude for having been given haven here.

The whole group came to the shocking realisation at the end of the war that little remained of the society that they had left. That the fate suffered by their family members had been most cruel. That they had been subject to an extinction policy. Their Jewish communities had been ravaged. This led to a longing for normalcy in the community and a sense of solidarity between its members. What affected one also affected the other. What the group had in common is an abhorrence of persecution and racism, and an appreciation of the reasonable. This is still true of the German speaking Jewish community today.

b) Subjective aspects that are part of the Holocaust survivor condition

i) *A case study.*

I would like to speak of subjective aspects pertinent to the Holocaust survivor condition. This is to make palpable the feelings of this group. Details relating to a certain member of my family may be illustrative. Her name was Ika Beran. She had been in a number of camps including Auschwitz. She had a number on her arm and lots of fearful memories. In

her youth she had been a great beauty, and had been known for her congeniality and generosity. She suffered in her old age from survivor's guilt which is recorded as being a common feeling among survivors. It weighed on her mind that she was the only one who could remember the faces of some sixty relatives. This leads us to the subject of acknowledgement of other's pain.

I do not need to state that guilt and pain were a subject of fascination to the Nazis. It is known that they carried out sadistic experiments. In a particularly sadistic exercise a mother and child were alternately given electric shocks. If the mother was experiencing the shock, the child was free of it. Sometimes the physical pain was unbearable to the mother, who was determined to take it. She might for an instant allow the child to take it, but the dreadful feeling of herself being the instrument of her child's torture was worse than the physical pain itself.

Other people's pain can elicit pain. We do not need sadistic experiments to inform us of this. Part of the pain of the refugee condition was to witness the pain experienced by others. Inflicted needlessly by an unheeding person or institution, the matter becomes more disturbing. We are each of us stoical when the human condition demands it. If pain results from indifference, the experience of pain is amplified. Situations where pain is inflicted needlessly are avoided by civilised society.

Neo-nazism and antisemitism are to Jews life-threatening phenomena. Historically Jews have paid a heavy price when expressions of disdain towards Jews were allowed or encouraged. The impulse to prevent the recurrence of disastrous events is a norm. In viewing Jewish experience there is no room for complacency and self-delusion.

ii) *Why the need for vigilance?*

The paragraphs that follow attempt to give an insight into the emotional responses of survivors. The aim is to make palpable the feeling of survivors.

Cited here is a recent letter from a nephew of my father, now 93 years of age, living in New York. At the end of his letter he thanks me for sending him a speech of the Czech leaders Masaryk and Benes, about which he writes:

'These speeches were made before the "final solution" which often keeps me awake at night. Do you know what happened? My family, most of them living in Moravia, taken out of their comfortable homes and transported to gas chambers including their children, and after a long torturous journey. The horror is indescribable.' In another letter from Walter he enjoins me to 'tell the account of our lives, no matter how gruesome.'

The relationship with Walter is one that developed by letter. It began when both he and I were making a list of names of family members lost on my father's side of the family. He helped me to fill in forms in which questions were asked about the age, gender, occupation of the murdered family member and when the family member listed was last seen alive. These forms were then sent to Yad Va Shem in Jerusalem, where information is kept on Jews who perished during the war. Taking account of what happened to my family is turning out to be a life-long task.

In answering Walter's letters, I did not, for obvious reasons, mention to him that there exists a group of people, Holocaust Deniers, whose central tenet is that there were no gas chambers in Auschwitz, and whose motivation is to reinstate 'National Socialism' and to brush away the shameful acts in German history. That their strategy is to slander Jews. And that they are



gaining ascendancy in Germany, where their activities are illegal. I doubt whether with his failing eye-sight Walter has read about David Irving who is a prominent Holocaust Denier in the United Kingdom who has taken to court Penguin Books for publishing Deborah Lipstadt's book "Denying the Holocaust: the growing Assault on Truth and Memory", a book published in 1994 which explains Holocaust Denial thoroughly.

### iii) *Victim support in New Zealand*

It is healthy to not entertain suspicions about others. However, occasionally incidents occur that are very undesirable and harmful. Certain members of the community are harmed. This is so far removed from people's consciousness as a possibility, that often they cannot see it and are not prepared for it. However some situations form a cluster, for which the police are prepared. The police are in full force when there is a New Year's party on the beach at Tauranga. It is known that bottles may fly in these circumstances.

We are talking here about the need to be pre-emptive on behalf of other people. To recognise when something bad is about to happen, and to act in such a way as to make the situation less likely. Like picking up sharp bits of glass from the pavement outside a primary school.

Victim support has recently become an issue of importance in New Zealand. An indication of how many violent crimes are committed can be gained by referring to the work done by the New Zealand Council of Victims Support Groups, located in Wellington. Its work load has increased some 300% since 1995 [65,000 cases then, 209,000 cases today]. This relates to police referrals. Self referral, which represents 5% of this figure, has increased in proportion. Thus there is greater consciousness within the community of the need for vigilance. And a wish to be protected. Damaging things can happen to innocent individuals. Sometimes reality stares you in the face, and there is no avoiding it.

Sometimes the thing to be protected from is one's own anger. Consider the case of the parent of a murdered child reading in the paper that the murderer is about to be freed. Who's 'rights' should be considered in such a case? Is any limitation to be placed on the prisoner's freedom of movement or action? Would there not be regulations on a wise course of action in this case?

Where a group which has been victimised and in fact decimated, is placed in a situation where one or more of their members is needlessly confronted with a person who denies that their joint experience happened, who holds in contempt those who walk with a number on their arm, ie survivors of the camps, and who negates history, even within the lifetime of those who recollect only too well the historical events, who have felt its impact, and in some cases have experienced it, it is clear that pre-emptive action needs to be taken to protect this group. Should it be the group itself who takes such pre-emptive action, or the society as a whole?

The Jewish community in this country has never been known to throw bottles, nor to daub private houses. However, they are vocal. They reserve this for occasions where to not speak out is cowardly and destructive, not only to themselves but to society as a whole. And where it seems imperative to sharpen perceptions that have become jaded. Jews have often been the 'canaries in the mine'.

c) How could this problem have been avoided?

In what follows, the broad view is taken that a number of opportunities for avoiding the debacle with Kupka were missed. How could these have been avoided? It is my view that

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if the **repeated warning** to Knuferman [May 11, May 12 May 18 of 1998] that the research for a thesis on German Language in New Zealand which inevitably required

information from the German speaking Jewish community, could not possibly be carried out by a Holocaust denier, were not ignored. [Although it was known that those giving the warnings had a sophisticated grasp of the issues.]

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if Kupka had been directed to **a different research topic**. This suggestion was made by Bing to Knuferman in May 1998.

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if the University had acknowledged that in this case the person and the proposal, in connection with each other, were an agenda that the Human Ethics Committee were morally obliged to consider. It would not be called The Human ETHICS Committee if ethics did not have primacy. To say that Human Research Ethics 'did not apply in this case because the decision rested with the proposal and not the person' is incorrect. It applied precisely, and the **safety measures that were in the University Rules** should have been applied.

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if Kupka had been obliged to submit his proposal at the right time to the Human Ethics Committee.

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if the University had understood that antisemitic words, acts and symbols are inherently violent, that in Jewish history contempt and violence have gone hand in hand, not just recently, but over centuries.

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if all persons concerned with decision-making on the Kupka affair had sensibilities informing them that bureaucratic imperatives do not take away the onus to discriminate morally.

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if the Vice Chancellor had used the normal procedures of scholars to look into the matter, and had not dismissed the advice of overseas experts who had been labelled [wrongly] as

Jewish by others, had shown some integrity and leadership, and had not allowed his gaze to be fixated on a 'solution to the problem.'

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if the Vice Chancellor and his advisors had understood that any debate on 'freedom of speech' should include considerations of context.

The problem with Kupka could have been avoided if the Vice Chancellor had not created a climate of 'safety by bluff' for his staff, not relied on the judgement of those who were poorly informed, had rejected the considered judgement of those who were well-informed.

*man Bing-Kulka*