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Abstract

This study is undertaken to learn how Holocaust deniers use Internet websites to attain legitimacy and credibility. I attempt to show that this sort of "historical revision" is actually blanketed anti-Semitism.

I examine Holocaust denial as it is viewed by different disciplines. I investigate the main figures of Holocaust denial. As well, I analyze Jewish race theories of the past two hundred years to demonstrate how Jews have been perceived as aliens and as outsiders. The construction of the "Jew as outsider" sets the stage for how Holocaust deniers frame their discourse on their web pages.

My research investigates a selection of journal articles and essays that appear on a selected list of Holocaust denial sites. I delve into the following features of the text: coded language, repetitive keywords, underlying themes, word-selection, graphic design, information management, voice, tone, and intended audience. Through conducting a discourse analysis of these texts, specific elements are extracted and discussed.

Through a discourse analysis of these web pages, I illustrate that when the user analyses the text, the hidden meanings and messages within the texts, it becomes apparent that these websites are anti-Semitic and racist.

Holocaust Denial on the Internet is a new form of anti-Semitism.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Why Holocaust Denial?

When I was eighteen years old, I worked at the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC) National Archives in Montreal and often attended seminars held by CJC, including ones on Holocaust denial.

In the mid-1990’s Holocaust denial was just beginning to emerge in the online world and I was curious to see how such sites were constructed. I expected them to be blatantly hateful, anti-Semitic, with burning Magen-David’s, swastikas, and other anti-Jewish symbols. To my surprise, the sites appeared very neutral and did not contain any obvious anti-Semitic propaganda. They were well organized, current, and professionally designed. As I browsed through the websites and reviewed their literature, I started to question my beliefs about the Holocaust. I wondered whether the “revisionist” claims could be true. I began to doubt the severity of what had happened. The web sites were having a manipulative effect and I found this profoundly disturbing. This is the reason I decided to do further research on the topic.

The focus of this study is on how Holocaust deniers use the Internet and the World Wide Web to achieve legitimacy and authenticity. Their websites urge users to question the Holocaust, to re-think history, and to re-evaluate the past and, simultaneously, the present. The thesis explains how deniers disguise anti-Semitic discourse as historical revisionism and how they use the Holocaust as a vehicle to disseminate a contemporary form of anti-Semitism.
What is Holocaust Denial?

Generally, Holocaust denial is the claim that the extermination of approximately six million Jews in the Nazi genocide did not occur.¹ Holocaust deniers do not necessarily deny the Holocaust in its entirety. Rather, they minimize the devastation. Some deniers claim that gas chambers did not exist or that only 100,000 Jews died (due to typhus, starvation, and other “natural causes”) or that Hitler neither knew of nor implemented an extermination policy.² In fact, many Holocaust deniers sympathize with Hitler and believe that the Jews helped and provoked World War II.³

Since commonly accepted facts are not in accord with such claims, Holocaust deniers must find compelling means of dismissing them. This is not a simple task since the Nazis left behind multitudinous evidence of their plans, actions, and results.⁴ Many Holocaust deniers have come to the conclusion that the Holocaust is, in fact, a conspiracy. “Organized Jewry” or several variants of “Zionists” are at the root of a conspiracy to fabricate evidence. It began before the end of the Second World War and continues to this day. The conspiracy theory manifests itself in the following positions:

1. Surviving witnesses lied - even where their claims are corroborated by documents or other sources.

2. Perpetrator evidence was through torture, fear for their families, or falsified in various ways.

3. Documents left behind by the Nazis were falsified, do not mean what they appear to mean, or are forgeries.

---

³ Ibid, p. 129
4. Photographs were faked or manipulated.

5. Films were faked or manipulated.

6. Words were misconstrued. For example, when Himmler used the word “ausrotten” (to exterminate) in respect to Jews, he did not really mean, “to exterminate.” When Hitler used the word “vernichten” (to annihilate) in respect to Jews, he did not really mean “to annihilate.” When the Einsatzgruppen spoke of killing Jewish women and children, they really meant partisans - even though partisans were listed separately in the many reports they left behind.

7. Recorded speeches were falsified. Himmler's 1943 Posen speech, which was recorded, was not really his voice or parts were added later or the technology to record did not exist in 1943 (it did) or it disagrees with Himmler's notes for the speech (it does not).

8. The victims were responsible for what happened to them. The Jewish women and children killed were partisans or were guilty of committing heinous crimes or both.

9. Jews deserved to be tortured. Even though the Holocaust did not happen, it would have nonetheless been justified because the Jews are an alien, parasitical race, determined to destroy the noble Aryan race and/or defile his blood, etc.

10. If no written order from Hitler can be found for the Holocaust, then it means there no order was issued.

11. No gas chamber is currently functioning. Therefore, there never were gas chambers and if gas chambers did exist, they were only used for fumigating clothing, even if they were located in morgues.
Holocaust deniers attempt to legitimate their work as reputable scholarship under the veil of “historical revisionism.” There exist examples which I take to be legitimate historical revisionism in relation to the Holocaust and the Second World War. For example, A.J.P. Taylor applies a new interpretation to the events leading up to the World War II. He minimizes Hitler's role in events - the Anschluß with Austria, the annexation of the Sudetenland, the Danzig crisis, the role of the Allies, appeasement - compared to the standard interpretation, while portraying Nazi Germany as much less centralized and monolithic than has been assumed.  

Daniel Jonah Goldhagen challenges virtually all the usual interpretations of the reasons for the complicity of many Germans in the perpetration of the Holocaust and posits that ordinary Germans willingly involved themselves because of the existence of a deep-rooted, eliminationist anti-Semitism in Germans of that era. He diminishes, if not totally dismisses, the influence of Hitler and the Nazi Party. This thesis takes issue with the idea that Holocaust denial is historical revisionism.

**Where Does Holocaust Denial Flourish?**

Since its inception, the Internet has made it possible for people to communicate with others through a vast network of computers around the world. Today, Holocaust deniers use the Internet to communicate their versions of the Holocaust to anyone who has access to a computer.

The World Wide Web, born in 1989, is the main navigating tool on the Internet. The first graphical web browser, Mosaic, was introduced in 1993. With it, web users were able to create and design elaborate sites containing graphics, audio, and video. With the increasing popularity of the Internet, there was also an expansion in the number of controversial websites by, amongst

---

7 See the history of the Internet at The World Wide Web Consortium at [http://www.w3.org/history.html](http://www.w3.org/history.html)
8 *Ibid*.
others, Stormfront, the KKK, the Heritage Front, and the Nationalist Party. Currently, such groups have hundreds of web sites with a significant number of them mounting sites that specifically deny the Jewish Holocaust.

Public libraries in North America are equipped with Internet stations to facilitate research and access to information. The web not only offers a venue for communicating information, it also offers a venue for interaction with other users. Today’s Internet user can post messages, send emails, meet others from around the world, and join online communities of those with similar interests.

**Definitions**

Since Holocaust denial is a controversial and disputed topic, it is important to be clear about terms being used. Following is a list of definitions of terms commonly used on denial websites as well as in this thesis.

**Anti-Semitism**

According to *A Dictionary of Contemporary World History*, anti-Semitism is defined as hostility towards Jews or, more popularly, towards Jewish culture and traditions. For centuries, Jews have been made scapegoats for economic and other reasons. In addition, they have become identified by conservative populists as the harbingers of progress, industrialization, and international capital, people who have destroyed the values and livelihoods of an idealized rural peasant society.10

---

The term “anti-Semitism” was coined in the 1870’s by German journalist Wilhelm Marr.\textsuperscript{11} Marr claimed that since Jews were a separate race, even if they converted to Christianity, they would not lose their Jewish heritage. Although there are other Semitic peoples, notably the Arabs, anti-Semitism refers to prejudice against Jews. Anti-Semitism can be defined as hostility directed at Jews solely because they are Jewish.\textsuperscript{12} In spite of what anti-Semites profess, anti-Semitism is not caused by the actions or beliefs of Jews, but rather by the attitudes and interpretations held by anti-Semites. This antagonism has an ancient history. It dates back to the time of Christ’s crucifixion where it was assumed that the Jews were responsible for his death.\textsuperscript{13} This accusation has survived from century to century and been used as a reason for a number of campaigns: the Crusades, the Spanish Inquisition,\textsuperscript{14} the European Pogroms,\textsuperscript{15} and other less notorious incidents.\textsuperscript{16}

In Germany, anti-Semites remained on the political fringe before 1918, although it was during the German Empire that the foundations for the extraordinary rise of anti-Semitism were laid. Many of the Republic's most ardent supporters, affluent business leaders, and influential politicians were Jewish, and they became visible scapegoats.

After World War II, anti-Semitism became publicly unacceptable not only in Germany, but throughout most of Europe and elsewhere in the world. Yet even today, anti-Semitic incidents take place throughout the world: from cemetery desecrations to synagogue bombings, book burnings, and random acts of violence towards Jews.\textsuperscript{17} Having experienced the occasional anti-Semitic remark, I have learned to pass it off as “ignorance.” Perhaps, compared to the Nazi

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid p. xv
\textsuperscript{12} Mock, Karen R. (1996). \textit{Anti-Semitism in Canada: Realities, Remedies, and Implications for Anti-Racism} Retrieved July 2003 Website: \url{http://www1.ca.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/people/m/mock.karen/perspectives-on-racism}
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid p. 13-16
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, p. 36, 50
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, p. 172- 174, 211-215
\textsuperscript{17} For more information on anti-Semitism, The Simon Wiesenthal Centre in the United States and the B’nai Brith in Canada both develop reports on anti-Semitic incidents in North America.
Holocaust, we are more forgiving now than before when it comes to Jewish stereotypes and bigoted remarks.

With the advent of political correctness, some people are more savvy and clever in the way they discriminate. The image of the “red-neck” extreme radical racist is gone. Anti-Semites use more subtle methods to discriminate. Some employ Holocaust denial, Holocaust trivialization, and anti-Zionism as understated means to discriminate against Jews.

Digital Library

According to the *Oxford Dictionary of Computing*, a digital library is defined as “an online repository of electronic texts.” These texts may be highly specific, such as information sheets, or they may be similar to texts held in a normal library. For example, some libraries keep texts of classic out-of-copyright books in digital format.

A digital library is an organized collection of electronic documents, articles, essays, electronic books, and other reference material. Organized like a traditional “paper” library, it may contain a library catalogue or a database as well as subject and author indexes. Digital libraries may have staff who correspond with users via email. An example of a digital library is the Internet Public Library located at [http://www.ipl.org](http://www.ipl.org). Documents and links to authoritative websites are arranged according to a hierarchy of subject headings and adhere to the Dewey Decimal System. Most Holocaust denial websites possess digital libraries of documents. Some are thoroughly organized, some disorganized, but all contain a collection of electronic books, journal articles, pamphlets, graphics, and other material.

---

Discourse

Discourse can be defined as “the study of language, its structure, functions, and patterns in use. It is not merely a string of sentences, one following the other, but rather it exhibits properties that reflect its organization, coherence, rhetorical force, and thematic focus.”19 It is also defined as “the attempt by various linguists to extend the methods of analysis developed for the description of words and sentences to the study of larger structures in, or involved in the production of, connected discourse.”20

Examples of discourse include extended stretches of languages, such as conversations, narratives, polemical statements, and political speeches. In written discourse, the writer constructs the text and provides it with a formal and coherent structure, often through the use of various linguistic, stylistic, and rhetorical devices. The reader of the text faces the task of constructing an interpretation of it. One important aspect of such interpretation is the fact that the author guides the reader through the use of various linguistic strategies and structures to imbue the representation with more information than that which is overtly present.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is defined as “the analysis of language beyond the sentence. It is chiefly concerned with the study of grammar, the study of smaller bits of language, such as sounds (phonetics and phonology), parts of words (morphology), meaning (semantics), as well as the order of words in sentences (syntax).”21 It is the approach to the study of language that examines the

conditions of possibility of particular statements and their effects. Discourse analysis situates specific instances of language use within a larger context.22

**Hate Group**

As stated by David Goldman, director of Hatewatch.org, the definition of a hate group is an organization or website that advocates an unreasonable hostility towards or advocates violence against specific groups or individuals, based on their real or perceived ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or religion. The latest statistic, as of 1999, counts approximately three hundred and fifty active, substantial hate sites.23

Hate groups in the United States are protected by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution (Freedom of Speech). That is, they can say what they want as long as they do not target specific individuals. Holocaust deniers tend to use “symbolic hate”. John Leo defines this term as “non-criminal incidents with doubtful connections to hate or bias.”24 John Thompson defines “symbolic violence” as the exercise of domination through communication in such a way that the domination is disguised and appears to be legitimate.25 Holocaust deniers use this passive method for disseminating hate.

**Historical Revisionism**

“Historical revisionism” is the name given to a contemporary approach in studying history. It is associated with historian William Appleman Williams who addressed questions concerning American foreign policy and how they relate to the origins of the Cold War and the conflict

---

between the West and the Communist world.\textsuperscript{26} Revisionism is the advocacy of revising, of modifying, something that already exists. Applied to history, it refers to historians who challenge the accepted version of the causes or consequences of historical events. As such, it is an accepted and important part of historical endeavour because it serves the dual purpose of constantly re-examining the past while improving our understanding of it.

The term “revisionism” implies a reevaluation of history in terms of perspective and methodology and is a legitimate and necessary approach to historical analysis. Each generation acquires new information, facts, and methods that were not previously available to past generations. For example, contemporary historians, armed with the latest documentary, archaeological, and anthropological data, are in an improved position to assess the era of slavery in the American south. Their historical perspective would differ greatly from the historians writing during the period of slavery or in the decades immediately following it, since most of them were white.\textsuperscript{27} Another example of a historical revisionist is Gerda Lerner who argues that women were “forgotten” in recorded history. Ruling elites failed to take into account the histories of women, slaves, lower classes, proletarians, and colonials. Lerner states that women are the one group which occupied a subordinate status for the longest period of time.\textsuperscript{28} As a female historian she uses revisionism to challenge male historians who wrote from a patriarchal point of view and failed to reflect women’s experiences.

Historical revisionism attempts to enhance and extend our understanding of history through continual re-interpretation of existing historical data. Robert Eaglestone claims that history can never be objective given that each historian focuses on historical data using a variety of

\textsuperscript{27} Austin, Ben. (1996). \textit{Holocaust Denial and Deniers.} Web Site: \url{http://www.mtsu.edu/~baustin/denial.htm}
methodologies and philosophies. Furthermore, historians cannot report all the facts from the past. They must be selective and often give an account from their own political or social point of view.

Even if it cannot be entirely objective, historical revisionism does not aim to negate the actuality of historical events. There is no debate among historians regarding the fact that the Holocaust took place or the fact that Nazi Germany systematically killed millions of Jews. Although Holocaust deniers claim to be historical revisionists and often apply the term to themselves, they are not actually practicing historical revision as per the above definition.

**Holocaust**

For the purpose of this thesis, I will use the term Holocaust as defined by *Webster’s New World Dictionary*: “the systematic destruction of over six million European Jews by the Nazis before and during World War II.” According to Brian Levin the Holocaust was the largest and most recent coordinated genocidal attack against Jewry in world history. The Holocaust was a gradual process. When the Nazi party gained power in 1933, it began to remove the civil rights of Jewish citizens. “Nazi laws worked hand in glove with economic deprivation and social castigation to remove Jews from meaningful participation in German society.” Laws were enforced that removed the licenses of Jewish doctors and lawyers, seized Jewish businesses, and grouped Jews into restricted ghettos. Soon, Jews were forced to wear stars on their sleeves in order to be easily recognized.

On November 9, 1938, Nazis carried out a two-day attack across Germany and Austria, resulting in the deaths of many Jews and the wrongful arrests of 30,000 more. Jewish businesses,

---

homes, and synagogues were destroyed by vandalism and arson. This event was known as the “night of broken glass” or Kristallnacht. As Levin argues, this was a crucial turning point for even greater atrocities that followed.  

More atrocities took place during the years of the Second World War between 1939 and 1945 as the Nazis advanced through Europe and rounded up millions of Jewish citizens from occupied countries and sent them to death camps where they were worked to death, starved to death, or gassed to death.

**Holocaust Trivialization**

Holocaust trivialization is the use of Holocaust terminology and symbols to compare the Nazi Holocaust to a much less severe event, or to describe any undemocratic or unfair behaviour as Nazism, or to diminish the importance of the Holocaust and to diminish its significance as an essential part of modern Jewish history.

Denying or trivializing the Holocaust is a strategic priority for hate groups. Age-old stereotypes are fuelled. For example, the idea of “whiny Jews” is fed by claims such as that of Yves Michaud of the Parti Québécois who stated “Jews think they are the only ones who suffered in the Holocaust.” The concept of “greedy Jews” is invoked by hate mongers when they condemn Holocaust victims for getting reparations or compensation for slave labour or for having artwork stolen by the Nazis returned or for receiving victims’ insurance policy monies that were never disbursed.

---

Holocaust trivialization affects our daily lives. For example, various political groups have referred to the policies of their provincial governments as Nazi-like or reminiscent of World War II Germany. B’nai Brith Canada cites various examples in its annual report on anti-Semitism in Canada. One such instance occurred when the newly elected chair of the Toronto District School Board “compared the political climate under Ontario’s Premier Mike Harris to that of 1930’s Nazi Germany.” It is clear that her comments were inappropriate and offensive to those who survived the Holocaust. B’nai Brith asserts:

“The suffering which occurred under the Nazi regime reached the heights of that which has been experienced by humanity throughout the ages. To compare current day Ontario to that extent of amorality diminishes the reality of the collective experience of modern day Judaism.”

The B’nai Brith report (2000) also provides the example of Kimberly Glasco, a former employee of the National Ballet of Canada. When the company fired her, a newspaper article was published comparing the organization’s actions to that of Nazi Germany. Yet another example of Holocaust trivialization occurred in a classroom. While teaching the Holocaust, a teacher was asked by her department head, “Why are you dwelling on the Jews?” She was also told that when she taught about Hitler, she should teach the good things that he did.

Holocaust deniers make an association of the Nazi swastika and the Star of David. Most recently, deniers have compared the treatment of Palestinians by Israelis to how Jews were treated during the Nazi Holocaust. They attempt to blur the lines between anti-Israel and anti-Semitic sentiment. “To suggest the Israelis (symbolized by the Star of David) treat the Palestinians the

35 The B’nai Brith Report can be found at http://www.bnaibrith.ca/publications/audit2000/audit2000-03.html It was retrieved April 2003.
36 Ibid.
way the Nazis (symbolized by the swastika) treated the Jews is not only offensive and shocking to Jews, but shows a lack of understanding or even ignorance of both the historical and current realities.”37 The equation is used for shock value and propaganda purposes.

**Legitimacy**

Legitimacy is defined in the *Dictionary of Sociology* as “the process by which power is not only institutionalized but more importantly is given moral grounding. Legitimacy (or authority) is what is accorded to such a stable distribution of power when it is considered valid.”38

Max Weber discusses the relationship between power and legitimacy, distinguishing “factual power” and the “authoritarian power of command” as two distinct types. Authoritarian power of command refers to the subordination exacted on the basis of interests while factual power needs to justify itself through the process of legitimation.

Legitimacy may be claimed by those with power on the basis of either traditional, charismatic, or rational-legal grounds. Likewise, legitimacy – and therefore authority – may be accorded to a distribution of power on the basis of tradition, on affectual or emotional grounds usually associated with revelation (charisma), on the basis of value-rational faith or belief in an absolute, or, finally, on grounds of belief in the legality of the order. The content of the justification for continued domination—its legitimation—constitutes the basis for the differences in such empirical structures of domination as bureaucracies.

John Thompson argues that language can be a form of legitimacy when it is used to control and to serve as the formal and official language of the population.39 “To speak of language without

---

further precision, as linguists do, is to accept the official definition of the official language of a political unit: this language is imposed on all the citizens as the only legitimate one, and all the more so when the circumstance is more official, or formal.”

Thompson’s concept of ideology operates on three levels: legitimacy, dissimulation, and reification. He argues that every system of domination seeks to develop legitimacy through discourse. He asserts that relations of domination attempt to serve the interests of some at the expense of others. However, the dominators must conceal the fact that they are being deceitful (dissimulation). Reification involves representing an aspect of society without context or historical background. The study of ideology not only investigates the type of discourse found in a particular society, but also seeks to understand how it serves to maintain powerful relations.

Morris Zelditch states that something is legitimate “if it is in accord with the norms, values, beliefs, practices and procedures accepted by a group.”

Race

There are many conflicting views of what constitutes race. The definition of race, according to the Oxford World Encyclopedia is “informal classification of the human species according to hereditary (genetic) differences. Different racial characteristics arose among geographically separated populations partly through adaptation to differing environments across
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many generations. However, as there is no evidence of genetic racial distinctions, anthropologists reject the term.”45

The concept of race, as defined by The Dictionary of Sociology states that it is a way of classifying individuals and population groups into biologically distinct groups, based on genetic make-up. Racial categorization is often based on differences in facial characteristics, skin colour, and skull size. The sociology of race is largely concerned with examining the causes and consequences of the socially constructed division of social groups according to their so-called race, regardless of whether or not this is legitimated by reference to any of the above factors. To classify human beings into categories according to their biology is itself racist when it suggests that certain races are better than others by virtue of innate intelligence. Race is also an ambiguous term, as I illustrate in Chapter Four. Some of the issues that may be of interest are: Does Tiger Woods identify himself as a black man or as an Asian man? How do his fans identify him? Are Jews white? Is Michael Jackson still black even though his skin colour is very pale? I demonstrate that race is not a valid term anymore. The concepts of ethnicity, culture, and identity are better labels to categorize humans. I show that the question “Are Jews white or do Jews constitute their own race?” has no validity. If race were to be restricted to skin colour, then Jews are as white as Christians. However, white supremacists continually categorize Jews as a separate race. Hitler and the Nazis identified Jews as a diseased race.46

Zionism

According to the Anti-Defamation League, Zionism is the Jewish national movement of rebirth and renewal in the land of Israel. The concept of “returning to Zion,” the biblical term for

both the land of Israel and Jerusalem, has been the foundation of Jewish life since the Jewish people were exiled from the land two thousand years ago. It has deep roots in all aspects of Jewish culture.47

The father of modern Zionism is Theodor Herzl, an Austrian journalist. He developed Zionism into an organized political movement that promoted international recognition for a “Jewish state” and encouraged the Jewish diaspora to “come back to Israel.” The country was to be a “Jewish homeland,” a place where Jews could feel safe; where they could practice their rituals and beliefs in peace and tranquility.

The creation of the State of Israel brought out a great number of political issues. Many countries and political groups expressed disapproval and disagreement. Some groups who are anti-Zionist include left-wing political groups, Reform Jews, racists, and particularly, Holocaust deniers. Deniers are anti-Zionist for a variety of reasons. They argue that Jews fabricated the Holocaust to legitimize the creation of Israel and to seek global sympathy and monetary restitution. The Holocaust carried a brutal and completely warranted reason for the creation of the State of Israel. Jews everywhere desired an established homeland where they could put an end to anti-Semitism and Jewish persecution.

At present, Zionism continues to be a nationalist interest for the majority of Jews around the world who believe in the support and recognition of Israel as a Jewish state.48
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The Holocaust Today

Having taken place only sixty years ago, the Holocaust is still present in our collective memories. We see images of it on a daily basis in movies, television, newspapers, and books. From a Jewish perspective, we need to be vigilant and watchful to prevent its re-occurrence. We are socialized not to forget the atrocities and we owe it to our progeny not to allow the memories to fade. It teaches us what a “civilized people” is capable of inflicting on its citizens. There was no provocation for this massacre: no famine, no war, no coup, no logical explanation or reason other than that these people were Jewish. The Jewish Holocaust was carried out as a government policy. Buildings and facilities were built specifically for the purpose of mass extermination. Doctors, engineers, and chemists designed and implemented an extermination policy in a bureaucratic manner. The Nazis’ objective was to exterminate all Jews, as part of their “Final Solution to the Jewish Question.”

Scholars argue that the Holocaust is an important symbol in society because of its uniqueness and because it constitutes a modern form of genocide. Steven Katz argues that the Holocaust was no more evil than other genocides. He lists the Armenian genocide during World War I, the decimation of Gypsies during World War II, and the mass death of African Americans during the enterprise of New World Slavery. Katz also does not suggest that the Holocaust involved the greatest number of deaths. He argues that the numbers of victims does not establish uniqueness. He argues that there has never been a state sanctioned policy of annihilating every man, woman, and child belonging to a specific people.
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The Holocaust was an exercise in evil against Jews, Gypsies, Poles, homosexuals, and the mentally and physically disabled. In terms of world history, it is a recent event. There is a great deal of documented material about it. Shocking film footage and photographs exist. A few concentration camps are still intact for people to visit. Some would argue that the Holocaust has become an industry with literature, scholarly research, films, television programs, documentaries, and curriculum in the education system. People are horrified, and at the same time, curious as to how the Jews endured. The Holocaust also provoked the United Nations to establish a Jewish country, where Jews can settle. Israel, as we know it today, may not have been declared a Jewish state, if the Holocaust had not occurred.

The Holocaust has been one of the few events in the twentieth century that has sparked great popular interest. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum opened in April 1993. Approximately two million people visited the first year, and two-thirds of them were non-Jews. Holocaust education is part of the curriculum of many school boards so that this historical tragedy will be studied, remembered and, most importantly, prevented from ever happening again.

Holocaust denial is part of a long history of anti-Semitism. The Internet is one of the latest platforms used to disseminate this hate. Robert S. Wistrich argues that “the denial of the Holocaust – whether in Britain, France, America, or any other Western country has become an integral part of the revamped anti-Semitic mythology of a World Jewish Conspiracy.”

Holocaust deniers view the Holocaust as an important historical event to debate since they claim that when countries support the “Holocaust story,” more power is given to Jews worldwide. Deniers believe that Jews created the “Holocaust story” in order to spread anti-German propaganda
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and to obtain global sympathy. They further are of the opinion that Jews exploit the Holocaust in order to extort money for their losses. Holocaust deniers also assume an anti-Zionist approach when they argue that Jews used the Holocaust as a driving force to create the state of Israel.

**Thesis Questions**

Below are the thesis questions I will attempt to answer in my research.

1) *How do Holocaust deniers attempt to achieve legitimacy and credibility?*

Holocaust deniers attempt to achieve legitimacy and credibility through a variety of strategic methods. On the Internet, they construct professional looking, information-packed websites. They use words inaccurately to describe themselves and their activities. For example, the legitimate sounding Institute for Historical Review is actually the world’s largest anti-Semitic publisher. It publishes a “journal” which is far from being scholarly. In their discourse, Holocaust deniers manipulate language by taking legitimate facts and quotes out of context and interpreting them within their own social context. They all present similar ideas (gas chambers did not exist, Jews are lying) and provide links to each others’ websites. This system of links reaffirms Holocaust revisionist ideas and helps reinforce the “truth” of their claims.

Deniers also make alliances with Jews such as Norman Finkelstein, a critic of the Holocaust, and Noam Chomsky, an advocate for free speech, because they feel Jews cannot be considered anti-Semitic. Deniers mask their own anti-Semitism behind the veil of anti-Zionism, a legitimate political platform.

Finally, deniers portray themselves as scholars and claim to possess legitimate university degrees or credentials. They also frame their references as such. For example, Canadian Holocaust denier Ernst Zündel hired Fred Leuchter, a “self-taught engineer” from Massachusetts to conduct
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Unauthorized experiments at the Auschwitz death camp memorial. Leuchter claimed to be an engineer and chemist, by training and by education, but was later discovered to possess only a Bachelor’s degree in history. He traveled to Auschwitz to illegally collect soil samples and bits and pieces from the walls of the gas chambers. Zündel and Leuchter had this soil “analyzed” and reported their findings in *The Leuchter Report*, published by Samisdat Publications. Their findings suggested there was no evidence of gassing at Auschwitz. It quickly gained a scholarly status among Holocaust deniers as being one of the great revisionist key texts, even though the analysis was thoroughly rebutted in a report by French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac. Among other things, Pressac noted that Leuchter never looked at documents in the Auschwitz Museum, and failed to study German blueprints of the gas chambers.

2) *What rhetorical strategies do Holocaust deniers employ in order to achieve their goals?*

Holocaust deniers claim that they are fighting for truth and freedom of speech. They construct their role as the victim or the political fighter or the intellectually and politically sieged. They maintain that they are doing something good for society. For example, Holocaust denier Michael Hoffman II proclaims that “revisionist history consists in the art of discerning fraud and the courage to publicly strip illusion, even when the whole world is clamoring violently for it.” 56 These Holocaust revisionists claim to simply want the truth and accurate information. Others are Nazi sympathizers or pro-Hitler. For example, the Zündelsite website identifies its mission as “the rehabilitation of the honour and reputation of the German nation and people.” 57
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**Thesis Outline**

I commence my research with a review of the literature of Holocaust denial, Holocaust denial on the Internet, and legitimacy. In Chapter Three I review the key Holocaust deniers in Canada, the United States, Britain, Germany, and France. In Chapter Four, I review the literature on Jewish race theories in Germany and Britain and highlight how Jews were constructed as being “different,” “foreign,” and “alienated.” I illustrate how they were viewed as subhuman and as a result of which, were alienated in their own countries.

In Chapter Five I review the literature on discourse analysis, the methodology I have chosen. I illustrate the criteria I used to select nine Holocaust denial websites and why I placed them into three categories. In Chapter Six, I analyse two selected articles per website, from the selected list of nine Holocaust denial websites. Finally, in Chapter Seven, I discuss the importance of this research and future directions for this study.

In the following chapter, I review the literature of Holocaust denial and Holocaust denial on the Internet. I delve into the scholarship of sociologists, historians, and even librarians who have done extensive research on this topic. In addition, I further discuss the concept of legitimacy and how it applies to my research.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

This study of Holocaust denial gathers research from various fields. Included here is research by librarians, historians, and sociologists. Since my background is in librarianship, I am interested in examining how librarians deal with selecting Holocaust denial literature for their library collections. My background also gives me a unique perspective on the many Holocaust denial sites that are organized into digital libraries to include files, images and sound files. For example, David Irving uses three separate indexes to organize his site. Ernst Zündel’s website contains a large library of web documents, online books, transcripts, etc. Both sites teem with information and are professionally designed and organized with various sub-sections and indexes that assist the user in navigating the website.

Holocaust Denial on the Internet

There is a vast amount of research available on hate groups on the Internet and there is research available on Holocaust denial in general. Yet there is very little research on Holocaust denial on the Internet. The articles that do exist on this vast subject tend to avoid analyzing the content of Holocaust denial websites. Rather, they take a “parental” approach by pointing these sites out and labeling them as bad. However, by failing to address the legitimacy of such sites, they are not educating the public as thoroughly as they should.
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Betty Landesman, Systems Training Librarian and Subject Specialist for Judaic Studies at George Washington University, maintains that Holocaust deniers label themselves “revisionists” rather than “deniers” to appear more legitimate. Landesman argues that with the advent of the Internet, revisionist ideologies and research are more accessible. She describes most websites as highly organized and professional looking. Furthermore, sites that share ideologies support each other through Internet links which leads Landesman to suggest that Holocaust denial has become a community on the web.

Landesman’s article on Holocaust denial and the Internet provides a platform for my research as she illustrates the nature, style, and content of Holocaust denial on the Net. The propaganda that deniers disseminate in print has been converted into digital form. In addition to web articles and sites, Holocaust deniers maintain mailing lists, chat-rooms (IRC), and discussion boards (newsgroups) where users can interact. Holocaust deniers have created virtual communities of people who share their views, beliefs, and goals.

Shane Borrowman, a teaching associate in the English Department at the University of Arizona, discusses how students must be analytical when they surf the web. His article entitled “Critical Surfing: Holocaust denial and credibility on the web” draws parallels between the content of television programs and website content. He argues that television is market driven and that there exist different types of channels and shows that cater to different tastes. Holocaust deniers have little access to mainstream media such as television or print and thus find the Internet an inexpensive and efficient venue. Borrowman argues that the Internet is the largest free press. Unlike television, which is mediated by reporters, producers, directors or talk show hosts, there is no mediation on the Internet. When analyzing websites, Borrowman teaches his students the
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concepts of academic and techno-ethos. Academic ethos is “the traditional, print based ethos that is constructed through linear argumentation.”61 When academic ethos is presented on web pages, the web user is convinced that the author is legitimate and credible. Techno-ethos is “the authority that is constructed online in the programming and design of their websites.”62

Borrowman analyses the credibility of the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), CODOH, and Dr. Arthur Butz’s website. He claims that the IHR and Butz use academic ethos to achieve legitimacy and credibility. For example, Butz exploits his title of Associate Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Northwestern University. Borrowman claims that academic ethos seduces students because when they see a university professor’s webpage, they immediately form the opinion that it is scholarly and credible and sanctioned by the institution. IHR’s website statement refers to its content as “historical revisionism pioneered by distinguished historians”63 and also sounds scholarly and credible. The CODOH website, on the other hand, employs “techno-ethos.” The website is up-to-date, flashy, full of different graphics and fonts, and has a fresh, polished design. These features may mislead web users into believing that the website is authoritative and legitimate.64 I examine website design is Chapter 6.

Many Jewish groups have initiated counter-groups whose sole purpose is to fight against Holocaust denial through the creation and maintenance of counter-denial websites. Their mandate is to expose these sites and to educate the public. Rather than censoring Holocaust denial content and website addresses, they provide links and evaluate the content and nature of each hate site.
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Holocaust Denial in the Library

Some issues I found to be of interest to librarians are:

Should librarians censor hate material?

Should libraries place Holocaust denial material in a “sensitive” area of the library?

How should this material be catalogued?

Should librarians provide open access to hate literature?

What should librarians and libraries do to educate the public without compromising patrons’ rights to access this material?

In “Revisionist History in the Library: to Facilitate Access or Not to Facilitate Access?” Jeffrey Katz, a librarian, discusses whether or not libraries should collect Holocaust denial literature. His article identifies the major concerns that have been raised over the acquisition and dissemination of this literature. Katz interviewed a number of librarians from both camps; ones who believe that Holocaust denial literature should be collected and made readily available to its users and ones who believe Holocaust denial is essentially racist and anything that disseminates hate against an entire group of people has no place in a library.

Katz compares and contrasts the different points of view of various librarians and scholars. Some recognize the research value of hate literature and believe that it should be made accessible to students who wish to research anti-Semitism. Others believe that libraries should not purchase or acquire such material under any condition. They believe that this material is not only false, but may also promote bigotry and violence against a particular religious or ethnic group. This latter group supports the right to free speech and agrees that publishers have the right to publish this
Katz distinguishes between the needs of academic and public libraries. Academic libraries need to collect within a subject area as thoroughly as possible to support the teaching and research of a particular discipline. Public libraries are different since librarians acquire and purchase materials to meet the needs of the community. If the community does not want Holocaust denial in their libraries, then it is in its best interests to keep this material out of the library.

Katz also addresses some ethical concerns in library collection development. Librarians strive to build collections that best reflect the needs of the community they serve. They want to think of the “good of the community” and to reflect “the best interests” of the community or its library patrons. Moreover, Katz argues that librarians tread on dangerous ground when they take it upon themselves to decide what is “beneficial” for their user groups. Librarians need to critically evaluate how valuable it is to collect Holocaust denial literature and who this material will serve most effectively. As John Swan states (in agreement with the ALA Intellectual Freedom Manual): “freedom is indivisible and the librarian must be committed both to search for truth and the freedom of expression of untruth.”

Noel Peattie disagrees. He claims that the issue of “balance” becomes meaningless when we collect books that are proven false to balance books that are true. Peattie gives the example of the “flat earth theory.” We do not collect “flat earth theory” books to balance the amount of “round earth theory” books. If a library does acquire Holocaust denial literature, Katz emphasizes the need to classify or categorize such material appropriately. Katz suggests classifying the material.
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as “hate literature”, “revisionist history,” “a work of historical fabrication,” or assigning traditional Library of Congress subject headings and call numbers to it. Katz further suggests that the classification can be placed visibly on the cover or on the spine of the book and that the book can perhaps be physically shelved in a special area of the library.

Katz believes that it would be insulting and offensive to place Holocaust denial texts alongside Raul Hilberg’s *The Destruction of European Jews* and Gerald Reitlinger’s *The Final Solution*. Katz also identifies some problems that could arise if librarians classify standard Holocaust texts together with Holocaust denial texts. If a student is doing research on Nazi persecution of Jews during World War II, he or she may be misled when coming across Holocaust denial works. Katz delves into a case study of the Edmonton Public Library which received a grant to strengthen its Holocaust collection. At the time, there was great demand to “balance” the collection with opposing views in light of the James Keegstra and the Ernst Zündel court cases. The EPL director at the time, Vincent Richards, argued that the public library needed to provide a cross section of available literature, whether good or bad. He believed that people who visit the library can decipher the literature themselves and make their own choices. Librarians are not to preach or pass judgments on the material they collect.67

In “Holocaust Denial and Libraries: Should Libraries Acquire Revisionist Materials?” John Drobnicki, a reference librarian at the City University of New York, argues that Holocaust denial materials are based on deliberate fabrications of the historical record and are offensive not only to Jewish persons, but to anyone who believes that history should be an accurate record of the past (or as accurate as possible). He attempts to shed light on an issue that has been difficult for

librarians and libraries: “Should we purchase this material, or accept donated copies of any of it for our libraries? Should we block access to it on the Web?”

In “The Holocaust Did Happen” Drobnicki claims that the Nazis may be viewed as the first Holocaust revisionists, since they tried to camouflage their extermination program behind euphemisms such as "resettlement," "special treatment," and "final solution." Drobnicki warns that with each year that passes, fewer and fewer survivors of the Holocaust remain. For the younger generation which has no first-hand knowledge of this event, the Holocaust appears to be inconceivable. It is for this reason that revisionists target young people, particularly college students. Drobnicki explains that the best way to combat Holocaust deniers is through exposure and education, not censorship. He asserts that although Holocaust denial material is hate literature, the Library Bill of Rights states that “libraries should provide materials and information presenting all points of view on current and historical issues.”68 In fact, he further argues that libraries should acquire some revisionist material for students and teachers to use as primary source material to illustrate anti-Semitism and bigotry.69 It is vital for teachers and scholars to expose and refute these falsehoods and it is crucial for libraries to make this material accessible to its users.

Drobnicki emphasizes that it may be difficult to classify Holocaust denial material because there is no subject heading that includes Holocaust denial.70 Libraries must find a way to separate legitimate Holocaust research from Holocaust denial. Drobnicki suggests classifying Holocaust denial under the heading Anti-Semitism or Prejudice, but not all libraries may do this. This
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approach would move Holocaust denial material from the history section of the library into a new, separate physical space.

**Holocaust Denial Literature in the Social Sciences and Humanities**

Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of Jewish studies at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, examines the work of some well-known Holocaust deniers including David Irving, Paul Rassinier, and Robert Faurisson. Lipstadt argues that with Holocaust denial, there is no case for debate or question. She does not attempt to prove that the Holocaust existed. Instead she focuses on the origins of the Holocaust denial movement and concludes that Holocaust denial is another form of anti-Semitism that is legitimated through the use of debate and inquiry. Her main premise is to illustrate the methodology used and show how Holocaust deniers are linked to the radical right wing. She also demonstrates how the movement has moved into the mainstream creating a false sense of legitimacy. Since her book was written in 1993, Lipstadt does not discuss the emergence of denial on the Internet. She does argue that Holocaust denial has a global appeal – for example to anti-Zionists in Arab states and to those in Japan who wish to emphasize Allied atrocities to minimize Japanese ones.

Lipstadt claims that the focus for Holocaust deniers has evolved into free speech and censorship issues which allow them to infiltrate the mainstream and attract a new audience that would normally be wary of political and racial extremism. She argues that some right-wing conservatives have assisted in the effort to diminish the impact of the Holocaust. For example, Patrick Buchanan, a right-wing columnist who ran for U.S. presidency in 1992, coined the term
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“The Holocaust Survivor Syndrome” and publicly claimed that the Jews could not have died in the gas chambers.73 Although Holocaust deniers argue it is their right to exercise the First Amendment of the United States’ Constitution, Lipstadt concludes, “This appeal to the U.S. Constitution is a failure to understand the true implications of the First Amendment.”74

Taetia Zysshe, a history student and author of the article “Holocaust Denial on the Internet,” illustrates that upon examination of Holocaust denial websites, it appears that these sites appeal for free speech and acceptance as a legitimate historical endeavour. Quotations from supporters and detractors, non-Holocaust articles, and advertisements for publications, present a scholarly and professional facade.

Zysshe explains that racism is becoming increasingly subtle on Holocaust denial websites. She explains that deniers attempt to achieve legitimacy by distancing themselves from this aspect of their origins.75 For example, Greg Raven of the IHR challenges people to uncover racist, hateful material on his site, and, if found, promises to remove it. Paul Rassinier’s “Debunking the Genocide Myth,”76 a key early denial text, “must be combed diligently to find overt anti-Semitic references.”77

Zysshe illustrates how Bradley Smith of CODOH blames the “repression” of deniers on “political correctness,” implying a knee-jerk liberal defence of oversensitive minorities, which trivializes his opposition. He also refers to German atrocities as being “naughty,” in a more obvious attempt to diminish their seriousness. Ernst Zündel's claim to be rehabilitating "the honour
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and reputation of the German nation and people,” appears superficially reasonable, while David Irving's self-deprecating humour and Bradley Smith's “calm, kindly, elderly gentleman” demeanour\textsuperscript{78} contradict the image of Holocaust deniers as racist fanatics. Zysshe argues that much of the Holocaust denial discourse is subtle and implied, such as Ingrid Rimland using the German concept of Lebensraum for her book series.

I contacted Rimland via electronic mail on January 25, 2001. In my email, I told her that I was conducting research on Holocaust revisionism on the Internet and that I was unclear as to what the concept of Lebensraum meant. She explained that her concept of “Lebensraum” meant “living space.” She stated that in the context of her work, she uses it to describe the Mennonites in search of land and peace.\textsuperscript{79} She mentioned that it is a German word that was distorted and perverted by our enemies.\textsuperscript{80} I was confused as to whom she was referring: Jews or Nazis? From a Jewish perspective, the concept of Lebensraum was used to describe how the Nazis wanted to drive Jews out of Eastern Europe to make more “living space” for Germans.

Jack Fischel, a professor of history at Millersville University, argues that Holocaust denial represents a new wave of hatred of Jews in the United States. In impugning what is probably the most documented instance of state-condoned mass murder, Holocaust deniers have devised a strategy that appears reasonable to an audience who knows little history and is socialized to believe that there is always more than one side to a story.\textsuperscript{81}

Fischel argues that Holocaust deniers, like Bradley Smith, focus their energy on college campuses hoping to find a receptive audience. They count on reaching future generations of

\textsuperscript{79} Email correspondence dated January 25, 2001 with Ingrid Rimland, Ed.D.
\textsuperscript{80} I contacted Ingrid Rimland by email on Thursday January 25, 2001 to ask her what her concept of “Lebensraum” meant. The concept of Lebensraum is not explained on her website.
college students whose knowledge of the Holocaust is distant insofar as they have not had any
direct contact with Holocaust survivors or even an interest in the subject. Holocaust deniers
believe time is on their side. As witnesses to the Holocaust pass away and the memory of the
Shoah recedes, deniers count on being able to present their case as simply another, consideration-
worthy point of view, one well within the scholarly tradition of historical revisionism.

Fischel claims that Holocaust deniers feed on an audience's willingness to accept
conspiracy theory much in the same way that people during the Middle Ages accepted the reality
of witches and the devil. He argues that the denial of the Holocaust is not only a new form of anti-
Semitism but also an attack on the craft of history. Historians must become more vocal in
combating Holocaust denial, if only to protect their profession from falsehoods based on bigotry.

Pierre Vidal-Naquet, a French historian of the ancient world, argues that Holocaust denial
can be regarded as anti-Semitic. By its very nature, to claim that a particular historical event was
a Jewish or Zionist hoax, the movement is inherently anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist. He focuses on
the works of Robert Faurisson, Paul Rassinier, and Arthur Butz. Vidal-Naquet argues that the
revisionists all make the same claims: there were no gas chambers, there was no “Final Solution
to the Jewish Question,” the number of Jewish victims has been greatly inflated, and Hitler was
not aware of Jews being exterminated. According to revisionists, the principal enemy of the human
race was Stalin’s Soviet Union and genocide was an invention of Jewish and Zionist propaganda.
Furthermore, revisionists believe that any testimony made by a Jew is a lie and any declaration
made before liberation is not true or is treated as a rumour. Any document found has been
doctored. Any Nazi statement made to support what had actually taken place was obtained under
torture or intimidation.
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Dr. Robert Jan Van Pelt is a professor of architecture and a world-leading expert on the architectural construction of Auschwitz. He acknowledges that this concentration camp was, in fact, used to exterminate approximately one million Jews. He argues that in its time, Auschwitz was the most technologically advanced death camp, carefully designed by engineers and scientists years before it began operation. He concludes that Auschwitz’s function was to act as a conveyer belt for the mass extermination of Jews. Van Pelt also furnishes proof to indicate that deniers consistently falsify evidence and doctor documents to establish that gas chambers were never used at this death camp.

Gill Seidel, lecturer in French and Discourse Studies at Bradford University in England, traces the Holocaust denial movement to the early 1980’s in France (Robert Faurisson and Paul Rassinier), in England (David Irving), and in the United States (Arthur Butz and the IHR). She argues that Holocaust denial is a form of symbolic genocide that falsifies the historical record. She demonstrates that denying the Holocaust has a social significance and a political danger. Seidel claims that denying the Holocaust is simply a new form of old anti-Semitism. She argues that deniers are often anti-Zionist, since they believe that the Jewish State of Israel was only established because of global sympathy for Jews after World War II. She responds to deniers who claim that Hitler did not know about the “Final Solution to the Jewish Question.” The term “Jewish question” or “Jewish problem” was used in Europe for centuries as a method of dehumanizing Jews and viewing them as outsiders in their own land. She argues that today some anti-Semitic
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groups claim to support Palestinians and use anti-Zionist rhetoric as a way to “hitch their anti-Semitism to a much wider current of political opinion.”

Alain Finkielkraut, a French intellectual, examines the Holocaust and coins the term “negationism” to reflect the arguments of revisionists in France, namely Paul Rassinier, Robert Faurisson, Roger Garaudy, and Pierre Guillaume. His research, similar to that of Vidal-Naquet’s, delves into the revisionist scene of the early 1980’s. Revisionists blame the Jews for provoking the war. Finkielkraut argues that their main goal is to rehabilitate the magnetism of Hitler and the history of Germany. His central thesis is the need for people to “negate” the Nazi horrors. He examines the reasons why the revisionists in France deny this historical event and he studies other events in the 20th century from the point of view of contemporary politicians and intellectuals who also deny the extent of these genocides.

**Jewish Organizations**

The Simon Wiesenthal Centre has produced reports on the Holocaust denial movement. One such report by Sol Littman highlights the difference between historical revisionism as an academic discipline and revisionism as an anti-Semitic strategy. Littman analyzes the strategies used by Holocaust deniers as well as the relationship between Holocaust deniers and other hate groups. He provides a brief biography of the many “personalities” in the movement as well as case studies of events such as the Zündel trials. Littman also discusses the dilemma of placing Holocaust denial literature in university libraries.
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Kenneth Stern, Program Specialist on Anti-Semitism for the American Jewish Committee, discusses the beginnings of Holocaust denial and traces the movement worldwide, focusing on the United States. He outlines many of their claims and responds to each of them explicitly. Stern illustrates how people can respond to Holocaust deniers. He argues that we must be aware of the hidden agenda of Holocaust deniers and be prepared to do battle against them when all of the Holocaust survivors have died. He claims that Holocaust education in school is very important because it conveys to young people the horrors of genocide. He asserts that Holocaust deniers have abused the First Amendment’s right to free speech since they disseminate hate.

He finds that most Holocaust deniers are anti-Zionist. The IHR formed alliances with the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and produced the article “Burning of the Jews in the Nazi chambers is the lie of the 20th century in order to legitimize the new Nazism.” It is more acceptable to be anti-Zionist rather than anti-Semitic. The term anti-Semitic refers to hatred towards Jews for no other reason than that they are Jews. On the other hand, when Holocaust deniers express anti-Zionist views, they are situating themselves in a political position. Anti-Zionism is defined as objecting to the recognition of Israel as a Jewish state. Stern also argues that Holocaust deniers have adopted the incorrect term "revisionism" as an attempt to make them appear respectable and legitimate.

when Bradley Smith, founder of CODOH, paid to have Holocaust denial ads placed in university newspapers across the United States. Although he claimed that “America’s thought police” would ban the ads because they were not “politically correct,” some universities published them.

The Right Wing in Canada

Stanley Barrett, a professor of sociology and anthropology at the University of Guelph, examines different right-wing groups in Canada using an ethnographic approach. In his book *Is God a Racist: The Right Wing in Canada*, he asks two main questions: 1) How can the right wing exist in Canada and what is the relationship between the right wing and the wider society, and 2) Why do people join?

Barrett found that Ernst Zündel does not consider himself an anti-Semite or racist. Since 1981, Zündel has been a member of the organization Concerned Parents of German Descent and has distributed neo-Nazi pamphlets door-to-door throughout Toronto. Zündel believes that there exists massive stereotyping of Germans as ogres and villains. In an article published in Andrew’s Nationalist Report (no. 28) Zündel complains about hate propaganda in Canada against citizens of German descent. He claims his main goal in writing books and publishing pamphlets is to rehabilitate Hitler. Zündel maintains he does not deny the Holocaust, but that the Holocaust constitutes hate propaganda against Germans. His right wing activity is not limited to Holocaust denial. Besides being a member of Concerned Parents of German Descent, he is also part of the German-Jewish Historical Commission and while living in Canada, had a “News Hotline” where people could dial a phone number and listen to “the German point of view on world news and affairs.”
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In the early 1980’s, Zündel was charged with spreading false news with the publications of two articles: “Did Six Million Really Die?” and “The West, War, and Islam.” Both articles are controversial because one alleges an alliance involving international Zionism, secret societies like Freemasonry, and international banking and communism. The other article argues that the Holocaust is a hoax.\(^93\) The Zündel Affair, as it was labeled by the media, received extensive news coverage and many Canadian organizations defended Zündel’s claims. To an extent, the Jewish community and the Holocaust were the ones on trial. Many Canadian organizations supported Zündel’s cries for free speech worldwide. Doug Collins, a well-known journalist from the west coast, defended Zündel in his trial by stating that “discussing Santa Claus is spreading false news and the weatherman is always giving false news,” so why was the booklet “Did Six Million Really Die?” so controversial.” He argued that its claims were not abusive towards the Jewish community and that they should be freely available to all Canadians.\(^94\) When Zündel lost his case, Rabbi Gunther Plaut said that the trial only served to provide Zündel with a platform that would legitimize his views.\(^95\) Zündel benefited from the attention and the press coverage he received. Although he lost his case, his claims were broadcast throughout the world. After the trial, Zündel boasted that since he had received a million dollars of free publicity, he considered himself the victor – even though he was prohibited from discussing the Holocaust in public and was sentenced to 15 months in prison.

Barrett warns that the common perception of the radical right wing as made up of thugs, nut cases, and poorly educated is inaccurate. He argues that they consist of middle

\(^{93}\) Ibid. p.161  
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class, well educated, well traveled, and intelligent [people], but racist none the less.”  

Barrett also claims that for some anti-Semites such as Zündel, the Holocaust is a convenient instrument for striking out at Jews. The motive to attack the Holocaust is consistent with the philosophy of the Aryan prince and the Jewish devil, the “us” versus “them” approach of othering Jews. (See Chapter Four for an explanation of the concept of “Othering”)

**Summary**

Holocaust denial is a topic of interest for many disciplines because the Holocaust is so much part of mainstream consciousness. Holocaust deniers have found the Internet a very effective medium for expressing their views. There is no regulation on the web, no classifications, and no barriers. In libraries, on the other hand, Holocaust denial literature is not necessarily welcome. Although librarians are against censorship, many feel Holocaust denial crosses the line. Fortunately for them, the Library of Congress recently created new subject headings to differentiate Holocaust denial from general Holocaust literature: “Holocaust Denial,” “Holocaust Denial Literature” and “Holocaust, Jewish 1939-1945-- errors, inventions.” Although deniers feel this categorizes them negatively, it is important to make a separation.

Many scholars view Holocaust denial as a new form of anti-Semitism. Deniers, they say, get away with their racism by means of the United States First Amendment and the generally supported notion of free speech. Since Holocaust denial cannot be simply ignored, some Jewish organizations have taken it upon themselves to counter Holocaust denial claims by educating the public about their flaws. The following chapter discusses the most widely known Holocaust deniers. They are almost exclusively male and most devote a large part of their lives to Holocaust denial.
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Chapter Three: The Key Players in the Holocaust Denial Movement

This chapter identifies some of the key personalities in the Holocaust denial movement in Canada, the United States, England, Germany, and France. By examining these individuals’ backgrounds, I demonstrate the falseness of their claim of being objective examiners of the Holocaust.

The above countries were chosen because they have well documented histories. Of course, Holocaust denial exists in other countries and on other continents. However, there was substantially less information on deniers in other locations. For example, Fredrick Toben, who is of German descent, resides in Australia and owns the website and organization called The Adelaide Institute. This website has been online for several years, but I could not find much background information on Toben’s personal and professional life.

Below is a list of the most notorious Holocaust deniers who have generated a great deal of press coverage and who, as a result, have gained popularity over the past thirty years. I have chosen to discuss the following people:

1. Paul Rassinier and Robert Faurisson in France;
2. Willis Carto, Bradley Smith, Arthur Butz, and Harry Elmer Barnes in the United States;
3. Ernst Zündel and James Keegstra in Canada;
4. David Irving in England;
5. Germar Rudolf in Germany;
Paul Rassinier

As Kenneth Stern puts it, “Holocaust denial began before the Holocaust ended.” Paul Rassinier, one of the earliest Holocaust deniers, was himself a concentration camp survivor. Rassinier is known as the father of Holocaust denial. He was a former socialist and an anarchist. In October of 1943, he was arrested by the Gestapo for various activities, including the smuggling of Jewish refugees over the Franco-Swiss border. Rassinier was sent to the Buchenwald concentration camp for his actions. After the war, in 1949, Rassinier returned to his native France and was awarded the highest honour by the French government for his involvement with the Resistance. Rassinier, trained in history, set out to document his experiences within the German concentration camp system. He published a book claiming that the Nazis did not intend to kill Jews systematically. He also claimed that the number of Jews killed was exaggerated. He painted a hideous picture of the dead being brought from Dora to Buchenwald. Every day trucks brought full loads of dead bodies from Dora to be cremated at Buchenwald, and it was from the presence of these corpses that the horrors of the camp were deduced. Rassinier attributed the alarming death rate at Buchenwald to "bad treatment, the poor and insufficient food, the super human work, the lack of medicines, and pneumonia.” But he denied the existence of the gas chambers. Rassinier was keen to stress there was no systematic killing.

“One day I realized that a false picture of the German camps had been created and that the problem of the concentration camps was a universal one, not just one that could be disposed of by placing it on the doorstep of the National Socialists. The deportees, many of whom were Communists, had been largely responsible for
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leading international political thinking to such an erroneous conclusion. I suddenly felt that by remaining silent I was an accomplice to a dangerous influence.”

Rassinier embarked on a mission to debunk and deconstruct the works of his fellow inmates, such as Raul Hilberg's *Destruction of the European Jews*. Rassinier confidently predicted that in the future, Hilberg's work would not be OK at all, or if it was still mentioned, it would only be mentioned as an example of the most scandalous aberrations of our times.

Rassinier was skeptical of the lurid gas chamber stories that were being circulated. "In 1950, it was still too soon to pronounce a definite judgment on the existence of gas chambers in the camps; documents were wanting and those that existed were incomplete, inexact, and obviously apocryphal or falsified." In his article “The Drama of the European Jews,” Rassinier's view is even more definite. “With regard to gas chambers, the almost endless procession of false witnesses and of falsified documents to which I have invited the reader’s attention during this long study, proves, nevertheless, only one thing: never at any moment did the responsible authorities of the Third Reich intend to order - or in fact, order - the extermination of the Jews in this or any other manner.” As a result of his studies, Rassinier reached the following conclusion, “There never were any gas chambers, or any exterminations by that method at Auschwitz-Birkenau.”

Rassinier argued that no widespread gassings took place and that there was no policy to exterminate the Jews of Europe. He also provided revisionists with the first quantitative analysis
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of Jewish wartime deaths. His final total put the range of Jewish deaths during the Nazi rule between 987,592 and 1,589,492.105

Years later, Rassinier’s influence is apparent in Holocaust denial. Arthur Butz made reference to Rassinier’s studies in his book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, “I will offer here no definite estimate of Jewish losses. However, I have no strong reason to quarrel with Rassinier's estimate.”106 Rassinier also made a tremendous impact on Harry Elmer Barnes. In his article, “Revisionism and Brainwashing,” Barnes comments on the discouragement and smearing of outsiders like the distinguished French historian Paul Rassinier, who sought to expose the exaggerations of the atrocity stories. In the mid 1960's, it was Barnes who translated Rassinier's works into English.

**Robert Faurisson**

Robert Faurisson is known as the movement's “elder statesman.” He was born in the United Kingdom in 1929, holds dual French and British citizenship and currently resides in Vichy, France. Faurisson has a doctorate from Sorbonne University in literary textual criticism. He taught literature at the Sorbonne until 1973 and then at the University of Lyon until 1991, when he was removed from his chair after being found guilty of libel, racial defamation and incitement of racial hatred and failure to properly discharge his responsibilities as a scholar, both in his approach to evidence and testimony, as well as in his research methods.

Aware of the historical significance of the Holocaust, Faurisson has sought proof of the methods used, in particular killings by gas asphyxiation. While he does not contest the use of gas for purposes of disinfection, he doubts the existence of gas chambers for extermination purposes
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("chambres à gaz homicides") at Auschwitz and in other Nazi concentration camps. He was a star witness for Zündel at both his trials.

**Harry Elmer Barnes**

In the United States, the founding father of Holocaust denial was Harry Elmer Barnes (1889-1968), a well-known scholar and professor. (In)famous for minimizing the German role in World War I, Barnes claimed that Germans who were expelled from Poland and Czechoslovakia after World War II suffered more than the Jews who were exterminated by the Nazis. While he did not deny the Holocaust, his views, like those of Paul Rassinier, were sympathetic to Hitler. Both argued that Hitler was merely defending himself from his enemies; the Jews. Both argued that the Jews instigated the war and that Hitler’s goal was to remove Jews from Europe, not to exterminate them.

Regarded at one time as a respected historian, Barnes was an isolationist. He felt that the United States, contrary to its interests, was led into two disastrous World Wars. He saw a conspiracy that had manipulated his country into these conflicts. During the First World War there was a series of propaganda stories that had been circulated by the allies to taint Germany’s image. Subsequent investigation proved a number of these atrocity stories had been false.

**Willis Carto**

Willis Carto continued in Barnes’ footsteps. Carto is known as the father of modern Holocaust denial in the United States. Holocaust denial, as a serious enterprise, was established by Carto. He founded the anti-Semitic Liberty Lobby, The Institute for Historical Review
(IHR), and, more recently, the Barnes Review, an electronic journal devoted to Holocaust revisionism.

The Institute for Historical Review, founded in 1976, can be considered the world centre of Holocaust denial. It hosts conferences which bring deniers together from around the world. Carto started the IHR after NBC ran a television series entitled “Holocaust.” The series had a tremendous impact not only in North America but internationally and this spurred Holocaust deniers to increased activism.

In 1981, the Institute for Historical Review publicized its Holocaust denial claims and offered a $50,000 reward for “proof” that Jews had been gassed at Auschwitz. Mel Mermelstein, an Auschwitz survivor, took up the challenge and supplied the necessary proof, only to be ignored. He filed legal action and in July, 1985, the Superior Court of Los Angeles ruled in his favour. The IHR had to pay Mermelstein the $50,000 reward, as well as an additional $100,000 for the suffering he underwent as a result of their publicity stunt. The IHR apologized in writing to Mr. Mermelstein and other survivors for calling the Holocaust a hoax.

The IHR has a retail division called Noontide Press and publishes *The Journal of Historical Review* which presents itself as a scholarly journal and frequently publishes articles unrelated to the Holocaust. Historians such as David Irving have lent their names to the publication, although most reputable historians have distanced themselves from it.

The Institute presents itself as an authoritative organization dedicated to re-evaluating and debating historical events. Yet one has to wonder why it focuses exclusively on denying historical events pertaining to Jews. Carto has links to many neo-Nazi movements in the US and abroad – perhaps an indication of the underlying motives of the IHR.
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Carto has since left the IHR\textsuperscript{108} and it is presently managed by Mark Weber and Greg Raven.

**Arthur Butz**

Dr. Arthur Butz, a professor at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, was the first person to bring Holocaust denial into the academic community. In 1976, the IHR published Butz’ book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Butz’s main thesis is that gas chambers were not used to kill Jews in the concentration camps. He asserts that Jews died of natural causes for example, typhus and starvation. He argues that the number of Jews killed was not six million and that the figure was greatly exaggerated. His book takes a “scientific” approach to dissecting the events of the Holocaust. The publication was groundbreaking because an academic authored it. In the following years, more academics and scholars began to debate and question the Holocaust.

Previously, Holocaust denial was an extreme movement associated with uneducated racists and Nazi skinheads. However, Butz’s book addressed a new demographic of people, namely university-educated, middle-class intellectuals. Today, he is still a professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at Northwestern.

**Bradley Smith**

The Committee on the Open Debate of the Holocaust (CODOH) was founded by William Curry. After his death, Bradley Smith together with Mark Weber headed the organization. Both men have questionable ties to the IHR. Smith has served as a contributing editor to it since 1985. Weber is one of the editors at the IHR and the editor for the IHR’s publication, the *Journal for Historical Review*.

In 1991, CODOH tried to place full-page ads in college newspapers claiming that the gas chambers did not exist. Entitled “The Holocaust Story: How Much is False? The Case for Open
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“Debate,” the ad claimed that if anyone could provide proof that the gas chambers existed, they would receive $50,000 U.S. While many newspapers did not print the ad, many other newspapers did because of the censorship issue. Smith’s principal objective was to reach university campuses and target young people. He believed he was not disseminating hatred. Rather, he was fulfilling his responsibility to bring revisionist scholarship into the university community. Unfortunately for Smith, the debate he attempted to stir up was suppressed by a “secret group on campus as part of their larger political agenda” – or so he claims.

Supported financially by the IHR, Smith continues to pursue putting an end to “Holocaust cultism,” censorship, and the suppression of free inquiry. In his publication entitled “Revisionist Letters,” Smith attempts to differentiate between anti-Semites who used Holocaust denial to attack Jews and his own objective uncovering of the truth. Smith claims that the notion of a Nazi attempt to destroy Jews was the product of Allied efforts to produce anti-German propaganda.

Most recently Smith paid for ads offering $250,000 to anyone who could arrange a 90-minute debate between his organization and the Anti-Defamation League on national television. In the ad, Smith calls the Anti-Defamation League a "mainline Jewish organization" and states the Jewish Defense League threatened David Cole, the director of one of Smith's anti-Holocaust films.

**Ernst Zündel**
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Perhaps the best known Holocaust denier in Canada is Ernst Zündel. Zündel immigrated to Canada in 1958, at the age of 19, as a draft dodger from West Germany. A self-described "Christian and pacifist," he settled in Montreal and supported himself as a commercial artist, photographer, and photo retoucher.

Zündel ran a publishing house in Toronto’s Cabbagetown neighbourhood. The company published books authored by Zündel, such as *The Hitler We Loved and Why* as well as Holocaust denial classics like *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* by Arthur Butz and *The Six Million Swindle* by Austin App. In addition to publishing, Zündel created two essentially one-man operations: the German-Jewish Historical Commission, which promoted Holocaust denial, and Concerned Parents of German Descent, which disseminated anti-Zionist propaganda to ethnic Germans. Never one to keep his hands idle, Zündel also contributed articles to the now-defunct West Virginia-based neo-Nazi magazine *Liberty Bell* published by George Dietz; and was listed on the editorial staff of *White Power Report*, another Dietz publication.

Zündel's early writings contain a mix of neo-Nazi and white supremacist rhetoric, condemnations of Jews and Zionism, charges that Western media and governments criticize Germany and Germans, Holocaust denial and conspiracy theories. Zundel also has an obsession with UFO's, believing them to be Nazi secret weapons based somewhere in Antarctica. An article in the January 1977 issue of *White Power Report* entitled “Our New Emblem: The Best of Two Worlds” (referring to a design that merged a swastika and the American flag) conveys the tone of Zündel's work during this time.
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In 1978, a Canadian journalist revealed that using his middle names, Christof Friedrich, Zündel had become Canada's leading pro-Nazi and Holocaust denial propagandist. Once exposed, Zündel continued his efforts under his real name.

Zündel attempted to recruit minority European ethnic groups in Canada. In 1981, he mailed out a flier to "Fellow Canadians of the Ethnic Press." He wrote:

“You may remember that I had predicted that your own ethnic group and some of your leading citizens would next be the targets of defamation, vilification and distortion and that some of you might be transported to the Soviet Union and/or Israel for torture, trial and execution because the Zionists are striving to equate anti-Communism with Fascism in the public mind. Despite the hateful depiction of Poles and Ukrainians in the Holocaust hate film, you did not heed my warning. And now, the Zionist hate campaign is directed at you!"  

Along these lines, Zündel transmitted flyers to Jewish leaders in North America, as well as clergymen, politicians and media representatives that read:

“Should the present media-born hate campaign continue or be allowed to go unanswered, I see trouble ahead -- not from responsible people like myself, but from simple working people who express themselves by actions, not words, simply because they see no other recourse. Please believe me when I say that there is a growing and powerful current of German anger and frustration. I appeal to you to heed these danger signals and to prevent the situation from getting out of hand....
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Act now. Avoid more pain, suffering and disunity. We do not need any pogroms on this continent neither against Jews nor Germans.\textsuperscript{117}

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Zündel’s catalogue of publications of Holocaust denial grew considerably. He had a wealth of Nazi and neo-Nazi paraphernalia, artwork, memorabilia, posters, audio tapes,\textsuperscript{118} and numerous pamphlets and books devoted to the enumeration of Allied and Zionist “war crimes.” Through the sale of these items, Zündel was able to spread his Holocaust denial and pro-Nazi materials throughout the world, particularly in Canada, the United States and West Germany. Zündel claimed that through his mailing list to media outlets, he reached some 29,000 politicians and educators in the United States. He placed full-page advertisements for his publishing house in many mainstream magazines as well as Marvel Comics. He claimed that he had a growing clientele for his mail order business and sent mailings to West German government officials.

The dissemination of Nazi and neo-Nazi materials was (and is) illegal in Germany and Zündel's efforts attracted the attention of the authorities. In 1980, a representative of the West German Federal Ministry of Finance announced that between January, 1978, and December, 1979, some two hundred shipments of right-wing extremist and neo-Nazi material including books, periodicals, symbols, decorations, films, cassettes, and records were intercepted as they entered Germany. These shipments, the official reported, “came overwhelmingly from Canada.” In April, 1981, it was confirmed that the source was Samisdat Publishers.

As Zündel's reputation spread, he came into contact with Canadian officials, who launched several criminal investigations into his activities. In November, 1981, Canada Post suspended
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Samisdat's mailing privileges. The government argued that Zündel's anti-Jewish campaign violated criminal prohibitions against using the mail system to disseminate hate. While waiting for a review board to hear his appeal, Zündel distributed his materials through a post-office box in Niagara Falls, New York. In January, 1983, Canada lifted its ban on his mailing privileges and his activities resumed.

The next phase of Zündel’s legal conflicts began in 1985, when he was charged under Section 177 of the Criminal Code of Canada for “knowingly publishing false news.” The centerpieces of the trial were two Zündel mailings: a four-page letter entitled “The West, War, and Islam” and a thirty-page pamphlet entitled “Did Six Million Really Die?” While Zündel only contributed a foreword and conclusion to the latter, he composed “The West, War, and Islam” himself and mailed it to several hundred public figures in the Middle East. The letter warned Muslims that their enemies, “international Zionists” in particular, were “stimulating the West into a future criminal war” against them. Zündel asked for financial support so that he could lead the fight against the Zionist misinformation campaigns and dispel the myth of the “so-called Holocaust,” from which, he claimed, Zionists gain so much of their power.

Although Zündel was convicted he did not serve his sentence. In January, 1987, the Ontario Court of Appeals overturned the 1985 conviction, citing procedural errors during the trial. In June, 1987, a new trial was granted.

In August, 1996, the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) opened another chapter in Zündel's legal saga. This time, it concerned his website: the Zündelsite. Because of the broad range of issues, including free speech, the definition of hate speech and the regulation of the Internet, many groups followed the trial with interest. Free-speech groups, such as Electronic
Frontier Canada, voiced their opposition to the prosecution of the case, even though they disagreed with Zündel's views about the Holocaust.

Zündel has maintained a low profile over the past few years. He re-located to the United States and married Ingrid Rimland. His flamboyant presence has helped him remain a popular and influential propagandist in what he calls “the struggle for truth in history”.

James Keegstra

For many Canadians, Holocaust denial was a non-issue until the mid 1980’s. It was then that a high-school teacher in rural Alberta brought the movement into the public eye. The teacher, James Keegstra, taught his students that a group of Jews called the “Illuminati” were responsible for all the revolutions and debts in the world since the 1700’s. According to Keegstra, Zionism was a Jewish fraud and the Holocaust was a hoax to get the world to feel sympathy and to support Israel as a Jewish state. Keegstra was openly anti-Semitic and taught classes in this manner for fourteen years before anyone complained.

Keegstra was charged with introducing anti-Semitic material into the curriculum of his social studies classes. His trial began in July, 1985, and lasted seventy days. Jurors heard testimony from Keegstra's former students and testimony from Keegstra himself. Many of his former students read from class notes and exam papers, which typically included phrases like “We must get rid of every Jew in existence so we may live in peace and freedom,” “Jews will always cut your throat” and “The Holocaust was just a big sob story.” Several students testified that Keegstra gave good grades only to those students who reiterated his views.

Keegstra was represented by Douglas Christie who had also represented Ernst Zündel. He did not claim that the prosecutor or his former students were misrepresenting his views. In fact,

his testimony was largely devoted to elucidating his belief that Jews had conspired against Christians throughout history. The jury found Keegstra guilty and he was fined $5,000.

David John Cawdell Irving

David Irving is a well-known author in England. Before becoming a hard-line Holocaust denier, he wrote best sellers devoted to World War II history and biographies of Adolf Hitler. Although in his books, Irving praised Hitler for his charisma, his strong leadership skills, and his power, the books were not anti-Semitic. Now, Irving calls himself, “a moderate fascist.” He owns and operates his own publishing house called Focal Point Publishing.

Irving's involvement in the discussion of the Final Solution began at the end of the 1970s, after he had published *Hitler's War*, his most successful book. The aim of the book, according to Irving, was to describe the war from Hitler's point of view, “through Hitler's eyes, from behind his desk.” In order to understand the link between *Hitler's War* and Holocaust denial adopted by Irving ten years later, one should concentrate on Irving's portrayal of Hitler, which Martin Broszat labeled “the strategy of de-demonization.” The image of Hitler in *Hitler's War*, as well as in the *War Path*, published by Irving a year later, is totally different from that of the fanatic dictator portrayed by historians such as Allen Bullock, Karl Dietrich Bracher and Eberhard Jackel. Irving argues:

“Hitler was a realistic, fair-minded leader, who strove to restore Germany's political status as a dominant power in Europe. As a solution to Germany's rapid population growth, he sought to acquire new territories in the East, a goal also motivated by a
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genuine fear of Bolshevist expansion and by a desire to mark the ultimate frontier between Asia and the West. Hitler believed that the annexation of new territories in the East was not fundamentally different from the colonialism of other European powers, most notably Britain. Moreover, he had no aggressive intentions in the West; on the contrary, he sought to reach an agreement with Britain and was willing to accept painful compromises, and even harsh terms, in order to maintain peace in Europe.  

Irving's revisionist thinking did not end with the publication of his book. In 1979, a German publisher had to compensate the father of Anne Frank after printing the German edition of Hitler's War in which Irving claimed that Anne Frank's diary was a forgery. By the late 1980s, David Irving had become one of the most well-known representatives of this stream of Holocaust denial. Unlike other deniers whose primary interest was to distort or deny the Holocaust, Irving questioned the number of Jewish deaths. He argued mainly against Hitler's demonic image during what he described as “years of intense wartime propaganda and emotive postwar historiography.” However, up until the late 1980s, Irving refrained from explicitly denying the extermination itself.

Irving claims that, according to his research, the Holocaust is greatly exaggerated. In fact, Irving’s research may not have been very thorough. During the 1988 trial of pro-Nazi publisher Ernst Zündel, he admitted under cross-examination that he had not actually read all of Adolf
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Eichmann's 1960 trial testimony, in which Eichmann admitted that Nazi leaders discussed the so-called Final Solution to the Jewish problem in 1942.  

Irving rebuffs the label “Holocaust denier” or “Hitler apologist” and seems willing to resort to legal action if necessary. In a recent fax printed in the daily newspaper, the Kitchener-Waterloo Record, he is reported as saying, “I have warned 22 British newspapers that I shall not hesitate to commence libel action if they use smear phrases like 'Hitler apologist' or 'Holocaust denier' to embellish their writings.”

Irving's attitude toward Hitler as a fair-minded leader, as well as his “balanced” approach toward the role of Germany in the outbreak of World War II and its atrocities, made him popular in extreme right-wing and Neo-Nazi circles. Irving was praised as one of the few reliable and unprejudiced historians. He was valued as an authoritative source for World War II history. His books could be obtained from reputable publishers and he gained worldwide publicity when Hitler's War appeared. In addition, Irving's thesis with regard to the question of Hitler's role in the destruction of European Jewry stimulated the ongoing debate in West Germany about the genesis of the Final Solution.

In November 1991, a reporter demonstrated that Irving omitted crucial lines from a translation of Goebbels' diaries, lines that would have contradicted his theory that Hitler knew nothing about the extermination of the Jews. At the time of the second Zündel trial Irving finally admitted that he is a Holocaust denier.
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In May 1992, Irving claimed that the gas chambers at Auschwitz were “built by the Poles after the war as a tourist attraction.” For this remark, a Munich court fined him 10,000 Deutschmarks.131 The judge was quoted as saying that the gas chambers of Auschwitz were “an historically certain fact.”

Within the last four years, Irving has been involved in a libel case with Professor Deborah Lipstadt, professor at Emory University in Georgia. She wrote in her book, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* that Irving was best known as a Holocaust denier and that he fabricated history.132 Irving sued Lipstadt and her publisher Penguin Books, for calling him a Holocaust denier. Lipstadt won the case in 2001, but Irving has since appealed.

**Germar Rudolf**

The most popular and credible Holocaust denier in Germany in the 1990’s was Germar Rudolf. Rudolf’s most significant contribution to the Holocaust denial movement was the “Rudolf Report,” in which he claims that the gas chambers at Auschwitz could not have functioned in the way documented. Like Fred Leuchter, Rudolf went to Auschwitz and illegally extracted soil samples and took them to test for certain levels of iron cyanide. Unlike Leuchter, Rudolf actually has a scientific background as a chemist. Other deniers often look to him as an authority to dismantle the “gas chamber myth.”

Rudolf joined the Republican party in 1985. He left and re-joined in 1989. He was dissatisfied with the party because it was not interested in his radical far-right claims. Rudolf wrote and published various articles under several pseudonyms to deny the Holocaust. Rudolf claims that there are three publications that changed the way he viewed the Holocaust. Unlike
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other Holocaust deniers, his claims revolve around the issue of “chemical historical questions,” which Rudolf claims have nothing to do with ideologies or anti-Semitism.

Rudolf used pseudonyms in his research to create the false sense of a discussion about his findings with other scholars. He used pseudonyms when citing references and he used pseudonyms when his articles were peer-reviewed. By using a network of pseudonyms, he created a community of scholars that did not exist, but that gave his article positive reviews and great support.

Rudolf used the Max Planck’s institute’s logo when he requested samples analysed from Auschwitz and Birkenau. He went to trial in Stuttgart and was sentenced to fourteen months in prison in June 1995. He appealed and by the time the appeal was rejected, Rudolf fled Germany and has been in hiding in the U.K. ever since.

British authorities have not arrested Rudolf in the U.K. since Holocaust denial is not illegal there. Since 1996, he inherited the organization “Stiftung Vrij Historisch Onderzoek” (VHO or The European Institute for Free Historical Research) from Herbert Verbecke. He also gained control of Castle Hill publishers, which, like the IHR, publishes anti-Semitic literature which would normally be banned in Germany.

Like Zündel, Rudolf portrays himself as a political martyr and the ultimate victim. Holocaust deniers like Rudolf use words like “persecuted” and “political prisoner” to identify themselves as the sufferers and fighters for truth and justice. Rudolf portrays himself as an unbiased scientist, not a Holocaust denier. Since he does have a background in the sciences, he can use the façade of a scholar. Rudolf is careful in his writings to not demonstrate his opposition to the Jewish community, as he does not want to appear anti-Semitic. Rudolf wants to maintain credibility and objectivity but he also claims that there needs to be a revolution in
Germany. He believes that he is a freedom fighter and that he has the right to free speech.

Rudolf tried to enter the United States but was refused.

Over the past decade, Rudolf has attracted a network of international contacts. He has spoken at many conferences and many deniers are attracted to his youthfulness and his scientific background. Zündel, in particular, was quite happy to find another person of German descent who was passionate about denying the Holocaust. Zündel wrote to Rudolf: “You cannot believe just how happy I was about your letter! Finally a German in the area, who wants to adopt this important cause! Praise the Lord! I have been hoping for somebody like you for years!”

In June 2000, Rudolf joined forces with Bradley Smith, owner of CODOH (Committee on the Open Debate of the Holocaust) and merged their resources into a larger website that can be accessed by www.vho.org or www.codoh.com. Rudolf wanted to provide his resources in English and in German and making alliances with Smith allowed him to reach a broader audience.

Currently Rudolf is still in hiding and he hopes to immigrate to the United States where he can enjoy total freedom of speech. Anthony Long believes that Rudolf will eventually succeed Ernst Zündel, David Irving, and Robert Faurisson, as being the most popular and successful Holocaust denier in the world. The others view Rudolf as more legitimate because his academic qualification is in a field that is directly relevant to his contribution to Holocaust denial, unlike most other deniers.

Legislation

---
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Due to legislation that criminalized Holocaust denial in Germany, it is illegal to publicly deny the Holocaust. If a person denies the Holocaust, they are subject to imprisonment and a penalty. Prior to 1985, Holocaust denial was liable to be penalised under Paragraph 185 of the German Penal Code that considers denial an insult to the survivors of the Holocaust. In June, 1985, the German government added Paragraph 194, which allows prosecution for the dissemination of the “Auschwitz Lie”\textsuperscript{137} either at public conferences or conventions or in electronic media. Paragraph 86 criminalises the distribution and storage of hate literature and hate propaganda. Since 1994, denying the Holocaust carries a prison sentence of up to five years. These laws have had a positive effect on reducing public dissemination of Holocaust denial but it is not certain if German citizens do or do not deny the Holocaust privately. This is an issue that can be addressed in future research but it will not be discussed further in this thesis.

In the USA, Zündel, Rudolf and other Holocaust deniers are protected by the first amendment of the constitution.\textsuperscript{138}

**Summary**

Holocaust deniers come from a variety of backgrounds. They have little in common besides as certaining that the Holocaust did not really happen. In the available biographies, it cannot be inferred what motivates these men to deny the Holocaust. However, for the most part, they dedicate their whole lives to their beliefs.

In the next chapter, the issue of Jews as the “Other” is discussed. This “otherness” may be one of the factors responsible for anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial.

\textsuperscript{137} The Auschwitz Lie is when people deny that gas chambers were used to kill Jews in Auschwitz. This was employed by the German government in addition to those who deny the Holocaust. Paragraph 194 under the German Penal code was an additional clause that was added to Paragraph 185 under the German Penal Code.

\textsuperscript{138} See the First Amendment of the U.S. constitution at [http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Amend.html](http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Amend.html)
Chapter 4: Jews as the Racial “Other”

Some race theories argue that Jews constitute a distinct race. Others claim that constructing Jews into a separate race is incorrect and inaccurate since there are no biological traits unique to the Jew.

At present, Jews live all over the world. Through the centuries, there have been intermarriages, conversions, integrations. Many people whose ancestors were Jewish no longer subscribe to Judaism and have no links to Jewish culture or to Jewish communities. This chapter argues that theories that maintain Jews constitute a separate race give Holocaust deniers fuel to marginalize the Jew into the category of “Other” in modern society. My research suggests that the Jews’ “otherness” may be one of the underlining elements behind anti-Semitism.

This chapter analyses the historical background of race theory over the last few hundred years and attempts to answer the following questions:

Are Jews White?

Do Jews constitute a separate race?

Are Jews White?

The concept of “whiteness” is intriguing. It goes beyond skin colour to identity and heritage. Michael Jackson, for example, has white skin, yet continuously identifies himself as a black man. Oprah Winfrey is a black woman whose popular television program claims to address issues relevant to both the white and black communities and to women in particular. However, most of the guests are white, middle-class women. According to some race theorists, Winfrey’s identity has been “whitened” by her wealth, along with her chemically straightened hair. So what
does it mean to be white? Is it based on skin colour? On a way of dressing and presenting one’s self? Or is it a question of social class and wealth?

According to contemporary research, Jews are Caucasian. White supremacists are rabidly pro-white and believe that the white race is the superior race. Yet they are also rabidly anti-Semitic, which is a bit of an oxymoron. Hate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan do not regard Jews as white because their concept of white is strongly connected with European Christians.

**Karen Brodkin: Jews Became White After World War II**


Brodkin argues that Jews were viewed as a separate race until they acquired money and became integrated into the “white” race. She suggests that after World War II, Jews became “white” through federal government polices that permitted them to become members of the white suburban middle class. Brodkin argues that prior to World War II, racial categorization differed. Thus Jews were not considered properly within the boundaries of whiteness and its privileges.

Brodkin’s analysis of Jews acquiring a “white” identity provides insight into the changing nature of Jewish identity in the United States. Brodkin argues that Jews were constructed as off-whites (neither white nor black) in American history. After World War II they became more accepted into white Christian society. Consequently, they were allowed to mesh into the white middle-class American model, live in the suburbs, etc.
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Brodkin discusses the concepts “ethnoracial assignment” and “ethnoracial identity,” and how they apply to American Jews. Ethnoracial assignment refers to "the ways in which the dominant culture and popular understandings construct different categories of social and political beings," whereas identity, used in a political sense, refers "to a system of values and meaning shared within a community by which we measure ourselves as social actors." Brodkin examines the interplay between ethnoracial assignment and ethnoracial identity as it transforms over time and how it relates to larger political phenomena in the United States.

**Sander Gilman: Jews as Multiracial**

Sander Gilman observes that in the Middle Ages the physical signs used to distinguish Jews were horns, hooked noses, or discoloured skin. They were thought to give off a peculiar body odour and their men were believed to menstruate. They were compared to orangutans. Adam Gurowski, a Polish nobleman visiting America in the 1850s, “took every light-colored mulatto for a Jew.” John Quincy Adams, the sixth president of the United States, disdained Florida Senator David Levy Yulee for “the dash of African blood in him,” and Confederate statesman Judah Benjamin, olive skinned and black haired, was immortalized as the “dark prince” by poet Stephen Vincent Benet in his poem “John Brown’s Body.”

In his book *The Jew’s Body*, Gilman argues that Jews define themselves as both Jewish and white. Their identity is based on the fact that historically they were constructed as a separate race, neither white nor black. Jews were constructed as being off-white, of a diseased or an impure race, as olive, swarthy, and even black. Gilman argues that the colour of their skin was directly
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related to a particular disease, that of being Jewish. He illustrates that the fundamental nature of an Eastern European Jew was to be stricken with syphilis and to be unhygienic.

According to Gilman, being black was not beautiful in the mid-nineteenth century. He indicates that being Jewish, black, diseased, and ugly were all linked together. He describes how the Bavarian writer Johann Pezzl traveled to Vienna and observed Jews there. Pezzl confirms the notion that Jews were perceived as outsiders and they were considered unclean. He believed that their sole and eternal occupation was to counterfeit, salvage, trade in coins, and cheat Christians, Turks, heathens, and each other.\textsuperscript{143} Pezzl observed Jews as being dirty when their faces were covered with a beard, they were said to resemble an orangutan.

Gilman argues that Jews’ appearance made them a visible minority and an alien in their own country. Skin colour was the marker to prove that the Jew was odd and contaminated. Gilman writes about Friedrich Ratzel, an antithetical theorist, who argued that skin colour was a reflection of geography. He argued that since Jews were mobile there would be much variation in skin colour amongst them. They began to become invisible since the Jewish racial type was slowly disappearing.

In 1787, the president of Princeton University, Samuel Stanhope Smith, confirmed that Jews came to be seen as the adaptive people par excellence.\textsuperscript{144} He indicated that in Britain and Germany their colouring was fair. In France and Turkey they were brown; swarthy in Portugal and Spain, olive in Syria and Chaldea, and copper-coloured in Arabia and Egypt.\textsuperscript{145}

By the end of the nineteenth century, “Western European Jews had become indistinguishable from other Western Europeans in matters of language, dress, occupation,
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location of their dwelling, and their hairstyle.”  

During the twentieth century in the United States, there was a shift in the perceptions of the Jewish body and of Jews as being non-white. As Gilman states, “It is not merely that second and third generation descendents of Eastern European Jewish immigrants do not look like their grandparents, but they look American.” The perception suggests that Jews resemble chameleons that adapt and assimilate according to their environment. This is what makes the European population uncomfortable, that Jews could become invisible.

Holocaust deniers frame Jews as the “Other” in modern society, because historically, they have always been viewed as the “Other.” Since they place Jews in the category of the “other,” the “alien,” and the “outsider,” they can situate themselves in the “victim” position and portray themselves as the vulnerable and oppressed group ruled by outsiders.

Finally Gilman suggests that “Jews may have become white when they acculturated into American society, so identifying with the ideals of American life, with all of its evocation of race, that they have become white.”

**Leonard Rogoff: Jews as Racial Tabula Rasa**

In his article “Is a Jew White?: The Racial Place of the Southern Jew,” Leonard Rogoff argues that during the nineteenth century in the U.S. Jews were a racial tabula rasa upon which anything could be written. During the nineteenth century, nationalists split races into increasingly hierarchical categories. Racial theorists defined Jews as Semites and Orientals, and the Jews' status as Europeans was questioned. The Jews were described variously as white, black, or mixed. Rogoff indicates that in the American South, a new social line between the Jew and white gentile followed the disengagement of white and black. This separation occurred at a time when the Jews'
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colour was being questioned. The immigration of millions of Eastern European Jews to the south aggravated the Christian community. Thus very few settled in the South and opted instead for the Northeast.

Jews who chose to settle in the South entered a bipolar racialized society. There was difficulty placing the Jew in the context of the Southern racial hierarchy because of how they were viewed historically. Southern Christians inherited a folkloric prejudice, a colour symbolism that attributed virtue to white skin and evil to black.\textsuperscript{149} This bias drew upon more ancient theologies and folk beliefs that physiology reflects character.

Rogoff demonstrates that the Jewish racial question was not a social or political issue in the antebellum South, but primarily class related. He illustrates that in 1846 John C. Calhoun, Vice President of the United States, complained that Jews were “notoriously a race of brokers, bankers, and merchants.”\textsuperscript{150} The discourse of race in this respect lacked any scientific justification and it instead suggests that Jews were viewed in terms of class.

**Do Jews Constitute a Separate Race?**

According to Yosef Yerushalmi, a professor of Jewish History at Columbia University, racial terminology was applied to the Jews as early as the fifteenth century, when the Purity of Blood Statutes were enacted by the Spanish and Portuguese to restrict those of Jewish descent from obtaining certain privileges. By the mid-nineteenth century, the opposition between “Aryan” and “Semitic,” had become an orthodoxy of racial science in Europe.\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid.
A Racial Hierarchy

John Efron illustrates in his book *Defenders of the Race* that the eighteenth century witnessed the birth of modern anthropology and biology where the goal was to classify human beings scientifically. Drawing on Aristotle’s image of the “scala naturae,” or “the great chain of being,” anthropologists developed a theory that illustrated that all humans are connected to God through a continuous ladder of ascent. White men were at the top of the ladder, followed by white women.152

Dutch anatomist Peter Camper quantified the measurement of race in the 1770’s. He invented the concept of the facial angle. He took this measurement by drawing a horizontal line from the nose to the ear and a vertical one from the upper lip to the forehead. The more the jaw protruded, the greater the angle, the more it resembled the angles of an ape. This would make a race inferior. At the time, Camper held that the Negro was more like an ape than was the Caucasian.153

In 1843, Gustav Klemm argued that there was a division of people into “passive” and “active” races. The active races lived in cold climates and were male while the passive races lived in warm climates and were female. This and many other kinds of classification paved the way to the development of human body analysis, skull size analysis, and race science.

Germany was one of the only countries where Jews were constructed as the Other in the discourse of scientific racism. Many professional anthropology journals discussed different cultures, including Jewish, as one of their “Other” cultures. An anti-Jewish campaign arose based
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on the perceived notion that Jews were racially different and their difference presented a danger to Germans.  

The perception of the Jew as an outsider became integrated into the literature of the biological sciences. Jews were classified as members of the white race, but German medicine and anthropology considered them to be a separate group. The Jewish racial question focused on determining the physical and psychological differences between Jews and non-Jews.

John Efron writes about Jewish race theorists in Germany, England, Russia, and Austria from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. He argues they were driven by two factors: the external threat of anti-Semitism and the need to reassert their Jewish identity which was threatened by assimilation. Efron demonstrates that the work of Jewish anthropologists and physicians differed from place to place because it was contingent on such historical factors as the nature of Jewish integration in a given country, the character of a nation's Jewish community or communities, and the level of anti-Semitism.

Efron discusses the first Jewish race scientists, Joseph Jacobs, an Australian who focused on the Jews of Western Europe, and a Russian Jewish race scientist Samuel Weissenberg, who studied the Jews of Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East. Finally Efron examines the link between race science and the politics of Zionism, showing how Zionist scientists used race science not to assert Jewish superiority but to promote a political cause that was concerned with Jewish spiritual and physical regeneration.

Efron examines the “Jewish question” in Germany, beginning with the bizarre tales that Jewish males menstruated, that they were uniformly effeminate, that Jews were more subject to
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insanity than other races. He describes the work of race scientist Georg Wachter, a Dutch anatomist, who studied the skull of a thirty-year-old Jewish male and published his conclusions in 1812. Wachter remarked on the large nasal bones, the square chin, the typical bony impressions on the lateral sides of the orbits and concluded that “among Jews, the muscles primarily used for talking and laughing are of a kind entirely different from those of Christians.”

Efron recounts the work of other race scientists such as Andreas Retzius and Carl Vogt in the mid-nineteenth century who devised the fatuous notion of using craniometry (measuring certain key diameters of the head) to differentiate racial types and by this mathematizing divided Jews into two taxonomic niches: the round brachycephalic and the long dolichocephalic. The Austrian physician Augustin Weissbach published a paper in 1877 in a scientific journal, confirming the stereotypes based on his study of nineteen Jewish males, and Bernhard Blechman in 1882 supported Weissbach's conclusions with a study of his own.

Other race scientists built upon this scientifically grotesque edifice to divide Jews into Ashkenazis (of Eastern European background) and Sephardics (of Mediterranean background). Constantine Ikow reclassified Jews into three racial types on the basis of evidence derived from the craniometry method. Prominent German psychiatrists such as Emil Kraepelin and Richard Krafft-Ebbing stressed the emotional fragility and the putatively high rate of insanity among Jews. Krafft-Ebbing remarked that religious fervor in the Jewish community promoted deviant sexual practices such as consanguineous marriages.

In 1875 the world-famous surgeon Theodor Billroth unleashed a lengthy anti-Semitic speech in the press, protesting the admission of Jewish students in what he termed disproportionately large numbers to German medical schools. A single non-Jewish pathologist,
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Rudolph Virchow, battled the accusations by ridiculing the entire racial typing project and defending Jewish physicians.

Jewish physicians, such as Joseph Jacobs in Great Britain and Samuel Weissenberg in Germany, took on the race science question, conducting studies and publishing scientific papers refuting the virulent anti-Semitism of the German non-Jewish medical community. However, by 1900, Jews had been thoroughly marginalized and the ground had been prepared for Alfred Ploetz and Wilhelm Schallmeyer, the founders of the German racial hygiene movement in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

**Race and the Environment**

Joseph Jacobs was the first Jewish race scientist to examine Jews as a race in Victorian England. Jacob’s work scrutinized various aspects of racial science and he asked questions such as “What was the role of the environment in connection with race?” He undertook to identify whether a changed environment alters a race. He also researched whether certain races were susceptible to certain diseases. Jacobs challenged the view that Jews were physically and mentally degenerate and that Judaism was a fossil religion. Jacobs was influenced by George Elliot and Charles Darwin. He believed that Jewish history, with its gradual evolutionary qualities, was an example of Darwinism because over time those qualities that assisted it in the struggle for existence were preserved and those that did not were discarded. Jacobs acknowledged Darwin’s theories to be very important and he applied them to Jewish race science.

Jacobs began collecting his own anthropological statistics with the rise of anti-Semitism in the 1890’s. He published his most important collection of racial studies entitled “Jewish Statistics”

---

in 1891. He argued that his studies of Jews as a race were motivated by political reasons.\textsuperscript{157} He found that Jews, as a group, had a high assimilability and they shared values and lifestyles with Christians. He argued that these Jewish qualities were social and not biological in origin. He maintained that the study of the history of the Jewish people was rooted in his belief in the historic “mission of Israel.”\textsuperscript{158} Jacobs did further research into the anthropological history of Jews. John Efron argues that “Jacobs was never a crude racial determinist, as much of his research was taken up asserting the primacy of nurture over nature.”\textsuperscript{159}

Jacobs’s research aim was to defend Jews against anti-Semitism in England at the end of the nineteenth century. The notion that all Jews were wealthy led Jacobs to conduct a study of the social conditions of Jews in London. Using statistics he demonstrated that the occupational structure of Jews was a product of specific historical conditions. He found that most people in Britain envisioned the Jew as rich because much of their business was conducted with Jewish merchants. His main objective was to dispel the myth behind the axiom “rich as a Jew” by examining Europe’s wealthiest city (London) and illustrating that there was widespread poverty amongst Jews.\textsuperscript{160}

It was argued that since Jews resisted marrying outside their faith, there was a possibility for Jews to have children with many diseases. There was also a myth that developed that indicated that Jewish parents took better care of their children than Christian parents. In addition Jewish people were seen as killers of Christ, and were symbolically accused of the deaths of Christian
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children. 161 Ironically, when Jacobs compared the rate of Jewish infant mortality versus Christian infant mortality rates he found that more Jewish children died than Christian children. 162

When Jacobs studied the occupations of rural versus urban Jews, he found that their occupations varied greatly. He demonstrated that the stereotype of Jews working in the stock exchange or in any kind of commerce was greatly exaggerated. Jacobs argued that Judaism itself was responsible for the occupations Jews pursued. Due to anti-Semitism and restrictions in their daily life, Jews found it practical to work in areas where they could serve their country while being faithful to their religious obligations.

Jacob’s studies did not account for Jews as a race, until he studied intellect by studying the shape of their skull. This was the beginning of constructing Jews as a different race, as a separate racial category. Jacobs attempted to make connections between a term he coined “brain work” which meant psychological power and its effect on intelligence and cranial dimensions. 163 Jacobs attempted to quantify brain power and to illustrate that it was passed on through generations. Jacob’s findings on professional life led him to conclude that Jews were represented in all of the principal professions. He found that there was a disproportionate number of Jews in law, medicine, journalism, art, politics, and academia. 164 He concluded his research with statistics, such as the fertility of Jewish women, the health of its people, the number and sex of the children and their birth and death patterns.

German Research

Karl Kautsky was a prominent German Social Democrat who graduated from the University of Vienna in 1874 and joined the Austrian Social-Democratic Party in 1875. He began
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working with the Democratic and Social-Democratic press, especially with the Volkstaat and was influenced by German Jewish economist Ferdinand Lassalle and other economists.

In his book *Are The Jews a Race?* Kautsky argued that Jews have mental and physical qualities that distinguished them from non-Jews. For example, Jews are physically different due to the shape of their nose and their crooked feet. Jews’ high intelligence also sets them apart from non-Jews.⁶⁵ Kautsky explained how anti-Semites believed that Jews were born capitalist and were impregnated with the capitalist mode of thought and feeling – that it was a race trait that makes them efficient in all modes of business and production.⁶⁶ Anti-Semites concluded that Jews were destructive and heartless and they had a ruthless desire for financial gain. Kautsky stated that “the thorn and flesh of these theorists is the mental qualities of the Jew.”⁶⁷ He suggested that anti-Semites were jealous of Jewish accomplishments and this perpetuated hatred against Jews.

In his study of Jews’ mental qualities, Kautsky found that the fundamental difference between Jews and non-Jews (in his time) was that Jews were city dwellers and non-Jews lived in rural communities. He concluded that because Jews lived in the city, they were better able to prosper economically and become successful merchants. Although his analysis was very generalized and far from scientific, he made interesting insights on how Jews tended to settle in big cities where there was more possibility for commerce and development.

Kautsky argued that a city dweller must be mentally and physically stronger in order to work in the bustling environment of the city. He argued that in the country, people were more relaxed and there was a tendency to use alcohol as a means for celebration.⁶⁸
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festivities involving alcohol, there were more disputes that would lead to more fighting that would lead to more violence. In the city, where there was less open-air movement, the ethos of the city dweller was to work rather than celebrate. Kautsky’s observations are very compelling even today as most North American Jews settle in major cities along the east and west coasts. Of course, they settle in large cities for different reasons than in the nineteenth century.

Kautsky found that when Jews settled in cities, they were still treated as foreigners. In order to adapt, it was in their best interest to become merchants. This way, they were able to live as strangers among other strangers, which Kautsky claimed was not so difficult when doing business. Kautsky pointed out that in various Jewish communities, Jews comprised a variety of classes. They showed interest in careers such as agriculture and commerce, but due to feeling alienated and living as an “outsider” they felt most comfortable working in trade and industry.

Kautsky addressed some of the physical differences between Jews and non-Jews that shaped the image that Jews were of a separate race. Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, a German naturalist and anthropologist, argued the following: “It is generally known that the Jewish race has been spread for many centuries over all the earth; it has nevertheless maintained its racial traits pure and even typical.” Richard Andree, a well known anthropologist, argues that the Jews presented a permanent racial form for centuries. The principal trait that scholars have found to be consistent is the Jewish nose. However, as Kautsky showed, several anthropologists, such as Maurice Fishberg, found that only 14.25% of adult male Jews and 12.70% of adult female Jews possess the hooked nose.
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Kautsky found that wide noses were prevalent amongst Jews in Northern Africa and snub noses were common in Jews living in Eastern European countries. In this case, Kautsky indicated that the most stereotypical trait of the Jew has been disproved. It was assumed Jews had different nose shapes based on their geographical origins. Other Jewish physical traits that were measured were skin pigmentation, hair colour, and eye colour. When Fishberg examined New York Jews he found that 53% of Jewish men had brown hair and 57% of Jewish women had brown hair. Only 10% of Jewish men and 10% of Jewish women had blond hair. The rest had varied types of hair.

The last physical trait Kautsky and Fishberg discuss is the Jews’ skull. They illustrated that the Jewish skull size was different according to geography. “The Jews in the Caucasus are mostly brachycephalic, while those in Northern Africa and Arabia are predominantly dolichocephalic and those in Europe are predominantly of medium types.” It was evident in Fishberg’s analysis that the Jews in various parts of the world comprised the racial types of white, black, and yellow skin. Based on Fishberg’s research Kautsky stated that there was great difficulty in proving that a separate Jewish race exists. Jews had been constructed as being different, apart, and outsiders, but Fishberg’s analysis suggested that this had little to do with biology.

The image of the Jew as an outsider in German anthropology at the beginning of the twentieth century was best explained by Ludwig Woltmann. Woltmann’s journal, The Revue, was anti-Semitic as it represented a vital force in promoting the idea of Aryan superiority. The Revue suggested that the qualities of Blacks, Asians, and Semites were opposed to Nordics, who were renowned for being smart, courageous, and virtuous. Other scientists such as Eugen Fischer and Fritz Lenz held similar views to that of Woltmann. They founded the “racial hygiene
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movement” which was a movement to preserve racial purity within the Aryan race. The Jewish racial question was focused on the physical and psychological differences between Jews and non-Jews. Their aim was to uncover a hidden pathological feature that was unique to Jews and to pinpoint the racial types that made up the biological composition of the Jew.

**Jewish Religion vs. Race**

Fred Foldvary, professor of economics at Santa Clara University, argues that Jews who live in Ethiopia are as black as their Christian neighbours. Jews who have lived in India for hundreds of years appear Indian. Chinese Jews seem Chinese. Jews who come from northern Africa appear Arab. European Jews look Caucasian. There are many ways to look Jewish.177

Foldvary shows that the concept of race is a variety of the human species characterized by various physical features such as skin color, hair color and texture, body shape and size, eye color, and so on. Anthropologists have divided human beings into several races, such as Caucasoid, Negroid, Mongoloid, African pygmy, and American Indian. Race is a genetic classification. One is born into a race and is of a certain race or mixed race because of one's ancestors.

Foldvary makes the claim that Jews do not constitute a race. Jews are members of a religion, Judaism. In ancient times, Hebrews were considered an ethnic group. Since then, Hebrews have scattered throughout the world. There were intermarriages and conversions. The Hebrew origin has led to a spiritual group. There is also a culture tied to Judaism and its laws regarding diet, the Sabbath, and various rituals, along with cultural practices in various locations that are “Jewish”. However, there is no “Jewish race.”178
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The concept of Jews as a race emerged from the propaganda of the National Socialists of Germany – the Nazis. Their ideology classified not just races but also ethnic groups and nationalities into levels of inferiority. The Nazis viewed Jews as a race, basing their persecution not on religion but on origin.179

Foldvary maintains that Arabs and Jews are of the same ethnic family, the Semites. Hebrew and Arabic are both Semitic languages. Many Arab Palestinians and Israeli Jews have common ethnic origins, some Jews in Israel having converted to Islam after the Arab conquest and some ancient Canaanites having converted to Judaism.180 Jews and Arabs are ethnic cousins, if not brothers. In conclusion, Foldvary illustrates that labeling Zionism is an attempt to discredit Judaism as a religion.

The Jewish Race as a Legal Term

Tracey R. Rich, a law librarian in Pennsylvania and editor of an online Jewish encyclopedia, writes that in the 1980s, the United States Supreme Court ruled that Jews were a race, at least for purposes of certain anti-discrimination laws. The reasoning at the time was that people routinely spoke of the “Jewish race” or the “Italian race” as well as the “Negro race.” So it was the idea of a cultural group legislators intended to convey with the word “race.”181 Yet many Jews were deeply offended by the decision because for them the idea of Jews as a race brought to mind visions of Nazi Germany where Jews were an inferior and menaced race.
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Rich argues that race is a genetic distinction and refers to people with shared ancestry and shared genetic traits. “You can't change your race, it’s in your DNA. I could never become black or Asian no matter how much I might want to.”

Although many Jews worldwide share common ancestry, as shown by genetic research, common ancestry is not necessarily required to be a Jew. You can become a Jew by converting. Although a Jew could never become black or Asian, blacks and Asians can become Jews (Sammy Davis Jr. and Connie Chung, for example).

**How Jews Labeled Themselves**

Eric Goldstein’s article on Jewish identity and race illustrates how American Jews employed the concept of race in defining their Jewishness during the late nineteenth century. By “race,” nineteenth-century Jews meant something different from “ethnicity” in its present usage. Their conception of Jewish distinctiveness was one rooted not only in cultural particularity but in biology, shared ancestry, and blood.

Jews have been preoccupied with assigning proper symbols to describe their Jewishness. During many centuries they were segregated from gentiles and had little reason to reflect on the nature of Jewish identity. But as Jews integrated into the societies of Europe and America, questions concerning their group status arose with greater frequency. Without the “ghetto” walls to define them, they had to rely on their own powers of articulation to clarify who they were and how they were different from their non-Jewish neighbours. “Jews described themselves as a
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nation, a race, or merely a religious group depended upon the opportunities and pressures presented by their participation in the wider world.”

During the colonial period (1600-1775) they had frequently referred to themselves as a “nation,” a term commonly used in the early modern period to describe communities of foreign birth. By the 1870s Jews discovered that identifying themselves as a “race” would allow them to express their desire to maintain a distinct identity. Jews felt confident that they could employ a racial self-description without being subjected to demonization on racial grounds. While unflattering racial caricatures of Jews were familiar in nineteenth-century America, positive racial images were at least as common.

Goldstein demonstrates that race served American Jews of the late nineteenth century as a means for balancing their conflicting impulses for communal solidarity and Americanization. Race served as a means to identify their people and was used for expressing cherished Jewish commitments. American Jews embraced race during the nineteenth century because of particular social circumstances. There was a change in the relationship between race and American national identity that altered the efficacy as a term for self-description. The Jewish use of race had been made possible by the firm distinction between blacks and whites in American society.
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186 Jews used the term “nation” during the colonial period to distinguish between Jews of different geographical (i.e. Portuguese or German) origin as well as to refer to the Jewish collective. See Eli Faber, A Time for Planting: The First Migration, 1654-1820 (Baltimore, 1992), 60-1, 136. On the history of the term see Guido Zernatto, “Nation: The History of a Word,” Review of Politics 6 (1994): 351-66.
Summary

Since the late 19th century, many race theorists have concluded that Jews do not constitute a race or if they do, they have become part of the white race through economic and social integration.

Yet stereotypes remain about physical distinctions such as the “Jewish nose” and about Jewish characteristics such as “the rich Jew.” These differences help to distinguish the Jew as the “Other”. In Holocaust denial literature, this “othering” is often, if not always, present. The rhetoric is set up to reflect a struggle against the Jews and a victory over them that is imminent.
Chapter Five: Methodology

In this chapter I discuss the method I have chosen to conduct my research: discourse analysis. This chapter contains a review of the literature on discourse and discourse analysis. Discourse analysis studies language use and draws upon a variety of disciplines including linguistics, philosophy, psychology, rhetoric, and sociology.

What is Discourse?

Discourse is a complex of social, psychological, and linguistic phenomena subject both to the rules of grammar, which all speakers of a language know implicitly, and to the general principles of discourse coherence, information management, interpretation, and organization, which speakers of a language also command. A large body of scientific research has been developed which examines how speakers construct and how hearers interpret discourse. Within discourse analysis research, attention is typically focused on spoken and written texts and on the roles and strategies of the writers and the readers who participate in the text.189

Discourse is used to describe the structure which extends beyond the sentence. Sara Mills argues that since a sentence has a specific structure, then discourse analysis must have similar elements above the level of the sentence that contains similar structures. The meaning of discourse has been developed by linguists who refer to themselves as discourse analysts. “Discourse analysts are concerned with language in context, rather than focus on abstract versions of language.”190 Mills also illustrates that critical linguists wish to analyze texts for political purposes. They argue that “language is a central vehicle in the process whereby people are constituted as individuals and as social subjects, and because language and ideology are closely imbricated, the close systemic analysis of the language of texts can expose the way that people are

---

190 Ibid., p.132
oppressed within current social structures.” Discourse analysis can be viewed as a reaction to a more traditional form of linguistics. Discourse analysis translates the structure from the level of the sentence and expands on the meanings of the text. Mills argues that when people have conversations, there is a layering effect when they have an interchange of sentences. Those sentences are affected by the previous sentences. Thus they build on each other. Every successive sentence the person utters builds more meaning and context than the previous. She further argues that in writing, sentences combine into paragraphs and paragraphs form chapters. She claims that our everyday speech is just part of a larger context. Mills gives the example of “OK” and “anyway” as discourse markers. They function as signaling a change of topic at the discourse level, but they have no meaning at the sentence level.

Michael Stubbs, a discourse analyst, argues that while text is written, discourse is generally spoken. He claims that a text is not interactive, but speech is. Other discourse theorists, however, would argue that discourse may include text and that text may be interactive. In the case of dynamic text similar to chat rooms on the World Wide Web, mailing lists that are sent out to millions daily, and web pages, it can be argued that text is not stagnant but dynamic.

Emile Benveniste illustrates that a stretch of text which connotes a sentence represents the “very life of human speech in action.” He argues that language is used as an instrument for communication and to exchange information. He claims that in every utterance, there is a speaker and a listener, and the speaker’s aim is to influence the listener in some way. In written text, there is a similar interaction. Text is created in such a way as to convince and to inform. It is seen as a transaction between producer and reader. Text is seen as coded for the reader to interpret and as I
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will illustrate in this chapter, text can also be used to create powerful relations between the text producer and text reader.

Discourse is either in conflict or in agreement with other positions. Mills provides the example of the women's movement, which has been represented by the media as two forms of discourse that oppose each other: the discourse of acceptance and the discourse of anti-feminism. Mills also claims that there are two different discourses on menstruation, one that constructs menstruation as private, shameful, and negative, and the other that celebrates menstruation as part of womanhood.

**What is Discourse Analysis?**

Discourse analysis is a way of deconstructing and interpreting text. Discourse analysis cannot provide absolute answers to specific problems. However, it can assist us in reading “between the lines” as it may help us recognize the essence of the text. Discourse analysis allows us to gain a comprehensive perspective of the “problem” and ourselves in relation to that “problem.” It provides us with a better awareness of the hidden motivations of others and ourselves. Thus it enables us to solve concrete problems - not by providing unequivocal answers, but by making us ask ontological and epistemological questions. Discourse analysis is a deconstructive reading and interpretation of a problem or text.

Discourse analysis can produce vast insights when rich contextual information is provided. Tashakkori and Teddlie argue that “the essence of qualitative analysis of any type is the development of a typology of categories or themes that summarize a mass of narrative data.”

Deborah Tannen maintains that discourse analysis is defined as the analysis of language “beyond the sentence.” It is chiefly concerned with the study of grammar: the study of smaller
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bits of language, such as sounds (phonetics and phonology), parts of words (morphology), meaning (semantics), as well as the order of words in sentences (syntax). Discourse analysts study larger chunks of language as they flow together.  

Zellig Harris characterizes discourse analysis as “a method of seeking in any connected discrete linear material, whether language or language-like, which contains more than one elementary sentence, some global structure characterizing the whole discourse (the linear material), or large sections of it.” Lemke argues that discourse analysis “embodies a theory of meaning making that is nearly co-extensive with a theory of human behaviour and human culture.”

Rhetorical Strategies in Discourse Analysis

Writers and readers employ discursive strategies in order to make sense of a text: discourse coherence and cohesion, word selection, information management, phrase structure, and rhetorical organization.

The list below illustrates some strategies Holocaust deniers take when constructing their text.
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1. Targeting an Audience: Deniers attempt to appeal to young, educated people who are open-minded towards new concepts, are free thinkers, and who are anti-government.

2. Targeting Jews: Deniers single out Jews and use them as targets by repeatedly criticizing and ridiculing them.

3. The Inversion Strategy: Commonly held meanings are inverted to mean the opposite, as in instances in which victims are transformed into aggressors and aggressors transformed into victims. Holocaust deniers view themselves as the oppressed minority and view Jews as the powerful oppressors who are behind a world Jewish conspiracy.

4. Re-defined Terms: New meanings are assigned to words, wherein important terms and expressions are given a special, often restrictive definition in one location and are then used subsequently and without notice in a different, often broader, meaning to lead to logically untenable and misleading conclusions.

5. Coded Language: Deniers employ key words and metaphors, and establish a series of expressions and controlled vocabulary, that are laden with negative meaning. This coded language constructs a network of interrelated and often interchangeable terms.

Text and Discourse

Gillian Brown and George Yule argue that there is a difference between text and discourse. They label the differences as “text as product” and “discourse as process.”\textsuperscript{205} The analysis of the

text as a product does not consider the method with which it was produced or how it was interpreted. Discourse as a process attempts to communicate a message from the producer of the text to the recipient. Discourse examines the exchange of meaning as a continuous process, one that is involved in all human interactions. The method of discourse analysis is associated with a particular event or text, coupled with a specific context.\(^{206}\) Meaning is constructed using language within a given context. In speech, meaning is formed when accompanied with gestures, body language, and physical posture.\(^{207}\) They argue that the discourse analyst is concerned with how the piece of linguistic data is processed from the producer to the receiver and vice versa. They illustrate that the context or environment shapes the way the text is interpreted.\(^{208}\)

In text analysis, Brown and Yule argue that the reader knows how to decode the language based on the context of the page. They argue that text is structured together and readers decode the meaning of language based on how the information is packaged and identified. Discourse analysis of written text attempts to analyse the organizational properties of the sentence and it attempts to develop a system of notation and description of the organizational units. It also analyzes language based on the social relations that impinge upon the written text or speech and the power relations between its speakers or writers.\(^{209}\) Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Porter analyzed the language of racism in their book *Mapping the Language of Racism*. Their research has direct links to my research since they analysed the language of white New Zealanders and their attitudes towards Maoris. Throughout the analyzed written texts, white New Zealanders construct the Maoris as the other, without being overtly racist. Wetherell and Porter reveal that the white
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New Zealanders attribute crime to various groups of people, rather than blaming them for crime in the country.

They argue that discourse does not concern itself with structured language in a system, but is defined as “language in use.” Other theorists define discourse as a large text that has some form of internal structure that is cohesive and coherent. Mainstream linguists argue that discourse represents the occurrence of certain bodies of text within a given context.

With written language, face-to-face interaction does not exist. The words must carry meanings and the context must be inferred from the text. Written language is used as a means for action (for example, news, magazines, bills, menus, web sites, telephone directories). Words, phrases, and sentences are tools that one organizes in order to construct specific meanings, to narrow the potential range of possible meanings down to those reasonably or typically consistent with the rest of the context.

James Paul Gee discusses how cultural models within discourse are strongly connected to context. He endeavors to bridge the gap between language, cultural models, and discourse in his analysis of Charles Fillmore's concept of "the bachelor." Gee illustrates how the context can shift the meaning of words and language. He claims that in our social life, the word "bachelor" is not just a one dimensional word, but a concept with a great deal of depth. Gee claims that cultural models help shape discourse. He gives the example of heterosexual romance and the two elements that are linked with this model: beauty and intelligence. Cultural models are the building blocks to discourse. The concept of bachelor revolves around the cultural model of heterosexual romance but the term "bachelor" may be inaccurate if the context is shifted. Gee discusses Fillmore's
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concept and suggests that context is needed in order to analyze language and bodies of text. Gee indicates that cultural models exclude certain elements because they do not fall within the norms of the cultural model. In this respect, the definition of the word is altered by its context. The term "bachelor" becomes somewhat narrower in its definition as it excludes elderly men who have never married or gay men.

Gee also discusses the concept of a situated meaning, which is defined as an image or pattern that we assemble on the spot. The text is analyzed within a certain context by the reader who assembles a mental image by relating the words together (known as intertextuality). Gee gives the example of the expression "The coffee spilled, get the mop," and "The coffee spilled, get the broom." In the first instance, a mop is required to clean up the mess, so it is understood the coffee is the hot black liquid type. In the second instance, we are told to get a broom, so we know the speaker is implying that it is coffee grounds that have been spilt. In addition, Gee discusses the concepts of "situation" (or context) and social language as one of the main elements of discourse analysis. The social language is the type of rhetoric that one uses within the context of their discourse.

Gee summarizes the qualities of an "ideal" discourse analysis. An ideal discourse analysis involves the building blocks of “semiotic building,” “world building,” “activity building,” “socioculturally-situated identity and relationships building,” “political building,” and “connection building.”213 Semiotic building identifies the relevant signs and symbols a text generates to the reader. In addition, the text should generate a body of knowledge about a specific social situation. It should also create a social language that falls within the appropriate context of the text. In world building, the text should generate a body of keywords and phrases that seem important in the
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situation. Gee also illustrates how the text will bring forth a set of cultural models and situated meanings that link the keywords and phrases together. Within this text, Gee illustrates how a discourse is being constructed by these elements. In activity building, Gee states that the text is associated within a larger social context and that its situated meanings go beyond the text and into a larger social sphere. Gee states that activity building is the part of discourse analysis that attempts to disclose the activity (or objective) of the text. He also claims that within this text, there are actions in the text that drive the objective. For example, Holocaust deniers use political jargon to drive the text into the genre of a political campaign.

Tony Trew analyzes a series of South African newspaper articles and discusses their deep-rooted meanings. He uses the article title “Rioting Blacks shot dead by police as ANS Leaders meet” and argues that if Blacks were written of in an active voice then the headline would be constructed differently. He compares the article title to the difference between “Police shoot Blacks” and “Blacks are shot by police” which clearly changes the way the article is approached. Trew illustrates that the title is implicitly biased and frames Blacks as the enemies. As shown above, the text can be altered using passive or active tenses thus resulting in a new set of meanings in the larger stretch of text.

Norman Fairclough argues that discourse comes from two main issues: that discourse constitutes the “social,” and that any type of discourse is defined by its relations to other forms of discourse. He concludes that discourse is part of larger social structures and that it is interrelated to other social phenomena. Similar to Fairclough, Julia Kristeva coins the term “intertextuality” which discusses how texts refer to prior texts and how discourse is constructed and referred to other texts. “The concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can
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transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions to generate new ones. The theory of intertextuality cannot itself account for these social limitations, so it needs to be combined with a theory of power relations and how they shape social structures and practices." Fairclough argues that intertextuality is one aspect of text construction. For him, intertextuality represents the connection between texts and the connection between a variety of discourses.

**The Discourse of Holocaust Denial**

Holocaust deniers link their ideologies to an anti-Zionist perspective and a universal Jewish conspiracy. Deniers construct their social reality to act as fighters, as politically oppressed, and as revolutionaries who have uncovered the mystery of the Jews. The social context plays an important role in the development and circulation of their discourse. Discourse does not act in a vacuum, but is related to other discourses. Denier discourse is often a reaction to large Jewish organizations which educate the public about the Holocaust. Most denier discourse is often a defense of ideologies and statements. Many Holocaust denial websites provide an FAQ (frequently asked questions list) that criticizes Holocaust educational websites such as Nizkor or The Holocaust History Project (THHP). There are frequent feuds that erupt over email as a result of conflicting ideologies. Many of these email discussions are posted on Nizkor. One of the most important documents that will be discussed is a list of sixty-six questions and answers related to the Holocaust and compiled by the IHR.

MacDonnell illustrates that discourse is constructed through the exclusion of other forms of discourse. She gives the example of menstruation. In some instances, it is forbidden to discuss it, and it is given a negative label. But in other forms of discourse, it is essential to perceive menstruation as positive. In this manner, discourse that rejects the occurrence of the Holocaust
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can be both condemned by society or accepted. The form that is condemned is the one that can be instantly recognized as hostile, narrow-minded, and without foundation – coming from a member of a hate group or a self-proclaimed anti-Semite, for example. The other form is the one that so-called Holocaust revisionists have adopted: the discourse of debate and revisionism. They do not construct their discourse as denial, but as intellectual inquiry. The mainstream view of the Holocaust excludes other ways of looking at the Holocaust and deniers believe that they are revolutionary and radical by going against the norms and challenging their ideologies.

MacDonnell argues that the building blocks of discourse are those that have an effect in the future. The discourse of a Holocaust denier, although made of words, utterances, ideas, ideologies, and feelings, have an effect on the Jewish community and on society in general. I argue that their ideologies threaten our understanding of the past – the history of the Nazi Holocaust – thus increasing the legitimacy of Holocaust denial when all Holocaust survivors eventually die. The effects of their discourse can be dangerous and destructive.

Mills also analyzes discourse through the meanings of words and their relation to larger ideological structures. Holocaust deniers adopt the legitimate term of revisionism as they want to be associated with a new, modern, and progressive mode of thinking and theorizing. The word “deny” may have a negative connotation but the word “revisionism” does not. Rather, it may be associated with the feminist, post-colonial, or queer theorists. When analyzing the selected websites in chapter six, I illustrate that the construction of words and their meanings have larger social meanings than the words themselves.

Since Holocaust denial strives to resemble scientific inquiry and mimics scholarly qualities, the language used is professional, and scientific. Articles are cited in a scholarly manner,

and include a bibliography. Most articles are peer reviewed by academics who hold doctorate degrees. The social language varies for every social situation. As a librarian I engage in a social language that is different from those in another profession. My colleagues and I share a common jargon, language, expressions, and words that other people may not be aware of or not use at all.

The texts on many Holocaust denial websites are similar to speeches and political campaigns that seek to convince and recruit people to their cause. In socio-culturally situated identity and relationship building, the text is attempting to build a relationship with its reader and establish an identity. The text is using a discourse that is relevant to the social situation. The text attempts to build an identity with its discourse. The text attempts to create links to other cultural beliefs or cultural norms. For example, Holocaust denial discourse attempts to assume an identity of victimhood. This stance would gain sympathy, compassion, and support to fight its cause. Deniers construct themselves as the underdog, fighters for the truth, social activists, and revolutionaries. Political building involves the creation of power, status, race, and class through the manipulation of the text. The text defines itself as a narrowly defined social network and it is part of identity construction in the text. Connection building is similar to intertextuality because it involves the grouping of texts together that build some sense of logical meaning and the text grouping should be cohesive and show a sense of unity.219

In his article entitled “Discourse and the denial of racism,” Teun A. Van Dijk addresses the manner in which people deny their racism through a specific discourse. He argues that through conversation and text, people may abandon their position of positive self-presentation and self-defence and take a more active, aggressive counter-attack by assuming a victim complex. He claims that such people believe that they are victims of immigration and discrimination. As I
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illustrate in Chapter Six, most Holocaust deniers also portray themselves as victims who are
oppressed and controlled by the Jewish community.220 Van Dijk claims that group members
(Holocaust deniers) often engage in discourse that creates an “other,” for example, the Jewish
community.

Mills indicates that “some linguists use discourse to mean the analysis of the structures of
an extended piece of text and others use discourse as a politically inflected form of analysis.”221
Discourse analysts attempt to examine the structure of text within a social context and try to create
meaning within the larger social structure. Mills examines Michel Foucault’s conceptionalization
of power and its relation to language, discourse, and the text. Some theorists have argued that
language is a vehicle where people are forced to believe what they read or hear, but in discourse
theory language is the tool where power struggles are acted out.222

Mills gives the example of the language of someone’s profession as related to power
relations between men and women. She indicates how some women are referred to as weathergirls,
while men are referred to as weathermen. The assignment of “girl” to the woman alludes to a
vulnerable child while the assignment of “man” to the man makes him more serious. Thus his
status holds more power. She shows how language has acted as a discriminatory marker in terms
of gender. It is evident that the slightest shift in language can have adverse effects.223 They do
not deny the Holocaust, but they question and debate certain events during that period. They label
themselves revisionists, a more ambiguous and politically correct term that appears more scholarly
and legitimate.
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Foucault further claims that discourse is an instrument and an effect of power, but it can also serve as a hindrance. He further claims that discourse “transmits and produces power, it reinforces it, but also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it.”224 Mills demonstrates that sexism is an oppressive strategy within a discourse model that oppresses women and boosts the power of men. However, there lies an opportunity for another discourse model to develop where women can contest men’s actions and collaborate with other women to achieve gender equality. The debate around sexism has created a struggle to change language, curriculum, ideologies, legitimacy, and positions of power.

In the discourse of the Holocaust, the dominant model is that the Holocaust cannot be denied or debated. People must accept the facts and they must be continuously educated and informed about the Nazi genocide so that it will not occur again. The opposing discourse model opposes this “politically correct” attitude and attempts to uncover radical and revolutionary scientific research that disproves many of the ideologies related to the Nazi Holocaust. Two discourse models will be discussed in the following chapters: the discourse of Holocaust denial and the discourse of counter Holocaust denial. Similar to Mills analysis of sexism and feminism, intertextuality exists in many aspects of our social life. On the Internet, the texts of Holocaust denial have been attacked by texts of counter Holocaust denial. There has been a battle on the Internet for credibility and for legitimacy.

Ken Hyland discusses how discourse in scientific research helps shape academic culture. Hyland studies the link between academic communities and their discourses. The linguist studies the style and format of the text and how it is interpreted in academia. The sociologist studies the
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interactions between the texts and the scientists who interpret the texts. Hyland argues that academic discourse unites a community with common goals and values. Holocaust deniers’ discourse is pseudo-scientific. Thus it can be taken seriously and it may attract young intellectuals. Their discourse is characterized by a set of specific nomenclature, conventions, modes of inquiry, and bodies of knowledge.

Glenn Stillar discusses the framework of discourse. He illustrates how discourse is structured as systemic, functional, and social. The systemic structure discusses how discourse is created by sets of linguistic structures, through the selections and combinations of linguistic units. The aspect of function in discourse analysis is how the language system is organized and how its structure is interpreted. Discourse is constructed through a system of linguistic meanings and the system of linguistic meanings performs a function. This social aspect of discourse is that every functioning unit of discourse is social because it contains a context and is shaped by social phenomena. Moreover, discourse evolves according to social situations and social life. Stillar argues that texts contain the following traits: organization, representation, interaction and functional. Texts carry meaning through internal and external cohesion. In order to carry meanings, texts must form structures and “hang together as a whole.”

For my research on Holocaust denial, the text is supplemented with graphics that tie the text together. Graphics are used on the websites to unite the theme of the website. The graphics are attractive and they may help in a strategy to make the text more cohesive. Furthermore, many Holocaust denial web sites resemble books with chapters. Since the web is electronic, it is difficult
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to create a cohesive text. Many deniers organize their websites into digital library collections of electronic books and electronic journal articles. This structure creates a logical sense of organization, as many of us are familiar with libraries of documents and the structure of books and articles.

Stillar claims that texts represent ideologies and construct content. Texts concern specific situations, thoughts, circumstances and they generate ideas and perspectives. Stillar focuses on the verbs in the text, specifically action processes, mental processes, and relational processes. For Holocaust denial text, the content claims to be scientific, empirical, objective, innovative, radical, and politically correct. The next property a text displays is interaction. According to Stillar, a text draws on the relationship between an addresser and an addressee. In the case of my research, Holocaust denial text is addressed to a specific audience. There are very active modes of interaction on web pages; specifically, mailing lists, newsgroups, chatrooms, and daily news digests. The addresser is seen as the authority and the addressee is the vulnerable one who must be educated and convinced by the Holocaust denier. Finally, language must serve a function. According to Stillar, language serves three functions. The ideational function of language is used to construct ideas and content. The interpersonal function of language is concerned with shaping interaction. The last function that text should accomplish is the textual function. The text should contain texture; that is, depth, context, and cohesion with other texts. These three properties of text occur simultaneously and are interdependent. For my research, it is important to deconstruct the text in terms of these three functions independently.229

Stillar argues that there is a symbiotic relationship between the text and the context. The context is encapsulated in the text, through a systematic relationship between the social
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environment and functional organization of language. Stillar continues to discuss three general characteristics of situational context of the text: the social action, the role structure, and the symbolic organization. The social action is the meaning of the text, specifically the specific role the text is playing. For my research, the text legitimates the role of the revolutionary, the fringe, and a controversial political party. The role structure of the text represents a collection of socially meaningful relationships that are exchanged in the text. For Holocaust denial, the role structure of an addresser who writes text is to convince and recruit people to deny the Holocaust. The role of the addresser is to camouflage his/her anti-Semitism and to doubt the historical events of World War II and to debate the Nazi Holocaust. The structure of this role is to take a scientific approach since science is one way to convey legitimacy and this is the prime goal. The characteristic of “the symbolic organization” is the social status that is assigned to the text. For Holocaust denial, the text aims for legitimacy and credibility. The social status of the text attempts to be scholarly, authoritative, non-racist, and objective.

**Summary**

It is evident that discourse can be both written and spoken. Textual discourse is text “in motion” or text within a contextual framework. It is important to look beyond the sentences to uncover the implicit meanings of the writer of the text. I illustrate in Chapter Six the various strategies Holocaust deniers use to manipulate text. They choose certain keywords to convey meanings and they mask their anti-Semitic views with a scholarly guise and construct their political platform around anti-Zionism.
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Chapter Six

A Discourse Analysis of Holocaust Denial Web Sites

This chapter explores the results of my study. I explain my selection criteria, and, as well, my data are displayed with a short description of the sites and the articles. I selected nine Holocaust denial web sites, and with two articles per web site.

Selection Criteria for Articles & Web Sites

I focused on the most popular Holocaust denial web sites that had consistently been online for at least five years, had garnered the most press coverage, and contained a great deal of content. I also looked at popularity on search engines and web directories and at the language contained within the sites.

I selected two articles from each of these web sites based on the following criteria:

12. title,
13. theme/subject matter of article,
14. length of article,
15. popularity of article.

In addition to my analysis of the selected articles, I also deconstructed and analyzed the first few pages of the web site and focused on the following elements:

16. repeated keywords,
The first step in my analysis was the organization of the Holocaust denial web sites into the following categories: Political, Racist, and Intellectual.

Political sites frame arguments as a political struggle. Examples of political sites include the Zündelsite, David Irving’s Focal Point Publications, and Greg Raven and Mark Weber’s Institute for Historical Review. Political web sites are usually large and frequently offer merchandise for purchase, such as books and videos. I chose to describe such sites as Political because of their nature, style, and theme. These sites give the impression of a political party campaigning for an election.

Intellectual sites are not aggressive in their attempts to convince the user of their arguments. These web sites are dedicated to the life and work of specific Holocaust deniers. Some examples include Greg Raven’s Revisionist Materials, Bradley Smith’s Committee on the Open Debate of the Holocaust, and Arthur Butz’s personal web site.

Racist sites do not hide their anti-Semitic views. They do not try to lead the web user into believing that their goals are for scholarly inquiry or to fight against being politically sieged. The only web site analysed in this category was Carlo Whitlock Porter’s Made in Russia: The Holocaust. The content is overtly racist and the author’s voice and tone is racist as well. He does not hide or disguise his racism and bigotry.
I analyse the texts and demonstrate how Holocaust deniers employ specific rhetorical strategies, information distribution, graphics, design, topic continuity, coded language, and other discourse-founded principles to advance their claims and ideologies to gain respect, legitimacy, and to recruit people to their cause.

**Questions for Analysis**

Below are some of the questions I had to answer when I began to deconstruct and analyse the articles on the selected web sites:

1. What rhetorical strategies are used: word selection, dramatic role, de-contextualizing scholarly quotes and re-contextualizing into their discourse, coded speech, favourite catch phrases, slogans, and verbal formulae?
2. What is the dramatic structure?
3. What words or phrases are employed to convey legitimacy?
4. Are there any apparent anti-Semitic symbols or any anti-Semitic phrases or words, or images?
5. Are articles well written and the sites professionally organized?
6. Are the claims unified with other deniers? Do they agree or disagree with each other?

**Preliminary Steps**

I constructed a table (see Appendix 1, Table 1) as a guide to help me analyse the selected articles from the nine web sites. The table is divided into the three categories of Political, Racist,
and Intellectual. Each type contains a heading for the type of strategy employed by the denier. These strategies are grouped into broad headings: Keywords, Graphics/Cartoons, and Coded Language/Rhetoric. This table allowed me to list and uncover repetitive keywords, coded language, underlying themes, and techniques that Holocaust deniers use.

**Institute for Historical Review (IHR)**

**Brief Description**

The Institute for Historical Review is the world’s largest anti-Semitic publisher, chosen because of the authoritative-sounding name, popularity in the media, and popularity on the Internet. Its web site belongs in the intellectual category.

The IHR was founded in 1978 and is an entity of The Legion for the Survival of Freedom, which is a non-profit educational publisher that conducts business under various publishing imprints and operates two organizations, Noontide Press and the IHR.

**Analysis**

On its title page, IHR’s mandate is stated as follows:

“This site offers scholarly information and thoughtful commentary, from a revisionist perspective, on a wide range of historical issues, including the “Holocaust,” Auschwitz, World War II, Stalin, Hitler, Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, Hiroshima, Pearl Harbor, the Palestine/Israel conflict,
Zionism, the “Jewish question,” the Bolshevik revolution, and much more.”

Already, keywords such as “scholarly” and “revisionist” stand out. While it claims to be non-ideological, non-political, and conservative, the IHR is very anti-Semitic.

The IHR web site is divided into two sections. The first section, “Files on this site,” is an index of the various materials on the site. The second section entitled “Navigation Aids” provides aids to assist the user in navigating the site including a search engine, a directory, a list of new files, and links to other Holocaust revisionist sites.

On the splash page of the IHR, the following keywords are used: Institute for Historical Review, scholarly information, thoughtful commentary, non-ideological, non-political. The IHR carefully uses rhetoric that is non-dramatic, unlike the Zündelsite, analyzed later, which uses melodramatic, sensational language. Weber and Raven attempt to appear neutral with their choice of words, as well as intellectual.

The organization’s title, Institute for Historical Review, is a first indication of how it manipulates language to gain credibility. The name implies an establishment that critically studies and reviews history. The term “institute” denotes an established organization that is academic and respectable. The keywords of “historical” and “review” give the impression of a general study of world history. This, of course, is false, since the majority of issues the IHR deals with relate to the Holocaust, Jews, and the last century.

---

The IHR’s first link is to web articles or “leaflets” that contain reference information regarding various issues in Holocaust denial – even though the IHR supposedly deals with a “broad range of historical topics.” These leaflets also serve as a guide for people who are unfamiliar with Holocaust revisionism. To clarify its position, in the file entitled “A Few Facts about the IHR” under “Bigoted Attacks,” the IHR states that it is neither racist nor a hate group. Interestingly, it does not state that it is not anti-Semitic.

The IHR maintains that its readers have an interest in understanding the world today. This broad statement can be applied to anyone, but it helps in stirring up curiosity in people who have a desire to gain knowledge – i.e. just about everyone. The IHR promotes a “sane and healthy future for the reader, his family and his country, indeed for all humanity, and realizes that it can be achieved only through an understanding of history based on truth and reality.”

The IHR claims to have a network of scholars and activists who work to distinguish between historical facts and propaganda by conducting research studies and exposing the facts about history that have social-political relevance today. Labels are used to make readers more receptive to the message. Since the sender is a “scholar” or an “activist”, readers will place more trust in the message.

The reader is further made to be open to IHR’s “scholarly information” by learning that the material on the site is “free of charge, as a public service.” Public service suggests something that has a societal benefit. The material is additionally legitimized by the emphasis on copyright restrictions. If it is copyrighted, it must be serious.

232 See www.ihr.org/leaflets/leaflets.html
233 See www.ihr.org
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The two essays I chose to analyse are representative of the web site because both manipulate language and words in order to appear legitimate and credible. Both essays are written in the same style as other essays from the IHR web site, with citations, proper referencing, and a grammatically sound sentence structure.

**Article One: A Few Facts About the IHR**

In this article the following key words appear: revisionism (2 times), scholar (6 times), Holocaust (13 times), and historical (19 times). The term revisionism, as stated previously, is incorrectly used by Holocaust deniers. They do not objectively review history, but, like the IHR, attempt to demean its importance by debating various issues surrounding it.

The IHR portrays itself as a reputable organization. It has physical offices, is recognized by the IRS as a “not-for-profit, tax exempt educational and publishing enterprise,” receives media coverage, hosts conferences, and publishes a journal. *The Journal of Historical Review* can be accessed on the web site and those interested in subscribing to it can do so from the site. The IHR also has an online catalogue – through a link to Noontide Press - where videos, audiotapes, books, and other forms of media can be purchased. In the event that one requires a conference speaker, the IHR has “got your man.”

The IHR explains that it does not deny the Holocaust. However, it challenges its accuracy and severity. The IHR claims to receive support from several intellectuals including Arthur Butz and Robert Faurisson (“university professors”), David Irving (“historian”), and Fred Leuchter, Jr. (“American gas chamber specialist”). These individuals are not, in fact, historians or specialists.

---

236 See Appendix 4.1.1 or [http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.html](http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.html)
238 See [http://www.ihr.org/top/contact.html](http://www.ihr.org/top/contact.html)
For example, Leuchter has publicly admitted to lying about being a professional engineer and chemist and does not hold a university degree. Although these people may be intellectuals, this is irrelevant since the significant characteristic is that they are all anti-Semitic.

The article speaks about *The Journal of Historical Review*, which was started in 1980. It claims to be “the leading periodical of its kind in the world, appearing six times yearly in an attractive, handsomely illustrated magazine format.” The journal has an Editorial Advisory Committee and claims to attract a wide and diverse audience. The article declares that the world’s most prestigious university libraries subscribe to the journal. This might be accurate, however, only because academic libraries have a collection development policy that must fulfill certain requirements. The library must not censor or filter out material that may be offensive to some members of the university community. The library has an obligation to offer information that is pertinent for the research needs of the university community. Since many universities have material relating to the Holocaust, librarians deem it essential to include all research about the Holocaust. To differentiate between the two types of material, the Library of Congress has created the subject headings “Holocaust Denial,” “Holocaust Denial Literature” and “Holocaust, Jewish 1939-1945—errors, inventions.”

Throughout the article, the IHR is presented as a scholarly, dispassionate organization. It hides the anti-Semitic nature of the institute and thus portrays it inaccurately.

**Article Two: Liberating America from Israel**

This article is not related to the Holocaust, but it is important to include for analysis in this chapter. Holocaust deniers tend to stray away from denying the Holocaust since they cannot deny the fact that many lives were lost. They cannot deny hatred, bigotry, or anti-Semitism. They can

---

239 See www.ihr.org
240 See Appendix 4.1.2 or http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/liberatingamerica.html
only diminish its importance and prevalence. This second essay represents one common aspect of Holocaust denial discourse – anti-Zionist rhetoric. It is clear why this text was written. At the time of this writing, the U.S.-led war in Iraq may be seen as having links to Israel. Saddam Hussein has mentioned that if the USA fights against Iraq, he will attack Israel. The United States and Israel are closely linked together. Israel relies on the USA financially and for a variety of other reasons. The USA uses Israel as an access point to the Middle East. Their relationship is symbiotic.

Paul Findley, the author of this article, was a U.S. Congressional Representative – thus an important and reliable source. He begins this leaflet with: “Nine-eleven would not have occurred if the U.S. government had refused to help Israel humiliate and destroy Palestinian society…” 241

The first thing that Findley establishes is that Israel is to be blamed for the events of 9/11. 242 He argues that the terrorist attacks happened because the American government supports Israel in the conflict over land with the Palestinians. Blaming Jews is a common theme in anti-Semitism. Carlos Whitlock Porter blames Jews for the rise of A.I.D.S and the acceptance of homosexuality. He also blames them for legalizing abortion and decriminalizing it. Scapegoating minority groups and blaming them for perceived social problems is a common tactic used by hate groups.

The article argues that if the USA withdrew support from Israel, then the Middle East would not want to attack the USA and there would be more peaceful relations between the USA and Middle Eastern countries. Findley specifically blames the Jewish lobby in the States and the pressure it places on the President to support Israel.

242 9/11 being September 11, 2001, when a number of terrorist attacks were carried out in the United States.
Findley is a politician and anti-Zionist writer. The IHR’s policy of being non-political and non-ideological has been broken again with this essay which is clearly not objective or balanced. Findley blames the “Israel’s U.S. lobby” (perhaps a codeword for the American Jewish community) and stresses the word “lobby” six times in his essay. He uses powerful imagery in his article;

“Under the guise of anti-terrorism, Israeli forces treat Palestinians worse than cattle. With due process nowhere to be found, hundreds are detained for long periods and most are tortured. Some are assassinated. Homes, orchards, and business places are destroyed. Entire cities are kept under intermittent curfew, some confinements lasting for weeks. Injured or ill Palestinians needing emergency medical care are routinely held at checkpoints for an hour or more. Many children are undernourished. The West Bank and Gaza have become giant concentration camps.”

Findley uses keywords such as “undernourished,” “tortured,” “assassinated,” and “concentration camps” to diminish the suffering Jews had undergone during the Nazi Holocaust by his comparison to Palestinians’ present situation in Israel. He uses rhetoric that is familiar from accounts of the Nazi Holocaust. All of these keywords are part of the body of language in Holocaust literature. In the true sense of a Holocaust denier, Findley uses reversion to illustrate how the Jews (specifically Israelis) treat Palestinians like cattle. The fact that Jews were treated like animals during the Nazi Holocaust - rounded up, placed into cattle cars by the hundreds, and

---

243 Ibid.
244 Ibid.
locked up for the duration of the trips – is used by the author in a different context, this time using Jews as aggressors.

The arguments are one sided. Findley neglects to discuss the constant threat of suicide bombings by Palestinians in Israel, for example. He does not address other possible reasons for the 9/11 terrorist attacks, nor does he tackle the reasons why Israel’s neighboring countries are refusing Palestinian refugees. Findley blames Israel for various social problems in the United States.

The last argument Findley makes is that 9/11 originated more than thirty-five years ago when the U.S. began supporting Israel. It was at that point that “Israel’s U.S. lobby began its unbroken success in stifling debate about the proper U.S. role in the Arab-Israeli conflict and effectively concealed from public awareness the fact that the U.S. government gives massive uncritical support to Israel.”

Findley’s article illustrates IHR’s real mandate. The IHR and its staff write about a variety of social issues that have only one aim: to blame society’s problems on Jews.

**The Zündelsite**

**Brief Description**

The Zündelsite was chosen based on popularity in the media, lifespan online, popularity in search engines, and size of web site. It is a political web site.

The Zündelsite is the most popular and largest Holocaust denial web site. It is devoted to the life and times of Canadian Holocaust denier Ernst Zündel. It is designed and maintained by his wife Ingrid Rimland, a writer and fellow Holocaust denier.

\[^{245}\text{Ibid.}\]
Analysis

The site is offered in four languages (English, French, German, and Russian). It contains an index of articles relating to Holocaust denial, biographies of Ernst Zündel and Ingrid Rimland, court transcripts of Zündel’s trials, satiric cartoons246 created by Zündel, photographs, and a daily newsletter called Z-Grams that is distributed via email. Z-Grams contain the latest news and current issues in the world of revisionism and world Jewry. They resemble a daily news report, but are not quite as objective. Rimland’s play on words and language strives to construct Jews as the enemy and Holocaust Deniers as victims. The Z-grams keep a close eye on the Jewish community, mostly in the United States, Canada, and Israel. Conferences and events can be advertised on the mailing list. The web site also contains articles, pamphlets, and a bookstore where users can purchase material. The Zündelsite also offers Revisionist books online that users can download and read for free. There is a search engine with scores of flashy, animated graphics.

The Zündelsite has a list of links to “friends and foes”247 as well as to their Revisionist Satellite Television station. An article on famous deniers entitled “The Victims of Zion” is displayed. The article title is powerful, because it turns Zionists a.k.a. Jews into victimizers. The victims are, again, Holocaust deniers. This article provides brief biographical sketches of famous Holocaust deniers such as Dr. Fredrick Toben and Dr. Robert Faurisson. There is a section entitled language materials where users can read Zündelsite articles in nine languages. The only explicit indication of anti-Semitism on the site is the cartoon representing Jews as small, hook-nosed intellectuals and professionals attempting to restrain a youthful, attractive Ernst Zündel.

246 Zündel’s profession is as a graphic artist. His anti-Semitic cartoons are hidden in his web site. They represent Jews as small, hooknosed intellectuals and professionals attempting to restrain a youthful, attractive Ernst Zündel. This is reminiscent of pre-war popular German anti-Semitism.

The Zündelsite has been labeled as a “Political” web site and does contain themes from other categories. Most of the content deals with Holocaust revisionism and freedom of speech. I have chosen the label of political because the Zündelsite uses the keywords of “politically besieged” and “political campaign,” “political struggle,” “politically correct.” The front page of the Zündelsite lists the word “political” three times, and the word “Revisionism” fifteen times. 248

The Zündelsite uses a teacher’s tone. Rimland, who is purportedly the owner of the site, promotes her books and claims that she is a noted speaker at seminars and conferences. The web site is divided neatly and professionally into university-type courses: Revisionism 101, Revisionism 201, and Revisionism 301. Each course has a small introduction:

“Revisionism 101" - Basic Revisionist Articles Offered as a Detoxification Program to Cure the Politically Correct of the Hollywood version of the Holocaust.

"Revisionism 201" - More advanced articles and full length books on Revisionism. Including the famous Leuchter Reports, politically incorrect articles, the Cyber-War against the Zündelsite, and the infamous Zündelsite-Nizkor Debate / Rebuttal.

"Revisionism 301" - Court and Legal Documents about the Zündel Struggle

Each section contains an index of documents that relates to the course title. Revisionism 101 serves to introduce the user to Holocaust issues with articles such as “The Nizkor/Zündelsite Electronic Debate (Introduction to Revisionism),” “Holocaust Revisionism in a Nutshell,”

248 See front page of the Zündelsite at http://www.Zündelsite.org
“Auschwitz: Myth and Facts, Did Six Million Really Die?” and “Inside the Auschwitz Gas Chambers.” Revisionism 201 is for “Holocaust Skeptics” and Revisionism 301 is “The Legal Fight for Truth in History.”

The site uses the keyword “Hollywood” as a way of describing the Holocaust. By doing so, the Holocaust is presented as a fantasy, an invention. This idea is related to Steven Spielberg’s movie “Schindler’s List” which chronicles the life of Oscar Schindler who saved a large number of Jews during the Holocaust. The movie won many awards and received many great honours. The film had the look and feel of a documentary. It can be argued that Zündel is using the term “Hollywood” to compare Spielberg’s artistic interpretation of Schindler’s story to how the “Jewish lobby” presents the Holocaust to society.

Zündel and Rimland act as authorities on the subject of Holocaust denial. Zündel is melodramatic and sarcastic. Similar to other deniers like David Irving, the text is humourous and witty. Since Zündel’s profession is in graphic arts, he uses his talents to draw caricatures laced with satire and anti-Semitic undertones.

In terms of information management, the Zündelsite is highly indexed and organized. It gives the user the false sense of legitimacy since it contains a wealth of documents (including many from external sources such as the VHO web site.) Revisionism 101, for example, contains twenty-four documents, one of which is available in seven languages. It appears that having multilingual documents opens the possibility for a larger audience and increases legitimacy. For Zündel, the primary goal is to recruit, even though he claims that he does not want to recruit, but

---

249 Over the last few years, Revisionism 101, Revisionism 201, and Revisionism 301 have been re-named Holocaust 101, Holocaust 201, and Holocaust 301. It is not certain of what was the name of the original sections was at the time of this writing (April 2003). Some pages were labeled Revisionism 101, 201, and 301 and some were labeled Holocaust 101, 201, and 301 interchangeably.
250 www.vho.org is Vrij Historisch Onderzoek/Castle Hill Publishers, by author Germar Rudolf. This web site was not analysed for this thesis.
251 See http://www.Zündelsite.org/101.html
to convince. The keyword of “recruit” might have negative connections with cults and other
groups that try to manipulate people. Zündel does not subscribe to this language. Just as he uses
revisionism instead of denial, he uses the word “convince” rather than “recruit.”

Another technique that Zündel employs to maintain legitimacy is to associate himself with
respected scholars and politicians. In one press release from 1995, he claims that Mrs. Hillary
Clinton’s speech supports his web site. The following is the actual text from her speech:

“Freedom means the right of people to assemble, organize and debate openly . . . It
means respecting the views of those who may disagree with the views of their
governments. It means not taking citizens away from their loved ones and jailing
them, mistreating them, or denying them their freedom or dignity because of
peaceful expression of their ideas and opinions.”\(^{252}\)

Zündel takes Clinton’s speech out of context and attempts to create an alliance between her and
his web site. He comments after her quote,

“Members of the German and German descendent community in Canada wish to
go on record saying that they hope that Prime Minister Chretien of Canada is
listening so he may learn the basic lesson of democracy - that true freedom means
freedom to differ with the official view of things, including the official and
“sanctioned” view on historical matters such as the Holocaust.”\(^{253}\)

Zündel at the time was living in Toronto, Canada, and throughout the late 90’s continuously
criticized the Canadian government and Canadian policy for its censorship laws. He emphasizes
the word “freedom” and connects it to “Holocaust Revisionism.” The concept of freedom appears

\(^{252}\) Ibid.
\(^{253}\) See http://www.Zündelsite.org/english/disclaimer/hillary.html
throughout the Zündelsite. He claims that he lives in a dictator state\textsuperscript{254} and looks to American politicians as models for his discourse. Zündel’s concept of Holocaust Revisionism connotes a kind of freedom. The current Holocaust story, he claims, manipulates people to believe the version Jews have constructed and not the “true” story.

Revisionism 301 takes a legal jump into Zündel’s struggle. The sub-section is entitled “Court and Legal Documents about the Zündel Struggle.” Zündel uses the word “struggle” frequently in this section of the web site. His choice of words connects his discourse to a political platform and a political position. Zündel constructs his online identity as a martyr and as a victim in an oppressed position. His mandate is to convince his audience to believe and to be open to debate. He outlines this section with the following text: “His aim: Liberation through truthful information. Their aim: Suppression at any cost!”\textsuperscript{255} He frames his struggle as a symbolic war. He situates Jews as the “suppressor” and himself as the one struggling for liberation. This statement also presents a dichotomy. Zündel plays the role of the victim who is helpless and he creates the Jews as the oppressor. It is Zündel’s strategy to appear victimized, to play a melodramatic role and to appear sympathetic.

\textbf{Article One: Holocaust 101: Chapter One}\textsuperscript{256}

This is the first section of an eight part document with a fairly long introduction, which Zündel begins by explaining that after the document went online in January 1996, the Simon Wiesenthal Center tried to stop it from being published. To Zündel’s delight, this led to a great deal of activity including an article in the \textit{New York Times}, numerous letters exchanged and the

\textsuperscript{254} Zündel refers to Canada as a dictator state. At the time of this writing, Zündel was living in the USA with his wife and webmaster Ingrid Rimland. He left Canada, married Rimland and moved to Tennessee because he felt that Canada promoted censorship and denied him his freedom of speech. Their web site is hosted in the USA.

\textsuperscript{255} See \url{http://www.Zündelsite.org/301.html}

\textsuperscript{256} See \url{http://www.zundelsite.org/english/101/english1011.html}
mirroring (copies of the site on different servers) of the Zündelsite all over the world. These mirrors were supposedly put up by ““computer kids” and cyberspace journalists” on servers in the most “prestigious universities.” Already, it is established what sort of people support Zündel – intellectual and technologically savvy ones.

Zündel introduces himself and defends himself against charges that he is a publisher of hate literature. He explains how there are hate laws in place in Canada, yet he has never been charged or convicted under them. Those who describe him as a publisher of hate literature are actually committing libel. Again, Zündel is the victim. Ironically, Zündel does not deny that he publishes hate literature. He only states that he has never been charged or convicted of this. Even more ironic is his statement: “Had there been proof, my enemies would have made sure I would have been charged and convicted.” There is no proof gas chambers existed either, according to Zündel. It all depends what you look at and how you look at it.

Zündel admits to having been charged with spreading false news. He dismisses this accusation as “a frivolous charge a malcontent, multi-millionaire Jewess brought against me.” Once again we see the common Holocaust revisionist ideas of Jews making false claims and being able to do so because they are rich. He goes on to say how this legal case cost Canadians six million dollars (or is that an exaggeration like the number of Jews killed in the Holocaust?), concluding that the court found that “society may be enriched by cultural and intellectual diversity” such as he provides.

257 It can be assumed that Fredrick Toben, owner of the Adelaide Institute could have mirrored Zündel’s web site as he resides in Australia. As well Arthur Butz at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, could have mirrored some of Zündel’s web pages.
259 Ibid.
Zündel states: “Revisionism has taken hold as an intellectual revival movement all over the world. People are beginning to ask questions about the Holocaust. These questions are uncomfortable.”

Zündel addresses how Revisionism has become a worldwide intellectual movement but he fails to mention that this intellectual movement has nothing to do with intellectual freedom. He may be correct when he states that (Holocaust) Revisionism has now become a public social concern because more people are coming out of the Holocaust denial closet. They mask their anti-Semitism by joining this intellectual movement. Zündel argues that questioning the Holocaust does not equal anti-Semitism so Jews should not “cry wolf” or claim that anyone who debates the Holocaust is an anti-Semite. He argues that Jews are using anti-Semitism as a way to censor Holocaust Revisionists from disseminating their claims. Jews would not have a problem debating specific issues relating to the Holocaust if Holocaust deniers did not have a clearly anti-Semitic background. Zündel also avoids mentioning his anti-Semitic affiliations, the fact that he funds Neo-Nazis, and speaks at white supremacist conventions because it would damage his credibility. It is the context in which the speaker situates himself that determines the claims he makes. Zündel argues that the powerful Holocaust promotion lobby silences him and other Holocaust deniers. If Holocaust Revisionists were not anti-Semitic and if they did not have a political agenda, then World Jewry would not have the need to censor them.

On other Holocaust denial web sites, the Jewish community is coded in a variety of terms such as “the powerful Jewish lobby” or “the Liberals.” Zündel’s webmaster and wife Ingrid Rimland uses codewords on her daily Zgrams mailing list. In one, she discusses how her web host has been pressured to take her web site down. “Vincent Breeding, a Southerner affiliated with the David Duke group in Louisiana, kindly offered free space on his server, and I gratefully
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Rimland does not indicate that David Duke is a former leader of the Ku Klux Klan, but instead uses the term “the David Duke group in Louisiana” as though speaking about a generous, unaffiliated group of people. Rimland uses a form of code to conceal the Zündelsite’s racist ties.

The first section of the document begins with the claim that “the Holocaust is useful postwar propaganda that started as a systematic, insidious campaign during World War II as one of the tactics employed by moneyed interests to rally the troops and engage the world, specifically America, in what turned out to be, essentially, a fratricidal war.”

Zündel claims that the Holocaust was used as propaganda to rally Allied armies against Nazi Germany. This strategy was created by “moneyed interests” and resulted in brothers killing brothers. Zündel does not refer outright to the Jewish community. Rather he uses the codeword “moneyed interests” to mean Jews. Essentially, Zündel blames Jews for provoking a senseless war. Zündel then writes how the Allies made Hitler out to be a demon by spreading stories. Zündel’s aim of rehabilitating Hitler’s reputation is clear in this passage. Quoting a letter from the British Ministry of Information, Zündel demonstrates one of the reasons the British created anti-German propaganda was to distract Allied countries from what the Russian army was doing. Zündel uses a rhetorical strategy to remove the blame from Nazi Germany and transfer it to the Americans and the British for the dissemination of anti-German propaganda and to the Russians for unspecified behaviour. He claims that the Americans used the method of “let's get an enemy

---

262 Ingrid Rimland’s daily ZGrams consist of a daily newsletter that gets distributed via email 365 days per year. It was first created on January 1, 1996. For more information see [http://zgrams.Zündelsite.org](http://zgrams.Zündelsite.org)
to kill an enemy,” by which the Russian Red Army joined the war against Germany while the Americans and the British sat back and created anti-German propaganda. 264

In a bit of a leap, Zündel concludes that since this letter did not mention gas chambers, it proves their non-existence. Zündel’s main argument is that propaganda played a major part in WWII. He claims that the gas chambers also started as a piece of propaganda. He references (but does not reproduce) another letter that was sent to the British clergy, in which the British Ministry of Information supposedly asks for help in spreading the “gas chamber story.” It later judged it to be too strange and implausible to be accepted, so the request was withdrawn.

As web users, we trust Zündel as the information provider, but there is need to question his selection criteria and his understanding of selected text. It is important to note that in 1944, the existence of gas chambers was not known to anyone outside the Nazi regime. All of the documentation regarding them was kept confidential and codewords were used for the extermination plan. Obviously, Zündel could not have found solid evidence of the gas chambers because the language was coded with symbolic language that only the Nazis knew. Another reason Zündel would not have found evidence about gas chambers might have been because he deliberately looked for articles that failed to mention them. Unlike a true historian or scholar, Zündel is not objective and uses a strategy to selectively present his research.

Zündel continuously portrays Germans as innocent victims and Britain, the U.S., and Russia as propaganda machines. He goes back to the First World War and cites earlier accusations made against Germans “all of which proved to be lies.” One of these accusations was that even then Germans were killing millions of Jews. He also cites Ben Weintraub, whose name sounds Jewish, who had stated that the six million figure “has mythical significance.” Mythical replaces

real. Since the six million figure has been used many times in history and has more of a symbolic nature than an accurate representation of Jewish deaths in the Holocaust, then the six million figure must be false. Zündel makes generalizations and conclusions without taking into account any context or conducting social scientific research.\textsuperscript{265}

Like Michael Hoffman, Zündel uses the image of a poodle when describing the general population in respect to the Holocaust. He claims that today’s population is gullible and consumes what the media delivers like lap dogs. The lap dog is associated with being obedient, naive, vulnerable, controlled by its owner. Zündel refers to the media as the “dog owner” and society as the “lap dog.” He illustrates how the media (that deniers generally claim are owned by Jews) are oppressing the general public. Zündel calls Holocaust awareness a “psychological onslaught” and traces its beginnings to the “fictitious television series” entitled “Holocaust.” He suggests that because the Holocaust was not discussed in the mainstream until the TV series was broadcast in the 1970’s, it did not really exist beforehand. He uses the terms “vicious” and “destructive” to describe films and documentaries that deal with the Holocaust (such as “Schindler’s List”). Portraying Germany as the victim is Zündel’s main theme in this essay. He claims that it is the Jews who have tarnished the reputation of Hitler and Germany and who have destroyed and viciously attacked the history of the German people.

In the final passage, Zündel compares the gas chamber claim to a piece of cheese.

“\textquote{The Allied leaders had detailed aerial photos, none of which corroborated the hysterical claims then made by Zionist agitators like Rabbi Stephen Wise and others around the world. It simply wasn’t true. There were no gassings of people going on - only of lice! The story was a cheese with

\textsuperscript{265} Ib\textit{id.}
many, many holes. And it was judged as problematic. As a consequence, the Allied leadership specifically removed any reference to "gas chambers" in their wartime atrocity propaganda, even in their diplomatic dispatches, because there was no proof. (Allied Diplomacy in Wartime, Samisdat Resource Book, pp 108-110)"

Zündel uses the word “hysterical” to suggest that Jews were making claims based on emotion and not intellect. He also links the Holocaust with Zionism. Like other deniers, Zündel believes that Holocaust education is deeply rooted within Zionism and the ability of Israel to be a Jewish state. The mocking claim that gas was used to get rid of lice reinforces the anti-Semitic imagery of Jews as dirty. The analogy of “cheese with many holes” suggests that there are many flaws to the gas chamber “story.” The writing style is satiric and flamboyant. It might appear familiar because Zündel is citing himself. The Samisdat Resource Book is a reference tool published by Zündel’s publishing house Samisdat Publishing. Zündel’s supporting quote was taken from his own publication. Zündel ends this section with claims that Zionists (a codeword for Jews) have “feverish brains” and played the part of the victim to help to create Israel and to gain postwar political advantage.

**Article Two: “Holocaust 101” Chapter Two**

This second section title claims that “there is no proof that the Holocaust, as depicted by the Holocaust Promotion Lobby and the highly politicized Hollywood industry, actually occurred.” The title contains two concepts of interest: the Holocaust Promotion Lobby and the “highly politicized Hollywood industry” (which Zündel and other Holocaust deniers believe are dominated

by Jews). Zündel defines the term “Holocaust Promotion Lobby” as being similar to terms such as "The Flower Generation" or "The Jet Set" to describe a set of people. Earlier on in Holocaust 101, he defines the Holocaust Promotion Lobby as:

“a summarizing construct meant as a shortcut to describe a subset of the human race, most but not all of whom are Jews, with unique and identifying social and political characteristics and dedicated to the maintenance and enhancement of a dogma called the "Holocaust."”

In sum, the Holocaust Promotion Lobby is composed of Jews and others who support the actuality of the Holocaust. Nitpicking the definition, play on words abound: “subset of the human race” may be a reference to Jews as subhuman, “unique and identifying social and political characteristics” may be a reference to the anti-Semitic view that Jews possess unique and usually negative physical and psychological characteristics, and “dogma” may be a reference to Zündel’s view of society as a lap-dog; i.e. willing to accept the actuality of the Holocaust.

In this essay, Zündel claims that there is no credible proof that a Holocaust existed. He claims that Jews created this story during World War II as a means to blame the Germans. Zündel’s sympathy to Hitler is once again made evident. Zündel claims that the Holocaust Promotion Lobby and the Hollywood industry came together to create the Holocaust story. He also coins the term Holocaust Enforcers.

In the opening of his essay, Zündel makes the following statement:
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“Revisionists don't claim that Jews didn't suffer. They don't argue the fact that Jews were, in fact, unwanted in Germany, and that there was a state policy to remove them as a “parasitic people” harmful to the country. It is absolutely true that Jews were incarcerated and often treated cruelly. They were seen as the enemy, just as in our times the “Nazis” are seen as the enemy of entrenched oligarchies.

Revisionists do claim and argue that there was no state policy that called for the “mass extermination of the Jews” or any other unwanted minorities.”

Zündel sets up the context for his argument. He uses a method used by many Holocaust deniers; that it, using bait to catch the web user, and then reeling them in. He uses the same rhetoric all Holocaust deniers use and it is almost like a script. Most of these essays begin with a form of acknowledging a small part of the Jewish experience in WWII and continuing with a big “but.”

Zündel states that Jews were unwelcome in Germany and the state wanted to get rid of them. Not only does he agree with these facts, but the structure of the rhetoric leaves the impression that he agrees with these attitudes as well. It is important to note the use of quotation marks. Zündel uses quotation marks for certain words. Obviously, quotation marks make a word stand out and give a sense of questionability to it. Zündel uses quotation marks to indicate how Jews were described historically as “parasitic people.” As shown in the Chapter Four of this thesis, Jews historically were seen as a parasitic race of people, full of disease which infected others. Zündel questions this label that race theorists have placed on Jews because he wants to lift the

---

“victim” role off Jews once again. Zündel believes that Jews created this image of themselves so that others would take pity on them.

Zündel compares Jews being seen as the enemy then to Nazis being seen as the enemy today. He uses quotes when referring to the Nazis because he is questioning the validity of the stereotypes associated with the term. What he is really asking is, “Are Nazis the real enemy?” or are they being branded as such by the oligarchies (perhaps another reference to Jews in power)? This is a form of trivialization. In Nazi Germany, Jews were not simply seen as the enemy. There were major consequences for being (identified as) a Jew. Seeing Nazis as the enemy today has little consequence because Nazis, for the most part, exist in the past. The term “mass extermination” is also placed in quotation marks, because, of course, Zündel does not believe this was the case.

Later in the text, the words “confession,” “incriminating,” “document,” “war crimes,” and “confessed” are placed in quotation marks. Zündel uses the word “confession” thirteen times in this essay – always in quotation marks. He dismisses all declarations of guilt supporting the systematic murder of Jews because he is convinced German officers were forced to make false confessions about their activities during the Holocaust. He claims that “documents, testimony and confessions as well as affidavits presented at Nuremberg and elsewhere were frequently produced and signed after psychological and physical torture.”

Zündel focuses on two German officers, Rudolf Hoess and Julius Streicher, who were beaten and tortured in order to get a confession. Even if they were beaten and tortured, this does not necessarily indicate that all Nazis were beaten and tortured in order to extract confessions. It also does not necessarily invalidate the two men’s confessions. Not only does Zündel reject officer

271 Ibid.
confessions, he places the officers in the victim’s role – “beaten mercilessly” and “savagely tortured” are some of the descriptions he uses for their ordeal.

Zündel quotes a passage from the English writer Rupert Butler’s book *Legions of Death* to further dismiss Hoess’ confession. Rupert seems to have written that Hoess’ “confession” was written in English even though he did not speak or read a word in English. This seems to be a valid point to consider. Yet a preliminary Internet search reveals that the sub-title of Butler’s book is “The Nazi Enslavement of Europe” and according to the short description, the book details the Nazi “plans for the wholesale killings and subjection of Eastern Europe, including the “Final Solution” of the gas chambers.”272 One gets the feeling that the quote has been taken out of context and, in fact, does not support Zündel’s claim.

Zündel makes vast generalizations and his conclusions are based on a few examples of Nazis who were tortured into making confessions. From there, he concludes that all Nazis were tortured to make a confession. Thus the Holocaust was constructed out of false confessions, and as such, the Holocaust was a hoax. His supportive quotes are questionable, possibly taken out of context. In one case, he quotes himself, without citing himself. His data is selective to his likings and he fails to be impartial. It appears that Zündel is looking for ways to identify Nazis as the victims and the Jews as the aggressors.

**Analysis of Graphics**

There are two dominant graphics on the Zündelsite. The first is only displayed on the splash page and the second is displayed on every page, except the splash page.

1) Remember: Whenever you see a blue ribbon

272 See [http://www.pen-and-sword.co.uk/cgi-bin/uk/0379.html](http://www.pen-and-sword.co.uk/cgi-bin/uk/0379.html)
The Zündelsite was at the centre!

This first graphic gives the user the impression that the Zündelsite is an innovative initiative that strives for Freedom of Speech. The word “campaign” is associated with the blue ribbon. This keyword of campaign alludes to a political platform and this is one of the reasons that I labeled this web site “Political.” On the left is the blue flag, which denotes free speech online.

2)

The concepts expressed in this document are protected by the basic human right to freedom of speech, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, reaffirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court as applying to the Internet content on June 26, 1997.

For those who do not understand the nature of the blue ribbon, the Zündelsite provides a second graphic to explain. The image on the right is the American flag and there is also a small image of Zündel with his trademark red construction hat. The text discusses how the contents expressed on each page of the site are supported by the First Amendment. The fact that this banner is displayed on each page acts as a license or a seal of approval from the U.S. government. It also acts as a symbol of legitimacy. The two symbols of the American flag and the blue ribbon act as
political markers that situate Zündel and Rimland within a social and political context. Their website is essentially a political tool, a campaign to fight for the political right to Freedom of Speech.

Another feature of the Zündelsite that appears on each page is the banner:

Please support the Zündelsite – the most politically besieged web site on the Net!

To be politically besieged is to be oppressed and victimized. A siege is when one is under control or under domination by another group. In this case, the Zündelsite constructs its reality by being controlled and dominated by the American media. Zündel claims that the American media is controlled by rich and powerful American Jews.

The Zündelsite also contains a selection of Zündel’s political cartoons. They are difficult to access from the homepage because they are deeply embedded in the site. These politically satiric cartoons border on anti-Semitism. For example, one cartoon displays a circus clown and a poodle. The clown is labeled “HOLOCAUST LOBBY” and a circus poodle, flying through the clown’s ring, is labeled “THE GULLIBLE”. Zündel’s choice of using a clown to represent the Holocaust Lobby suggests that Holocaust lobbying groups cannot be taken seriously. Furthermore, the image of the circus clown signifies exaggeration, theatrics, and melodrama. The poodle represents the public that is manipulated by Holocaust lobbies. Another cartoon shows the “I.R.S.,” shaking a “U.S. TAX PAYER” and emptying his pockets on top of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial museum. Zündel is accusing the I.R.S. of taking advantage of tax-paying U.S. citizens and using their money for the American Jewish community. He uses the image of the U.S. citizen as puppet and the government entity as puppeteer. Zündel’s compassion for U.S. citizens should

be noted – he was born in Germany and has, up to recently, made his home in Canada since the age of nineteen.

The last cartoon depicts Revisionist scholarship as a bright sun melting the Holocaust. The Holocaust is represented as a bar of soap. The symbol of the melting item could be a bar of soap or a block of ice. This symbol is important because once this item melts it disappears forever and is lost.

The bar of soap or block of ice represents the fate of millions of Jewish people and Zündel illustrates how the myth of “Jewish soap” was false, so the rays of sunlight (which symbolize hope and positive energy) will melt away the doubts or myths or falsehoods.

The cartoons are below:

Arthur Butz’s Personal Web Site

Arthur Butz’s personal web site fits into the intellectual category and promotes his controversial book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, published in 1976. This book was written
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from the perspective of a historian. Dr. Butz has a doctorate in Electrical Engineering and is currently a tenured professor at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, in the Electrical and Computer Engineering department. His personal web site is hosted on his university’s web server. The fact that his educational background is in engineering, not in history, greatly lessens his legitimacy. I would argue that his academic credentials make him less credible. His research interest does not stem from scholarly review, but rather from hatred and bigotry towards Jews.

Analysis

The web page was created in 1996 as a means to disseminate information about Butz’s research interests. It contains a number of articles and research papers Butz has written for various revisionist conferences. The site is simple in design and layout without any graphics or photos. Neither does it contain a mailing list or a search engine or a guest book. It has not been updated since 1998. It is basically a promotional tool for Butz’s books, ideas, and beliefs. He claims that the Holocaust is a legend and a myth.

Since the site is mounted on a university server it has created several problems. Some Northwestern University alumni have threatened to discontinue their contributions to the university because they refuse to fund Butz’s anti-Semitic research. Butz’s legitimacy slips as Shane Borrowman points out: “This web site exists for the purpose of expressing views that are outside the purview of [his] role as Electrical Engineering faculty member.”

Butz’s tone is somewhat different from that of Porter, Zündel, or Irving. It suggests that he does not need to convince or recruit others. He is calm, relaxed, and neutral. Unlike Zündel, Butz is not melodramatic, but professional and authoritative. His confidence allows him to avoid having a professionally designed and organized web site. In the first line of text, he introduces

---

himself as “the author of the book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (1976), a work of “Holocaust revisionism.” He straightforwardly explains that the site focuses on Holocaust revisionism. Simple and to the point, there is no mention of Jews, Nazi sympathies, or any reference to the First Amendment or free speech. Although the tone might lull the reader into thinking this is finally an objective, reliable Holocaust revisionist site, further examination proves otherwise.

**Article One: Holocaust Denial or Holocaust Revisionism?**

The central theme of this text is the debate of the two terms “Holocaust denial” and “Holocaust revisionism.” Butz uses colloquial language, taking on the role of the common individual. The text is written in a humble yet confident tone. The tone of the article is far from scholarly. Butz attempts to remove himself from his role as professor. He keeps the argument short and to the point.

Butz’s position is identified in the beginning: “Generally, my side says “Holocaust revisionism” and our enemies say “Holocaust denial.”” His intentions are clear when he refers to “our enemies” as the ones who label Holocaust revisionism as denial. He constructs denial as a negative term by associating it with the enemy. This illustrates a bias on Butz’s part and that his research is not necessarily objective.

The “problem” Butz sees with the term Holocaust denial is that

“it conveys, to most people, a false idea of what we say. For the typical person the term “Holocaust” refers to a complex of events. He thinks of Nazi persecution of Jews, concentration camps, crematoria, dead bodies strewn about camps (especially Belsen) at the end of the war and, of course,

---
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“extermination” of millions of Jews in gas chambers located in some camps. Thus he tends to take the meaning of “Holocaust denial” as denial of all of these things, whereas we deny only the last among them. The effect is to make us seem, to passing observers, detached from reality.”

Butz claims that the term “deny” alludes to a complete denial of the Holocaust, but that this is untrue since revisionists “only” deny that millions of Jews were killed. The text does not delve into the meaning or philosophy of revisionism. Butz also avoids addressing the issue that denying the Holocaust, even partially, may be interpreted as symbolic racism and a denial of historical facts. Deniers accept facts regarding Jewish enslavement, Jewish hatred, and the forced relocation of Jews to concentration camps. It is the very detail of the number of Jewish deaths and that many were killed in gas chambers that Butz and others deny.

In his essay Butz, like Zündel, uses quotation marks for certain words, such as “Holocaust,” “extermination,” and “denial.” This is done because Butz wants to address these terms and ridicule them. The words in quotes are used as a parody, as concepts he is critiquing and satirizing. He consistently attacks the claim that there was an extermination policy. Thus he argues that Jews have created the term Holocaust denial to shift the blame to the deniers who falsely represent themselves. This text illustrates the symbolic struggle between Jews and Holocaust deniers. Each group strives to make itself creditable.

**Article Two: A Short Introduction to the Study of Holocaust Revisionism**

---
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This second text is part of a larger article entitled “Context and Perspective in the “Holocaust” Controversy.” The theme of this text is that Jews fabricated the Holocaust story in the midst of the chaos after World War II ended.

Butz uses quotation marks, as in the previous text, to mock the meaning of certain terms and to question them. He uses quotations marks for “extermination camps,” “extermination,” and “Final Solution.” These three terms are highlighted so that they can be highlighted for debate. They are not simply words, but have deeper meanings and significance in the context of World War II. Furthermore, Butz uses the term “legend” eight times in reference to the Holocaust. The word “legend” implies a fable or story, something that is partially true, but was transformed while being passed down from generation to generation. He uses this term not to deny the reality, but to demean its seriousness and significance.

Butz mixes factual data to gain more legitimacy and gently stirs in subjective interpretive propaganda that may be perceived as racist and bigoted. He claims that most of the Jews “allegedly exterminated” were from Eastern Europe and thus population statistics cannot be used to prove or disprove the extermination. He does not explain why there are no population statistics, but manages to create a sort of Catch-22. Butz agrees that the Jewish population has decreased in Poland, but attributes this to a variety of factors, such as typhus and emigration, which sound quite plausible. He reconstructs a partial reality, to blame the decrease on social and environmental issues, but disregards any evidence to support that an extermination policy existed. By selectively using historical events, Butz manages to arrive at his own interpretation.

Butz highlights some historical errors to shed light on the events of World War II. Like Zündel, Butz uses facts and overlaps them with inferences and theories that may be misinterpreted.

---

and doctored. For example, Zündel calls attention to the belief that human fat was turned into soap, which was later shown to be false. This strategy of negating errors during the Nazi Holocaust and dispelling these myths helps achieve credibility. Butz and Zündel both argue that if no concentration camps were on German soil, then it is essential to be wary of the other claims made by Jews.282

The hyperlinks used in Butz’s text link to other texts by the same author. The hyperlinks use language that is different from the regular unhyperlked text. Butz writes an article about the concentration camp but uses the word “extermination camp.” This difference between concentration camp and extermination camp is important because the hyperlink gets routed to an article about concentration camps. For example, Butz accepts that there were concentration camps, that is, labour camps, but not extermination camps. Other hyperlinked texts include: Zyklon, horrible scenes, Vatican, Jewish leaders, and German military intelligence.

In the text, quotation marks and hyperlinks are used as devices that point out conceptual flaws, and as ironies. Butz’s tone is pseudo-scholarly and he draws attention to these debates and concepts through the use of quotation marks and hyperlinks. By claiming that the actual culprit for the large number of deaths was typhus, not Nazis, Butz uses the inversion technique to blame the deaths on external causes and to deflect blame from the Nazis. He fails to acknowledge that the Nazis forced Jews, homosexuals, gypsies, and communists into these camps where they suffered poor hygienic conditions. He blames the “natural” effects of war for the number of people killed. Lastly Butz uses coded language to refer to the Jews. Like Carlos Whitlock Porter who repeatedly codes Jews as the “Liberals,” Butz uses negative terms for the prisoners like political

prisoners and ordinary criminals\textsuperscript{283} rather than victims. This strategy serves to invert the blame to the prisoners, inferring that they were the perpetrators of the war and that they deserved to be jailed and treated poorly. He also groups political prisoners with ordinary criminals in the same sentence with Jews and homosexuals, which makes a connection between a Jewish person, a homosexual and a criminal.

\textbf{David Irving’s Focal Point Publications\textsuperscript{284}}

\textbf{Brief Description}

David Irving, a well-known British historian, owns a publishing house, called Focal Point Publications whose web site is located at \url{http://www.fpp.co.uk}. It was chosen because of its lifespan on the Internet, the press coverage it has received, and its highly indexed position on all major search engines.

\textbf{Analysis}

The web site functions as an online human rights newsletter. There is a list of articles indexed alphabetically with photographs, as well as links to the bookstore, a list of free book downloads, and where web users can purchase material. Irving’s site also has a guide on how to uninstall Internet filters. Internet filters are commonly used on home computers to filter out objectionable material on the Internet such as pornography and hate. Some search engines have filtering systems that block search results if they contain certain keywords and phrases. Google, for example, created Safesearch software that is built into a search engine that will check keywords and phrases, URLs and directory categories. When Safesearch is enabled, web sites and web pages

\textsuperscript{283} see \url{http://pubweb.acns.nwu.edu/~abutz/di/intro.html}

\textsuperscript{284} See \url{http://www.fpp.co.uk}
that contain pornography, explicit sexual content, and hate are blocked from search results. Irving encourages the public to uninstall the software and disable it from search engines.

The site has a section called “Readers’ letters,” where web users provide feedback to Irving about his thoughts and ideas. For example, a web user will email a thank you note for the free book downloads or the informative articles. Recent news is listed in Irving’s Action Report (similar to the Z-grams on the Zündelsite). Irving’s Action Report is archived and his web site also contains a mailing list and contact address and email. There is a section on Irving and his family, his career, and the Irving/Lipstadt court transcripts. Also, users can donate money for Irving’s cause.

There are six indexes to the site. The main index is an alphabetical listing of every page on the site. There is also an index labeled “Some Traditional Enemies” where sites which are “enemies of free speech” are listed. It is interesting to note that all these enemies are Jewish organizations. Irving provides an introductory page for each organization, but does not provide a direct link. For example, the Canadian Jewish Congress, which is a national lobby group that fights against anti-Semitism and for Jewish civil rights as well as restitution for Canadian Holocaust survivors, is listed in this section with an index, but the links generally lead to one of Irving’s own Action Reports which contain articles that generally depict the organization in a negative light, “confidential reports,” letters, etc.

In addition to Holocaust denial, David Irving has recently targeted the issue of Zionism and his web site also spotlights people who criticize Zionism. This site is most similar to the
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285 Irving sued Deborah Lipstadt of Emory University in the United States for denouncing Irving as a Historian. Her book on Holocaust Denial discusses how Irving is a Holocaust denier, anti-Semitic, and inaccurate in his claims. Irving’s career was put on the line, as Lipstadt’s book defends the Holocaust and denounces Irving. Lipstadt won the case months later.

Zündelsite because it also proposes that there is a worldwide Jewish conspiracy to suppress free speech and force the public to believe the Holocaust and support Israel as a safe haven for Jews.

Irving’s rhetoric is more serious than Zündel’s melodramatic and preachy tone or Hoffman’s sensationalist tone. His web site is inviting and he takes on the role of a tour guide or host. The page entitled “homepage” of the site (not the splash page, but the introduction page) has a drop-list: “Mr. Irving, please take me to…” and there is an extensive list of indexes that sets the user on an adventure into David Irving’s digital library of web documents.

Irving’s rhetorical strategy, which Irving has been known for, is the extraction of quotations and the de-contextualizing of the quotes and the use of them in a new context. This process has been coined de-contextualized quote extraction and re-contextualized quote insertion. Many Holocaust deniers use this method to gain more legitimacy and credibility in their claims. Since Irving’s web site contains the most documents of all Holocaust denial web sites, it is difficult to select two representative documents. His web site is like the Nizkor web site in that it contains a library of thousands of web documents, indexed tightly into subject headings and subdivisions of these subject headings.

The first set of keywords that stands out is from the web site entitled “David Irving’s International Campaign for Real History.” The words “international” and “campaign” allude to a large political movement. In addition, a reoccurring keyword that is used on this site is “real.” Irving has found a simple yet powerful word to describe his research and his political campaign. Irving does not explain what “real” is. It is just inferred that his research and claims are real while the Jews’ claims are lies and fabrication. Like Zündel and Hoffman, he makes references to a Jewish conspiracy of political and social control and the manipulation of the media. Like Zündel,

\[287\] In the Deborah Lipstadt and David Irving libel case in 2000, Irving was found to doctor documents and to take quotations out of context and re-interpret those results as empirical.
Irving is fighting for freedom of speech and like Zündel, Irving feels politically oppressed and victimized. Irving uses powerful titles in other areas of his web site like “David Irving’s Action Report” to describe his pro-active stance on fighting repression that the Jews are causing. These two words “action” and “campaign” are strong keywords. They are political and promote political acts. It is difficult to see how Irving is running a political campaign. He has selected and organized web content that deals with Holocaust denial and Jewish issues, such as Zionism and the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

**Article One: Battleship Auschwitz**

Battleship Auschwitz is a paper Irving presented at the Tenth Annual Revisionist Conference.

Irving starts off by commenting on Mark Weber’s introduction, neglecting to refer to Irving’s “criminal career over the last 12 months.” Irving is attempting to be humourous and cocky when he labels his career “criminal.” The title of Irving’s presentation “Battleship Auschwitz” takes the most infamous of death camps and transforms its significance into a symbol of a warship. The concept of a battleship refers to a fighting army or a fighting organizational unit. The concept of the Battleship Auschwitz represents the Jewish community as fighting to legitimize Auschwitz. On the Zündelsite, there is a caricature of Battleship Auschwitz sinking into the ocean. Irving and Zündel refer to this concept because they both believe that the conceptual idea of Auschwitz is dying and that the key arguments made by Jews about Auschwitz - that it was a concentration camp where Jews were systematically killed, tortured, and gassed - are disappearing from sight. Irving and Zündel both argue that Auschwitz was a work camp and that prisoners died
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from poor hygienic conditions. They claim that there were no gas chambers and that no one died in those alleged gas chambers.

Irving’s essay chronicles his last twelve months and he constructs his paper from a victim’s point of view. He talks about a visit that he was supposed to make to Berlin to take part in a televised roundtable discussion on a “historical matter (I forget what the exact detail was).” Irving mentions this to show how important he is; that he is a member of an elite club of historians. A “roundtable” is a scholarly discussion amongst scholars, which seems to suggest that Irving is a scholar and a professional historian. In reality, Irving has written extensively on World War II history, but he never finished his university undergraduate degree and he is not a trained historian. Irving was later un-invited by the producer after all the “mainstream” historians refused to participate with him. 290 The reader (or listener) can only guess what the roundtable topic would have been.

Irving sets himself up as the victimized historian, an alien or outcast in his profession. He argues that the other historians cannot debate because they are “all on the same wave-length” and they all speak the “same lies.” Irving ended up going to Berlin anyway, assembled some “friends” and staged a protest outside the studio. 291 He credits Zündel as helping establish this network. It is indicative that many Holocaust deniers attempt to make alliances with one another to strengthen their cause.

Irving calls the other historians cowards. This indicates that there is an oppressive force and these historians are controlled by it. Considering what other denial sites preach, it can be inferred that Irving is implying intimidation by Jewish organizations. Irving never mentions Jews or Jewish organizations, but he is always insinuating them.

290 Ibid.
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In the next passage, Irving, not too modestly, proclaims himself a prophet. He claims to have predicted the unification of Germany at a news conference that he gave after the Berlin protest.\textsuperscript{292} Hence he feels his predictions about other matters – i.e. his version of the Nazi Holocaust – will also be proven true. He continues to discuss his speaking tour, during which he was disappointed at the low turnout. However, after he realized that the reason no one showed up was because the Berlin wall had fallen and his prediction was slowly coming true, he felt better.

Irving attributes his forecasting ability to being a great historian. He relates how while speaking to “Major Manfred Kehrig -- head of the Military Archives in Freiburg. One of Germany’s leading military historians, he wrote the standard history of Stalingrad -- a first-rate German historian”. It turned out that Kehrig too knew that Germany would be unified.\textsuperscript{293} Irving links himself to a credible person, which is a common rhetorical technique used by deniers. He claims that this person is on the “same wave-length,” and thus reinforces his own legitimacy. The fact that Kehrig also foresaw the reunification supports Irving’s belief that historians have a better understanding of matters present, past, and future.

Irving tells the story of how he “was smuggled” into a news conference where the publishing of Hitler’s diaries was announced. Irving automatically knew it was a fake diary. Even though all the other German historians claimed that the diary was genuine, Irving claimed the opposite. He confidently speaks of what a world-famous scholar he is on the life of Adolf Hitler. So without even evaluating or analysing the announced diary, he knew it was fake, since he had spent “twenty years of [his] life studing the story of Adolf Hitler.”\textsuperscript{294} His argument is somewhat

\textsuperscript{292} At the time of writing, it was October 3, 1989 and Irving claims that by October 3, 1990 Germany will be re-united.
\textsuperscript{294} Ibid.
fallacious. Even if he is an expert, he cannot know something is fake without seeing it. Perhaps this is another example of his prophetic abilities.

Irving argues that when claims are made about any historical fact, it is important to always conduct proper archival research. He promotes the archives because he believes that they are a source of truth. However, according to Irving, most historians do not conduct any archival research but instead go by what others have written about historical events.

Following this line of reasoning, Irving cites the Leuchter Report. He claims that this document represents the very nature of genuine archival research and factual forensic research. He praises this document as primary evidence that no Jews were gassed at Auschwitz. In addition, since there was no German document that referred to such gassings, then it follows that there were no gassings. Irving fails to acknowledge that the Nazis used code words to refer to the extermination policy and the gassings. He is also playing with words when he writes that there were no German documents because he avoids discussing the possibility of Polish documents (since Auschwitz was located in Poland).

Irving claims that “the idea that the human race was responsible for liquidating six million human beings in gas chambers is the biggest propaganda offensive that the human race has ever known.” Irving is again playing with words when he claims six million Jews were not killed in the gas chambers. Not all six million Jews were killed in gas chambers. They were killed in a variety of ways. Some died of torture, others of poor living conditions, gun shots, burns, human experimentation, and some died in the gas chambers.

The next passage illustrates that even the “crew” of Battleship Auschwitz – those Jews who support the story of the Holocaust – does not agree on the death toll. Irving claims that the crew
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is sinking its own ship by constantly decreasing the Holocaust death toll, from six million to four million, then to one million. He hints the number is probably even lower. Since they disagree, Irving argues that this de-legitimizes their claims that the Holocaust occurred. The image of Battleship Auschwitz sinking is quite powerful as it suggests that all Jews worldwide will suffer a symbolic death if the Holocaust is forgotten. Similarly, further in the text, Irving questions eyewitness accounts of gas chambers in Auschwitz. He dismisses their accounts based on claims that there were gas chambers in Dachau. Since it was found that there were no gas chambers operating there, then eyewitness accounts of gas chambers in Auschwitz must be equally untrue.

According to Irving, the Russians have released forty-six books from Auschwitz that kept track of the number of deaths at the camp between 1942 and 1944. According to Irving, the books show that only 74,000 people died in Auschwitz. Irving then allies himself with Arno Mayer who has criticized Auschwitz and the issue of gas chambers. Irving takes care to inform his readers that Mayer is Jewish and that he is a professor at Princeton University. Mayer wrote that many Jews died of natural causes at concentration camps. Yet it is clearly unnatural to round up people into large camps, provide extremely poor living conditions and little food and work them to death. Based on this statistic, Irving concludes that only “40,000 may have been killed in Auschwitz” over the three years and he trivializes even this number by comparing it to the number of people killed in Hamburg in one night by the British. Moving from a figured six million to forty thousand makes the original number quite exaggerated and makes Jews appear to be liars. Also, no matter what the number, the fact that any Jewish person was killed for simply being Jewish is an act of anti-Semitism and Irving fails to acknowledge and accept that Hitler and the Nazis persecuted Jews.
Irving goes even further and compares the claim of the six million death figure to a customer purchasing six kilos of potatoes in a grocery store. Irving once more trivializes the Holocaust. He might have chosen the potato on purpose because he wants to draw parallels between potatoes – starchy, bulky, cheap, and without (nutritional) value – and Jews. Irving argues that if you only receive two kilos of potatoes but get charged for six, then you are getting ripped off. Irving asserts that the German government is similarly getting ripped off when paying out compensation.

Irving questions the claim that the Nazis destroyed all physical evidence regarding gas chambers. He finds it difficult to believe because surely many carbon copies were made and circulated. Irving is depending solely on the fact that there was no direct language used for the extermination policy. As mentioned before, the Nazis used a set of codewords to refer to the extermination policy.296 Irving also challenges the world to come out with a document to show Hitler knew about Auschwitz and “whatever was going on.”297 Irving is a Hitler sympathizer and tries to exonerate Hitler from any blame.

Later, Irving does address the use of codes. He claims that the British were able to break the Nazi code and knew everything that was happening and being communicated between the camps and Berlin. This information remains confidential “for reasons we […] could only surmise” – a reference perhaps to the Jewish conspiracy. Yet the government seems to have released enough information for Irving’s purposes. He claims that in an appendix to an official history book, the government stated that there are “no references to any gassings in Auschwitz.”298 This statement

297 See http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v10/v10p491_Irving.html
298 Ibid.
can be interpreted in several ways depending on its context and does not necessarily mean that no gassings took place. The gassings were supposed to be secret and undocumented and this might be one reason no references to them were found. Irving praises Professor Hinsley, the man who made the statement, and indicates that he is brave to admit this since anyone who argues against the Holocaust is “prodded off into the crocodile infested seas where the crocodiles swimming around all look remarkably like Simon Wiesenthal.”

Irving continuously employs the Battleship Auschwitz image and claims that it has been steadily cruising, staying afloat for over forty-five years. Irving denies any wrongdoings in Auschwitz, merely labeling it an “Endstation” or “Terminus,” belittling its importance as a death camp. If Auschwitz were a terminus or bus station, then it would be a place where people in transit came and went. Irving proposes that the Battleship will sink when the truth is exposed. It is a denier technique to use metaphor or simile to extend the deeper meaning of something. If Auschwitz were a ship or a terminus (like a bus or train station), then it would symbolize a mode of transportation or a place where people came and went. Irving then discusses a photograph used for a Holocaust documentary in Germany. He calls the documentary “propaganda slime.” He claims that the photo was doctored. The photo of people “pitifully packed into open coal cars” was supposedly showing Romanian Jews being sent to death camps. Yet Irving claims he has looked through the archives at the Hamburg central train station and saw the photo there within a different context. The photo was actually taken one year after the war ended and the people on it

299 Simon Wiesenthal is a Nazi hunter in the United States. For more information, see the official web site for the Simon Wiesenthal Centre at http://www.wiesenthal.com/about/wiesenthal.cfm and at http://www.wiesenthal.com/about/wiesenthal_bio.cfm
300 See http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v10/v10p491_Irving.html
were actually Germans leaving the Hamburg train station to go shopping. Irving does not explain why the German shoppers were packed in open coal cars and not regular passenger trains.

Irving seems to feel that he is truly doing legitimate, objective research. He has done archival research and found the same picture that was supposed to represent Romanian Jews leaving their country in the annals of the Hamburg train station. Some people do have political or ideological agendas and they want to tell stories that are shocking, controversial, and sensational. It is clearly unethical to misrepresent the Holocaust. So if the documentary did take the photograph out of context, that would be wrong – but it is unclear why it would have made such a giant contextual leap. Irving condemns Jews over and over for misrepresenting the Holocaust in all aspects. Ironically, at the same time, he himself is accused of the same error. What's more, Irving has been accused of doctoring documents, taking quotations out of a social context and re-inserting them into a new context (“de-contextualized quote extraction and re-contextualized quote insertion”).

In private, Irving claims, he is friends with all the German historians, but they do not want to associate with him in public. Irving implies that they need him and that they consider him a scholar in the field of German and World War II history. Irving attempts to make alliances with notable, credible historians. He writes of Professor Berndt Martin, his friend of twenty years, who he met with “for a bottle of wine and [...] sat up talking ’til 2 or 3 in the morning.” Irving is trying to illustrate that he is very important in his profession and that his colleagues in Germany actually respect and like him very much. He is trying to show that the roundtable discussion mentioned (at the beginning of his article) was all an act and that in private, German historians admire him.
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Martin apparently disclosed to Irving that the director of the Auschwitz museum admitted that the museum is phony and that it was built to please the tourists. Irving attempts once again to write off the Auschwitz gas chambers. After the war, the Nazis aimed to destroy all evidence of their wrongdoings. So it is true that the gas chambers were recreated for the museum, but that is because they were destroyed after the war. It does not mean that they never existed. The museum’s purpose was to recreate the look and feel of the concentration camp during the war. When Piper supposedly claimed that the gas chambers were built purely for the tourists, it could have been entirely true. The Auschwitz Museum was recreated to illustrate a historical event so that visitors can get an idea of it, much like the Upper Canada Village in Ontario. It is likely Irving took the conversation out of context and fit it into his own political agenda.

Irving’s tone is one of excitement as he reveals that the gas chambers have been falsely constructed. He mentions Martin’s reference to the genuine gas chambers in Birkenau, a camp which is very closely located to Auschwitz. Irving insinuates that if the Auschwitz museum can show “dummies,” then perhaps the other gas chambers were likewise fakes. He then switches tone and sounds upset by the fact that to deny the existence of gas chambers is a crime in Germany. He then describes how he led a street march to celebrate Hitler’s birthday and was detained by the police. He mentions these two events, one after the other, to suggest that the present German criminal code is very pro-Jewish and anti-Hitler. He is dissatisfied with Germany’s capitulation to the Jews and he believes that the Jews are forcing censorship upon the German government.

Irving concludes his article with some last remarks about Battleship Auschwitz. He reiterates his belief that the ship will sink itself. “We can leave it – it will quietly founder all by itself.” He is sure that the Auschwitz “story” will eventually be dismissed and the “entire army of liars” will die out. Irving also mentions that he is working on a biography of Dr. Joseph Goebbels,
the Nazi Propaganda Minister. Irving proudly proclaims that he has received the 1938 Goebbels diaries from the Russians. He does not explain why the Russians would present him with these documents. According to the diaries, various executions and killings were done without Hitler’s permission and Hitler only found out about them many days later. Irving again attempts to exonerate Hitler and attempts to show him in a new light. The diaries show that it was the chief of the Gestapo who ordered a number of deaths be carried out.\textsuperscript{302} Irving claims that although these deaths occurred, Hitler was not aware of them and so he should not be blamed.

In the closing paragraph Irving boasts of obtaining other personal material. He claims he has also obtained letters that were exchanged between Goebbels and his first mistress. His concluding sentence addresses the fact that personal letters and other primary archival information are more credible than second-hand information such as books and journal articles. This might be so, but Irving ignores the fact that during the Nazi era, there was a great deal of censorship. Therefore, documents such as personal letters do not contain references to anything that was censored information. And even official documents might not reveal everything that was going on at the time.

\textbf{Article Two: The Wages of Apostasy: Life under Fire}\textsuperscript{303}

\textsuperscript{302} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{303} See Appendix 4.4.2
The paper entitled “The Wages of Apostasy: Life Under Fire” was presented by Irving at the eleventh annual IHR conference in October 1992 in the United States. The title alludes to the “reward” or “remuneration” one gets for abandoning the traditional dogmas. Irving claims that his life is “under fire” because he does not accept the traditional facts concerning the Holocaust. Irving presents himself as a martyr, someone who has sacrificed his own set of beliefs and someone who has abandoned his faith. The term “The Wages of Apostasy” refers to the risk Irving takes by questioning history and which results in him becoming persecuted. The term “Life Under Fire” refers to Irving as a victim of societal and political control.

In the opening address to the audience, Irving thanks the United States for allowing him to speak. He thanks the US because it is one of the few countries that guarantees him freedom of speech law. This freedom facilitates Irving’s International Campaign for Real History, which he is in the process of waging. As noted earlier, this campaign title appears throughout Irving’s website. It is Irving’s point of view which is “real” and it is his version of “history” which is the most objective. This “history” is actually one historical event: the Holocaust. Since Irving considers himself an authority on Hitler and World War II, he feels he has an impervious case proving that the Jewish point of view on the Holocaust is not only incorrect, but completely false. During his Campaign for Real History, Irving recounts how he is in a constant battle in a campaign against the truth. He presents the audience with a political and social struggle in which he is the good guy. The “international force,” which he does not yet identify as being Jewish, is constructed as the enemy – the oppressor and the suppressor of the truth. The vague term “international force” is used because it can mean any political group and thus cannot be construed as racist.
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Right after discussing this “international force,” Irving regrets how he has opened up a file to report Jewish harassment. He indirectly makes a link so that it is obvious the oppressive force and the Jewish harassment are one and the same. Irving wants sympathy from his audience and sets himself up as the victim of the big, powerful Jewish lobby. After discussing his harassment file, he plays with words in the following statement. “This should not be taken to mean in the slightest, that I am anti-Jewish, because I’m not. The fact that many Jews are anti-Irving does not mean to say that I’m anti-Jewish.” So not only is he a victim, Irving is also a martyr, because even though he suffers harassment and embarrassment at the hands of the Jews, their actions have not turned him into an anti-Semite. He seeks admiration for this and implies that he has the upper hand because he still does not hate them.

The victim complex is further perpetuated when Irving claims that he has been persecuted by the (Jewish) “worldwide campaign” for the previous two years. He gives an account of all the countries into which he is not allowed to enter because of the “worldwide campaign” against him. He discloses that he has been able to secretly enter countries with the help of professional contacts. Due to his scholarly line of work, he has maintained connections with the professional world and with the rich and powerful so he is able to get into places despite prohibitions. Irving does not mean to show off when saying, for example, he has entered Germany illegally over sixty times. Instead, he frames these illegal entries as a necessary counter-action to a senseless persecution. He does not disclose how he manages to get into the countries, but keeps it a mystery. He presents himself in the guise of a mysterious, higher force with secret connections.
Irving’s tone is cocky as he lists all of the trips he has made to the countries that ban him, specifying the number of days he was there and the purpose of his trips. He illustrates how he cannot be stopped and how he continues to successfully speak to large audiences (concerning Holocaust denial) without getting caught or arrested. When he was denied entry into South Africa, Irving claims, there was an outcry from South Africans to hear him speak. He labels this as “another encroachment on freedom of speech.” He stresses the importance of his campaign on the grounds of freedom of speech. He wants his audience to be aware of his alleged popularity and that he is in huge demand as a speaker. In Canada, Irving claims he had a “big speaking tour lined up,” but before his visit, he received a letter informing him that he was prohibited from entering the country. The Canadian government felt Irving would likely commit a criminal offense if he entered. Irving points out the fact that he had entered Canada numerous times before and never committed a crime. He seems to forget that many people consider his speeches and actions anti-Semitic and him to be a propagator of hate. Therefore, he would be a veritable threat to the Jewish community in Canada.

Irving continues to discuss his travels, noting that he speaks many languages and works in various archives around the world. He provides another example of persecution with his trip to Rome, where he was invited by a university professor. Again, Irving aims to identify himself as a sought-after, well respected scholar. In Rome, he was taken into custody by the police and interrogated. He describes how during his detention he “hadn’t understood” a word of Italian, and […] made them speak English.” His tone is once again arrogant and he mocks the police officer whom he goaded. Irving then speaks of his experience in Argentina. He participated in a TV program with a man named Maurizio Maro who turned out to be Maurizio Goldfarb. Irving felt tricked for not being told his interviewer was Jewish. It is unclear why he is upset since Holocaust
deniers often emphasize their desire for debate. Irving illustrates the nature of their argument and portrays Goldfarb as a hysterical, manipulative, and overly emotional Jew. When Goldfarb holds Hitler responsible for all the deaths of World War II, Irving argues that if Hitler was a criminal, then George Bush (senior) was a “major criminal because of the damage he did in the Gulf War.” Irving trivializes Hitler’s role by minimizing, if not obliterating, his responsibility for WWII. After this interview, Irving claims all of his other media appointments in Argentina were canceled. The Argentinean government warned the public that Irving was an “International Agitator.” Irving mocks Jews for being overly sensitive. His tone is sarcastic and he concludes by saying that his “job is to go there and lecture on the historical truth as [he sees] it.” Once more, he uses coded terms – “historical truth” – instead of factual ones – the Holocaust.

In the next passage, Irving claims that he is allowed to be wrong. He attempts to appear vulnerable and open-minded by acknowledging he may be wrong. He claims that if he can admit an error, then Jews should be able to debate the Holocaust. He questions why any event in world history can be debated except for the Holocaust. He claims that if anyone disagrees or disputes a Jewish issue, then he/she will be labeled an anti-Semite. Irving suggests a Jewish conspiracy; that if an issue is not found acceptable by world Jewish leaders, then it is not accepted by anyone or the person is labeled an anti-Semite. Irving attempts to show that anti-Semitism is not a serious issue because the term has been over-used.

Similar to the previous article, here too Irving claims that he is in possession of certain historical documents. Irving wants to convey his importance and reputation as a notable scholar who was able to access rare archival photos that were hidden from the world. He published these photos of the destruction of a small German town in his book Hitler’s War. Irving praises himself for the numerous colour photos in the book and the fact that “our traditional enemies were
absolutely livid because of this book.” “Our traditional enemies” is a code for those who disagree with him. They are traditional because they believe the mainstream version of the Holocaust. It is more progressive in these times to be non-traditional. In a sense, the concept of tradition implies stagnant, non-progressive, backward, intolerant, and dormant.

Irving tells how he personally delivered his book to different booksellers and stores across the country and around the world. In response, the “traditional enemies” (the Jews) visited every store and demanded the removal of the book. Since the bookstores were “not open to intimidation” and refused, they had their windows broken. The following day the Jewish Board of Deputies or the local synagogue would claim responsibility. The whole story sounds absurd. Why would the book not be delivered by mail? Perhaps because the post office refused to deliver it. How did Jews “demand” the removal of the book? Often, when there is a controversial book, people who are offended by it will ask stores not to stock it. For example, a recent book about Karla Homolka was at the centre of such a debate. People rarely resort to violence to achieve their goal. The window-smashing seems to be a reference to Kristallnacht. If so, Irving is inverting the victim and the aggressor roles. Finally, it is unlikely synagogues would promote violent behaviour, no matter who the target. There are also no cited references to any news article to support Irving’s claims. According to Irving, all local British newspapers reported the mass window smashings, but these incidents were not reported by any national British newspapers. If such a large-scale event occurred, it would have been reported at the national level. Irving claims that the reason it was not is that the The Times in London is led by a Jewish journalist, a “spineless, nasty little
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It is clear that even though Irving claims he is not anti-Semitic, he does have strong hateful feelings toward Jews.

Irving further de-legitimizes newspaper articles by claiming that whatever is said about him is news today and recycled tomorrow. He claims that a newspaper holds no authority or importance, only sensational news for a day.

“When I write a book it goes into a library and stays there--especially if it’s on acid-free paper. What a journalist writes for the Sunday Times appears on Sunday but by Monday it’s wrapping fish n’ chips. So who cares? Or if it’s not wrapping fish n’ chips, the paper’s being recycled to be made into new newsprint for new lies.”

As maintained by Irving, newspapers lack authority and only books should be considered as serious scholarship. Irving fails to acknowledge that most public and academic libraries collect local and national newspaper for years in print and microfilm or microfiche format. Some newspaper indexes are in electronic format and index the full text of newspaper articles from years back.

The last series of passages refer to “the height of [Irving’s] South African speaking tour.” He claims to have spoken at meeting after meeting and addressing packed halls with a usual crowd of two thousand people. His attitude is arrogant, as if he was one of the most popular historians. He claims to have received a fax from a South African journalist asking about one of the meetings. She had heard that “the meeting was of a Neo-Nazi nature. Complete with Nazi banners and Nazi
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salutes.” She wanted to hear what Irving had to say. He explains to the audience that he had to think over his answer since no matter what he wrote, the newspaper would “print lies.” So he replied with wit and sarcasm. He describes how as he “marched in, an orchestra struck up the Slaves’ Chorus from Verdi’s opera, “Aida.” Later, the orchestra played the first bars of Franz Liszt’s “Les Preludes,” and it concluded with Liszt’s Opus 63 String Quartet. He exaggerates the event for dramatic effect. He continues by saying that “searchlight banners stationed around the Goodwood Civic Centre lit up, their crystal beams joining in a cathedral of ice ten thousand feet above the site; a thousand hands were once more flung aloft in the holy salute, and a thousand throats roared the Horst Wessel anthem.” His letter is indeed humorous, but it simply masks the fact that his discourse at the meeting, like his speech here, probably contained anti-Semitic elements. Irving is not overtly racist. His persona as a Holocaust denier is sarcastic, witty, arrogant, and confident. This is his dramatic role. He is a condescending scholar who puts others down and plays up his own reputation. Throughout these two essays, Irving appears confident and sure of himself and this is one of his methods for capturing his audience and attaining credibility.

Analysis of Graphics

Irving’s web site has very few graphics and the ones that exist are well hidden. Within his highly organized indexes there exists an index of articles on the origins of anti-Semitism. The following graphic was found at http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/02/10/cartoon8.html:
Irving explains that this graphic is a Russian cartoonist's view of “that shitty little country,” which is an allusion to Israel. When one clicks on the thumbnail to the image, there is a short paragraph explaining why Israel is known as the birthplace of all civilization.

“Find your birthmark, but it is actually a pun on the word “rodina.” The word means “homeland,” or “land of one's birth,” and “rodinka” (the diminutive used here) means “birthmark,” (that is, “a little something you're born with”) but it could also be a diminutive of rodina, i.e., “little homeland.” So the caption can also be understood as “Find your little homeland.””

The author (who is not Irving) situates the Middle East on the body [the buttock], explaining that this area represents the birthmark or birthplace of the world. In a negative sense, he situating Israel on the anus where excrement leaves. This image is rather disturbing, but Irving’s Holocaust denial discourse centres on an anti-Zionist perspective in an attempt to uncover a Jewish conspiracy.

Another graphic found at the index entitled “The origins of anti-Semitism” is a cartoon of the Western Wall, which is a wall in Jerusalem where religious Jews pray and write small prayers that they place in the cracks of the wall. In the cartoon, the word “HATE” is embedded in the
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stone wall and two figures are praying in front of it. The small footer notes, “Worshipping their God.” This image is insulting to Israel and to Jews. It suggests that the Jewish religion and its belief system are built on hating others. The image suggests that the origins of anti-Semitism are constructed by Jews and that anti-Semitism was created to create a false sense of victimhood. In addition to other conspiracy theories, Irving believes that the Jewish religion is exclusive and it is built on hate and discriminatory practices.

Carlos Whitlock Porter’s Made in Russia: The Holocaust

Brief Description

Carlos Whitlock Porter’s web site was chosen based on its popularity and because it is the only Holocaust denier web site that is overtly racist. This site is very simple and its main goal is to promote Porter and his book Made in Russia: The Holocaust. The book is available on the site as a free download. However, the quality is extremely poor.

The book was written after Porter had conducted ten years of archival research. It is composed of photocopies of the Nuremburg Trial transcripts and related archival material and attempts to prove that gas chambers, human soap, vacuum chambers, human hair mattresses, electrical chambers, trees as murder weapons, etc. are all blatant bits of fiction constructed by Jews. Porter attempts to prove that the Nazis committed no war crimes against the Jews, but rather, it was Russians who forged documents falsely implicating the Germans. Porter also claims that the Holocaust is an expensive lie that costs tax payers millions of dollars. For this reason he coins the two terms Holocaust and Hoaxoclast. Porter is the only Holocaust denier who uses this alternative spelling and this is one of the reasons why this web site is considered racist. Using a
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dollar sign instead of an “s” is offensive and insulting to the Jewish community. It distorts the meaning of the Holocaust and infers that this tragic event has become simply a vehicle for making profit.

Analysis

Porter’s web site is significantly smaller than Zündel’s or the IHR’s. It is divided into sections such as Statement of Purpose, Book Reviews, and Letters Page. There are links to other revisionist sites and while there is no retail section, there are links to Zündel’s bookstore as well as many other online bookstores and publishing houses that sell Porter’s books, videos, and articles.

The site contains a library of over a hundred revisionist articles and graphics, mostly anti-Zionist and anti-Semitic. Most are written or compiled by Porter, but are not organized in any particular fashion. They are merely a smorgasboard of text and images amassed in a long list. When sifting through the articles, one will notice that they resemble streams of consciousness or rants. There are no proper references or citations. The text is not constructed into sentences but rather into lists, and there is a lack of coherence. Furthermore, Porter deceives the web user through the use of misleading or controversial essay titles. The content of the essays does not pertain to their titles. For example, “Human soap-American style” seems to pertain to the myth that human fat was processed into soap during the Holocaust. When the article is accessed, however, it discusses abortion. The title is misleading and deceptive even though Porter claims that there is an association between aborting fetuses and making human soap.

Porter’s web site is different from other Holocaust denial web sites in many ways. Porter introduces himself as a professional translator of German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese and a Holocaust denier. He does not claim to be a historian, a sociologist, or a scholar and does
not profess to hold any degrees. He also does not focus on his right to free speech and does not defend the controversy between the terms Holocaust Revisionist and Holocaust Denier. He uses the terms synonymously. This is unique as “denier” is usually defined as negative, but Porter seems to accept this label. Lastly, none of the other denial sites contain blatantly hateful phrases or words. This site, on the other hand, is very aggressive and bigoted in tone. There are no burning Magen Davids\textsuperscript{310} or any symbolic graphical allusions to anti-Semitism, but Porter does not shy away from anti-Semitic rhetoric. As a result, the site lacks authority and legitimacy.

Porter claims that the Holocaust is the “stupidest lie” and the “biggest lie” in history and that it is a tactic to make the world feel eternal guilt and a way for Jews to receive restitution through monetary measures. Similar to many other deniers, Porter has grievances against Israel because he is of the opinion that there is too much money being given to Jews and to Israel. He argues that Germany has paid exorbitant reparations to the Jews and to Israel. He claims that Hitler’s crimes were not exceptional and that the technology of the gas chambers is inaccurate and false. Like other deniers, Porter argues that gas chambers were not used to murder Jews. Porter maintains that this lie was perpetrated by several historians.

The mission statement is a five-page rant that indicates Porter's strong dislike for the Jewish community. He argues that Jews have always been liars. He claims that “eye witness” and survivor “fairy tales” were foisted on a gullible world by B.S. Holokostovitch and Co. Through the words of B.S. Holokostovitch and Co, he clearly displays anti-Semitism. Evidently, Holokostovitch is not a real person or company, but was constructed by the merging of two words Holocaust and “vitch,” a stereotypical ending for many Jewish last names. B.S. may denote the slang word bullshit.

\textsuperscript{310} A Magen David is the Star of David. For more information see the Jewish Encyclopedia article on the origins of the Magen David at \url{http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=38&letter=M&search=magen%20david}
The following excerpt is from the splash page:

“It is time for the citizens of our 'democratic' Western slave states to speak out, whether the Jews like it or not. The fact is that the 'Nazi gas chambers' (which serve as the pretext for the present system of tyranny) never existed. The impossibility of their functioning in the manner described has been repeatedly proven in expert chemical and engineering reports to which our slave masters have no answer. The ruling classes (in Germany and elsewhere) cannot prove the existence of any 'Nazi gas chamber'; they don't even try. All they do is fine and imprison all those who dare to defend the honour of the German people.”

Porter, like Zündel, creates an interplay of images; of the slave and the slave masters. He uses a great deal of sarcasm and melodrama. He claims that the democratic western world is actually under Jewish enslavement and that anyone who questions Jewish tyranny by probing into the accepted version of the Holocaust is persecuted.

Porter’s tone is sarcastic and bitter. I will analyse two representative articles from the site. Most of my analysis will focus on Porter’s word selection, tone, taking excerpts from his articles.

**Article One: Human Soap-American Style**

The title of this piece is misleading. When users access the document, they are directed to an article whose first half contains a series of images depicting aborted fetuses. Initially, it is difficult to understand why Porter is linking “human soap” with abortion. The images seem to
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have nothing to do with the Holocaust. But soon, the focus of the essay becomes apparent. Porter speaks about the Jewish influence on abortion and exposes his extreme right-wing values through his anti-abortion ideologies. For Porter, abortion is murder. He displays the remains of aborted fetuses and entitles it “Human soap-American style” to make comparisons between the Jewish Holocaust and how Jewish doctors abort babies today. Porter uses the inversion technique to reverse blame.

After scores of disturbing pictures, Porter begins his lecture. His manner is melodramatic and exaggerated. His tone is aggressive, like a protest or a rant. The essay is unstructured and lacks punctuated sentences. Porter argues that if Jews ask for restitution because of the Holocaust, then they must accept responsibility for the “murder of 50 million children by abortion.” Porter uses the rhetoric of “suffer the consequences.” He claims that since Jews have had the power and privilege to construct their reality as victims, then they must take responsibility for the killing of unborn children. The text belittles the Holocaust by using phrases such as “Hoaxoco$t museums and monuments,” “Hoaxoco$t horror stories, docudramas, and “propaganda.””

Not only does Porter draw parallels between the Holocaust and abortions, he also states that “…our Jewish “democracies” have now become the exact mirror image of the (largely imaginary) “Nazi” society.” Porter insists that this is a Jewish conspiracy. It is in fact Jews who are creating Nazi societies. All the evil things Germans are alleged to have done are actually being done by Jews in today’s democratic societies. Porter points out issues such as media censorship, the destruction of religious traditions, and unethical medical experiments. He maintains that they exist today, but did not exist in so-called Nazi Germany. Although the essay is mainly a pro-life text, Porter manages to turn it into an issue of Jews as the world’s resident evil.

Like Zündel and Irving, Porter is a Hitler sympathizer. He declares “Whatever Hitler did to the Jews, he was a saint compared to the people that are doing this.” The “people” are Jews, and “this” is abortion. Porter shifts the blame even further from Hitler and claims that these Jews who support “capitalism” and “individual rights” (quotes are Porter’s) have murdered more people than Stalin. Communists are bad, but Nazis are good. Porter again reiterates that the Holocaust never happened and was made up for “cold, cold cash.” The text frames (American) Jews as hypocrites and liars.

Porter does not debate the issue of abortion. It is a given that abortion equals murder. He does not provide statistics to show that abortions are performed solely by Jewish doctors, but implies it throughout the text. When speaking about abortion, Porter only cites Jewish “abortophiles” and pro-choice individuals, which makes the text very one-sided. Surely, not only Jews are involved in the pro-choice movement, but reading Porter’s article, it would seem that this was the case. Porter also names various Jewish organizations that are pro-choice. He writes, “Jews enjoy freedom from genocide -- but have led the drive for legalizing the slaughter of preborn children, a uniquely Modernistic form of ritual child murder on a massive scale.” This is a reference to an old myth according to which Jews ate Gentile children. Porter reinforces the image of Jews as monsters and murderers.

Throughout the article, Porter’s rhetoric sounds very fanatical. His claims are unsupported by tangible evidence and do not appear to be justifiable by logic. He throws out quotations from other authors, but fails to provide proper citations. His long-winded accusations and comments also discredit him as being a legitimate information provider.

On the whole, Porter’s statements on abortion are very detached from Holocaust denial. Yet through this text we can see Porter as someone who is not only pro-life, but also anti-Jewish. Not
only does he blame Jews for the legalization of abortion by the selection of a specific set of data, but he also accuses them for the bulk of the world’s problems.

**Article Two: In Praise of AIDS**

This essay is longer and is divided into three parts: the body, notes, and supplementary notes. Porter uses irony and wit in his sentences and attempts to be humorous through the use of repetitive expressions at the end of sentences such as "no problem." He uses a great deal of statistics, but does not cite where he retrieved the information. The essay criticizes liberals for being accepting of non-whites, homosexuality, and AIDS. It also praises the power of “exponential doubling” and provides different calculations to determine when the world’s non-white population will be wiped out by AIDS.

Porter uses the term “liberal” twenty-three times in the text but fails to define who he means. As one reads through the text, there are subtle hints to suggest that Porter uses it as a coded term for Jews. His comments regarding liberals resemble comments he makes regarding Jews in his article “Human soap–American style.” These include referring to liberals’ concerns for “civil rights” (quotes are Porter’s) and to liberals being the enemies of revisionism. Porter dismisses the liberal vision of equality. He states “liberalism is a form of progressive mental illness which may be defined as a form of moral coprophilia.”

Porter believes the white race is the superior race.
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and the non-white race is better off extinct. The text sets up two race categories – white and non-white – but generally means whites and blacks.

The first part of the essay is a satirical comparison of the growth of AIDS and the increase of the non-white population. Porter continuously uses the same set of terms: liberals, Jews, Negroes, non-whites, and race-mixers. We can see that these terms are associated with race and Porter situates his essay around the assumption that AIDS is a disease that stems from and is spread by minorities. He makes his view of non-whites evident by referring to them as “parasitic scum” and “negroes.” The latter term is considered racist and politically incorrect in our present time. Thus someone repeatedly uses the term, it can be inferred that they want to make their prejudice unmistakable.

Porter’s racism is further made obvious when he states that “[s]ince AIDS promises to wipe out the race-mixers, it follows that AIDS is the white man's best friend. The way things are going, we might end up alone on the planet -- reduced in numbers, perhaps, but of distinctly higher quality.” Porter makes the assumption that AIDS is a disease that only affects non-whites. Therefore it will only eliminate the non-white race, an idea Porter welcomes. He further suggests that those who try to find a cure for the disease are the white race’s enemy. He asserts “scientists and researchers working on a cure for AIDS are the world's worst threat to white race survival, and should be dealt with as race traitors.” Porter does not think that non-whites contribute anything to society. In fact, he feels that they are parasites and take advantage of the white race. He calls them “pimps, drug pushers, and rapists.” He seems to be concluding that if the non-white race was done away with, crime would also vanish.

---

317 As discussed in chapter 4, Jews are either considered to have a race of their own or to be non-white or “liberal.”
318 See http://www.cwporter.com/INPRAISEOFAIDS.htm
Jews are rarely mentioned in the text, but Porter does state that “since AIDS is a disease of minority groups, the only concern of the liberals, predictably enough, is to protect their “civil rights”.” Porter explains that the first step of the equality movement was to make no distinction between Jews and non-Jews. This led to equality between races, sexes, and nationalities. It also made homosexuality and AIDS acceptable. So if the concept of equality for people with AIDS was to be abandoned, a domino effect would ensue whereby Jews would lose their current individual rights. Porter argues that this is why the principle of equality is being upheld. He suggests that liberals should take their idea of equality even further and should make no distinction between people infected with AIDS and people who have died of AIDS. Liberals should be taken to cemeteries and “‘integrated’ with their dead friends.”

In his notes section Porter claims that

“it is now officially admitted that, in the past 20 years, 750,000 Americans have contracted AIDS, and that 450,000 of them have died, most of them presumably black or (that Holy of Holies) homosexual. This is 10 times the number of whites murdered by blacks since the “Civil Rights” movement began, but only 1% of the number of white children murdered by Jewish, lesbian, or homosexual abortionists since 1973. Fortunately, Jews have very high abortion rates, and relatively high AIDS rates.”

Here too, Porter fails to mention where he retrieved his data and statistics. He compares AIDS deaths to white deaths and is satisfied that more blacks have died as a result of AIDS than whites have died at the hands of blacks. Yet when Porter compares AIDS deaths to the number of

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
abortions, he finds that many more white children have died than Jews and homosexuals. Not only is it arguably unreasonable to compare death by AIDS to death by abortion, it is totally ridiculous to suggest abortionists are all either Jewish or non-heterosexual. Porter comforts himself and the reader by the claim that abortion and AIDS will kill off Jews. It is again made evident that Porter does not consider Jews part of the white race and that he is very much anti-Jewish.

Porter makes vast generalizations and the whole purpose of his essay is unclear. He is provocative with his words and uses sordid humour to make social commentary. Other than expose his racism and other bigoted attitudes, Porter’s article accomplishes little, except perhaps to make rational readers question America’s First Amendment.

Committee for the Open Debate of the Holocaust (CODOH)320

Brief Description

The Committee for the Open Debate on the Holocaust (hereafter CODOH) is an organization which attempts to debate the Holocaust. Bradley R. Smith is a writer who owns and operates its web site. The site was chosen because Smith is a controversial figure and also because of the site’s popularity, lifespan, size, design, organization, and highly indexed position on all major search engines. It is an ideological web site.

Analysis

The CODOH site is one of the largest and most comprehensive revisionist web sites in terms of information management, design, and appearance. It is organized into 24 sections including: Free Speech Online Blue Ribbon Campaign, Introductory Holocaust Revisionism, The Revisionist E-Zine, and Biography of Bradley R. Smith. Each section is divided into sub-sections.

320 See http://www.codoh.com
that are hyperlinked to specific web pages. However, the web site is only available in English. For this reason, many of Smith’s sections are partnered with Germar Rudolf’s VHO where documents can be accessed in French and German.\textsuperscript{321} CODOH International is a special section that lists articles, reviews, editorials, essays, reports, and other research written in several languages such as Turkish, Swedish, Arabic, Russian, and Italian. The site also contains a book list, bookstore, and information about intellectual freedom and freedom of speech, the very issues that support revisionist claims.

The three keywords in the title of the organization – “committee,” “open,” and “debate” denote scholarly inquiry. Smith refrains from using the term “denial” or “revisionism” because both terms may have negative implications. He uses terms that are used in the field of education like debate and committee. Smith also employs something he calls “The Campus Project,” a recruiting technique where he pays for ads to be published in university papers in the USA. These ads claim that anyone who can prove gas chambers existed will receive $50,000.

In Smith’s opening statement, he recognizes that the Nazi era was anti-Semitic. However, he does not believe that there was a scientific plan to exterminate Jews using gas chambers. He believes, as do most other Holocaust revisionists, that European Jews died of starvation and of poor health. Like many other Holocaust deniers, Smith is convinced much of the Holocaust is a fabrication. He does not deny that German war crimes occurred, but he rejects the existence of gas chambers.

Smith resembles a kind, non-threatening, elderly gentleman and does not appear to be anti-Semitic or racist. He claims that if users find anything incorrect or offensive on his site, he will

\textsuperscript{321} VHO is an acronym for Vrij Historisch Onderzoek. It is not known what this means. The organization was founded by Germar Rudolf and its English name is Castle Hill Publishers or The European Foundation for Free Historical Research. It can be accessed at \url{http://www.vho.org}
remove it immediately. Similar to Irving, Smith compiles many articles from various authors and scholars but does not write a great deal himself. Unlike Hoffman, who goes off topic and attacks different Jewish-related issues, Smith focuses on the Holocaust. There is a section called the CODOH Newsdesk that features articles from around the world that pertain to the Holocaust. The site also includes a section called Smith's Report. This “report” is Bradley Smith's personal newsletter. Published since 1990, it has grown from an informational letter to friends and supporters to a global revisionist newsletter. Each issue contains news, articles, latest CODOH projects, and other events in the world of revisionism.

Similarly to the “Friends and Foes” section of the Zündelsite, Smith has a list of links to other Holocaust denial web sites. It is common for revisionist sites to recognize their colleagues by including information such as biographies and photographs. This ensures unity. Smith’s list of genocidalist web sites (i.e. pro-Holocaust) is the same as lists on other Holocaust denial web sites. It includes organizations such as The Anti-Defamation League, The Jewish Defense League, and The Nizkor Project.

Most of the materials on Smith’s web site are online articles written by a variety of authors and scholars and people who claim to be specialists in the field. It should be noted that within Holocaust denial web sites in general, many articles are written by authors with Jewish sounding last names in order to attain credibility and legitimacy. For example, there are some articles authored by people with last names like Shapiro, Littman, or Zimmerman. Since many Holocaust deniers (like Zündel) have had many pseudonyms, it could be argued that some deniers are the actual ghost writers behind these Jewish sounding authors.
Article One: The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum: A Challenge

The first essay was written by a famous French Holocaust denier, Dr. Robert Faurisson. He is introduced as “Europe’s leading Holocaust Revisionist” and his authority is further publicized by a mention of his professorship at the University of Lyon in France. The introduction does not mention that he was removed from his chair because he was charged and convicted with libel, racial defamation and incitement of racial hatred.

The article discusses how the creation of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum presents a conflict because some of the exhibits inside are bogus and artificially constructed. The title of the article suggests that Faurisson is presented with an obstacle, the museum, and that it is his challenge to expose the museum as a fake.

The first passage seems to offer some objectivity. Faurisson argues that the gas chamber debate is a key issue because “[i]f the gas chambers existed, they provide evidence that the Germans attempted to physically exterminate the Jews; on the other hand, if they didn’t exist, we have no evidence of such an extermination attempt.” In fact, Faurisson is essentially trivializing the Holocaust by oversimplification. He makes the gravity of it be contingent on the existence of gas chambers, which, as expected, he quickly dismisses in the text. Faurisson labels himself a scholar, but fails to be open and objective. He rejects and denies that an extermination policy was put in place, due to the fact that he has found no evidence of homicidal gas chambers. His conclusions are rigid and he is not open to doing empirical research. Like most deniers, he already

322 See http://www.codoh.com/gcgv/gcfaur.html
has a political and ideological bias and uses research results that suggest this. His ideas are set
against an anti-Semitic backdrop.

Faurisson complains that the Holocaust Memorial Museum cost U.S. taxpayers $150
million dollars even though the only evidence of a gas chamber is the casting. Furthermore, the
casting that is on display is in reality a delousing gas chamber, not a homicidal gas chamber.
Following this declaration, Faurisson recalls the challenge he put out to the Swedish media to
provide him with proof about gas chambers. He does not disclose why he launched such a
challenge in Sweden. Although he was ignored by the media, Faurisson confidently and arrogantly
relates that his “Stockholm Challenge” was successful and put to shame the world Jewish
community. He speaks of the “embarrassment” and “frenzied agitation” of Jewish organizations
following this incident. The “challenge” was renewed in the US the day before the Holocaust
Museum was to be dedicated.

Faurisson frames his struggle as if he were a political fighter who has been oppressed by
the media. He also attempts to establish his scholarly objectivity. He claims to have searched for
a “physical representation of the magical gas chamber” for over thirty years. Yet, he has found
nothing but illusions which cannot be taken seriously. Faurisson’s tone possesses a great deal of
certainty and confidence. This helps to give the text more credibility.

In the next passage, Faurisson claims that Zyklon B and HCN (Hydrogen Cyanide) are
both very dangerous chemicals and they would have posed health risks for everyone in the camps
if used. He claims that it would have been impossible to remove the corpses from the chambers
because the HCN absorbs into the skin and the body. He cites his own scientific-sounding
research, although he is neither a chemist nor an engineer.
Faurisson’s arrogant demeanor continues when he restates his desire for proof. He “warns” museum officials not to provide him with forgeries in the form of delousing gas chambers or shower rooms and that he is “even less interested in […] a pile of shoes, a bundle of hair, or a heap of eyeglasses.” This is another example of Holocaust diminishing. Faurisson is not satisfied “debating” gas chambers, he also disparages symbols of the dehumanization that took place at Nazi concentration camps.

In the section entitled “Evasion and Trickery,” Faurisson suggests that the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum is tricking the public by giving false representations of historical objects from the Nazi era. He criticizes three photographs from a book describing the contents of the museum. Faurisson explains that the photographs are doctored and that the museum is playing a “trick” on the American public. These claims are similar to Michael Hoffman’s claim that there is a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. Both men attempt to expose the Jewish community as tricksters, liars, and collaborators of a Jewish conspiracy. Faurisson might in fact be using the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum as a codeword for American Jewish organizations.

Although Faurisson accepts that the Germans used Zyklon B gas as an insecticide he does not accept that they used it to murder prisoners. He claims that the gas was used to kill lice. He does not provide proof or evidence other than his own research and the Leuchter Report.

In addition, Faurisson cites Jean-Claude Pressac, a non-revisionist Holocaust scholar. Faurisson interprets Pressac’s results as an “admission.” This word suggests that it is a hidden falsehood that is exposed or uncovered. Faurisson selects this term because he argues that the world Jewish community is hiding facts and that Pressac is one of the few people to admit the truth. Pressac writes that the room that Michael Berenbaum, the Holocaust Memorial Museum’s
Research Institute Director,\textsuperscript{324} describes as a homicidal gas chamber can also be described as a delousing chamber. Faurisson concludes that the gas chamber description by Berenbaum is actually a description of a delousing chamber and he uses Pressac as support for his claims. Like many other Holocaust deniers, Faurisson takes quotes out of context from legitimate Holocaust scholars and places them in a newly constructed context that suit his own arguments.

The next passage is entitled “A New Advance for Revisionism,” yet there do not appear to be any advances in Faurisson’s analysis. He indicates that “Berenbaum is an adjunct professor at Georgetown University. Where a historian was required, a theologian was chosen - which is appropriate because, for some years now, in the place of the history of the “Holocaust,” Jewish organizations have substituted the religion of the “Holocaust.””\textsuperscript{325} Faurisson tries to delegitimize Berenbaum by claiming that he lacks any scholarly authority since he is a theologian, not a historian. This argument is somewhat weakened by the fact that Faurisson himself is neither a historian nor a chemist, but has placed himself in both these roles. Like Hoffman, Faurisson claims that the Holocaust has become a religion whose dogma is shoved down people’s throats. He further claims that the central pillar of this religion is the existence of the gas chambers. Since there were no gas chambers, as demonstrated by his research, Faurisson feels he is the victor.

Given that the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum would not exist without the American taxpayers’ money, Faurisson demands “a little more intellectual honesty and sanity” in the portrayal of WWII events on their behalf. These two key concepts of honesty and sanity infer that Jews are dishonest and insane. A common image that Holocaust deniers spread is the hysterical Jewish personality. Faurisson brings up Berenbaum’s admission that he “ended up in the analyst’s chair” as a result of being surrounded by death in the museum. Faurisson attacks this statement

\textsuperscript{324} Berenbaum wrote the book that delves into the collection of the museum and describes each exhibit.

\textsuperscript{325} See http://www.codoh.com/ggev/gcfaur.html
and comments that Berenbaum will really end up in therapy when he realizes he has deceived the American people.

Faurisson fails to acknowledge any Jewish suffering during World War II. He claims to be debating only the existence of gas chambers, but is dismissing all Jewish persecution. His tone in this article is that of an arrogant scholar. He believes that he has realized a victory and has embarrassed world Jewry by “exposing” them as tricksters and liars regarding the existence of gas chambers. Faurisson concludes his article by showing his alliance to other Holocaust deniers – a rhetorical strategy to give readers a sense of community and cohesiveness. He thanks Ahmed Rami, the IHR, and Ernst Zündel.

The inclusion of this article on Smith’s web site suggests that the CODOH web site is not only ideological but political as well. Bradley R. Smith is not only fighting for free speech and intellectual freedom as his mandate suggests. He also does not support the creation and development of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

**Article Two: The Good, The Bad, and the Anti-Semitic**

In “The Good, The Bad, and the Anti-Semitic,” the author attacks the concept of anti-Semitism. The author, who remains unknown, argues that anyone who doubts or disbelieves the Holocaust is labeled anti-Semitic. He/She also dismisses the anti-Semitism label as a weapon used by Jews to sabotage those who do not agree with their political or ideological views. Finally, the author suggests that anti-Semitism should not be taken seriously because so many Jews are themselves considered anti-Semites.

The title of the article is provocative and almost ambiguous in meaning. The author may be referring to the film “The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly” and may be playing with words by

---

replacing the word “ugly” with “Anti-Semitic.” Given that one of the article’s foci is Jewish anti-Semites, the term “anti-Semitic” in the title might be referring to the Jew him/herself.

The opening argument is that the anti-Semite label is “routinely attached to anyone openly doubting or outrightly questioning the tabloid version of the Holocaust story.” Even the Jewish scholar Arno Mayer is considered an anti-Semite for “his mild flirtations with revisionist themes.” Right away, the author tries to establish the irrationality of the term. Referring to Jewish scholars and personalities is common among Holocaust denial authors who make such alliances to strengthen their own positions. They name Jews who are critical of world Jewry, who are anti-Semitic or anit-Zionist in order to appear more credible. Many give the example of Norman Finkelstein or Noam Chomsky who they can identify with because they promote free speech. The author here gives an example of a Jewish anti-Semite to downplay some of the impact and negativity surrounding the concept of anti-Semitism.

The author claims that the term “anti-Semite” is overused and exploited to control free speech.

“Unfortunately for organized Jewry, familiarity not only breeds contempt, but meaninglessness as well; and that shopworn “anti-Semite” nametag, because of its promiscuous use by those seeking to fix the parameters of debate on the Holocaust and a score of other Zionist or Jewish related issues, has by now reached a saturation point where the very term has ceased to have any real, definitive meaning; having instead been turned into a kind of

327 Mayer wrote *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The “Final Solution” in History*, a scholarly text critiquing the Holocaust. Mayer is Jewish and an established historian. Holocaust deniers consider him an idol because he critiques the existence of gas chambers at Auschwitz.


329 I am not suggesting that Chomsky or Finkelstein are anti-Semitic but they are very critical of Jewish issues such as Israeli politics, Zionism, and freedom of speech regarding Holocaust discourse.
smear artist’s paintbrush, which organized Jewry can use to tar its critics and opponents in order to discredit them as bigots and hate mongers.”

The image of a “shopworn nametag” is very powerful because it suggests how unimportant and futile this term is. Although a nametag identifies a person, it is incredibly superficial. Store employees can choose not to have their real name disclosed, so the nametag can be like a mask, where a person can pretend to be someone they are not. It is not official identification, but a loose, informal nameplate that attempts to bridge the communication gap between clerk and customer.

The author also claims that anti-Semitism is a tool and describes it as a “smear artist’s paintbrush” that is used to ruin the reputation of people who are anti-Jewish or anti-Israel. It is interesting how deniers lump Israeli politics and world Jewish politics together with the word “or” as though the two were interchangeable. From this passage, it is clear that the author is attacking the concept of anti-Semitism as a unique form of discrimination and like other Holocaust deniers he/she is degrading the significance of any Jewish hatred or discrimination against Jews.

The anti-Semitic label is discussed in regards to Holocaust revisionist literature. The author recalls that when the CBC interviewed a Jewish lobbyist he stated that Holocaust denial materials should not be censored in libraries, but should be placed in a separate section called “anti-Semitica.” The term anti-Semitica might be a term coined by this author in reaction to the term “Judaica” to describe books with Jewish content. The author might be using a play on words to mock and degrade the significance of anti-Semitism. The author argues that this separation and categorization of material as anti-Semitic carries a negative stigma. He/She believes that this is a “wholesale smear job,” referring to librarians and publishers pre-judging Holocaust denial texts

---

and classifying them as anti-Semitic, thus placing them in a negative category before the reader picks up the book and makes a personal judgement. The author argues that world Jewry has passed the label of anti-Semitism to the source, thus the term wholesale is used to describe the process.

The author tries to find a clear-cut definition of “Jewish.” He/She cites Jewish authors and scholars and he/she demonstrates that not even Jews can agree on a single, unified definition of who they are. An “influential Jewish statement” is quoted as saying that there are more than twenty definitions of Judaism, and he/she relates that to anti-Semitism. Since there are so many defining features of Judaism, the author argues, then it is impossible to define and even acknowledge anti-Semitism as a viable form of discrimination. He/She also quotes Jean-Paul Sartre who said “a Jew is anybody whom other people designate as such.”331 Again, the author is attempting to disregard Judaism as a viable entity. This process of de-legitimizing Judaism is a method that is extended to the Holocaust.

Finally, the author talks about Jewish scholars who seem to express anti-Jewish sentiments. He/She gives the example of Dr. Alfred Lilienthal who stated that nowadays “an anti-Semite is anyone whom Jews hate.” The author argues that anyone can be labeled anti-Semitic and it is not about hating Jews; rather, it is the other way around. He/She claims that Jews hold the power and they decide who is anti-Semitic based on a political or ideological agenda. The author claims that if someone is disliked in the Jewish community, then they are labelled anti-Semitic.

The author fails to realize that just because a scholar is Jewish, they can still be anti-Semitic and also assumes that a formal university education at the doctoral level grants objectivity and authority to people. An anti-Semite is an anti-Semite despite their religion or credentials. Yet the

331 Ibid.
premise and the theme of the article is that since being a Jewish anti-Semite is oxymoronic, therefore anti-Semitism as a legitimate form of discrimination will collapse.

Noam Chomsky and Nathan and Ruth Perlmutter are given as examples of other Jews who criticize anti-Semitism. Here the author sneaks in anti-Zionism as a synonym for anti-Semitism. Clearly the two are different but the author makes no distinction. Chomsky is cited as saying that “the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai Brith, interprets anti-Semitism as unwillingness to conform to its requirements with regard to support for Israeli authorities.” The author is reinforcing his/her argument that anyone who disagrees with Israeli politics is labeled anti-Semitic. It can be argued at present that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism are distinct while some argue that they are strongly related. This thesis will not debate the relationship between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. It is a rhetorical technique for deniers to bring anti-Zionism into their discourse to camouflage anti-Semitic claims. A person is not necessarily anti-Semitic if they disagree with Israeli politics. Although most pro-Zionist organizations are Jewish, non-Jewish Zionist organizations can exist.

The Perlmutter’s’ book entitled The Real Anti-Semitism is given as another example supporting the article’s claims. The book is sympathetic to the Palestinian community and supports the Palestinian state. The author of the article describes how courteous Yasser Arafat was to the widow of Yitzhak Rabin and reminds the reader that the person who killed Rabin was a Jewish fanatic. The author suggests that Arafat is a kind man and Israel is the bully who oppresses the Palestinian state. This unfairness is reinforced by citing Jews such as the Perlmutter who are anti-Zionist and do not support Israel’s political decisions.

\[332 \text{Ibid.}\]
Continuing with the image of Israel as the bad guy, the author claims that the media, mostly controlled and owned by Jews, censored the severity of the Six Day War between the Israelis and Palestinians. He/She alludes to an American or possibly world Jewish conspiracy through the control of the media and information censorship. The world Jewish conspiracy model is a common rhetorical technique that deniers use. The author claims that the Israelis used napalm\textsuperscript{333} which the North American media failed to disclose.

Reverend A.C. Forrest is said to have published a photo of a little girl recovering from napalm burns. He was labeled anti-Semitic for this revelation. Again, the author claims that Jews label anyone anti-Semitic if they cause bad publicity. In other words, if there is any criticism of Jewish matters, then world Jewry brands those critics anti-Semites. The author is making vast generalizations from a few examples without a context. Also, the author seems to be saying that scholars and people in notable professions like Reverend Forrest are exempted from the anti-Semitic label and whatever claims they make are always legitimate.

The final arguments deal with the Holocaust. First, the author argues that some Jews collaborated with the Nazis and yet were not punished. During the war, certain Jewish people were able to stay alive if they obeyed Nazi orders. The author maintains that such Holocaust survivors were not rebuked because Jewish organizations felt to do so “would diminish the guilt of the Nazis.” This is an attempt to equate the Jew with the Nazi. The major flaw in the argument is that Jewish concentration camp inmates were forced to collaborate with the Nazis if they wanted to live. The Nazis were the ones forcing the collaboration and they were the ones killing Jews. This is a typical Holocaust denier attempt to remove blame from the Nazis and transfer it to the

\textsuperscript{333} Napalm is an incendiary mixture of polystyrene, benzene, and gasoline. For more information see http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=napalm
Jews. This term, known as inversion, is used by virtually every denier to remove the state of victimhood from the Jewish community.

The author makes an allusion to the decision not to punish Jewish collaborators to a decision made by a board of directors at a brokerage firm. Holocaust deniers tend to use terms that revolve around money, economics, banking, and commerce when relating to Jewish decisions or world Jewish policies. The author uses the imagery of a board of directors making a financial decision because he/she believes that Jews are “calculating” and that they only think in materialistic terms. He/She reaches the following conclusion; “The result of this approach has been a grotesque distortion of values and perception, and a willingness to format historical truth in order to better serve immediate social and political ends.”

This conclusion, in turn, leads to another so-called Jewish lie. It seems that there is a “historical lie” that all-black U.S. army units were some of the first units to free inmates at Dachau and Buchenwald. The author quotes a former president of a Jewish organization who maintained that this “lie” was “good for the Holocaust” because it improved relations between Jews and blacks. The author takes a philosophical turn by claiming that if “falsehoods may be “good for the Holocaust,” then some truths may also be bad for the Holocaust.”\textsuperscript{334} This is a reference to Holocaust denial. After mentioning some out-of-context incidents, the author makes it seem as though the entire Holocaust is a lie. He/She concludes that based on the above argument, honesty may even be anti-Semitic. This statement is powerful because the author sets things up so that if anything, whether it be just or unjust, is in conflict with Jewish interests, then world Jewry will label it anti-Semitic.

\textsuperscript{334} Ibid.
The author sums up his/her thoughts in a sombre conclusion, claiming that Jews have total control and the label of anti-Semitism holds great power and influence. It can ruin a person financially and tarnish their reputation for life. Anti-Semitism, the author argues, is a corrupt term that should not be taken seriously, because the term is invented by powerful Jewish interests who decide what is and is not anti-Semitic. The author claims that anti-Semitism is not about hatred for Jews but about hatred towards anyone who disagrees with anything Jewish.

**Analysis of Graphics**

Most of the materials on Smith’s web site are articles. There are very few graphics to analyse. Recently, Smith wrote an autobiography chronicling his struggles as a Holocaust revisionist. There is a promotional page and banner which shows a photo of Smith looking off into the distance with the title of his book *Break His Bones: The Private Life of a Holocaust Revisionist* on his right. The book promotes intellectual freedom and Smith portrays himself as a kind, elderly gentleman who is not racist or bigoted or anti-Zionist. He plays the victim who simply wants to express himself intellectually. The image portrays Smith as peaceful, innocent, and harmless.

Smith is not aggressive or provocative. He is calm and confident, like Arthur Butz. He presents himself as a quiet, humble intellectual. Like Greg Raven, Smith argues that he does not want to offend anyone and will remove anything that is deemed offensive or upsetting. He does
not deny that Jews were killed during World War II, but he questions the events in Auschwitz and he questions Hitler’s vision.

**Greg Raven’s Holocaust Historiography Project**

**Brief Description**

Greg Raven’s “The Holocaust Historiography Project” was chosen because Raven is one of the current staff members of the IHR and is very active in Holocaust denial. He devotes some of his personal time to maintaining this web site comprised of mostly textual documents. The site gives the impression that it is an ongoing archive of documents that pertain to the history of the Holocaust. Plain and simple, it contains a large collection of documents, and articles, indexed by year, that deny the Holocaust. Sarcastic and cocky in tone, the authors of the site never identify themselves.

To find out who was behind the site, I had to search through an Internet archiving web site at [http://www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org). I found out that “The Holocaust Historiography Project” was created as early as 2000 and was then called “Greg Raven’s Revisionist Materials.” Exploring the timeline section of the page, it shows that the web site has been online since January 29, 1996. It is interesting that Raven decided to remove his name from all of the pages.

In 2002, the title of the web site was changed to something that sounds more credible and authoritative: The Holocaust Historiography Project. This title seems to imply an organizational body that compiles information about the history of the Holocaust. This image is somewhat altered by the author’s introduction: “this Web site is my personal “spare time” project, and is not supported, sponsored, or financed by any other individual or group. I tend to be pretty busy, so this

---

335 See [http://www.corax.org/revisionism/](http://www.corax.org/revisionism/)
site is updated only in fits and starts.” 337 The title provides further confusion because it implies the author is studying Holocaust history which should automatically mean that the Holocaust is accepted as fact. Yet the first line of the home page reads “Dedicated to examining the disparity between “the Holocaust” as it is commonly known, and the actual historiography of “the Holocaust.” There are obvious contradictions between the title and who maintains the web site and what purpose.

Analysis

The site resembles an electronic library of documents. It is very plain and does not contain any graphics. On each page there is a link to the Institute for Historical Review, the organization that Raven manages along with Mark Weber, as well as to its retail division, the Noontide Press. On one hand, Raven creates links to the organization he works for; on the other, he detaches himself by claiming that his work is not supported by any external organizations. His articles are well written and have footnotes and citations. The writing style is professional.

Raven’s ideas are legitimate, but his dismissive tone and the fact that he associates himself with the IHR indicate that he is an anti-Semite. “Although I firmly believe in the factuality and accuracy of the materials on this Web site, I also understand that they might be offensive to some. If you are one of those who are or would be offended, please browse elsewhere.” He also claims that he will remove or revise material that is incorrect if he is so notified and makes the same assurance for material that is found to be racist or hateful. However, Raven reminds the reader of the First Amendment, which allows for free speech. This can be viewed as another contradiction.

---

Article One: Defining 'Holocaust' - - A proposal

In his article “Defining 'Holocaust' - - A proposal” Greg Raven takes issue with the word “Holocaust” being used exclusively by Jews to describe their experience in the Second World War. His main thesis is that the Holocaust was not unique, since there were many genocides in human history. As well, since there is no definite, commonly agreed upon definition of the term, it is not possible to properly debate the events associated with it.

The article, which appears scholarly and legitimate on the surface, contains a hidden agenda. The word “holocaust” is used 211 times. In the introduction, Raven states that there have been many books written on the destruction of European Jews during World War II but none have defined what the Holocaust really means. Raven does not deny the content of these books, but he believes that they do not define “the central term itself.” He quotes a speech made by former US President Bill Clinton at the dedication of the Holocaust Memorial Museum. Raven concludes that politicians know how to give speeches but they do not actually say anything. In contrast, historians have to have substance. Thus, he establishes himself as a historian who will be saying something noteworthy.

The first section is entitled “Confusion.” After praising historians, Raven begins his argument by attacking an article written by a writer/scientist. He tackles Michael Shermer’s piece “Proving the Holocaust,” which, according to Raven, presents three different definitions of the Holocaust. In fact, Shermer presents one definition as per the Oxford English Dictionary, one definition as per Michael Berenbaum, and only the third definition is his own in respect to an analysis. Yet Raven asserts that these assorted definitions represent confusion on the part of
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Shermer and insists that Shermer’s own definition is Judeo-centric, contradictory, and “so vague and all-inclusive as to be worthless.” The possibility that Raven has personal issues with Shermer emerge in the statement “Shermer is guilty of the very thing of which he accuses revisionists, focussing [sic] on the Holocaust as involving only Jews.” 340

Raven goes on to say that “the events said to make up the Holocaust are usually derived from the evidence presented against the Nazis at the post-war Nuremberg Trials.” The problem, Raven maintains, is that most of the evidence from these trials has since been dismissed as false. He footnotes work to demonstrate this claim. Four out of the five citations lead to works by fellow Holocaust deniers. Clearly, the supportive material is biased. Looking at the endnotes as a whole, most are either for revisionists or reference materials such as dictionaries and encyclopedias. Only a handful of the citations are for non-revisionist historians.341

Based on his research, Raven concludes that the word “Holocaust” began to be associated with the Jewish experience in WWII in the 1970’s. He attributes this in large part to the television series “Holocaust” which was broadcast in 1978. He subtly suggests that there may be a conspiracy beginning at the end of the 1970’s, since that is when the word began to pop up everywhere in relation to WWII. First, Raven acknowledges that language is constantly evolving and this is normal. Nevertheless, he then informs the reader that “sometimes groups will intentionally attempt to “high-jack” parts of the language for social or political ends.” He does not give any examples of this except to claim that at the present time, non-Jewish groups are trying to apply the “Holocaust” term to themselves because it “describes the ultimate in victimhood.”342
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Raven states that the term is “a potent linguistic device” which alludes to revisionist claims that Jews are using the Holocaust as a weapon. Although Raven’s analysis of the development of the word “holocaust” might be correct, his conclusions are certainly not.

Still unable to provide definitions from historians, Raven criticizes Jewish organizations for their varied collection of the meaning of the word “Holocaust.” He creates a library of inconsistent definitions, then claims that the term lacks credibility because of this. The inconsistencies include where the events took place, who carried out the extermination, etc. They are not, in fact, inconsistencies, but rather degrees of specification. However, Raven finds fault with all of them. Some, he claims, “could be said to “deny” the deaths of Jews in the Eastern territories and elsewhere, as well as the often brutal but non-fatal mistreatment of Jews during the war, both of which are acknowledged by revisionists.” Others only take into account Jewish deaths that are deliberate. By using the word “deny,” Raven “inadvertently” claims that Jews are the Holocaust deniers because they deny accidental Jewish deaths and non-fatal mistreatment – details which Holocaust revisionists acknowledge. Using typical denier technique, Raven inverts the Jewish role so that the Jews become the bad guys.

Raven compares the Greek and Hebrew roots of the word “Holocaust.” He feels the term most likely comes from Greek and that it is “inaccurate to imply that “Holocaust” comes directly from a Hebrew word of slightly different meaning.” Raven believes that the Hebrew origin that the Anti-Defamation League offers makes it easy to label all historians “Holocaust deniers” (quotes are Raven’s) since the definition specifies that six million Jews were killed. This number,
according to Raven, is deemed too high by “virtually all historians.” This extreme claim is further outlined in Raven’s article “Jewish Casualties During World War II.”

The survey of definitions for the Holocaust continues. Raven analyzes practically each definition separately. He focuses, among other details, on differences between the number of Jews killed (millions, six million, not specified), the exclusion/inclusion of non-Jews (such as gypsies, homosexuals, and the disabled), systematic/unsystematic extermination, Nazi perpetrators versus Nazi and others, and the timeline (1933 or 1939). Raven ignores that words have varying definitions depending on the context. Different dictionaries and encyclopedias exist because they each offer slightly different definitions. Such differences are to be expected. For example, looking up “World War II” in various reference books, there are differences in how specific the definition gets as to who the Axis and Allies were and where the battles took place.

Since the definition has been altered and changed and interpreted so many times, Raven concludes that it lacks legitimacy. He states that this “amorphous nature of the term “Holocaust” is convenient to the extent that it implies an inconceivable sequence and combination of events, which lead to an improbable result, leaving the specifics to the imagination.” According to Raven, the flexibility of the definition is “convenient” because when facts regarding the Holocaust are revised (implying “disproved”), they do not diminish the terrible imagery associated with the term. Raven claims that the “public conception” and “the facts surrounding the period known by scholars” are very different. The public's impression of the Holocaust is manipulated by the different definitions of the term, while scholars (the group to which he belongs) are privy to the true facts.
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Raven further argues Holocaust historians who are “perceived as accepting the Holocaust as a unique and horrific crime against Jews and the Jewish people” are able to evaluate some of the events of World War II (i.e. redefine the Holocaust) without receiving the Holocaust denier label. Raven claims that revisionists should have equal rights to debate events of World War II without being called “deniers.” He places deniers in the victim role by stating “No matter how much of the Holocaust story is acknowledged by a revisionist, the definition of “Holocaust” is so plastic that the “denier” label can still be applied by opponents more interested in ideology than in historical discussion.” Raven’s choice of words is interesting. He uses “story” to describe the Holocaust, implying that it is fiction. He uses “plastic” to describe the definition of Holocaust, implying that it is fake. Finally, he claims “ideology” is the factor behind the denier label, thereby implying that there is a Jewish conspiracy.

On the surface, Raven is quick to pointedly distance himself from typical revisionist claims, such as a “conspiracy.” Still, he asserts that the Holocaust “can be inflated to act as a socio-political weapon.” This is in keeping with the traditional denier claim of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. Raven suggests that the differences in definitions of the Holocaust hinder historical discussion. He fails to understand that the Holocaust comprises many different facets and different definitions have emphasized different elements. He also fails to understand that the definitions do indeed have a common central theme: Jews died in WWII and the Nazis were responsible.

The litigation between “best-selling British historian David Irving” and Deborah Lipstadt is brought up. The way the two parties are introduced is misleading. Irving writes historical books, but is not a historian by formal training. In fact, he has no university degree at all, yet he is set up by Raven as a historian. Lipstadt, on the other hand, has a Ph.D. and is a
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Raven discusses the different definitions of the Holocaust provided by Lipstadt and her witnesses. Again, Raven finds the definitions are in contradictory. He states “someone ought to spend at least a few minutes defining the game” since not only is the term “Holocaust denier” on trial, but so are “hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees.” By mentioning money, Raven is once again alluding to the Jewish conspiracy.

In the next passage, Raven claims that concentrating on the term “extermination” takes sympathies away from those Jews who were “uprooted, driven out, forced into labor or concentration camps, and otherwise mistreated.” Although many definitions emphasize Jews that died, it is incorrect to assume that those who survived are ignored. Following this seemingly sympathetic assertion, Raven subtly trivializes the Holocaust by excluding those who “left by choice, or who died of old age or other natural causes.” Very few Jews left by choice, initially because of a failure to see into the future and later, because they were not allowed. As for Jews who died of old age and other natural causes, they too were persecuted by the Nazis while alive. Thereby sympathies should be extended to them as well.

Approaching the end of his article, Raven’s anti-Semitic leanings become more and more apparent. He broaches the theme of Nazi and Jewish collaboration. He writes; “The period covered by the term “Holocaust” cannot start in 1933, with the Nazi rise to power, because […] [some] Jewish groups collaborated with the Nazis between 1933 and the outbreak of war in 1939.” Raven does not give examples of how Jewish groups collaborated with the Nazis. Nor does he discuss Jewish persecution before the war (such as anti-Jewish laws and Kristallnacht). He simply moves some blame onto Jews. Considering that Raven has so far not accepted any definition of the Holocaust, it is difficult to understand why he claims it cannot have started in 1933. Following
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his logic, it could be said some Jews collaborated with the Nazis after 1939 and so the Holocaust never happened.

In his conclusion, Raven defends his revisionist perspective by providing a dictionary definition of the term “revision.” Simply put, a revisionist is someone who reexamines something in order to improve it. Accordingly, Holocaust revisionists are doing something worthy. In another transfer of roles, non-revisionist historians are the ones labeled as corrupt. “An anti-revisionist would be someone who has fixed ideas about a historical event, and then finds facts to support his conclusions, usually at the expense of context.”348 It is clear that Raven is defining the non-revisionist historians as the ones with the political agenda. Raven suggests that the non-revisionist historian is a prisoner to a Jewish-dominated ideology. In contrast, revisionists are objective, non-political, and non-ideological.

Raven ends the article with his own proposed definition of the Holocaust: “The mistreatment and death of Jewish civilians at the hands of the combatants during the Second World War (1939-1945).”349 There are major flaws with this definition. To begin with, Raven uses the term “mistreatment” first and “death” second, alluding to the fact that more Jews were mistreated than died. Also, “death” is vague. The term “murder” or “killing” would illustrate more strongly the active involvement of the “combatants” in the deaths. Second, the definition ignores the Nazis as the ones responsible for the mistreatment and death of Jews. Instead, the word “combatants” is used. This can be interpreted to mean anyone from Germans to Americans. Third, Germany ceases to be the birthplace of the Holocaust. No matter how much revisionists sympathize with the German people, Germany has to take responsibility for its role in the Jewish deaths. There is no mention of an extermination policy or of concentration camps. Jews were killed on purpose,
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not simply because there was a war. They were rounded up in ghettos and camps. Their deaths were coordinated and systematic. The failure to mention a number of deaths is also problematic.

The definition is not incorrect, but it is very limited and lacks precision. It diminishes the severity and significance of the Jewish experience. As such, it is the perfect revisionist definition because it excludes everything revisionists disagree with.

In the text, Raven presents many different definitions of the Holocaust. Even though he asserts historians are the most knowledgeable group on the topic, he cites very few of them. He fails to acknowledge that many definitions of the Holocaust do have common components: a coordinated extermination policy by the Nazis and the resulting millions of Jewish deaths. Raven fails to acknowledge Nazi responsibility and to acknowledge that the Holocaust was a coordinated, organized, and government-directed policy aimed at eliminating one group of people based on racial politics.

**Greg Raven’s REVISIONISTS.com**

**Brief Description**

In addition to maintaining the IHR and his own personal web site, Greg Raven also manages the web site ambiguously titled REVISIONISTS.com. This is an ideological web site.

**Analysis**

The web site is an alphabetical index to Holocaust deniers across the world. The indexed list of names links the user to a page devoted to the specific Holocaust denier. Each deniers has their own page, with a brief biography, a photograph, and some links. For my analysis, I analysed the only essay on the site not associated with a specific denier. The text is entitled “What is
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Holocaust Revisionism?” and contains pertinent text and graphics that are provocative, disturbing, and worth analysing.

The splash page of the web site possesses Raven’s typical sarcastic tone. It invites readers to “find out more about those politically incorrect persons known as revisionists.” There is an accompanying photo of about a dozen middle-aged, smiling men. Clearly, Raven is mocking the labels associated with revisionism. The following statement is made: “This site is dedicated to the individuals and organizations behind modern historical revisionism. Revisionists put their lives, reputation, money, and freedom on the line in their efforts to bring historiography into accord with the facts.”

Revisionists, as always, are placed in the victim/martyr position and the search for truth is declared.

At a superficial overview, a form of the word “history” is used three times while “revisionists” is used five times on the page. As per the introductory paragraph then, the keywords for this web site are “revisionism” and “history.”

**Article One: What is Holocaust Revisionism?**

On the front page, the link is specified as “historical revisionism” and the web user assumes that they will go to a page discussing historical revisionism. However, when the user clicks on the hyperlink, they find a page entitled “What is Revisionism?” There are two boxes below this title. One has a definition of revisionism (“advocacy of revision”) and the other a definition of Holocaust Revisionism (“The act of revising World War Two history in accordance with the real facts”).
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definitions are not cited and there is no definition of “historical revisionism” provided. There is actually no mention of the term at all in the following text. It is misleading bait for the web user.

The definition of Holocaust revisionism is inaccurate. The Holocaust is only a part of WWII. Thereby, Holocaust revisionism does not revise WWII history, but only aspects of it that relate to the Holocaust. Also, it is unclear what “the real facts” are. The definition infers that WWII history has been skewed and distorted and Holocaust revisionists are the ones to uncover the truths about it. Raven already creates a subjective bias at the start of the essay. It appears that he has an agenda in the nature of his definition.

The essay states that revisionists

“object to the terminology, “THE Holocaust,” which by implication suggests it was unique, monumental, over-arching, perhaps even the central historical event of our century if not epoch. In fact there have been many holocausts over the centuries, a good portion of them in our own Twentieth century. The Jewish Holocaust is merely one of them, and not even one of the more vicious ones.”

From the onset, the Holocaust of WWII is trivialized and brushed aside as just another holocaust. Since it is “merely” another holocaust, the essay opposes the exclusive use of the term “Holocaust.” This is illogical. It is the same as saying The Great War i.e. World War One was not THE greatest war or the most violent one and should not be called The Great War. Although there has been a body of literature that argues that the Holocaust was not unique in terms of how many people were killed, the uniqueness lies in the fact that it was institutionally created by doctors, engineers, and scientists.
Raven identifies the influence of Hollywood. He blames it for exaggerating portrayals of the Holocaust. Later, he quotes a “Jewish observer” saying “There’s no business like Shoah business.” Like many other Holocaust deniers, Raven sporadically uses anti-Jewish quotes and claims they were said by Jewish people. Many will argue that when a Jewish person expresses anti-Jewish sentiments, it is not as disturbing as when a non-Jewish person does so. This allows them a legitimate reason to do this.

Following this brief introduction are rows of graphics, large-font headers and pages of text. Raven selects images that construct Jews as the liars and evil-doers while sympathizing with Hitler and Germany. The dramatic structure of the text is sarcastic and melodramatic. Like other Holocaust deniers, Raven focuses on denying specific facts such as the number of Jews killed during the war. He does not acknowledge that the real tragedy of the Holocaust is not the numbers persecuted or killed, but the fact that it happened.

Holocaust deniers such as Raven are passionate about their claims but omit the context and other social circumstances surrounding the Holocaust. The images provided in the essay also lack context. There is no referencing besides the headers inserted by the author. The graphics are used for shock value, much like the aborted fetus pictures on Porter’s web site. The first graphics depict “One of the many other Holocausts”, the destruction of the German city of Dresden. The images are small and unclear. Under some photos of the dead, Raven writes: “350,000 Germans Holocausted.” The word “Holocausted” is a play on words that Raven never explains. Raven uses this word as a common verb, thus diminishing its uniqueness and changing its definition to simply mean “killed.” Raven also fails to explain why he qualifies the bombing as a holocaust. The next row of pictures depicts Latvian people murdered by “Jewish Communists.” Again, there is no context or explanation.
The web site is composed of many such shocking images as well as news clippings that support claims of factual errors regarding the Nazi Holocaust. Like many deniers, Raven uses the “human soap” and “lamp shade” stories that were found to be false. These discovered truths are attributed to revisionists and it is implied that revisionists will uncover other made-up stories fabricated during the Holocaust.

Following the first set of images, Raven writes “Revisionists are, in fact, Holocaust DIMINISHERS, not deniers.” He then constructs deniers as martyrs by discussing the penalties they face for simply questioning a historical event. He qualifies the Holocaust as a “tale” and insists that revisionists should be able to freely discuss the Holocaust.

Raven’s admission that revisionists are diminishing the Holocaust is unusual. However, it is true. Deniers have very little to deny since there is so much evidence that does not support their claims. The truth is exposed as to why revisionists diminish the Holocaust. It is a rather easy explanation. Raven and other Holocaust deniers claim that Jews only want money and sympathy. The terms of sympathy are related to the preservation of the Jewish state of Israel and money is related to Hollywood. Raven claims that since Hollywood is run by Jews all of the movies, dramas, and documentaries are pro-Holocaust, pro-Jewish, and anti-German. He does not understand why there is so much anti-German sentiment. The role deniers play is intimately linked to being anti-Zionist (not supporting Israel as a Jewish state) and being a Hitler sympathizer.

Under the heading “Were their [sic] any Jewish victims in WWII?” Raven acknowledges that there was “much Jewish suffering,” but puts this in the context of a violent war where 50-60 million died. He trivializes the Jewish experience, since it was negligible compared to the fate of others. These others include the German and Japanese working classes and German POW. Using pictures once again, Raven compares the living conditions of Germans POW who, Raven claims,
were forced to live outdoors in deprived conditions to the Auschwitz Barracks, where there was a swimming pool, heating, running water, and comfortable beds. The two images lack context. They could have been taken anywhere at any time. Raven’s byline reads: “Who were the inhumane ones?” The images and text attempt to illustrate that the Nazis were not the inhumane ones. They treated their “inmates” very well. In contrast, the German POW had to suffer. Raven compares and contrasts dissimilar situations and fails to establish equivalences between the two images.

Then, Raven spells out the “real facts.” He writes “there was no attempt by Nazis, or anyone else, to exterminate the Jews.” Nazis simply wanted to “expel” Jews. Revisionists often claim that Hitler only wanted to deport Jews from Europe and did not develop an extermination policy. They fail to explain why deporting Jews en masse out of their home countries is acceptable. “Historically there seems to be something about the Jews that brings forth a plenitude of animosity on the part of the people amongst whom they live.” Revisionists never admit that even an expulsion of Jews is wrong, unjust, or criminal. They instead blame the Jews for what happened to them.

In the text, Raven never acknowledges any wrongdoing by the Nazis during WWII, not only in respect to what they did to Jews, but in respect to having started the war in the first place. He manipulates the content of the essay and offers a very subjective look at so-called facts. Throughout the text, though, there is a repetition of the phrases: “Is someone a “Holocaust denier” if…” and “Should someone be considered a “Holocaust denier” because…” This structure suggests Raven is encouraging an open debate where readers can think and decide for themselves what to believe. The problem is that he leads readers to believe his own fabrications and propaganda.
Raven makes the usual revisionist claim that there were no gas chambers in Auschwitz. He clarifies this by stating; “None. Zero. Nada. There is NO evidence of gas chambers that an objective person can find credible.” This is untrue. There is evidence of gas chambers and if Raven was as scholarly as he claims, he would present it in his essay and explain how he thinks it is false. Instead, he repeats his opinion that there are “NO documents, NO orders, NO planning, NO blueprints, NO photographs, NO autopsies - NOTHING that is definitively or even reasonably credible to support gas chambers.” In his claim, Raven writes the word “no” with capitals. The capital letters represent yelling in email etiquette, but here they represent Raven’s confidence. The capitals also accentuate the negative. But giving an opinion and providing proof are two different things. Obviously, Raven opts for the easier route.

In the next passage Raven claims that the only evidence that exists is testimony. Since all testimonies are lies, they must be overlooked. No legitimate historian who does proper research assumes that evidence or oral testimony is fraudulent and stops there. Historians do not work this way. They cannot go into the field with a set of presupposed assumptions. They need to be objective and open to looking at all sides. Failure to do so will make their work unacceptable by their peers. Their judgments have to be value-free and they cannot hold biases such as “our subjects are lying, we don’t believe them.” Clearly, Holocaust deniers such as Raven hold non-neutral, biased views. Without any further inquiry, we can assume that most of his results are skewed.

The justification Raven finds for this claim is that “Lying, or mythologizing, is a common human trait according to Joseph Campbell.” This might be true, but it does not mean all humans lie all the time. Raven goes on to say that not all the testimonies are lies. Some testifiers do not
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realize they are lying and honestly believe they are telling the truth. The reason for this is that “it is important to them and to the Jewish people that the myth survive.” Raven now changes his views to say that some survivors do not lie, but feel so strongly about the Holocaust myth, that they make themselves believe that there were gas chambers and victims. Raven implies that this belief across many countries (since gas chambers were located in various camps across Europe) suggests an international Jewish conspiracy. As with other Holocaust deniers, Raven sees himself as a revolutionary whose aim is to inform the world and uncover the conspiracy.

Raven uses the word “myth” or “story” to allude to the Holocaust. According to www.dictionary.com the myth means “A fiction or half-truth, especially one that forms part of an ideology.”³⁵⁴ Raven cannot deny the Holocaust in totality, but he can diminish the very elements that build its veracity as one of the most brutal genocides in world history.

Holocaust deniers attempt to diminish the significance of the Holocaust. Their only valid and accurate claim is that the Nazi Holocaust is one of the many genocides in history and in the twentieth century. In this respect, Raven and the others are accurate. However, into this claim creeps a medley of statements, assertions, and ideologies that are manifestly anti-Jewish. It would be more legitimate for revisionists to state that their discourse stems from an anti-Semitic standpoint, so that web users can understand the context behind their Holocaust denial.

After discussing how Jews died (executed for partisan activities, disease, starvation) and how many of them died (between half a million and a million), Raven reiterates the three things revisionists question: the number, the method (how Jews were killed), and the plan (there was none to exterminate Jews). This set of claims exists in different shapes or forms on all Holocaust denial web sites. It is almost a requirement for deniers to place their common ideology somewhere on

³⁵⁴ See http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=myth
their sites. It is similar to dogma. To maintain legitimacy and credibility, they must unite and echo the same set of ideologies. Such is the case with The Leuchter Report. Revisionists continuously refer to it as the key authoritative tool in disproving the presence of gas chambers, even though the seemingly scientific report was authored by a non-scientist funded by Ernst Zündel. There is strength in numbers and if enough people make the same claims, the claims appear more genuine.

Another example of unscholarly material that revisionsists often cite is John Ball’s web site (www.air-photo.com) which claims to contain aerial photographs that indicate that there were no holes in the roofs of gas chambers to drop Zyklon B pellets down. Some questions that may arise are: Who is John Ball? Is he a professional? Does he have the qualifications to critically analyse photos of Auschwitz and other camps? Why is he only analyzing WWII photos relating to concentration camps? Since Ball’s site seems to be part of a revisionist ring, it is easy to question his neutrality.

Returning to “the numbers,” based on population statistics, Raven’s figures are incorrect. Lucy Dawidowicz, a famous scholar who wrote The War Against the Jews 1933-1945, claimed that the Jewish population of Europe in 1933 was approximately nine million and approximately six million Jews vanished by the end of the Second World War.355 Raven would argue that these Jews emigrated or that the Jewish community is lying in order to claim restitution, sympathy, and money. To make such claims without doing any research is very bigoted. As well, Raven’s claim that Jews represented only 2% of fatalities is misleading. First of all, Raven uses the one million death toll, which is inaccurate. Secondly, even if Jews represented a small percentage of the total fatalities, the number of Jews killed in relation to the pre-war Jewish population was huge.
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Thereby, the Jewish deaths seem miniscule in relation to the total WWII deaths, but was enormous in relation to Jewish population losses.

The same ideas continue to be hammered into the reader throughout the text. Raven uses a table to illustrate why the six million death figure is wrong. Raven provides this table without providing a reference. There is a small, blurry copyright in the bottom corner of the table that reveals the source: Samisdat Publications. The table cannot be considered authoritative since it originates from another racist individual, Ernst Zündel. Raven does not evaluate this evidence or question where Zündel found the statistics even though Zündel is not an authority on World War II history or a statistician. Raven further questions how many Jews were really killed. He claims that several of the most prominent Holocaust historians could be regarded as “deniers” because they do not agree with the six million figure. He cites Professor Raul Hilberg who calculated 5.1 million Jewish deaths and Gerald Reitlinger who calculated a maximum of 4.6 million deaths. The difference between a denier and a historian is that historians base their results on some sort of legitimate research while deniers base their results on no research.

Raven spends a great deal of time illustrating that the six million figure is an exaggeration. Another chart he uses traces the number of deaths in Auschwitz as estimated from 1945 to 1993. Raven’s reference for this data is an article from the *Journal of Historical Review*, a revisionist publication. To support his findings, Raven generally uses material from other revisionist sources. This is a questionable approach. One article he employs that is not from a revisionist source has the headline “Auschwitz deaths reduced to a million.” This seems to support Raven’s claims and the Jewish conspiracy theory, but if the reader bothers to delve into the body of the article, there
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are some surprises. First, the numbers were exaggerated by Poland, not by Jews. Second, many Israeli experts had arrived at the lower figures based on their own research.

The conclusion of the text is lighthearted. Raven ends his essay with the request to “Let this issue be settled as all great historical controversies are resolved: through free inquiry and open debate in our journals, newspapers and classrooms.” This could be possible if the researchers or historians from both sides of the “controversy” conducted fair, objective, unbiased research. Raven is right to expect that every historical event should be re-evaluated and reviewed – but not within a racist frame. This would yield biased data that only illustrates a narrow world view and contains a political agenda.

In this text Greg Raven employs a common strategy used by many Holocaust deniers. He faintly acknowledges Jewish suffering and persecution but quickly diminishes these by highlighting other horrific events in history and in WWII to which he compares and measures them. This is not a professional and ethical way to do research. Such comparisons always minimize Jewish pain and suffering.

**Michael Hoffman’s The Campaign for the Radical Truth in History**

**Brief Description**

Michael Hoffman’s The Campaign for the Radical Truth in History was chosen based on size and its vast collection of electronic documents. It has been categorized as a political web site because of Hoffman’s usage of four sets of key words that are consistently used throughout the web site: “campaign,” “radical truth,” “revisionist historian,” and “investigative reporter.” On this web site Hoffman plays the role of the “private investigator” or “investigative journalist” who
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uncovers the evidence. He is sensational and dramatic and most of the text from this web site lacks the scholarly style that is present on other Holocaust denial web sites.

**Analysis**

The splash page of Hoffman’s web site is slightly misleading. At first it does not seem to be a revisionist web site. The page is introduced as “Your source for suppressed information on Judaism's strange gods, secret societies and psychological warfare and radical history.”358 It is ambiguous as to what “suppressed” means in the context of Judaism. Hoffman also does not explain who the “strange gods” are. The text is also ambiguous because there is no mention of the Jewish Holocaust. Unlike Zündel who specifically targets the Holocaust, Hoffman’s web site seems to be the source of a variety of themes. At this point, Hoffman’s web site is unique. The introduction avoids the term revisionism, but uses other terms like “radical history”, “psychological warfare”, “secret societies”, and “suppressed information.” Through his word selection, Hoffman sets up Jews as the “Other”. Like Zündel, he sets Jews apart as mysterious, sneaky, secretive, and strange. It is not until the mission statement lower down the page that Hoffman admits that he is a revisionist.

The web site’s mission or The Revisionist Mission appears on the right-hand side. It describes the revisionist as struggling to expose the truth – a typical portrayal. An interesting section of the mission statement is “the key to getting as close to the truth as we can depends not on obtaining the most information, but rather, in honing our ability to detect fraud.” This statement seems to excuse the lack of legitimate research on the part of revisionists as well as encourage their biased, baseless rhetoric. The mission statement concludes: “Revisionist history consists in the art of discerning fraud and the courage to publicly strip illusion, even when the whole world is
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clamoring violently for it.” If revisionism is an art, it is not scientific. This would explain quite a number of things about the revisionist approach. Even in the mission statement, the emphasis is on imagery achieved by the choice of words. Art, of course, is very subjective and personal. It has little to do with the study of history.

Hoffman introduces himself as an investigative journalist who is radical in his thoughts and ideologies. The text is sensational, aggressive, and contains controversial key words. Hoffman describes the site as “the cutting edge of legitimate, studious conspiracy research. […] You'll join us in uncovering the bizarre, the arcane, the occult, and some of history's greatest plots.” Many of Hoffman’s articles illustrate the existence of a Jewish conspiracy and that Judaism is a secretive religion that attempts to exploit, manipulate, and fool society. Hoffman continually labels himself a historian and an investigative journalist but there is no proof of either. At the bottom of the front page, his brief biography claims that he was educated at the State University of New York and that he is a former reporter for the Associated Press. There is no indication of the degree or diploma he received nor of his current occupation.

Hoffman’s web site contains a library of web articles that pertain to various Jewish controversies. The web site is organized into three main areas: news bureau, archived news articles, and bookstore. The news bureau section displays a list of online articles and late-breaking alternative news. The organization is poor since the articles are listed in no logical order. Each link in the archives section displays a list of eleven subject headings. Each subject heading displays a large list of articles relating to the specific subject. For my research I have chosen to go into the subject heading of “World War Two Revisionism.”
The text entitled “The National 'Holocaust' Museum: Synagogue of the New State Religion” is an excerpt from Hoffman’s newsletter. It clearly demonstrates Hoffman’s anti-Jewish feelings. The excerpt is one long hateful tirade attacking the U.S. Holocaust Museum and blaming it for “the death of America.” There does not seem to be anything investigative about it at all.

The emotional ranting begins with the following paragraph:

“The holier-than-thou hollerers of “Holocaust” hucksterism have hit the jackpot in Washington, D.C. Just a few hundred yards from the Washington Monument squats a chamber-of-horrors financed by the taxpayers, stocked with state-of-the-art video illusion technology and dedicated to the proposition that all Israelis are created superior.”

Hoffman depicts the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum as an institution for the glorification of Israelis. He seems to equate all Jews with Israelis, which would mean Jewish Holocaust victims have nothing to do with America. Words associated with money are used. Words like “hucksterism,” “jackpot,” and “financed” are used. The word “squat” is used to describe the building’s position right before the word “chamber-of-horrors” is used to describe the building. This is probably not accidental and is meant to conjure up the image of someone squatting above a chamber pot. Hoffman uses the words “illusion technology” and “chamber of horrors” to express his disbelief in the contents of the museum. The term “chamber of horrors” alludes to a haunted
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house, a fictional element of many amusement parks. He uses the two terms to argue that the exhibits on display at the museum are fake and are solely brought to life by technology.

In the next paragraph, Hoffman uses a technique that many Holocaust deniers use; quoting a Jewish individual who denounces some aspect of the Holocaust. In this case, the individual is Dr. Mark Ellis, a “Jewish theologian.” Hoffman purposely selects a negative quote from Ellis to justify his own claims regarding the Holocaust. Ellis is quoted as saying, “Jews are ‘using the Holocaust to justify brutality against the Palestinians. […] Could Auschwitz be used in a perverse way to claim an inherent and internal (Jewish) superiority?’” Hoffman uses the quote without giving a context for it and without critically analysing all the possible interpretations. For example, why is the word “Jewish” in parentheses? Perhaps Ellis was not talking about Jewish superiority and someone else inserted the parentheses.

Many of Hoffman’s claims are exaggerations. He views the Holocaust as a religion and alleges that the Jews’ purpose is to “replace the crucifixion of Christ at Cavalry with the experience of the Jews at Auschwitz, as the central ontological event of Western history.” Again, he separates America from other countries – even though Western history is tightly interwoven with European history – and claims that Jews are seeking martyrdom and want to be acknowledged as the ones who suffered the most. He does not expose facts but only makes his own interpretations on social issues. He too brings up the “Hollywood publicity machine” as the reason why the Holocaust is receiving so much attention. Revisionists tend to give the impression that all Hollywood films are about the Holocaust and Jews.

Hoffman asks radical questions like “Was Jesus Christ a Nazi?” to shock the reader. He reasons that since Jesus denounced Jewish leaders, today he would be labeled an anti-Semite.
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Hoffman uses flamboyant imagery such as a “half-million German women and children deliberately burned to death” by the Allies. He triggers emotional responses but few facts and figures support any of his arguments.

Hoffman takes issue that the Holocaust museum is dedicated only to the victims of the Nazis. He argues that the exclusion of the Arabs of Beirut, the Palestinian children, or the 20 million Russian-Christian victims (all murdered by Jews) from the U.S. Holocaust museum is not right. What Hoffman is doing is setting up Jews as the aggressors and as the murderers of millions of people. Within this framework, it seems outrageous that Jews have a memorial. Yet again, Hoffman is manipulating words and events to make his points. He is not actually offering any proof for his claims.

The division between America and the rest of the world is further built up towards the end of the text. In Hoffman’s opinion, the Holocaust has nothing to do with America and the Holocaust museum has no business being in Washington. He calls the museum a “necrophiliac shrine to religious and ethnic negativity” and argues that America was “founded as a haven from such destructive and divisive obsessions.” It seems Hoffman is setting up America as a superior country where the Holocaust and thereby Jews do not belong. Hoffman ignores the fact that a large part of the world’s fourteen million Jews live in the United States.

In the last passage, Hoffman argues that the Holocaust has seeped into the American fabric of society and poisoned its ideologies and influenced Americans to adopt its own ideology. This ideology, Hoffman claims, has killed the American dream. These statements are powerful because they illustrate how Hoffman equates the Holocaust and thus Jews with a destructive power and evil influence. This essay is very biased and racially prejudiced. It disregards details and essential
facts, preferring to construct hateful misinformation. Hoffman states he wants to strip illusions, but in fact, he is creating illusions himself.

**Article Two: Holocaust Poodles**

We can already see Hoffman’s bias from the title. He is being facetious by joining the words “Holocaust” and “poodle” together. The Holocaust was a terrible, violent event. The poodle is a fluffy, endearing pet. For the common person, the two have nothing to do with each other. For Hoffman, the term “Holocaust Poodles” refers to people who are so weak and naïve that they believe all the lies about the Holocaust.

The article begins with Hoffman claiming that the Holocaust has become a new religion that is being forced into daily life so much that it has become unbearable. He coins the terms “Judaizing” and “Holocaustianity” to explain how this historical event has been exploited for the benefit of Jews. Hoffman writes that “before “The Holocaust” was imposed on the world, independent thinking on this old globe was still possible.” The notion of free speech is put forth as well as the idea that the Holocaust impedes free speech: “The world is being drenched in Judaism, which is what promulgation of ”The Holocaust” actually signifies.”

Hoffman uses the term “Holocaustianity” in a sarcastic tone to illustrate how the Holocaust has become a world dominating religion, a powerful dogma. The term is used to illustrate how the U.S. government, in conjunction with Israel and Hollywood, is manipulating the public to believe that the Holocaust was a unique historical event in world history. Hoffman argues that the Holocaust was not unique but was built on many exaggerations and falsehoods. He claims that
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the Jews fabricated this story and that it only became popular in 1968 with Nora Ephron’s book on the topic. Hoffman claims that the Holocaust is only presented from a Jewish point of view and that it was a very small part of World War II history.

This title “Holocaust Poodles” aims to criticize American society and how Americans are manipulated by their government. Hoffman is a strong believer in government conspiracies. He claims that the world Jewish community, with the help of the government, is doing two things: 1) making it seem as though World War II was entirely a Jewish experience; and, 2) through this dissemination, “Judaizing” Gentiles. Hoffman claims that since the Jewish aspect of the atrocities of World War II was only presented to the public starting in the late 1960’s, many years after the war, it is very suspicious and likely untrue.

The social concept of “Holocaust” as genocide and “Holocaust” as extermination policy towards European Jewry during World War II was indeed a new phenomenon during the latter half of the twentieth century. Perhaps Hoffman’s observations are correct in that the issue of the Holocaust was not addressed until the 1960’s. This is not the central theme of his essay and he does not investigate it further. Instead, his essay attacks the Jewish community and accuses them of manipulating the general public by saturating it with Holocaust education.

After discussing how powerful the “denier” label is and how racist it is for Jews to claim they are the only ones to have suffered through a holocaust, Hoffman illustrates how the Holocaust dominates society through fear:

“With this cosmic dichotomy of good and evil comes the panic people feel in the face of crushing power. This is why Swiss bankers and German statesmen are laying down on their backs like timid poodles, baring their genitals to the snarling teeth of a ferocious junkyard dog, risking
dismemberment in the hope that having submitted to such a degrading extent, they will be allowed to get up and return to the world of the living without having had to fight against so awesome a foe.”

In this striking example, Jews are aggressive dogs. Hoffman uses “Swiss Bankers” and “German statesmen” as pawns for the Jewish community to use. Swiss bankers have had to pay out compensation and Germany has introduced strong laws against Holocaust denial and anti-Semitism. Hoffman seems to be saying they only did this because they are cowards and not because it was the right thing to do.

Hoffman clearly is not an objective “investigative journalist” as he maintains but a bigot. He gives derogatory nicknames to famous Jewish people and politicians such as Ronald Reagan and Bob Dole. Like Carlos Whitlock Porter, he is also homophobic. He refers to Alan Ginsberg as a “degenerate” as well as a “hideous Khazar pederast.” Hoffman is basically calling Ginsberg a Russian pedophile.365 Ginsberg’s father was Jewish, although Ginsberg himself became a Buddhist. It is unclear why Hoffman labels him a Khazar except perhaps to make a link to Russia and communism (Ginsberg’s mother was a communist). Like Porter, Hoffman seems to blame Jews for the acceptance of homosexuality. As a journalist, it is surprising how subjective, opinionated, and bigoted he is. He tends to go off topic and address social issues and blame them on Jews.

Expanding on the poodle image, Hoffman discusses Pat Buchanan and David Duke. Buchanan is considered an anti-Semite by some while Duke is considered a white supremacist by many since he has been a director of the Klu Klux Klan and is still very active in pro-white causes.

365 See http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=pederast
Hoffman prefers Duke and criticizes Buchanan for being a poodle by endorsing Bob Dole. But he also describes Buchanan as the “son of a two fisted Catholic Irishman” – an allusion to strength, virility, and the white racial model Hoffman looks up to – and contrasts this against Ginsberg, the “son of a Khazar madwoman.” Hoffman demonstrates his white supremacist racism when he juxtaposes Ginsberg as the Jewish, Russian, gay, sodomizing man to Buchanan as the Catholic, Irish, heterosexual, strong man.

Like other Holocaust deniers, Hoffman provides quotes without providing any context. Hoffman quotes a rabbi saying that all non-Jews are “extraneous garbage.”366 This quote must have had a context because it surely did not come out of a rabbi’s mouth in this form. Hoffman selectively chose this quote because it sounds controversial and supports his position.

Hoffman’s white supremacist views are further exposed when he criticizes Ronald Reagan’s decision to make Martin Luther King’s birthday a national holiday. Hoffman claims that King was a Marxist and an adulterer so he does not deserve to be a national hero. Hoffman acts as a moral arbiter. He then condemns Reagan for approving the Holocaust Museum. Hoffman claims that the creation of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum was like creating a new state religion for the United States. He claims that the museum is actually a national synagogue in disguise. He is critiquing the development of this museum because it costs American taxpayers a great deal of money. It is interesting to note that this issue of the Holocaust Museum runs through most Holocaust denial web sites. Holocaust deniers are very unhappy with the creation of this museum and feel that the world Jewish community is preaching to convert. The reality is that Judaism is one of the least preachy religions. Unlike other religions, Jewish community members do not coordinate proselytizing by going door to door to people’s homes. Furthermore, the Jewish

community does not coordinate mass conversions or rallies for people to become Jewish. Hoffman labels Reagan “Bozo the Clown” and with this, we are reminded of the clown and poodle caricature that appears on the Zündelsite (as discussed earlier). The poodle jumps through the hoop that is held by the clown. Such repetitions help reinforce revisionist ideas.

Hoffman also criticizes the Jehovah’s Witnesses. Hoffman claims that in New York the Jehovah’s Witnesses are very wealthy and in a position to counter Jewish power, but they are cowards and Holocaust poodles and are afraid to do so. By constantly referring to people as Holocaust poodles, Hoffman is making the Jewish community seem more powerful than it really is. He seems convinced that Jews have unlimited power by means of the Holocaust. He provides excerpts from the 1934 Jehovah’s Witness Yearbook that appears to prove that before the Holocaust, Jehovah’s Witnesses were anti-Jewish and pro-Nazi. Hoffman ends his essay with a yearning for this pre-Holocaust period.

**Graphic Analysis**

There are a number of graphics in the News Bureau section of Hoffman’s web site. Both Porter and Hoffman discuss various anti-Jewish topics but tend to avoid going into a deep analysis of the Holocaust.

Hoffman tackles the issue of the history of Judaism and tries to de-legitimize its ties to the Old Testament. He also makes references to the current intifada (uprising) between Israelis and Palestinians. He uses visual imagery like posters, book covers, and photographs to illustrate his anti-Semitism. Hoffman describes the book *Judaism’s Strange Gods* as being the book that proves that Judaism is not based on the Old Testament. Of course, he does not highlight the fact that he
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wrote the book himself. He gives us a brief review of the book and states that Judaism is a man-
made religion. Since all religions are man-made, so this is misleading statement. Hoffman also 
argues that “Judaism's God is not the God of the Bible, but the strange gods of Talmud and 
Kabbalah and the racial self-worship they inculcate.” This is all his own subjective 
interpretation.

The next graphic in the News Bureau section is the cover for a controversial book entitled 
The Israeli Holocaust Against the Palestinians, again written by Hoffman, along with Moshe 
Leiberman. The cover shows a mother and a child crying with the keywords of “The Israeli 
Holocaust.”

Hoffman attempts to demean the “Nazi Holocaust” and to suggest that the “real” Holocaust 
is happening right now in Palestine. The book tackles the issue of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. 
Hoffman is using an anti-Zionist strategy to develop a pretext to deny the Holocaust. Using the 
discursive technique of inversion, his book cover demonstrates that Israelis are the perpetrators 
behind the current genocide in Israel and Palestine. As a journalist it is disappointing that Hoffman 
does not analyse both the Israeli and Palestinian points of view. It is true that the Israeli army is 
destroying towns, killing innocent civilians, and so forth. However, Hoffman fails to discuss the 
history of the Israel and Palestinian conflict, the war over land and water, and the constant
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occurrence of suicide bombings in Israel that create fear and instability to Israel’s people and their economy. Furthermore, Hoffman departs from his Holocaust denial claims and attempts to bridge a link between denial and anti-Zionism.

Moreover, Hoffman attempts to establish legitimacy through his book by co-authoring it with Moshe Leiberman, a person with a Jewish sounding first and last name. It is quite possible that the co-author is using a pseudonym and is not really Jewish. Or Hoffman, like other deniers, might have joined forces with a Jew who is anti-Zionist in order to establish legitimacy and credibility. The argument is that if there is a Jewish person who does not support Israel, then he or she is more credible because they do not appear anti-Semitic.

In Hoffman’s photo gallery entitled “Featured Holocaust Exhibits,” under the section called “Israeli Holocaust against the Palestinians” there exists a large photo gallery of context-free photographs that are disturbing and often gory.369

Under a photo of two soldiers lighting candles the following quote is inserted: “Israeli troops take a break from their mass murder of Palestinian women and children to mark “Holocaust Remembrance Day” on April 9, with ceremonies around the country for the “Six Million” Jews “killed by the Nazis.” Another photo showing two dazed women covering their mouths is captioned “Jews gas Arab civilians and medics, Ramallah, April 3, 2002.” In all of these photos, there does not exist a context, but a one-line explanation that lacks a reference or a time period. There is a disturbing photo of several bodies with blood spattered on the wall. Another photo is entitled “Victims of low-intensity genocide are buried: Relatives and medics inter the bodies of 21 Palestinians in mass graves, in Ramallah, April 2. The twenty-one represent a fraction of those Palestinians massacred by the Israeli army since March 29.” It illustrates a mass grave site for
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Palestinians. This is a strong image because Hoffman attempts to argue that the way Jews were treated during the Nazi Holocaust is comparable with how they treat the Palestinians at present. There is a constant comparison between the Nazi Holocaust and the present day situation in Israel. It seems inaccurate to compare the two since the conflict in the Middle East is over land boundaries and the Nazi Holocaust was the systematic killing of a group solely because of the fact that they were Jewish.

Hoffman uses photos to show what the “Zionist war machine” has done to Palestinians. Making alliances with the Palestinians, Hoffman takes the position of a victim himself by showing commonalities between Holocaust revisionists and Palestinians. He coins the term “Zionist war machine” to suggest that the Zionists are the initiators of war since they have a powerful army funded by the USA and the Palestinians do not. Hoffman fails to mention the powerful force of Palestinian extremist groups like Hamas, who, on a daily basis surprise Israelis on buses, open markets, universities, bars, and dance clubs with suicide bombers. He fails to document the 1948 war and the Yom Kippur war, which Israel won and the pre and post 1967 borders that Israel took because they won the war. The issue here is the land, yet Hoffman avoids discussing the roots of this intifada.

**Summary**

Through a deep analysis of the text and graphics one can see the ulterior motives of the Holocaust denier. They are not simply fighting for truth, intellectual freedom, and for their right to free speech. There seems be confusion between free speech and hate speech. Although Jewish, Noam Chomsky is a firm advocate of freedom of speech. He does not necessarily support Holocaust denial but he supports free speech, including that of the deniers. Deniers take advantage of this by creating false alliances with Jewish people who are critical of the Holocaust or Israel.
This is one of their many strategies to gain legitimacy, to quote a Jewish person or a Jewish-sounding person who makes a statement that supports their views. Norman Finkelstein wrote the book entitled *The Holocaust Industry*, a book that illustrates how the Nazi Holocaust has been exploited in North American culture. As a result, he has become an icon or an admirable figure for many Holocaust deniers.

Deniers have been found to take quotes out of context from many classical Holocaust texts (I coin this technique de-contextualized quote extraction) and then they re-interpret the text and add it to their articles or essays (I coin this technique re-contextualized quote insertion). This strategy is not successful because they purposely fail to acknowledge or understand the context behind the text. They treat the quotes as having a life of its own, like living in a vacuum without any context.

To conclude, Holocaust deniers cannot deny an historical event with so much evidence to prove them wrong. As illustrated, most of these articles show that deniers can only trivialize and demean the significance of the Holocaust.
Chapter Seven: Conclusion

Concluding Observations

There are a few interesting points worth mentioning after my analyses. There is a huge amount of repetition and of borrowing text from one essay to another in Holocaust denial literature. I found myself reading the same essays over and over. From the IHR’s “What is Holocaust Denial?” to Greg Raven’s www.revisionists.com “What is Revisionism?” to Barbara Kulaszka’s text entitled “Criminal Prosecution of 'Holocaust Denial'” it seemed as though I was rereading the same essay again and again.

Many of the Holocaust deniers’ web sites are large libraries of essays and articles written by other writers, some unknown, some with Jewish sounding last names, and some more popular personalities. It is interesting to note that Holocaust deniers who claim to be eminent writers and scholars write very little of the material on their own web sites. Most deniers compile articles from magazines, radical right wing journals and newspapers, and receive volunteer contributions from radical right wing writers and scholars. Most believe when one places a “Phd” or “Ed.D” beside their name it suddenly gives them more credibility. It would be a shame to think that scholars are well regarded and received even if they are racists. Holocaust deniers must assume that web users are unintelligent and gullible, if they think that placing an academic degree beside one’s name makes them more legitimate.

The Holocaust denier has a similar role to that of a librarian or an archivist. He (because it is almost always a male) selects and acquires information in the form of essays and articles, which he then organizes and catalogues in a methodical manner. Once done, he makes this information accessible to his user groups in an effective and efficient manner. These are the fundamentals of librarianship: selection, organization, retrieval, and transmission. However, there is an essential difference. A librarian presents a balanced and objective perspective on everything they select and collect. The Holocaust denier does not present both sides of the story. Holocaust denial is hateful and there is no question that every Holocaust
denier has a hidden agenda. The work of a Holocaust denier is organized and efficient because their aim is to provide an accessible database of information.

I have observed that Holocaust deniers assume dramatic personas on their web sites such as the “investigative journalist,” “the teacher,” “the scholar,” “the kind, elderly gentleman,” “the political martyr,” and finally “the angry, bitter racist.” Each and every one of these models has been addressed in the previous chapter. Some deniers are more successful than others who cannot be taken seriously.

Since this research commenced over two years ago, the number of Holocaust denial web sites has steadily risen. It is difficult to keep track of them, since some are hidden. Only the most popular Holocaust denial web sites were selected for analysis, those that are easily accessible to anyone, at anytime. The analysis was especially difficult because of the instability of the web sites. Some web sites that were examined for Chapter Six were omitted for a variety of reasons. The Adelaide Institute in Australia, for example, was initially analysed, but at the end of 2002, the web site was supposed to be shut down. Thus I omitted it in the final draft. At present, the web site is online again. It has been difficult to monitor the constant changes in the content and design of Holocaust denial web sites.

It is interesting to point out the common trend of vilifying the Jew by reversing roles: claiming that Jews have created an Israeli Holocaust against the Palestinians. Deniers use graphic photographs to shock and to trigger the web user’s emotions. On Michael Hoffman’s web site, for example, there is a large section entitled “The Israeli Holocaust Against the Arab People.” In this section, Hoffman places a collection of photos and compiled articles from various sources. For one article from The Guardian, Hoffman changes the title from “A new exodus for the Middle East?” to “Israel's Hitlerian Plans for the Palestinians.” The web site is filled with quotes and photographs, and excerpts of articles that lack context and objectivity. Hoffman frames the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a holocaust led by the Israelis against the Palestinians, but he never exposes or uncovers the deaths or losses of Israelis during the same time.
period. Like many other Holocaust deniers, his views are one sided. Although he takes on the role of an investigative journalist, Hoffman’s legitimacy and credibility have been questioned because of his bigotry.

It is noteworthy that Greg Raven’s Holocaust Historiography Project did not have a title the previous year before. Furthermore, his other web site www.revisionists.com does not advertise the fact that Raven is the webmaster and content manager. It has been interesting to look at the ever-changing content of these web sites. Attached in the appendix are sample pages of the texts I analysed. Please note that the URL’s at the bottom of the pages may not be valid anymore and their content or design may have changed since the writing of this chapter.

**Updates**

As of early 2003, Ernst Zündel was deported from the United States to his native country of Canada. Although he fled Canada in 2001 to the US, his visa expired and he was arrested and brought back. Zündel is applying for refugee status and many Canadians hope that he does not get it. They do not want him living in Canada since they consider him an anti-Semite and a racist. If Canada refuses Zündel’s refugee application, he will be deported back to his native country of origin, Germany, where he will be imprisoned for his Holocaust denial activities. The instability of the Zündelsite over the past month has been worrisome. There has been a great deal of bandwidth and much of the media have consulted the web site for background research.

**The Future of Holocaust Denial**

What does the future hold for Holocaust Deniers and their movement? Based on my research I believe that their goals are to become integrated into mainstream society and to recruit and persuade young people.

Holocaust survivors are slowly dying out and this gives deniers more power symbolically to use full force to disseminate their ideologies without being challenged.
It is an uncertain future for World Jewry with the conflict in the Middle East over land claims, worldwide anti-Semitism, and the Holocaust denial movement.

Gil Seidel’s term “Symbolic Genocide”\(^\text{370}\) in the early 1980’s directly applies to how Holocaust deniers use the Internet to debate a historical event and to obscure Nazi and Hitler’s responsibility for genocide. This term is relevant as anti-Semitism is becoming more symbolic, obscure, and ambiguous. In this postmodern age, anything can be labeled anti-Semitic but anyone can argue that the comment was not anti-Semitic at all.

To prevent criminal litigation, Canadian deniers relocate to the United States or go into exile. If they move to the US, they obtain the freedom to disseminate their claims under the First Amendment. Holocaust deniers in other countries use the American model of free speech as their tool to spread their hate. There is a fine line between freedom of speech and hatemongering and the Holocaust denial movement is a classic example of where the limits become indistinct.

During my research I have found that Holocaust deniers are verbose in their claims. Although, they cannot deny an historical event, they can, however, diminish its value. Some deniers call themselves Holocaust Diminishers, while most label themselves Revisionists.

**Questions for the Future**

Another central concern in my research was “What will happen to Holocaust denial in the future?” That my future as a Canadian-born Jew will be very different than that of my parents and grandparents can be directly related to the study of Holocaust denial. As Holocaust survivors die, deniers can take the opportunity to gain legitimacy and credibility. Some questions that can be answered in the future are: Where will Holocaust denial be in twenty years? Will it eventually move into the mainstream or remain on the fringe? I would argue that over the

last twenty years, Holocaust deniers’ efforts have accelerated. There is a rise in Holocaust denial
web sites and an increase in anti-Zionist rhetoric. The current intifada in Israel only furnishes
deniers more fuel to spread their views. I have found a direct link between anti-Zionism and
Holocaust denial. Since several Holocaust denial web sites act as lobby groups that assume a
political stance as anti-Zionism, they can supplement their claims with a political position. This
gives them more substantial issues to discuss and to debate, and it gives them a reason to harass
Jews and criticize Israeli politics.

**Limitations and Future Research**

In the future, this research can be augmented with an ethnographic study of being a member of a
Holocaust denial movement. In future research I can join Holocaust denial chat rooms, interview one or
more Holocaust deniers, attend an IHR convention, or go out in the field and become a Holocaust denier.
It would be very interesting to conduct further research of the Holocaust denier: the average age, their
clothing, gender, ethnicity, race, religion, and other factors. It is apparent that most deniers are white men.
However, it would be useful to identify the attendees of such conferences as well as the speakers and the
agencies who fund these conferences.

My research was very limited because I tried to answer how Holocaust deniers attempt to achieve
legitimacy through their writings on their web sites. However I never found out whether or not they were
successful. In the future I may wish to find out if Holocaust deniers are successful with their web sites.
Do they influence their users to become deniers themselves or are they seen as eccentric, anti-Semites, or
racists? Are web users puppets who are not critical of web sites? Do web users automatically believe
everything they see on the Internet? It would be beneficial to interview a sample of web users and test
them to see if they find the Holocaust denial web sites to be believable, credible, and legitimate. It would
also be useful to conduct interviews with Holocaust deniers or perhaps go out in the field and live as a Holocaust denier and attend revisionist conferences. These methods can further my research.

This leads us to another question raised in 2002 by Harry Mazal of The Holocaust History Project (THHP). In an email correspondence he asked an important question, “How are they [Holocaust deniers] funded?” This question was not part of my research but thinking about it, I really do not know how deniers are able to give up their day jobs and devote their whole life to denying the Holocaust. I found this question to be an interesting segue into future research. Maybe there is a secret network of corporations or philanthropists who fund deniers to denounce the Holocaust. It would be beneficial to research who funds the Holocaust denial movement. How is it funded and how expensive is it? How did Ernst Zündel get funds to send Fred Leuchter to Auschwitz to take soil samples in the camps? If Zündel knew Leuchter was not a true chemist and engineer, then why did he waste his money?

It is interesting that Arthur Butz is still employed as an Associate Professor at Northwestern University. How can the alumni association agree to have the university fund Butz’s research when one of his research interests is denying the Holocaust? Surely there is a community in the school that opposes his tenure track status at the university. It would be interesting to visit the university and to interview students and faculty, as well as staff and alumni and to ask them if they know about Butz and how they feel about their funds going to his research.

Butz claims that Holocaust denial is an interest outside of his profession as a faculty member of the university. Perhaps the university community is not aware of his research interests or some of them accept the fact that he wrote The Hoax of the Twentieth Century in 1976 (his only book on Holocaust denial).

As a Canadian, another question arises, Will there be any more Canadian Holocaust deniers spreading their theories? Will one be caught teaching his philosophies to classes for twenty years before
being discovered? Will our rights as Canadian citizens be compromised for the sake of freedom of expression equivalent to U.S. Freedom of Speech?

**Final Comments**

Since 1995, the number of Holocaust denial web sites has increased. They grow in size and popularity and they attract press coverage and appeal. There is an increasing amount of literature on the movement and its personalities. This may give them free publicity and promotion as more people become interested and may question the severity of the Holocaust.

Henry L. Feingold claims that “History is a battleground.”371 Deborah Lipstadt's courtroom victory against David Irving is an important one. There is a struggle not only for the continued existence of the Jewish state but also for a Jewish place in history. It is an existential struggle. This is another reason why the increase of Holocaust denial is so disturbing. It was the creation of the Jewish state that allowed Jews to regain control of their history. It is troubling to see Feingold illustrate how some Palestinians who deny the state of Israel also claim that there was no Holocaust.372

In the mid 1990’s American talk-shows used Holocaust denial as a tool to boost ratings. The TV show and radio hosts tried to convey “both sides of the story” by inviting both Holocaust survivors and historians to debate with Holocaust deniers in an open forum. The problem with this idea is that the Holocaust did happen. There is no “other side” to the issue. The very fact that the radio/TV host invites the denier to the show in order to debate the issues gives the deniers’ revisionist beliefs undeserved legitimacy and publicity.373

Some issues that are worth noting are: Will the American media drive Holocaust denial into the mainstream through sensational TV talk shows like Montel Williams, Sally Jessy Raphael, or Jerry
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Springer? Will this be their ticket into the mainstream? It would be interesting to study how people are influenced by talk shows and how Holocaust denial has shaped their opinions before and after the show.

My research illustrates that Holocaust denial has reached mainstream society by way of the right-wing movement. Syndicated columnist Pat Buchanan, who twice ran for president, has made references to the so-called Holocaust “Survivor Syndrome” and claimed that it was “physically impossible for the gas chambers at Treblinka to have functioned as a killing apparatus.” Although Holocaust denial is a belief shared by a few fringe groups, its theories have already taken root in American media and politics. There have been a few politicians, professionals, journalists, and others who have associated Holocaust denial with anti-Zionism. It appears as though this link is one of the ways to disseminate anti-Semitic discourse using a political pretext. It is acceptable not to support the state of Israel; yet it has no relation to Holocaust denial.

Jean-Marie Le Pen, a right-wing politician in France, has a long history of anti-Semitism, racism and bigotry. He is the founder and longtime leader of the National Front, an anti-immigration party that blames the influx of foreigners for France's high crime rate and unemployment. Le Pen has repeatedly used hateful words in attempts to stir up resentment against France's minority groups, including Jews. He has repeatedly made statements that attempt to diminish or deny the Holocaust, once remarking that the Nazi gas chambers were “a mere detail” in history. In February 1997, for example, Le Pen accused President Jacques Chirac of being “in the pay of Jewish organizations.” It is rather disturbing that politicians and intellectuals blame the Jews for the world’s hardships.

Holocaust deniers portray themselves as victims and use Jews as scapegoats for their problems. It is not the Holocaust that they are cynical about, but its consequences. They are dubious about all of the
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monetary support that is given to Israel and of all the Holocaust education initiatives that sprung from this tragic event. They believe that the exploitation of the Holocaust benefits Jews and that Jews use the Holocaust as a tool to their advantage. These are the themes that are drawn from my research, as well as the presence of anti-Semitism on their web sites.

It would be worthwhile to monitor these web sites in a longitudinal study, perhaps over five years. It would be important to monitor their progress and to view the changing themes, the new issues that arise in the movement, and the new obstacles that Holocaust deniers must face in the future. It is evident that there is a symbolic war between Holocaust deniers and the public for their voice to be heard. As Deborah Lipstadt states, Holocaust denial should be taken seriously. In the past, people would just overlook it and perceive the movement as headed by a group of fools, but the movement has changed over the years. More people create web sites, more mailing lists are being compiled, more conferences are set up, and more books are published. Holocaust denial discourse comes from the old traditional form of anti-Semitism, a World Jewish conspiracy.

Since 1995, there has been an ongoing Internet battle between Holocaust denial web sites and anti-Holocaust web sites. Web sites like Nizkor, THHP, and the ADL respond to postings made by the Zundelsite or CODOH. Some web site owners send emails to deniers and post them, some challenge their claims. For example, there is a library of information on David Irving’s web site with his correspondence with Nizkor and vice-versa.

Nizkor is a digital library of web articles, documents, and email correspondence that defends the Holocaust and exposes Holocaust deniers for who they really are: anti-Semites. It would be interesting in the future to see if anti-Holocaust denial web sites grow and win the battle against Holocaust denial. Are web sites like Nizkor or THHP successful? Do they help steer naïve people out of the way of Holocaust denial? At this time, there are few anti-Holocaust denial web sites. Web site maintainers volunteer
countless hours to challenge claims and they spend a great deal of money on web hosting, domain registration, and other administrative costs, in order to fight against bigotry and racism. It is rather alarming that there are more Holocaust denial web sites than web sites that refute Holocaust denial.

The problem lies in that these anti-denial web sites do not receive enough funding to remain operational, while Holocaust deniers mysteriously have funds to hold conferences, plan elaborate trips to concentration camps, and publish books and journals.

Before the Internet, deniers were limited to spreading their claims using pamphlets and flyers, articles in underground newspapers and magazines, and secret conferences held in ambiguous locations. With the advent of the Internet, it is easier to come out of the Holocaust denial closet. The Internet resembles a free press where anyone can publish anything online for a minimal fee. All one needs is an Internet connection, a modem, and a computer. It is simple to create a web page. Users do not have to know HTML as there are many web page editors that create professional web pages in minutes. Web sites are like promotional tools, press kits, digital libraries, or personal stages where their authors can vent, complain, promote, provoke, or defame anything.

In the future, it would be interesting to monitor the changes in all of these web sites and track their changes over the years. What language has changed over the years, what stays the same? Where is the anti-Semitism hidden in the web site? The Zundelsite, for example, has anti-Semitic cartoons deeply embedded within the web site. Zündel portrays Jews as hook-nosed, money-grubbing intellectuals. It would be interesting to do research on Holocaust denial graphics and visual propaganda through the years.

My research focused mostly on text in a web environment, and it focused very little on graphics. Most images on Holocaust denial web pages were not anti-Semitic. Most web sites contained elaborate graphics and images, photographs, and some web sites were more professionally designed than others.

See [http://www.zundelsite.org](http://www.zundelsite.org)
However I could not locate any anti-Semitic cartoons, caricatures, or images. It would be vital to do research on visual Holocaust denial, like comics, art, paintings, caricatures, and it would be useful to see if this form is more powerful than online text.

Some questions that may arise are: Do people want to view images on the Internet and will those images help recruit or convince people to be anti-Semitic or is text more powerful? At this time my research did not focus on images but on discourse. There is a large body of literature on anti-Semitic cartoons and imagery, but it would be interesting to delve into images relating to Holocaust denial. It would be useful to delve into its history and development and how it can accompany the Holocaust denial movement. Do the cartoons help deniers or does it impede their claims? Are they humourous or racist? Are they subtle or overt? One example is Ernst Zündel’s cartoons and there may be more caricatures that relate to Holocaust denial but they are more underground than the movement itself. It would be useful to study visual imagery that relates to Holocaust denial. One web site that is particularly unique is John Ball’s Air Photo Evidence. His web site is simply a photo gallery of images that indicate that gas chambers could not have been in the concentration camps. It would be fascinating to do research on caricatures that mock or debate the gas chamber controversy. Zündel and Ball’s imagery can be a platform for further research. Unfortunately my research did not delve into this enough, but it would be an important aspect of Holocaust denial.

In conclusion, Holocaust denial should be exposed and not censored. If censored, the movement will find other routes to disseminate its claims. It is an important task for the librarian or historian or sociologist to analyze the true intentions of the Holocaust denier and to scrutinize how they manipulate history to create a newly constructed reality to suit their viewpoint.
## Appendix 1

### Table 1: Coding of Web Pages into Four Broad Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology? (Political/Intellectual/Racist)</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>What keywords are used?</th>
<th>What type of graphics?</th>
<th>What is their claim/rhetoric?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Revisionism, Holocaust</td>
<td>Political cartoons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish deaths are greatly exaggerated, using pseudo-scientific rhetoric to suggest that gas chambers did not exist, and claiming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisionism, Holocaust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisionism, Holocaust Diminisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example of a Political Web Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology?</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Graphics</th>
<th>Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Revisionism, Holocaust</td>
<td>Political cartoons</td>
<td>Jewish deaths are greatly exaggerated, using pseudo-scientific rhetoric to suggest that gas chambers did not exist, and claiming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocaust Skeptics, Holocaust Myth, Holocaust story, Politically Sieged, Victims of Zion, Campaign</td>
<td>that Hitler did not have extermination policy. Using the First Amendment of the United States Constitution to support their claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example of an Intellectual Web Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology?</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keywords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Intellectual Freedom, First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, Debate, Inquiry, Radical truth, Freedom of Speech Institute, History, Historical, Historiography, Conferences, Journal, Article,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of a Racist Web Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology?</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td>Graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist</td>
<td>Holohoax, Holoco$\text{St}$, Holocaust Enforcer, Hitler Sympathizer, Holokostavich,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Table of Preliminary selection of Holocaust denial web sites before final selection and analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>When/Where</th>
<th>Summary and Category (Political/Intellectual/Racist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernst Zundel /Ingrid Rimland</td>
<td>The Zundelsite</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zundelsite.org">www.zundelsite.org</a></td>
<td>Early 1995, Toronto, ON, Pigeon Forge, TN, USA</td>
<td>Political: Chronicles the life of Canadian Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel. Web site divided into University type courses, Holocaust 101, 201, 301, newsletter (Z-Grams), biography, Designed and maintained by his wife Ingrid Rimland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley R. Smith</td>
<td>CODOH and CODOH’s Newsletter “The Revisionist”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.codoh.com">www.codoh.com</a> and <a href="http://www.codoh.org">www.codoh.org</a></td>
<td>October 1995, San Diego, CA, USA</td>
<td>Intellectual: American writer, scholar, web site that debates the gas chambers and extermination policy, professionally designed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Irving</td>
<td>Focal Point</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fpp.co.uk">www.fpp.co.uk</a></td>
<td>January 1998</td>
<td>The site of David Irving, chronicling his life and legal struggle with Deborah Lipstadt. Irving is a famous British author who is known for writing histories of Hitler and World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Establishment Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrick Toben</td>
<td>The Adelaide Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adelaideinstitute.org">www.adelaideinstitute.org</a></td>
<td>c.1999 in USA</td>
<td>c.1996 in Norwood, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Weber/Greg Raven</td>
<td>The Institute for Historical Review</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ihr.org">www.ihr.org</a></td>
<td>c.1996 in Newport Beach, CA (United States)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germar Rudolf VHO/Castle Hill Publishers European Foundation for Free Historical Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vho.org">www.vho.org</a></td>
<td>c.1996 in Hastings, East Sussex (United Kingdom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Whitlock Porter</td>
<td>Made in Russia: The Holocaust</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cwporter.com">www.cwporter.com</a></td>
<td>c.1996</td>
<td>Racist: Writer, scholar, who calls the Holocaust a Holocoax, or HolocoSt. This site promotes his Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. Hoffman II</td>
<td>Michael Hoffman’s The Campaign for Radical Truth in History</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hoffman-info.com">www.hoffman-info.com</a></td>
<td>October 1996</td>
<td>Political: Hoffman was a reporter for the New York bureau of the Associated Press and he is a well known author of many Holocaust books that Site includes news bureau, store, archives, and there is very little information about his campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis Carto</td>
<td>Barnes Review</td>
<td><a href="http://www.barnesreview.org">www.barnesreview.org</a></td>
<td>c.1997</td>
<td>Washington, DC (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Weber/Greg Raven</td>
<td>Noontide Press</td>
<td><a href="http://www.noontidepress.com">www.noontidepress.com</a></td>
<td>c.1998</td>
<td>Newport Beach, CA (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims that the concentration camp was really a resort and inmates lived there comfortably.</td>
<td>Site can be accessed in English, Swedish, German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Table of Preliminary overview of web sites refuting Holocaust Denial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>When/Where</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Mazal</td>
<td>The Holocaust History Project</td>
<td><a href="http://www.holocaust-history.org">www.holocaust-history.org</a></td>
<td>c. 1997 San Antonio, TX (USA)</td>
<td>-collection of electronic book and journal articles that educate the web user about the Nazi Holocaust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Nicoletti</td>
<td>Anti-Defamation League (ADL)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adl.org">www.adl.org</a></td>
<td>c. 1995 New York, NY (USA)</td>
<td>-collection of electronic reports, articles, and other documents that track down hate groups on the Internet. Divided into anti-Semitism, anti-Black, anti-gay, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken McVay</td>
<td>Nizkor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nizkor.org">www.nizkor.org</a></td>
<td>c.1995 Nanaimo, BC (Canada)</td>
<td>Nizkor, meaning “We will remember”, is a site dedicated to keeping the memory alive for the people who suffered and died in the Jewish...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holocaust. The site acts as a tool to combat Holocaust denial web sites. Nizkor attempts to expose Holocaust deniers by challenging their claims. This web site has thousands of articles and web documents, correspondence between Holocaust deniers and the Nizkor staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stephen King</th>
<th>The Simon Wiesenthal Centre</th>
<th><a href="http://www.wiesenthal.com">www.wiesenthal.com</a></th>
<th>c.1995</th>
<th>Los Angeles, CA (USA)</th>
<th>The Simon Wiesenthal Center is an international Jewish human rights organization dedicated to preserving the memory of the Holocaust by fostering tolerance and understanding through community involvement, educational outreach and social action.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Franklin</td>
<td>Hate Directory</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bcpl.net/~rfrankli/hatedir.htm">http://www.bcpl.net/~rfrankli/hatedir.htm</a></td>
<td>c.1999</td>
<td>Woodstock, MD</td>
<td>A comprehensive list of hate web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites, IRC channels,</td>
<td>newsgroups, classified and listed into various categories. This site’s purpose is to expose, list, and classify hate online. The sites are not annotated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4- List of articles/essays selected from the nine Holocaust Denial Web Sites

Appendix 4.1 The Institute for Historical Review (Mark Weber and Greg Raven)
Appendix 4.1.1 A Few Facts About the IHR: https://www.ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.shtml
Appendix 4.1.2 Liberating America from Israel http://ihr.org/leaflets/liberatingamerica.shtml

Appendix 4.2 The Zundelsite (Ernst Zündel and Ingrid Rimland)
Appendix 4.2.1 Holocaust 101 chapter one
http://www.zundelsite.org/archive/basic_articles.html/english1011.html
Appendix 4.2.2 Holocaust 101 chapter two
http://www.zundelsite.org/archive/old_zundelsite/english/101/english1012.html

Appendix 4.3 Arthur Butz’s Personal Web Site
Appendix 4.3.1 Holocaust Denial or Holocaust Revisionism?
Appendix 4.3.2: short introduction to the study of Holocaust revisionism
http://www.ibiblio.org/team/history/controversy/abutz/intro.html

Appendix 4.4 Focal Point Publications (David Irving)
Appendix 4.4.1 Battleship Auschwitz http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v10/v10p491_Irving.html
Appendix 4.4.2 The Wages of Apostasy: Life Under Fire


Appendix 4.5 Made in Russia: The Holocaust (Carlos Whitlock Porter)


Appendix 4.5.1 Human Soap, American Style


Appendix 4.5.2 In Praise of A.I.D.S. https://www.cwporter.com/praids.htm

Appendix 4.6 The Committee for the Open Debate on the Holocaust (Bradley Smith)

www.codoh.com and www.codoh.org

Appendix 4.6.1 The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum: A Challenge

http://www.zundelsite.org/archive/basic_articles/incorrect.001.html

Appendix 4.6.2: The Good, The Bad, and the Anti-Semitic


Appendix 4.7 The Holocaust Historiography Project (Greg Raven)

Appendix 4.7.1 Defining 'Holocaust': A proposal https://www.historiography-project.com/misc/definition.php
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Appendix 4.8 Revisionists.com (Greg Raven)

Appendix 4.8.1 What is Holocaust Revisionism?


Appendix 4.9 The Campaign for Radical Truth in History (Michael Hoffman)

https://www.revisionisthistory.org/

Appendix 4.9.1 The National 'Holocaust' Museum: Synagogue of the New State Religion

https://www.revisionisthistory.org/holocaust.html
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