

**THE WEB OF HATE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF
HOLOCAUST DENIAL ON THE NET**

by

Daniela Di Giacomo

B.A. (Hon), University of Ottawa, 2002

D.E.C., CEGEP John Abbott, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, 1999

THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

In the
School
of
Criminology

© Daniela Di Giacomo 2005

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2005

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

Simon Fraser University



Ethics Approval

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics for the research described in this work, or has conducted the research as a member of a project or course approved by the Ethics Office.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for ethics approval and letter of approval is filed with the Office of Research Ethics. Inquiries may be directed to that Office.

Bennett Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

Holocaust denial is one manifestation of racist and antisemitic thought, the scope of which has increased dramatically over the last decade, especially on the Internet. This thesis applies an anti-racism framework to the study of Holocaust denial on the Internet with the objectives of identifying the key claims made by Holocaust deniers, the themes emerging from these claims, and how practitioners working in the fight against hate understand and identify the phenomenon of Holocaust denial.

Qualitative thematic analyses of twenty-five Holocaust denial websites and six supplementary interviews reveal that three strategies are used in denial arguments: the relativization of the Holocaust, the trivialization of the Holocaust and the literal denial of the Holocaust. Holocaust denial serves two primary functions: the ideological goal of promoting hate, racism and antisemitism, and the political goal of furthering white supremacy and National Socialism. Notably, the law remains ineffective and inefficient in combatting Holocaust denial.

To my parents, Alba and Edoardo, who have encouraged and supported me throughout my academic endeavours.

To the victims of the Holocaust: may this examination of Holocaust denial illuminate the danger posed by such literature and preserve the memory of those who perished.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support provided by so many. I would to thank my committee, who provided guidance and encouragement throughout this experience. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Robert Menzies for all his incredible insight and for his phenomenal editing skills. A special thanks goes out to Dr. Parin Dosa for the theoretical contributions she made and for her excellent comments and questions. I'd especially like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Wendy Chan for believing in the importance of this topic and the need for research in this area. Her continuous support has made this thesis on Holocaust denial possible.

I cannot forget the unwavering emotional and moral support from my family and friends throughout this process, in particular Jeff, Susan, Sheri, Jen and Mark. In times of hardship, I drew strength from your encouragement. All of you have helped to make this journey a little easier. An additional thanks goes out to Dr. Margaret Jackson for her exceptional listening skills, patience, and positive energy.

Finally, I wish to thank all the interviewees who participated in this study. The insight and knowledge you have provided have been invaluable to this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Approval | ii |
| Abstract | iii |
| Dedication | iv |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| Table of Contents | vi |
| List of Acronyms | viii |
| Quotation: George Orwell | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction: Hate and Holocaust Denial | 1 |
| 1.1 Chapter Outlines..... | 5 |
| Chapter 2: Understanding Holocaust Denial – A Review of the Literature | 7 |
| 2.1 Racism | 7 |
| 2.2 Antisemitism: Definitions, Manifestations and Repercussions | 12 |
| 2.3 Hate Crime and Hate-Motivated Activity in Canada | 18 |
| 2.4 Holocaust Denial: History, Conceptualization, and Implications | 24 |
| Chapter 3: Research Methods | 36 |
| 3.1 Theoretical Framework | 36 |
| 3.2 The Research Context..... | 39 |
| 3.3 Research Design | 42 |
| 3.4 Sample | 47 |
| 3.5 Conceptual Baggage | 49 |
| 3.6 Limitations and Contributions..... | 52 |
| Chapter 4: The Discourse of Holocaust Denial | 54 |
| 4.1 Website Results..... | 54 |
| 4.1.1 Claims of Holocaust Deniers..... | 55 |
| 4.1.1.1 Relativizing the Holocaust | 56 |
| 4.1.1.2 Trivializing the Holocaust..... | 61 |
| 4.1.1.3 Literal Denial of the Holocaust..... | 75 |
| 4.1.2 Holocaust Deniers as the Real Victims | 80 |
| Chapter 5: Working Against Hate | 93 |
| 5.1 Interview Results | 93 |
| 5.1.1 Conceptualizing Holocaust Denial | 94 |
| 5.1.2 Effectiveness of the Law: Combating Hate and Prosecuting Holocaust Deniers..... | 98 |
| 5.1.3 Need for Education and Awareness: the Canadian Context..... | 107 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Chapter 6: Conclusion: Combatting Hate and Holocaust Denial | 112 |
| 6.1 Strategies for Change | 112 |
| 6.2 Holocaust Denial as a Societal Problem | 115 |
| 6.3 Contributions and Future Research | 117 |
| APPENDIX A: List of Websites | 121 |
| APPENDIX B: Interview Demographics | 123 |
| APPENDIX C: Study Information Document..... | 125 |
| APPENDIX D: Informed Consent by Participants in a Research Study | 128 |
| APPENDIX E: Interview Questionnaire | 131 |
| APPENDIX F: Claims Made by Holocaust Deniers..... | 134 |
| Reference List | 137 |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|------|---|
| PO1 | Interviewee: Member of the New Westminster Police Department's Hate Crime Unit |
| PO2 | Interviewee: Member of the Ottawa/Carleton Police Department's Hate Crime Unit |
| CJC1 | Interviewee: Representative of the Canadian Jewish Congress, Pacific Region |
| CJC2 | Interviewee: Representative of the Canadian Jewish Congress, Pacific Region |
| HEC | Interviewee: Representative of the Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre |
| RRF | Interviewee: Representative of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, Toronto Region |
| CHRL | Interviewee: Former Canadian Human Rights Commission Lawyer |

Prosperity will never hear of you. You will be lifted clean out from the stream of history. We shall turn you into gas and pour you into the atmosphere. Nothing will remain of you: not a name in a register, not a memory in a living brain. You will be annihilated in the past as well as in the future. You will never have existed.

George Orwell (1949)

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: HATE AND HOLOCAUST DENIAL

Diversity has become a defining element of what it means to be Canadian. However, with such a diverse composition in Canadian society come numerous forms of racism, prejudice and discrimination. The most extreme forms and ramifications of these ideologies and practices of hate are what have come to be known as hate crimes. Although the concept of hate crime is relatively new to the criminal justice system, it is hardly new to the human experience. Janhevich (2001) notes that “from the persecution of Christians during the height of the Roman Empire and the Nazis’ ‘final solution’ for Jews in the Second World War, to ‘ethnic cleansing’ in the former Yugoslavia and genocide in Rwanda, hate [crime] has been an evident fact in the history of the world” (p.7). In fact, Canada has a long history of harbouring prejudicial views and scapegoating minority groups, such as the Chinese, Aboriginal Peoples,¹ Jews, and African-Canadians, ultimately resulting in hate-motivated activities against these groups.² Racism and discrimination have been and remain a historical reality in Canada.

Numerous forms of hatred, prejudice and discrimination exist and can be found in every society around the globe. However, such phenomena are not always visible as they can manifest themselves in different ways. Not all individuals or groups act on their feelings of hate and prejudice. When these feelings escalate into acts of discrimination

¹ Abuses perpetrated against Native peoples were often justified by the belief that Aboriginal people were “intellectually and morally inferior to White Europeans, or that they were damned because they were outside the limits of the Eurocentric religious vision” (Mock, 1996, p.126).

² For more information on hate directed at such groups throughout history, refer to the works of Peter Ward (1972, 1982, and 2002), Irving Abella (1982 and 1990), Tan and Roy (1985), Patricia Roy (1989), and Roy, Granatstein, and Takamura (1990).

or violence, serious implications arise. Denial of the Holocaust,³ perpetuated by antisemitic thought, is one form of such hate crime practices. The consequences of such action, however, are universal.

Holocaust denial material, especially on the Internet, has increased dramatically in scope over the last decade. Matas (2000) has noted that “the rise of the Internet has coincided with a rise in hate crimes, a lowering of age for the commission of hate crimes, and the existence of hate crime where it never existed before” (p.155). Organizations such as the League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada⁴ document antisemitic hate crimes, including Holocaust denial, annually. The League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada (2001) has reported that the Internet is “polluted with hatred,” estimating that the “importation of material denying the Holocaust has risen by as much as 2,000%” (p.15).

³ Holocaust denial has also been referred to as Holocaust revisionism (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer & Grobman, 2000). Holocaust deniers prefer to be called Holocaust revisionists, as this term reinforces the contention that their endeavours reflect a legitimate search for historical truth.

⁴ B’nai Brith, Canada is the only organization that I have come across in my research that systematically collects statistics on antisemitic hate crime in Canada. The League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada began collecting statistics and documenting reported incidents of antisemitic activity in 1982. B’nai Brith is considered “a barometer of racism in Canada” (Mock, 2000). The Canadian Jewish Congress also collects antisemitic hate crime statistics; however, these statistics are not published for public use. At present, Canada does not have a centralized reporting system for the collection of police reported statistics on hate-motivated activity. Each police force or RCMP detachment has its own policy regarding the investigation and prosecution of hate-motivated behaviour as well as its own system of data collection and documentation procedures (Janhevich, 2001). To date, there are no federal or provincial policies that mandate the collection of such statistics. The British Columbia Hate Crime Team also collects hate crime statistics (B.C. Hate Crime Team Status Report, Jan.1999-June 2000). However, the investigation and collection of reported hate incidents were seriously affected by financial cutbacks in 1999. According to the Canadian Jewish Congress, since the financial cuts, “the unit has not been able to do outreach and education or fill vacant positions, including hiring a data analyst and seconding a Vancouver police officer to join the unit’s full-time RCMP officer” (Kramer, 2004). As of June 2004, the B.C. provincial government decided to boost its funding and support for the B.C. Hate Crime Team (Kramer, 2004). Although the B.C. Hate Crime Team is mandated to collect hate crime statistics across the province, it does not provide a clear picture of the extent of antisemitic hate crime in British Columbia or in the rest of Canada.

According to Davies, “antisemitism, although not rampant in Canadian society, is not dead, despite all the lessons of history and despite the horrendous events of the 20th century” (p.1). The denial of the Holocaust represents just one facet of antisemitism and is merely one method of promoting such thought. Nevertheless, such denial does not take place in a vacuum and has serious implications for the whole of Canadian society. Denial represents a “stealthy form of antisemitism that connects and strengthens a broad spectrum of extremists” and thus unites hate groups (Levin, 2001, p.1028).

Such forms of hatred exist in Canadian society. We must therefore acknowledge that the existence and promotion of such antisemitic messages have an effect on public consciousness and public opinion. In this thesis, I argue that the public has a right to know about the existence of Holocaust denial and the problem it poses to society. If Holocaust denial is not properly analyzed and discussed in the public arena, we are permitting an attack on history and on the victims of the Holocaust. The importance of this issue gains greater salience given that, in recent years, there has been an increased presence of Holocaust denial literature on the Internet (Borrowman, 1999). Numerous authors have noted that the Internet presents an entirely new danger in the promotion of hatred to a global audience. Shermer and Grobman (2000) discuss the problematic nature of uncritically accepting anything in print:

“I read somewhere that...”, has become the doctrine of evidence in the Modern Age that demands proof for claims. And the Internet has accentuated the effect. Where anyone can speak of the past, no one can. Where everyone’s opinion is equal to everyone else’s opinion, no one’s opinion matters. Where all truths share equal billing on the public stage, no truths can emerge with meaning. Facts blend into fiction. Cautious interpretation morphs into wild speculation. Historiography melds into hagiography. History sloughs into pseudohistory (p.5).

Moreover, hate on the Internet, specifically, cannot be ignored. As David Matas (2000) asserts,

the existence of hate propaganda on the Internet, rather than sapping our will, should mobilize it. Hate speech on the Internet is not just an old threat in new clothes. It is a whole new monster. The Internet has made hate speech accessible to those who before might never come into contact with it. It has brought hate speech to children, to the suburbs. (...) The Internet allows hatemongers to reach into the privacy and isolation of people's homes, to find vulnerable, those who are prone to the message of hate speech, wherever they happen to be (p.485).

These statements point to the danger of leaving the claims made by Holocaust deniers unquestioned, unchallenged, and unknown to the public. Once society allows the distortion of one segment of history to occur, without an appropriate response, we also risk the possible distortion of other historical events. Shermer and Grobman (2000) claim this is why the denial of the Holocaust should not be viewed as merely a Jewish issue. They assert, "it is an attack on all history and on the way we transmit this past to the future" (2000, p.16). Moreover, the claims made by Holocaust deniers not only deny historical events, but they also deny any moral authority to the victims who perished at the hands of the Third Reich, and to those who survived. Since the efforts made to shut down or ignore Holocaust deniers do not stop the messages from being released and potentially assimilated by others, one important response to such a phenomenon is education and discussion (Schwartz, 2000). It is for these reasons that an examination of antisemitic hate crime, such as Holocaust denial, needs to be undertaken in both Canadian and global contexts.

The aims of this thesis are to examine the discourse found on Holocaust denial websites and to establish how they can be understood as a reflection of hate. Previous research has studied Holocaust denial literature through an analysis of printed documentation and published works, or through Holocaust deniers' affiliations (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer & Grobman, 2000; Evans, 2001). With a specific focus on Internet websites, this thesis analyzes material on the Internet and demonstrates how Holocaust

deniers enlist this electronic medium to promote their hateful messages. This thesis identifies the techniques and strategies used by Holocaust deniers to disseminate and promote messages of hate to the readers of their websites and the factors which motivate individuals to engage in the denial of the Holocaust. In addition, the research reveals the thoughts and opinions of representatives from law enforcement agencies, anti-racist organizations, and Jewish organizations, and how they understand and identify the phenomenon of Holocaust denial. Through a qualitative thematic analysis of twenty-five websites and six interviews with individuals and organizations working to combat hate, I also provide some suggestions as to how Canada can more effectively combat hate speech, particularly Holocaust denial. This study applies an anti-racism framework, which views Holocaust denial and antisemitism as a reflection of racism, oppression and violation of human rights to contextualize our understanding of the problem. The results of this thesis alert people to the dangers of the Internet, the dangers of Holocaust denial literature specifically, and the need to regulate hate material that can be found through this medium.

1.1 Chapter Outlines

This thesis consists of six chapters. A brief description of the organization and content of each chapter is provided below.

Chapter Two explores the existing research and writing surrounding the definitions, manifestations and repercussions of antisemitism and Holocaust denial. This chapter offers an overview of the main themes and arguments found in the literature.

Chapter Three outlines the theoretical and methodological framework of this study. The research context, data sources, collection, analyses and the strengths and weaknesses of the research are described in this chapter.

Chapters Four and Five offer descriptive overviews and analyses of the findings from both the website and interview results. Chapter Four is divided into two main sections: the claims advocated by Holocaust deniers about the Holocaust and the Jewish people, and the belief that Jews were not the true victims of the Holocaust. Chapter Five details the interview results, the conceptualization of Holocaust denial, the legal context and the problems associated with prosecuting Holocaust deniers, and the importance of education in the fight against hate and Holocaust denial. This chapter also explains how the motivations behind denying the Holocaust can be understood by viewing the phenomenon as a form of antisemitism and an expression of white supremacy and National Socialist ideology.

Chapter Six, the concluding chapter, addresses the importance of this research and its implications for Canadian society. In addition, I canvass potential strategies for counteracting the spread of Holocaust denial literature, and provide suggestions for future research in this area.

CHAPTER 2: UNDERSTANDING HOLOCAUST DENIAL – A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Currently, there is limited research investigating Holocaust denial literature on the Internet. However, numerous authors, such as Vidal-Naquet (1992), Lipstadt (1993), Sneiderman (1999), Shermer and Grobman (2000), and Evans (2001), have studied Holocaust denial and its social implications. Past research on this topic has focused predominantly on printed material or literature (in the form of pamphlets, books, articles, flyers, etc.) disseminated through traditional means such as the mail. Researchers have yet to thoroughly examine the impact of the Internet on the proliferation of Holocaust denial material and related hate-motivated activity. Holocaust denial raises a number of critical issues, including antisemitic ideology and practices associated with the demonization of the Jew, stereotypes and myths, and hate-motivated activity. In an effort to illustrate the complexity of Holocaust denial and the ramifications of such actions, this chapter explores some of the concepts and themes that emerge from the denial literature.

2.1 Racism

Racism is a complex phenomenon, as it incorporates a system of oppression that has a historical foundation in the “long-term domination of Americans of colour” by white Europeans (Johnson, Rush, & Feagin, 2000, p.95). Racism functions at both a structural and ideological level. According to Thompson (1997), at a structural level, “racism operates to ensure an unequal distribution of social goods according to race” (p.12). Ideologically, racist thought serves to legitimize these unequal distributions when

one group identifies and asserts itself as superior, racially, morally, culturally or otherwise, in contrast to other groups (Thompson, 1997; Brunner, 1999). The manner in which others come to understand, view, and categorize groups of people based on conceptualizations of appropriateness, attractiveness, legitimacy, morality, and intelligence is derived from structural and ideological racism (Thompson, 1997). As such, racial differences have become “the key organizing principle, implicitly or explicitly preparing understanding for perceptions predicated on racial contrasts” (Thompson, 1997, p.12).⁵

Although race is a social construction, “the concept of racism remains very real in that human societies continue to function as though races do exist” (Roy, 2000, p.1), thus contributing to the perpetuation of human inequality (Roy, 2000, p.1). Essed (1990) notes that practices of racism function to associate “specific racial groups with certain kinds of character traits and a certain kind of behaviour” (p.9). It is this attribution of specific character traits and behaviour to different racial groups that forms the core of racial thought (Essed, 1990, p.9). For example, racial theories have formed the basis for exclusion and oppression of Jewish peoples. Pseudo-scientific theories have been employed to reinforce the racial inferiority of the Jew, regardless of religious beliefs, and to justify acts of discrimination, oppression and domination (Mock, 1996). This sub-human portrayal of the Jew has reinforced their image as the “other” and simultaneously engendered and legitimized their persecution. Nazism exemplifies the link between antisemitic and racist ideology. The Holocaust, fuelled by Nazi antisemitism, was the

⁵ Historically, African Americans, Native peoples and other non-European/Caucasian groups were labelled as biologically, culturally, morally, and intellectually inferior, in order to legitimize European systems of slavery and colonization (Johnson, Rush & Feagin, 2000). These groups were thus portrayed as the ‘other’ so as to legitimize and reinforce their domination, supported by theories of racial superiority. As studies of colonization have shown, strong ideologies which legitimate a hegemonic group’s dominant status are often created by “exaggerating [the] physical and cultural differences” of the outgroup (Cox quoted in Johnson, Rush & Feagin, 2000, p.97).

result of “deliberate acts based on pseudo-scientific theory” (Arendt quoted in Hamm, 1994, p.4).

Racism also tends to be coupled with the idea that other groups are “out to ‘snatch away’ and ‘walk over’ the rights of the dominant group” (Essed, 1990, p.11). The belief that the Jews are conspiring to control and dominate the non-Jewish world, for example, reflects this fear and threat posed by an outsider group. Thus, racism and xenophobia⁶ are closely connected. Practices of othering and demonization are integral to racist practice. As noted by Thompson (1997), “racism requires ‘others’ but also requires that they *be* other” (p.12). Thus, White interests must be served, while the rights and interests of the inferior group must be subordinated (Thompson, 1997). Accordingly, Whites are portrayed as more deserving of status and privileges over other, inferior groups (Thompson, 1997). Racist discourse serves to emphasize this categorization of peoples into groups based on notions of superiority and inferiority and further polarizes conceptualizations of the ‘other’ as a threat to the dominant social order. According to Henry and Tator (2003), this discourse involves “a huge range of coded words, ideas, images and practices, which taken together, allow individuals, groups and institutions to socially construct a symbolic or imagined sense of community, a framework for interpreting who is ‘us’ and who is ‘them’” (p.4).

The form of racism most relevant for an examination of Holocaust denial on the Internet is cultural racism. Cultural racism reflects “the value system which is embedded in society which supports and allows discriminatory actions based on perceptions of racial difference, [and] cultural superiority and inferiority” (Roy, 2000, p.1). The image of minorities is based on prejudice and is attacked through the manipulation of language,

⁶ Xenophobia can be defined as a fear of anything or anyone foreign – in other words, a fear of the “other” (Wistrich, 1999).

religion, art, and culture (Essed, 1990). The culture, customs, and values of minority groups are defined as inferior and underdeveloped (Essed, 1990). For example, black skin colour has continuously been associated with a lack of civilization, animalistic characteristics, barbarianism and cannibalism. These characteristics have also been attributed to Jews, coupled with stereotypes and myths that serve to reinforce these images. The target audience and medium used to conduct these messages of hate illuminate the danger posed by cultural racism. Print and visual media (including telecommunications such as the Internet) perpetuate these racist messages and images of inferiority, specifically targeting children, who have no control over the material, nor of the acquired racism once it has become part of their way of thinking (Essed, 1990, p.14). Although cultural racism can theoretically exist without discrimination, in a racist society, cultural racism affects the ways institutions and people operate⁷ (Essed, 1990; Roy, 2000; Henry & Tator, 2003).

There is a mistaken belief that, as a democratic and multicultural society, Canada is free of racism and hate. This is unfortunately not the case. In fact, this belief in the absence of hate and racism in Canadian society may make the situation all the more dangerous, as it ignores its existence and influence, thereby leading to the proliferation of what Henry and Tator (2000) call “democratic racism.”⁸

⁷ For example, such conceptualizations may affect the development and institutionalization of hate crime policies and legislation, whereby definitions of what constitutes a hate crime are constructed and the groups to be awarded protection under the law are identified.

⁸ According to Henry and Tator (2000), “the concept of democratic racism refers to a deep tension in Canada and other democratic states such as the United Kingdom and the United States that arises from two competing value systems: the clash between the reality of pervasive racism and, at the same time, a commitment to the ideology of democratic liberalism” (p.285). This form of racism is deeply embedded in popular culture and popular discourse; it therefore reaches every aspect and institution in society (from families to communities to schools to governments and political authorities, to the media and popular culture) (Henry & Tator, 2000, p.290). In addition, a constant moral tension exists when institutions are controlled and

The Discourse of Racism

The use of language in racist discourse has important ramifications for the perpetuation of racism, antisemitism and Holocaust denial, as it impacts the meanings attributed to the claims and our understanding of the material and messages espoused by Holocaust deniers and other hate mongers. Language is used for numerous purposes: to blame, excuse, justify, persuade, and represent individual or collective characteristics of people or groups (LeCouteur & Augoustinos, 2001). Language can be manipulated to accomplish certain objectives through racist discourse. In fact, such manipulation of language is a necessary requirement for “doing racism.” According to LeCouteur and Augoustinos (2001), “the language of contemporary racism is flexible, ambivalent and contradictory” (p.215). As such, messages of hate and racism may be transmitted to the public in a covert and unsuspecting fashion, hidden within the ambivalence and contradictions inherent in racist language and discourse (Riggins, 1997; Sizemore, 2004). Racist language serves to solidify a racial, cultural, moral, and intellectual hierarchy whereby Whites/Aryans are sitting comfortably at the top while minority groups, such as Jews, Blacks, Asians, etc., are forced to the bottom, resulting in the exclusion of these groups from the privileges enjoyed by the dominant majority (Riggins, 1997; Tsesis, 2002).

The use of humour and satire, an effective tool of racist discourse, is one method by which exclusionary practices and policies are realized (Riggins, 1997). Jokes that target ethnic minorities and racial groups, rhetorical manoeuvres, hyperboles and derogatory generalizations play a key role in racist discourse, maintaining stereotypes and “dividing the world into good and evil forces that are embodied in the differing races

dominated by the White culture: “the lived reality and everyday experiences of people of colour [and other ethnic groups], [are] juxtaposed against the perceptions and responses of those who have the power to redefine that reality” (p.290).

and ethnic groups” (Tsesis, 2002, p.103).⁹ As noted by Sizemore (2004) “language is clearly tied to ethnic divisions, and it works as a ‘tool’ of inclusion or exclusion by categorizing minorities as ‘(un)acceptable,’ ‘(dis)similar,’ or ‘(un)worthy’” (p.547).

A review of the discourse of racism demonstrates that racist arguments or ideology are not based on rational reasoning, judgements or responses (Tsesis, 2002). Racist or prejudiced reactions to certain ethnic or racial groups are often informed and influenced by emotions. As Tsesis (2002) argues, “bigots frequently become livid when minorities refuse to comply with traditional ingroup expectations” (p.104). In response to feelings of anger, resentment, contempt, aversion and frustration, then, the dominant group feels threatened and resorts to techniques by which to degrade the image and status of the minority group (representations of moral, physical and cultural superiority, stereotypes, and practices of demonization and “othering”), which justify exclusionary practices against them (Sizemore, 2004).

2.2 Antisemitism: Definitions, Manifestations and Repercussions

Antisemitism¹⁰ – the hostility towards Jews as a religious or social minority – is intrinsically linked to the ideology and practice of racism. Antisemitism is premised upon a long-standing tradition of hatred of Jewish people, informed by an ideology of racial domination and oppression (Essed, 1990; Mock, 1996).¹¹ A discussion of antisemitic

⁹ Accordingly, stereotypical features and characteristics are constructed and attributed to the minority group, further constructing them as inferior “in order to accomplish social actions (persuasions, blaming, denial, refutations, accusations, etc.)” (LeCouteur & Augoustinos, 2001, p.220).

¹⁰ The word “antisemitism” was first coined by Wilhelm Marr in 1870, connoting “someone who opposes Jewish world dominance and supports German ideological restoration” (Tsesis, 2002, p.15).

¹¹ Although antisemitism allowed for the systematic extermination of 11 million people, it must be noted that the mere presence of antisemitism will not always result in genocide. The experience of antisemitism extends far beyond those societies that have actively pursued genocidal policies. Furthermore, antisemitism is but one ideology to have spawned genocidal policies and practices;

ideology and practice demonstrates how antisemitism can be viewed as a function of racist thought.

Although antisemitism is often used to refer to hatred or hostility towards Jews or Judaism, antisemitism can be conceptualized and defined in a number of different ways.¹² According to Daniel Schwartz (1999), antisemitism is “the hatred of the Jews resulting from the very existence of the Jewish people as a foreign body among other peoples” (p.73). Within his conceptualization, the core of antisemitism has not altered over time and place, as it is grounded in the “strangeness” of the Jew – as they are constructed as foreigners whose ways and customs are not familiar to other peoples (Schwartz, 1999, p.73). Kallen and Lam (1993) view antisemitism as “a particular expression of racism which is rooted in a long, historical tradition of prejudice and discrimination against the Jewish ethnic group” (p.4). Accordingly, antisemitism is a reflection of the ideological and behavioural assumptions of racism, which encompass predispositions (attitudes, beliefs, feelings), institutionalized norms (laws and public policies) and practices “predicated on the erroneous assumption that human populations (‘races’) are innately superior to others” (Kallen & Lam, 1993, p.4). Levy (1991) asserts

homophobia and misogyny have also permitted numerous atrocities to unfold over the years. Holocaust denial, however, is the most apparent and overt manifestation of hate that has come out of the events and ideologies of the Holocaust and the hatred of Jews.

¹² Numerous forms of antisemitism have manifested themselves over the centuries, many of which still persist to this day, including Pagan/Ancient antisemitism, Christian antisemitism, Islamic Antisemitism, Enlightenment antisemitism, Leftist antisemitism, Nazi antisemitism, and anti-Zionist antisemitism. Throughout the various types of antisemitism that have been manifested over time, the influence of various ideologies can be identified. The religious components of Christianity versus those of Judaism, nationalistic sentiments and opposition toward the state of Israel as a Jewish homeland, the inherent “otherness” of the Jew and the degradation and humiliation associated with the construction of “otherness” and racial inferiority, are common threads among these manifestations of antisemitic ideology. The different types of antisemitic ideologies that have existed over the centuries are indeed ideologically progressive in nature. They were not constructed in a vacuum; rather, they were influenced from and developed out of previous forms of antisemitism already rampant in society. In addition, these forms have all had a role in the demonization of the Jew and the perpetuation of Jewish stereotypes and myths. For an in-depth discussion of these forms of antisemitism, see Prager and Telushkin (1983); Mock (1996); Schalit (1997); and The World Union of Jewish Studies (2002).

that “antisemitism is a willingness and a commitment to act against Jews over long duration for either one of two aims: 1) to render Jews harmless by some means or another, thus negating the enormous power they [have] legitimately gained or 2) to accomplish other political goals not directly bearing on the well-being of Jews” (p.5).

Clearly, antisemitism can be defined in different ways and must therefore be examined as a multi-faceted cultural phenomenon. Due to the complexity of the concept, no one definition will ever capture its true meaning. Nevertheless, the manner in which antisemitism has been conceptualized by Levy (1991), Kallen and Lam (1993), and Schwartz (1999), illustrates certain commonalities of antisemitic thought, the most noteworthy being that Jews are fundamentally different from other groups of people – namely, that they epitomize the “other.” As such, their “racial” inferiority is confirmed, resulting in feelings of animosity toward and hatred of the Jew as being a common enemy among people and nations.

The mere ideological presence of antisemitism is not sufficient to result in a physical or psychological manifestation of harm against a Jew. Practices of othering and demonization often precede such harm. According to Henri Zukier (1999),

the most fundamental building block of human thinking is the ability to organize objects and events into discrete classes or categories. Categorization is an act of discrimination, separating those things which belong together from those which do not. Categories thus define the nature of things by stipulating the necessary and sufficient qualities for group membership. Categories often also imitate a hierarchy of differences: they specify relations between classes of objects and a hierarchical organization among them (p.121-122).

It is this separation of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ that is central to the classification of Jewish people into the ‘other.’ Such dichotomous thinking forms the basis of the phenomenon of ethnocentrism – “the attitude or opinion that one’s own ethnic group is not only unique

but 'better' than other ethnic groups" (Essed, 1990, p.7). This ideology of ethnocentrism is at the heart of practices of 'othering.' Groups that have been classified as constituting the 'other' are believed to be different from the dominant groups in society, and are therefore considered to be a threat.

Numerous practices and ideologies have been put in place by various societies across time and around the globe to ensure that Jews are differentiated as constituting not only the 'other', but also the manifestation of the devil. For example, Philippe Burrin (1999) notes that Jews have been represented as "carriers of infection, germs, bacillus, microbes, etc., which attack the organism and poison it" (p.226). Since Jews are believed to be different, both morally and socially, not only are they seen as posing a threat to the dominant group in society; but they are also viewed as possessing a different moral or social code from the pagans, the Christians, the Muslims, and the "Aryans." Hence, they represent the enemy (Wistrich, 1999).

This perceived threat to the dominant moral and social order has led to the demonization of the Jewish people and to the rise of discriminatory practices. Wistrich (1999) notes that "scapegoating and the projection of evil onto humans who have been demonized is a universal human problem. Not only does it exorcise unavowed guilt, create boundaries between in- and out-groups, help to define social, religious and national identity, but it helps construct a moral order against the dangerous, disrupting, defiling other" (p.8), namely the Jew. By assigning the devil or a demon a human face and persona of a Jew, a type of logic is constructed whereby human appearances translate into human demonic character (Befu, 1999). According to Befu (1999), it is this presumed ability to "transfigure themselves from one form entirely into another and to totally deceive unsuspecting humans, which gives demons a power that is threatening

and terrifying to humans” (p.18-19). Antisemitism allows this presumed ability to be transferred onto the Jew, thereby constructing the Jew as a terrifying threat to others.

Stereotypes and myths also play an important role in the continued presence of antisemitic ideologies and exclusionary practices. According to Locke and Johnston (2001), stereotypes are representations of social groups and their members which contain “attributes and traits, both positive and negative [...] and expectations about the behaviour of members of the group” (p.108). In psychoanalytical terms, myths are “plausible stor[ies] concocted to explain and validate unconscious wishes and attitudes” (Ostow, 1996, p.64). As such, myths are used to “explain, rationalize, and resolve insupportable contradictions and tensions in society” (Henry & Tator, 2000, p.290). As explained by Ostow (1996), myths serve to “bridge the gap between fantasy and reality.” Stereotypes and myths about Jewish people therefore influence the manner in which people act and react toward them as a social group, and are used to demonize and label Jewish people as the “other.”¹³ Those most commonly associated with Jews include: blood libels, the black death and well-poisoning, the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, and the Shylock Jew.¹⁴ The blood libel myth adheres to the belief that Jews would kidnap Christian children, drain their blood, and proceed to drink it (WUJS, 2002). Black death and well-poisoning myths maintain the view that Jews were responsible for spreading these diseases during the 14th century (WUJS, 2002). The *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* is a book containing myths about Jewish attempts to dominate the world (Porat, 1999; Tsesis, 2002; WUJS, 2002). Finally, the myth of the Shylock

¹³ See Henry Ford’s (1920) book entitled, The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem for a first-hand account of many of the stereotypes and myths associated with Jews.

¹⁴ Jews have also been blamed for “partnership with the Devil, for internal, economic, and political conspiracy, and for every form of economic, social, and political upheaval” (Mock, 1996, p.125). Other stereotypes have portrayed the Jews as “deicides, usurers, international bankers, cultural subversives, and as the driving-force of Communism” (Wistrich, 1999, p.358).

Jew, drawn from Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, depicts Jewish people as mean, devious, and immoral (WUJS, 2002).

Tsesis (2002) argues that stereotypical "portrayals of outgroups are most dangerous when they exploit images that have been extensively developed over long periods of time" (p.74). The persecution endured by the Jewish people since the pre-Christian era demonstrates the impact of these stereotypes. Furthermore, these stereotypes and myths inform and reaffirm antisemitic perceptions about Jews. As noted by Schul and Zukier (1999), "stereotypical beliefs manufacture the evidence needed to support them" (p.35). Thus, "rather than being refuted by disconfirming evidence, they help generate evidence consistent with them, and thereby survive intact" (Schul and Zukier, 1999, p.35). Stereotypical representations of the Jew effectively illustrate this phenomenon, as they support antisemitic ideology and reinforce negative images of the Jew in the modern world. These stereotypes are both perpetuated by antisemitic groups and individuals, and continue to be disseminated through popular culture and media images (White & Perrone, 2001). The cases of James Keegstra and Ernst Zundel, who was recently deported to Germany for his crimes, are recent Canadian examples of how the practices of othering and demonization, as well as the persistence of stereotypes and myths commonly associated with Jewish people, continue to be reinforced. These two cases also received intense media attention, bringing about both supporters and activists against the continued existence of antisemitism.¹⁵

As demonstrated above, discussions surrounding antisemitism and its practices are complex. Holocaust denial reinforces many of the myths and stereotypes associated

¹⁵ For more information on these cases, see Bercuson (1985), Weimann and Winn (1986), and Kulaszka (1992).

with the Jew, as it serves the function of justifying the claims commonly made about Jewish people. It also perpetuates the ideologies of different forms of antisemitism. However, antisemitic ideologies, practices of “othering,” the demonization of the Jew, and the perpetuation of stereotypes and myths associated with the Jew are not mutually exclusive categories. These processes all interact within the various manifestations of antisemitism as an ideology and practice. In addition, the forms of antisemitism that have been present in the past are now being expanded to encompass a broad new range of antisemitic thought and activity, such as Holocaust denial.

2.3 Hate Crime and Hate-Motivated Activity in Canada

There is much controversy over the definition of hate crime in Canada.¹⁶ Barbara Perry (2001) describes hate crime as “an assault against all members of stigmatized and marginalized communities” (p.1), thereby identifying the unique nature of hate crime and the harms associated with such behaviour. Jenness and Grattet (2001) extend this definition, arguing that hate crimes encompass “acts of violence motivated by animus against persons and groups because of race, ethnicity, religion, national origin or immigration status, gender, sexual orientation, disability and age” (p.19). Accordingly, members of the dominant majority define which group(s) are inferior, racially, religiously, or otherwise, and proceed with demonstrations of such power to underscore the inferiority of such groups. As stated by Perry (2001), hate crime can be used as an “instrument of intimidation and control exercised against those who seem to have stepped outside the boxes that society has carefully constructed for them” (p.2).¹⁷ It is

¹⁶ Hate crimes are also commonly referred to as bias crimes (Hate/Bias Crime Policy Guide, 2000). The occurrence of hate-motivated activity is often exacerbated by hate propaganda, the “distribution and dissemination of hate material” (League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith, 1996, p.17).

¹⁷ For example, the power and influence of the emerging Nazi power allowed for the Jews to be labelled as biologically, intellectually, and culturally inferior to the Aryan race, thereby posing a

nevertheless important to note that hate-motivated behaviour does not occur in a cultural vacuum – “it is a socially situated, dynamic process, involving context and actors, structure and agency” (Perry, 2001, p.1), embedded in social interaction processes. The interrelationship between the ideologies and practices of antisemitism and the perpetuation of hate crime within a given society is evident within these definitions.

The legal definition of hate crime is somewhat different. Under section 318 and 319 of the Canadian *Criminal Code*, there are three forms of hate crime: 1) advocating genocide; 2) the wilful promotion of hatred; and 3) the public incitement of hatred (Suriya, 1998).¹⁸ In this country, these are the only actions currently defined as criminal in relation to hate-motivated activity.¹⁹ The law dictates that offences under the categories of “advocating genocide,” “public incitement of hatred,” and “wilful promotion of hatred” must be directed at an identifiable group (Suriya, 1998, p.33-34). Suriya (1998) explains how the protection of identifiable groups is unique to the criminalization of hate in Canada:

The rationale behind identifiable groups is that a single act directed at one individual victimizes more than just one individual. A hate victim is selected for victimization on the basis of the perceived group in which the individual is a member. This form of selection [...] makes hate victimization non-random. [...] As a result, a hate victim cannot be individuated to one individual; a hate crime victim is a deindividuated victim with a group identity. Accordingly, a hate victim can be best described as a deindividuated non-random victim. It can be argued that

threat to the dominant group. Within the hierarchy of power operating at the time in Germany, it is not difficult to see how the events of the Holocaust were perpetrated against the Jews, without significant protest from Germany, its citizens or other European and North American countries.

¹⁸ See <http://laws.justice.ca/en/C-46/> for the complete Canadian *Criminal Code* description of these categories.

¹⁹ Although these are the only current provisions in place against the commission of hate-motivated offences, there are nevertheless other ways to pursue criminal action against a hatermonger. For example, Ernst Zundel was prosecuted under Section 181 of the *Criminal Code* (spreading false news). In addition, Section 320 (1) of the Canadian *Criminal Code* allows for the seizure of hate material, including electronic databases, and the shutting down of hate websites. The provisions of the Human Rights Act also provide a legal alternative for the prosecution of hate-motivated activities.

the creation of criminal laws against “advocating genocide,” “public incitement of hatred,” and “wilful promotion of hatred” was a recognition of the deindividuated non-random nature of hate victimization (1998, p.36-37).

In addition, Canada’s *Criminal Code* has provisions that deal specifically with sentencing issues. Under Section 718 (2) of the *Criminal Code*,²⁰ sentencing of any criminal offence can be increased if the crime committed was motivated by hate or prejudice against the victim (Suriya, 1998, p.46-48). However, this provision is enforced only after the Crown has secured a conviction for a *Criminal Code* offence and is imposed in limited circumstances.

There are obvious limitations to these legal definitions. Since many crimes motivated by hate do not fall neatly into the three categories enumerated above, numerous hate-motivated offences remain untouched by Canada’s criminal justice system. Who and what get included in the definition of hate crime is a matter of interpretation, legal and otherwise, informed by “a fundamentally political process” (McPhail, 2000; Jenness & Grattet, 2001, p.5). This process may lead to inconsistencies with regard to which groups are guaranteed protection by hate crime legislation. Under the current hate crime provisions of the Canadian *Criminal Code* (Sections 318, 319 (1), and 319 (2)), for example, offences based on language, national origin, age, and sex are do not fall within the scope of the legislation, despite numerous attempts by various community organizations to include them (Suriya, 1998, p.38).²¹ This omission is problematic, as hate-motivated activities are not limited to

²⁰ The definition under this section is more encompassing of the nature of hate-motivated activity, as it allows for the inclusion of categories not covered in Sections 318 and 319. As a result, this sentencing provision has been employed efficiently, albeit infrequently. Although the sentencing provisions of Section 718 are considered part of Canada’s hate crime legislation, in my critique of this legislation, I specifically address the hate crime provisions found within the Canadian *Criminal Code*, and not this sentencing provision.

²¹ These classifications however, are included in Section 718 (2) of the *Criminal Code*.

characteristics based solely on race or religion; rather, traits that contribute to a group's social identity or emphasize differences from the dominant group – such as class, sex, ethnicity, nationality, socio-economic, and political status – have both historically and presently been used as a basis for exclusion and categorization (Katz, 1999, p.269). Furthermore, as the years pass, individuals will be increasingly grouped into categories that form the basis for discrimination against them. It is therefore necessary that the law evolve in accordance with changing social conditions. The effectiveness of Canada's current hate crime legislation must therefore be questioned.²²

Holocaust denial imposes irreversible harm on its victims, a compelling argument for the inclusion of Holocaust denial literature on the Internet in the current hate crime legislation or for the expansion of the current legislation to effectively prosecute such material. The perpetration of hate-motivated activity against a targeted group has significant consequences for the victims of these crimes, and for those who identify with these victims. Numerous studies have examined the harms that are associated with hate speech and hate-motivated activities. The League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada's 1993 study of the impact of hate-motivated crime on six racial and religious minority communities in Toronto found that enormous pain is inflicted by racially motivated crime, pain that transcends community boundaries (Mock, 1994, p.32). The

²² Suriya (1998) notes that since hate crime provisions became part of the *Criminal Code* in 1970, "there have been only three cases with successful prosecutions out of a total of five prosecutions" (p.51). Section 318 on "advocating genocide" has been used only once, and unsuccessfully; Section 319 (1) on "public incitement of hatred" has never been utilized; and section 319 (2) on "wilful promotion of hatred" has been used four times, three of them successfully (Suriya, 1998). Unfortunately, most hate-motivated activities, while abhorrent in nature, are not *Criminal Code* offences or have not been successfully prosecuted as such under Sections 318, 319 (1), and 319 (2) (Suriya, 1998). Consideration in these cases is generally directed toward human and civil rights protection legislation, harassment policies and community-building efforts through the Ministry of Multiculturalism and Immigration (Hate/Bias Crime Policy Guide, 2000). The symbolic function of Canada's hate crime legislation must also be questioned, given that this legislation was developed for the protection of identifiable groups and deindividuated non-random victims (Suriya, 1998). If the current hate crime legislation fails to protect society from hate-motivated

study further notes that such hate-motivated activity both isolates minority communities and increases their potential for victimization (Mock, 1994, p.32). A pilot study of 72 hate crime victims conducted in 1989 by the National Institute against Prejudice and Violence in the United States concluded, “there were more symptoms and a greater effect on the individual when the motivation was prejudice” (Cohen, 1999, p.105).

The American Psychological Association Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence (1984) had already established these findings and had further demonstrated an increase in psychosomatic systems among the victims of racially motivated crimes (Cohen, 1999, p.105). Hate propaganda promotes negative feelings within the targeted group, which may lead to a negative self-image among its members, combined with feelings of worthlessness (Mock, 1994; Mock, 1996; Cohen, 1999; Tsesis, 2002). Such activity has both direct and indirect consequences for the victims and their decision-making processes. Hate propaganda, hate speech, and hate-motivated activity maintain “hierarchies by helping to legitimize degrading stereotypes and dangerous attitudes” (Tsesis, 2002, p.96), thus affecting the way victims approach the world around them and the decisions they make.

Clearly, hate crimes are not victimless crimes – they are highly personalized attacks based on a set of characteristics (such as race, ethnicity or religion), creating an environment of fear and uncertainty among members of the target group (Lauder, 2001). As noted by Silver, Mihorean and Taylor-Butts (2004), “5% of Canadians [and 11% of visible minorities] are worried or very worried about becoming the victim of a crime, because of race, ethnicity, language and/or religion” (p.1). Statistics on hate-motivated activity in Canada establish the salience of the current problem. In British Columbia,

behaviour, an argument can be made that the law’s ineffectiveness trivializes the significance and impact of hate crime on its victims.

hate crime statistics are generally collected by the British Columbia Hate Crime Team.²³ The Team estimates that only 5 to 10% of hate crimes are reported to police.²⁴ Furthermore, they suggest that “reporting and tracking of these crimes are inconsistent, reflecting a need for further education and training” (2000, p.1). In the time span from July 1997 to December 1999, 426 hate or bias incidents involving 532 victims and 451 suspects were reported to the BC Hate Crime Team. While reports were received from most B.C. regions, the majority (85%) of incidents occurred in the Lower Mainland.²⁵ Over 50% of hate crimes involved racial bias - sexual orientation (33%) and religious bias (10%) were other motives (over 70% of religious bias was antisemitic); bias against gender and physical disabilities were also factors. The League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada (2003) notes that “traditional antisemitic activity in Canada has remained a constant threat, with a 35% increase over the past five years” (p.1). There were 584 antisemitic incidents reported to the League for Human Rights in 2003. Their 2003 Audit Report of Antisemitic Incidents acknowledged the growing danger of hate on the Internet. According to the report, “the problem of widespread dissemination of hate propaganda has intensified” with an estimated number of 3500 to 4000 hate sites available world-wide (B’nai Brith, 2002, p.3). In fact, B’nai Brith received 55 Internet site

²³ The British Columbia Hate Crime Team lost most of its funding in 1999, causing a four-member team to be reduced to a one-member “team,” thereby seriously impeding the investigation and collection of reported hate incidents. The team was mandated to collect hate crime statistics from 1997 to 1999. As of 1999, these statistics were no longer collected in British Columbia. According to the Canadian Jewish Congress, since the financial cuts, “the unit has not been able to do outreach and education or fill vacant positions, including hiring a data analyst and seconding a Vancouver police officer to join the unit’s full-time RCMP officer” (Kramer, 2004). As of June 2004, the B.C. provincial government decided to boost its funding and support for the B.C. Hate Crime Team (Kramer, 2004).

²⁴ At present, Canada does not have a centralized reporting system for the collection of police reported statistics on hate-motivated activity. Each police force has its own policy regarding the investigation and prosecution of hate-motivated behavior as well as its own system of data collection and documentation procedures (Janhevich, 2001). There exists no policy mandating police forces to implement a national database for the collection and documentation of hate crime statistics (Janhevich, 2001).

²⁵ This is partly due to the fact that the Vancouver Police Department, who were further ahead in terms of training officers, had a member on the BC Hate Crime Team.

complaints in 2002. Holocaust denial websites would certainly fall within this category, although incidents involving Holocaust denial literature were not specifically identified within the audit.

2.4 Holocaust Denial: History, Conceptualization, and Implications

The final part of this literature review examines the phenomenon of Holocaust denial specifically. Holocaust denial, the most recent manifestation of antisemitic hate activity in Canada, can be conceptualized as the organized effort to deny or minimize the established history of Nazi genocide against the Jews (Lipstadt, 1993, p.21). As noted by Benz (1999), Holocaust denial should not be viewed simply as an expression of Nationalist Socialism or Nazism, but as a “code for a new antisemitism and for again excluding the Jewish minority from society” (p.340). Although denial of the Holocaust is not a new phenomenon and has been present for decades, the practice has increased in scope and intensity since the 1970s, particularly in North America (Lipstadt, 1993, p.17). According to Matas (2000), “Holocaust denial has become the leading form of modern incitement of hatred against Jews” (p.58). As stated by Benz (1999), Holocaust denial literature and motivations behind such activity are “completely antisemitic and follow traditional patterns while reinterpreting historical events” (p.346).

Shermer and Grobman (2000) and Levin (2001) have written about the history of the Holocaust denial movement in North America. They note that Holocaust denial has a history dating as far back as the 1930s, when historians such as Harry Elmer Barnes and Sidney Fay challenged the events and interpretation of World War I, asserting that Germany had not wanted war and questioning the involvement of the United States in European affairs (Shermer & Grobman, 2000). The aftermath of the Second World War brought on a similar form of revisionism in Germany, where there was opposition to the

Nuremberg trials. Shermer and Grobman (2000) further state that, beginning in the 1950s, Germany used two arguments to dispute its involvement in World War II: 1) “that *Weltjudentum* (world Jewry) had declared war on Germany in 1933, and the Nazis, as the ruling party of the nation, had simply reacted to the threat”; and 2) “that because Germany had grown into an industrial and military power under Hitler’s leadership in the 1930s, the Western powers had conspired against her by supporting Poland and had thus triggered World War II” (p.40). The specific denial of the events of the Holocaust began in the 1960s and 1970s as a result of antisemitic writings published during this period.²⁶ They also served as fundamental material for contemporary antisemitic claims by Holocaust deniers.

There is also some controversy over who should be accredited with the commencement of the Holocaust denial movement. Certainly, Holocaust denial was taking shape at the very moments in which atrocities were being committed against Europe’s Jewish population during the Second World War. Paul Rassinier, a French Socialist, has been recognized as the first influential person in the denial movement (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer and Grobman, 2000). He had spent time in concentration camps during the war and later took offence to Holocaust survivors’ allegedly ‘inaccurate’ testimonies regarding life in the camps (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer and Grobman, 2000).

Alexander Ratcliffe has been recognized as the first person to actually deny the events of the Holocaust, as evidence in a magazine he had published in 1945 and 1946,

²⁶ These publications include: Franz Scheidl’s 1967 ‘History of the Ostracism of Germany,’ Emil Aretz’s 1970 ‘Witches’ Multiplication of a Lie,’ Thies Christophersen’s 1973 ‘Auschwitz Lie,’ Wilhelm Staglich’s 1973 ‘Auschwitz Myth,’ Richard Harwood’s 1973 ‘Did Six Million Really Die?’, Austin App’s 1973 ‘Six Million Swindler,’ Paul Rassinier’s 1978 ‘Debunking the Genocide Myth,’ and Arthur Butz’s 1976 ‘Hoax of the Twentieth Century,’ which is considered the ‘bible’ of the Holocaust denial movement (Shermer and Grobman, 2000).

The Vanguard (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer and Grobman, 2000). This magazine claimed that the Holocaust was an outright invention of the Jews. As an organized propaganda and hate movement, however, the roots of Holocaust denial can be traced back to 1979, when Willis Carto, founder of Liberty Lobby, incorporated the *Institute for Historical Review (IHR)* as an organization aimed at promoting historical awareness (Levin, 2001). At present, this *Institute* is populated with many well-known Holocaust deniers, such as Mark Weber, David Irving, Robert Faurisson, Ernst Zundel and David Cole (Shermer and Grobman, 2000). Carto also founded the Populist Party, a far-right political party in 1983, best known for “its conspiracy theorist, bigoted newspaper, the Nationalist Times, and for its 1988 presidential candidate, former Klansman David Duke” (Levin, 2001, p.1011).

A number of claims are put forth by Holocaust deniers in their attempts to minimize or deny the events of the Holocaust and the suffering of approximately 11 million people, 6 million of whom were Jewish. These claims range from the assertion that the Holocaust is a mass fraud perpetuated by Jews, to the enormous amounts of sympathy and reparations enjoyed by the Jews (and the state of Israel) because of the focus and attention devoted to the events of the Holocaust (Matas, 2000). Sneiderman (1999) divides antisemitic claims in relation to the Holocaust into three categories: Holocaust denial, the Holocaust relativized, and the Holocaust trivialized. The first category of Holocaust denial involves the outright denial of the events of the Holocaust and the proclamation that the Holocaust is a myth (Sneiderman, 1999). The second category – ‘the Holocaust relativized’ – does not comprise an outright denial of the Holocaust, but rather purports to situate the Holocaust within a ‘historical perspective’ (Sneiderman, 1999). By asserting that crimes of genocide have occurred in numerous countries throughout history, this perspective argues that the Holocaust should not be

accorded any special notice (Sneiderman, 1999). The third category – ‘the Holocaust trivialized’ – involves trivializing or minimizing the events of the Holocaust by denigrating or de-legitimizing the atrocities that took place during the Nazi reign (Sneiderman, 1999, p.331). An example given within the article, reflective of Holocaust trivializing, is the following:

In Quebec, Mr. Justice Bienvenue was passing sentence on a woman convicted for murder for slicing the throat of her estranged husband with a razor blade. As reported by the Associated Press, he used the occasion to condemn her crime as worse than the gassings in the death camps: Even the Nazis did not eliminate millions of Jews in a painful and bloody manner; they died in gas chambers without suffering (Sneiderman, 1999, p.332).

This category also encompasses attempts at Holocaust humour or the denigration of the memories of Holocaust victims, Jews and non-Jews alike. Rafael Moses (1997) also speaks to this phenomenon of trivialization by noting how the word ‘Holocaust’ becomes drained of meaning when used too often, too widely, or too lightly. In doing so, he asserts that “the very special meaning and implication of the Holocaust by such a widespread misuse of the word Holocaust” may be forever lost (1997, p.60).

Sneiderman’s categorizations of the messages espoused by Holocaust deniers reflect new and increasingly harmful methods by which antisemitic ideologies are being perpetuated. Given the significant harm that Holocaust denial inflicts upon the Jewish community, it is imperative that Holocaust denial literature be recognized and challenged, to ensure that Holocaust deniers and hate groups do not have free reign to spread their message to whoever is ready and willing to listen. As stated by Tsesis (2002), “to wait until there is an immediate danger of violent actions is to ignore the empirical lessons of the past” (p.78).

The dissemination of Holocaust denial materials and messages is all the more problematic, given that they are being promoted and circulated “in schools and public venues across the country, along with active recruitment of young people in high schools and campuses to the racist and antisemitic cause, primarily through the dissemination of hate in pamphlets, tapes, videos and the Internet” (Mock, 1998/1999, p.2). The Internet, in particular, has made the dissemination of hate easier to accomplish, while at the same time rendering it more difficult to criminally sanction. In fact, it has been noted that monitoring hate activity on the Internet at the national level is an arduous task (Janhevich, 2001).

Vidal-Naquet (1992), Lipstadt (1993), Shermer and Grobman (2000), and Richard Evans (2001) are prominent figures in the modern movement to challenge the claims of Holocaust deniers.²⁷ Vidal-Naquet’s (1992) work demonstrates how history (human history in general and Jewish history in particular) has been distorted by mainstream cultures, attempts to refute the claims made by Holocaust deniers, and alert society to the danger posed by these groups. Lipstadt (1993) provides an account of the origins of Holocaust denial in Europe and America, explaining how the deniers falsify facts to uphold their antisemitic conspiracy theories. She also looks to other genocides that have occurred throughout the centuries in other parts of the world, and compares these events to the Holocaust, exploring their similarities and differences and the ideologies that have rendered genocidal acts acceptable to governments and citizens alike (1993). Shermer and Grobman (2000) explore the differences that exist between history and pseudohistory, using denial of the Holocaust as a case study of how “the past can be revised for present political and ideological purposes” (p.3). They also

²⁷ Ken McVay is challenging such literature on the Internet, on his website “the Nizkor Project,” an educational website aimed at educating about the Holocaust and directly refuting Holocaust denial arguments with historical facts.

examine various Holocaust deniers and the claims that they make about the Holocaust; provide evidence to refute these claims, and present the undisputable facts that prove the existence of the Holocaust (2000). Shermer and Grobman (2000) lay the framework for examining the manner in which we learn and acquire knowledge about the existence of any historical event. Shermer and Grobman (2000) actually acquaint themselves with the most popular and influential Holocaust deniers, interviewing them, attending their conferences, engaging them in debate, and using the words of the deniers themselves to refute their claims. Evans (2001) chronicles the history of the Holocaust, the main figures of the Holocaust denial movement and the claims that are made about the Holocaust – with a specific focus on David Irving's²⁸ work. Evans also identifies the political ramifications of the Holocaust and its subsequent denial.

The common link among the above authors and their work is the identification of the major figures and arguments associated with Holocaust denial.²⁹ These authors describe the principal tenets of Holocaust denial as falling into three main categories: 1) the absolution of the Nazis by arguing that they never had any systematic plan for the annihilation of Jews and that the means supposedly used for this annihilation were technologically impossible; 2) the legitimization of the killing of the Jews who died by contending that they were murdered for justifiable reasons; and 3) placement of blame for the perpetuation of the “Holocaust hoax” on Israel and Jewish leaders and scholars,

²⁸ In his book, *Lying about Hitler*, Evans describes David Irving's libel case against Lipstadt in great detail. He argues that Irving's loss can be viewed as “a victory for history, for historical truth and historical scholarship” (2001, p.265). Deborah Lipstadt (1993), on the other hand, contends that the trial was ultimately unsuccessful in defending and preserving the memory of the Holocaust. Lipstadt (1993) argues that Holocaust deniers not only represent a “clear and present danger” to society, but a future danger as well, rendering the public increasingly susceptible to the dangers of Holocaust denial (Evans, 2001, p.264).

²⁹ All of the conclusions made by the authors are derived from published Holocaust denial literature (in the form of books, articles, pamphlets, flyers, etc.) or from conversations with the deniers themselves. None of the authors focused exclusively on Holocaust denial literature posted on hate or Holocaust denial websites on the Internet.

all of whom ostensibly have material and political interests in its dissemination (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer and Grobman, 2000; Evans, 2001). In addition, these authors identify those individuals and organizations most prominent in the dissemination of Holocaust denial material and those who have been influential in the movement.

The Psychology of Denial

The psychology of denial is an important aspect for consideration in attempting to comprehend the factors involved in the denial of the Holocaust.³⁰ Stanley Cohen (1993) views denial as “an unconscious defence mechanism for coping with guilt and other disturbing psychic realities” (p.105). He explores Sykes and Matza’s neutralization theory to further explain the concept of denial. The techniques of neutralization, which he applies to human rights violations, consist of denial of injury, denial of victim, denial of responsibility, condemnation of the condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties. With respect to the Holocaust, denial of injury involves the view that Jews have exaggerated their experience and that their victimization was no greater than that of any other victim of the Nazi Holocaust or any other genocide. Denial of victimization reinforces the belief that the Jews are not the real victims of the Holocaust; it is the German people or the American public who are the actual victims, as they have been deceived over the years about the extent and magnitude of Jewish casualties during the Holocaust. Denial of responsibility blames Jewish people for their own victimization, asserting that they were somehow at fault or deserving of suffering, while condemnation of the condemners upholds the view that Jews are in fact accustomed to violence, as they act violently among themselves. Lastly, appeal to higher loyalties encompasses the belief that a higher purpose is being served through the manifestations of such denial practices.

³⁰ An in-depth analysis and application of the psychological motivations and explications of denial and why people hate would be useful in providing more insight into the phenomenon of Holocaust denial.

Accordingly, within the example of Holocaust denial, one of the claims Holocaust deniers would make is that their efforts at disproving the events of the Holocaust are part of a greater search for historical truth and awareness.

According to Cohen's theory, each technique of neutralization "is a way of denying the moral bind of the law and the blame attached to the offence" (Cohen, 1993, p.107). He contends that such techniques are applicable to human rights violations and state crimes, such as acts of genocide and hate crime. Cohen (1993) notes, "neutralization comes into play when you acknowledge (admit) that something happened – but either refuse to accept the category of acts to which it is assigned ('crime' or 'massacre') or present it as morally justified" (p.107). Clearly, this theory has implications for the activities of Holocaust deniers or "Holocaust Bashing," as coined by Sneiderman (1999), as Holocaust denial claims consist mostly of minimization techniques that attempt to justify or rationalize the events of the Holocaust and the suffering of its victims (Lipstadt, 1993; Shermer and Grobman, 2000; Evans, 2001).

Similarly, Rafael Moses (1997) asserts that an individual tends to make use of denial "at a time when he or she needs to ward off an external reality felt to be enormously threatening" (p.56). In this sense, denying the events of the Holocaust can be seen as a response to a perceived threat, namely the Jew, Jewish power, or Jewish world domination and control. The denier thus attempts to evade taking responsibility for all the acts that occurred during the Holocaust, the carrying out of plans to systematically murder millions of people, and the atmosphere in which it all took place (Moses, 1997). Abt and Hirsch (1994) also agree with Cohen (1993) and Moses (1997), stating that antisemitic narratives and viewpoints serve as "a way of reducing dissonance for group members and of affirming group boundaries among those who feel threatened by the Jews' recalcitrance" (p.8). In effect, racial hierarchies are reproduced and justified

through Holocaust denial arguments by depicting Jews as a threat, thereby emphasizing their inherent “otherness” and dangerousness.

Cohen (1993) stipulates that denial can be distinguished at the individual and collective levels, which can be further categorized into ‘denial of the past,’ ‘literal denial’ and ‘implicatory denial’ (p.108-110).³¹ Denial of the past involves “organized attempts to cover up the record of past atrocities” (Cohen, 1993, p.108). Holocaust denial and claims that the Holocaust is a ‘hoax’ or a ‘myth’ fall within this category. Literal denial involves denial at both the individual and collective levels – that is, denial that is structured “by the massive resources of the state” (Cohen, 1993, p.109). This discourse of official or state-sponsored denial has been noted by Charny, who has proposed a set of templates often adopted to justify the denial of a known genocide such as the Holocaust (Cohen, 2001, p.133-134). According to Charny, such a discourse involves the following tenets:

- 1) do not acknowledge that the genocide took place;
- 2) direct denials should not be attributed to the government or high leaders, only to functionaries and anonymous spokesmen;
- 3) deny the facts of the genocide by transforming them into other kinds of events;
- 4) represent the perpetrators as victims and the victims as perpetrators (or as lesser victims than others were);
- 5) not only deny the facts of the genocide outright, but advance counter-claims that the victims were treated well;
- 6) insist as long as possible that all the data are not available, that allegations are forgeries and hoaxes, and that further research is needed and/or that new research disproves the claims of genocide;
- 7) question the statistics, so that the number of dead victims is smaller than usually stated;
- 8) distance the event in time – it all happened so long ago, there is a new generation of the (perpetrator) people today, why not let the wounds heal? (Cohen, 2001, p.133-134)

³¹ Only two forms of denial – denial of the past and literal denial – are discussed, as they apply specifically to this study of Holocaust denial. As for implicatory denial, Cohen explains that this form of denial involves the use of excuses, justifications, rationalizations (or neutralizations) that seek to “negotiate or impose a different construction of the event from what might appear to be the case” (2001, p.110).

Social or economic factors can also have an effect on the psychology of denial. An appreciation of these factors facilitates our understanding of the conditions that may induce people to turn to denial to explain and contextualize the world around them. Various authors have voiced the belief that such factors can provide the impetus for hate-motivated activity, including but not limited to Holocaust denial. For example, Turner (1996) and Eberhard (1998) have attributed Hitler's rise to power to macroeconomic conditions (Glaser, Dixit and Green, 2002). Similarly, competition for material resources has also been invoked as an explanation for the occurrence of hate crime. Hovland and Sears' (1940) study supports this interpretation by demonstrating how "the price of cotton (and other economic indicators) in the post-Civil War Deep South correlated negatively with the number of lynchings of Blacks" (Glaser, Dixit and Green, 2002, p.179). However, these authors also concede that "recent analyses of historical and contemporary data indicate that economic variables are not reliable predictors of hate crime" (p.179). Other studies (Green, Glaser, and Rich, 1998; Green, Strolovitch, & Wong, 1998; Green, Abelson, & Garnett, 1999) reveal that economic conditions, such as unemployment, are not valid predictors of hate-motivated activity, nor do they show reliable correlations with hate crimes committed against Blacks, Asians, Jews, or gays and lesbians (quoted in Glaser, Dixit and Green, 2002). Although there may be an indirect correlation between economic conditions and the occurrence of hate crimes, it seems as though economic or social factors may not play as prominent a role as does a perceived threat to integrity, separateness, and hegemony of an in-group (Glaser, Dixit, & Green, 2002).

A compelling argument can be made that Holocaust denial is a distinct ideological movement, as it serves a purpose of broadly promoting antisemitism (Levin, 2001). Levin asserts, "because the 'Jew is a transnational figure of hate' for right-wing

extremists throughout the world, denial has a unique power to influence and bond a vast array of autonomous ethnic and political antisemites” (Back, Keith & Solomos quoted in Levin, 2001, p.1002). As previously discussed, Deborah Lipstadt (1993) has studied Holocaust denial, including an examination of its political implications. Lipstadt agrees with Moses (1997) and Levin (2001), stating that such denial of the Holocaust is indeed tied to antisemitic thought and, currently, to an antisemitic political agenda. Lipstadt (1993) argues that Holocaust denial is a “product of political bias and political extremism” which, she stipulates “has no place in the world of serious historical scholarship” (Evans, 2001, p.2).

David Matas (2000) also supports the view that Holocaust denial, as an incitement of hatred against Jews, should be understood as a political tool. Matas (2000) identifies the dual agenda served by Holocaust denial arguments: 1) convincing others in believing their ideology of “Jewish fraud, Jewish world control, [and] Jewish greed” (p.59) and 2) legitimizing the antisemitic and racist ideology that led to the Holocaust in the first place. As such, he notes that Holocaust denial “is not just a threat to Jews, but a threat to peace, a threat to democracy, and a threat to all humanity” (Matas, 2000, p.59). Society cannot dispute the fact that Holocaust deniers espouse both a politically and morally harmful message, one that is undoubtedly linked to hatred and antisemitic animosity. Such messages can create a societal climate that fosters not only animosity between races, but racial hatred and repression as well. Schwartz (2001) notes that “rhetoric can often trigger action, speech can turn into conduct, words can migrate into ‘sticks and stones,’ which do indeed harm us” (p.330). It is this antisemitic ideology, he asserts, that permitted German narratives depicting Jews as evil and justified the Nazi genocide (Schwartz, 2001).

A review of the literature on antisemitism demonstrates that antisemitic thought – and practices of categorization and exclusion based on such thought – still persist and remain influential. Holocaust denial is the most recent manifestation of such thought. Such denial literature has flourished under the encouragement of racist activities by dedicated hate propagandists and organized hate groups. It is thus important to examine Holocaust denial and its implications throughout Canadian society, since such ideologies have serious consequences for all of us. As stated by Griffiths, “today it’s the Jews who are slandered; tomorrow – the Catholics, the Blacks or me” (quoted in Weimann & Winn, 1986, p.27).

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section outlines the theoretical framework underpinning this thesis. The second section describes the methods used for the research, detailing the research design, data sources, sample, data collection procedures, and analyses undertaken for both the Holocaust denial websites and interviews. The limitations and strengths of the research are also discussed.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

As this study focuses on understanding the messages espoused on Holocaust denial websites and the repercussions of such hate material for society, it is appropriate that an anti-racism perspective be employed as an interpretive lens guiding the research and analysis. Accordingly, this thesis investigates Holocaust denial by viewing this phenomenon as an experience of social oppression, abuse of power, and violation of human rights, and therefore as a function of racism and racist thought.

Anti-racism refers to “an active resistance to the ways in which knowledge, status, value, and competence have been framed to give preference to dominant interests” (Thompson, 1997, p.14). Whiteness is perceived as normal, neutral and superior, while blackness (and by extension, yellowness, Jewishness, and the like) “stigmatizes groups and individuals as exceptional, problematic, exotic, or threatening” (Thompson, 1997, p.10). According to Johnson, Rush, and Feagin (2000), “Caucasians [are] at the top of what [is] seen as a ‘natural hierarchy,’ with Asians, Africans, and other non-European peoples” occupying much lower positions (p.96). Examining the

discourse of Holocaust denial through an anti-racist lens necessitates recognition of the ways in which the advantages enjoyed by certain groups of people have been informed and supported by racist discourse and practice (Thompson, 1997).

Himani Bannerji (1993, 1995) and Sherene Razack (1998) have written extensively about critical anti-racism theory. They argue that power is a concrete mechanism which organizes social and cultural relations according to race, class, and gender. Bannerji (1995) argues that racist ideology has been built into the policies, practices, and structures of society, where “a working class is still being created through racist immigration policies and segmentation of the labour market” and where the voices of women of colour in particular, are still being silenced (p.43). Racism is thus internalized, reproduced, and reflected in the Canadian social structure and cultural fabric on a daily basis (Bannerji, 1995; Razack, 1998). Members of society therefore become the “cultural and political workers supporting the daily reproduction of white racism” (Sheth & Handa, 1993, p.79).

According to Bannerji (1995) then, the solution begins “in the history of colonial and imperialist economic, social and political practices which have in the past and now continue to construct Canada” (p.44) and in ideologies and discourses that have emerged justifying the categorization of people based on perceived differences in race, ethnicity, religion or the like (Bannerji, 1995; Razack, 1998). Thus, in order to affect change, imperialist and capitalist “ideologies, institutions, economies and state powers” would have to be challenged, combined with a re-thinking of class and the manner in which racism currently constructs social life in Canada (Bannerji, 1995, p.48; Razack, 1998).

In the above conceptualization of anti-racism, any relationship or belief which employs assumptions about inherent characteristics of any 'race' has similar consequences for how these groups are viewed by the dominant society. Such outsider groups are perceived as inherently inferior and viewed as possessing characteristics that are threatening, unworthy, unreliable and/or childlike (Thompson, 1997). Racism and other forms or systems of oppression (such as gender, sexuality, class, and religion, among others) are thus interconnected. Hierarchies, regardless of the basis for exclusion of individuals or groups, reinforce racist ideologies and affect the ways in which such groups are treated and experience the world around them. As noted by Ferrarotti (1994), "the persecution of the Jews comes under the broader category of intolerance toward minorities and the elimination of the 'different,' overleaping the conceptual boundaries of racism, given its ancient history and the diversity of its forms" (p.7).

An anti-racism perspective acknowledges the dynamics and manifestations of hatred that are linked to the perpetuation of antisemitism and Holocaust denial within society (Butler, Elliott & Stopard, 2003). Intolerance towards minorities and belief systems advocating the elimination of those who are different form the foundation of racist thought (Ferrarotti, 1994). A compelling case can therefore be made that antisemitism and Holocaust denial, by implication, are inextricably linked to racism. Accordingly, an anti-racism framework would mandate solutions based on recognizing this relationship.³² Although the importance of this critical anti-racist perspective must be acknowledged in any study involving racist ideology and discourse, for the purposes of this exploratory study of Holocaust denial, educational efforts have been emphasized as

³² An understanding of the discourse and practices of racism, as discussed in Chapter Two, is thus essential for an examination of Holocaust denial literature.

a crucial strategy for change and as the first step in the fight against this dangerous phenomenon.

Working within this anti-racism framework, I qualitatively analyzed the content and discourse found on Holocaust denial websites, and my discussions with individuals currently working in the areas of anti-racism, antisemitism and Holocaust denial. The next section details the research context and the methods used within this study.

3.2 The Research Context

The scope of the Internet grows every year. According to Internet World Stats (2005), an estimated 888,681,131 individuals world-wide are accessing the Internet (representing approximately 13.9% of the world's population), with the United States, China, and Japan representing the top three countries in terms of Internet usage. In Canada, an estimated 7.9 million households (64%) have at least one member who uses the Internet on a regular basis (Statistics Canada, 2003). British Columbia, Ontario and Alberta exhibit the highest rates of use, with 6 out of every 10 households connected to the Internet (Statistics Canada, 2004). In the United States, 60% of people use the Internet (Sheehan, 2002), with the "current U.S. Internet user population estimated at 127 million home users" (Patwardhan, 2004, p.412). According to Steve Jones (1999), the Internet "is a medium with great consequences for social and economic life" (p.xii). For Jones (1999), what gets discussed on the Internet has the potential to influence the attitudes and opinions of the virtual audience. Hence, the existence of Holocaust denial literature on the Internet can have a significant impact on the audience as well as the broader social and legal worlds.

Mann and Stewart (2000) observe that “the suitability of the Internet for conducting research remains relatively unexplored” (p.4). However, Best and Krueger (2004) and Neuman (2004) have noted its potential as a site for social research. In fact, an increasing number of researchers are engaging in research that employs Internet data to “facilitate studies of human attitudes, preferences, and behaviour” (Best & Krueger, 2004, p.1). According to Neuman (2004), the Internet “has revolutionized how social researchers work” (p.78). Nevertheless, it is argued that, for research purposes, the Internet must be approached as “a unique medium that necessitates its own conventions” (Best & Krueger, 2004, p.1).

The Internet is an important venue for understanding Holocaust denial, as it has made myriad forms of hate speech accessible to individuals who would have never before come into contact with them (Matas, 2000). A web-based analysis of Holocaust denial offers the opportunity to recognize and comprehend the messages communicated by Holocaust deniers through such a medium. For the purposes of this study, the information individuals have access to on the Holocaust denial websites is viewed as a collection of texts. Hine (2000) identified how the Internet integrates traditional techniques of textual analysis, noting that the use of websites within the research process has become “a process of reading and writing texts” where “the [researcher’s] job is to develop an understanding of the meanings which underlie and are enacted through these textual practices” (p.50).

Extensive literature can also be found on cyber-communication, which consistently speaks to ethical considerations that must be attached to such research,³³ among other issues. MacKinnon (1997) asserts that there is currently a lack of ethical

³³ See Baym (1995); Boehlefeld (1996); Herring (1996); King (1996); Jones (1999); Hine (2000); Mann and Stewart (2000); and Popping (2000).

guidelines in relation to Internet research (cited in Jones, 1999). Moreover, there is some disagreement regarding how to proceed with research using a virtual medium (Mann & Stewart, 2000). One issue that must be acknowledged revolves around the concept of free speech on the Internet. Mann and Stewart (2000) point to the fact that the United States' First Amendment of the *Constitution* does not allow for the induction of any law which prohibits an individual's freedom of speech or expression.³⁴ As a result, there are "few sanctions and little legal redress" for literature found on the Internet that is seen to violate the rights of any individual or group (Mann & Stewart, 2000).³⁵ Furthermore, individuals who are engaged in online communication (in the form of chat rooms or message boards) may not realize that their conversations can be made public or that they are being monitored (Brem, 2002). Whereas ethical concerns may be present when monitoring online discussions due to the above noted factors, these are not applicable to my research, as the websites examined are posted for public consumption, with unrestricted viewing capability (Brem, 1997). Thus, there is no expectation of privacy on these sites.

The Internet nevertheless poses a number of challenges to any researcher, as websites are not systematically organized, making it impossible to catalogue such sites (Branham, 1997). In addition, the authority of a website is often questionable, since a well-designed website may disguise the source of the information provided; hence, viewers may be led to erroneously believe that the website is "legitimate" and factually correct. Awareness of this fact is nevertheless useful for Internet research, as it reminds the researcher to be attentive to bias that may be present on certain websites. Another

³⁴ Although Canada's *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* allows for freedom of speech and expression, such freedom is not "untouchable." There are limits to what an individual can say.

³⁵ Literature found on the Internet does not always fall neatly into the three *Criminal Code* provisions and is extremely hard to sanction due to numerous factors, the most important being the guarantee of freedom of expression under the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

disadvantage posed by the Internet is the fact that web pages can be easily altered over time without warning, possibly rendering the literature included in the study inaccessible at a later date (Branham, 1997). Furthermore, the websites used may not be representative of all Holocaust denial literature. For example, the websites chosen for inclusion within this study may not necessarily reflect the views espoused by all Holocaust deniers.

There are also advantages to using literature found on the Internet. One benefit is the wide geographical access to websites containing information, messages, and images that may not be accessible or attainable in the researcher's location (Mann & Stewart, 2000, p.17). The Internet also allows the researcher to access websites that may be dangerous or politically sensitive (Mann & Stewart, 2000, p.18). Moreover, using the Internet as a data source is cost-effective and time-saving ensuring that the handling and management of the data are efficient (Mann & Stewart, 2000, p.20-21).

3.3 Research Design

The goal of this exploratory qualitative research is to examine the messages promoted on Holocaust denial websites, the methods through which these messages are conveyed, and how the claims made may be linked to antisemitism and racism. As Holocaust denial on the Internet had not been previously explored, many questions arose around this topic. My research focused on the following questions:

- How is the Holocaust portrayed by Holocaust deniers on these websites?
- How are Jews portrayed on Holocaust denial websites?
- Do these websites perpetuate stereotypes about the Jews?
- What are the main themes or concepts emerging from the Holocaust denial websites?

- How can these themes/concepts be conceptualized as a reflection of hate?
- How do certain individuals or groups (law enforcement personnel, Jewish organizations, anti-racism organizations) understand and identify the problem of Holocaust denial, particularly on the Internet?
- Is the law an effective tool in the fight against Holocaust denial?

This study consisted of a two-pronged analysis, with written material from Internet websites (electronic documents and reports) serving as primary documentary data,³⁶ and interviews with representatives of various organizations providing supplementary data. The first part of the research process involved an unobtrusive measure of research – archival data (in the form of Holocaust denial literature found in electronic versions of written works).

According to Palys (1997), the use of archival data has many advantages. The researcher is able to perform longitudinal analysis if needed, as the data sources are contained in “hard copy” records, allowing the researcher to accurately examine records within the context of past events (Palys, 1997). However, longitudinal analysis is often made more difficult with Internet websites and electronic documents as data sources, as the information on websites is consistently altered or updated. The use of archival data is also much less costly than other forms of data collection (Palys, 1997). The disadvantage of using archival data is that a particular researcher’s interpretation of a document may be inconsistent or inaccurate (Palys, 1997).

This thesis project applies a grounded theory approach to the study of Holocaust denial. Accordingly, no one ‘theory’ guided the research process; rather, as suggested by Palys (1997), Holocaust denial websites and relevant electronic literature were

³⁶ The electronic documents retrieved from the twenty-five websites examined for this study totalled approximately 1300 single-spaced pages of textual data.

inductively examined. Strauss and Corbin (1998) have identified the importance of systematically gathering and organizing themes throughout the research process; as such, I derived a conceptual ordering of Holocaust denial themes from the data reviewed.

A study of Holocaust denial literature necessitates the application of grounded theory, as such an approach is more “likely to offer insight, enhance understanding, and provide a meaningful guide to action” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.12). Flick (1998) emphasizes the need to be aware of the research process; a grounded theory approach allowed me to continually reflect on my research process and the steps I had decided to take throughout this process (Flick, 1998). Straus and Corbin (1998) encourage researchers to incorporate their own voice in their study; I therefore ensured that my own creativity spoke and emerged throughout the research process. In addition, I mobilized the above-reviewed literature to inform the development of coding categories.

Coding procedures occupied a significant role in my research. Strauss and Corbin (1998) note that such coding procedures are crucial in the interpretation of data, in the development of concepts that may relate to or build a broader theory, and in the creative interpretation of the meanings of certain messages. I utilized QSR NVivo³⁷ to code the documentary data. An open coding procedure was employed to analyze the findings of the website and interview data. This method involves searching an entire document, while asking the questions “what’s going on here?” and “what makes this document the same as, or different from, the previous ones that I coded?” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.120).

³⁷ QSR NVivo is a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software, which aids in the coding process and organization of the data and coding categories. For more information on this software, see www.pugh.co.uk/Products/QSR/nvivo-2.htm.

In undertaking these operations, I was then able to return to a document and code more specifically with those similarities and differences in mind. This coding procedure can also be referred to as a constant comparative method (Ristock & Pennell, 1996). According to Flick (1998), “this procedure becomes a method of constant comparison when interpreters take care that they compare codings over and over again with codings and classifications that have already been made” (p.234).

The data collected from the various websites and electronic documents found on these websites underwent a qualitative analysis. I analyzed the website literature thematically, examining the patterns emerging from the material and demonstrating how Holocaust denial messages are interrelated. As suggested by Silverman (2000), this approach allowed me to identify, describe, and examine the external reality of Holocaust deniers and the messages they espouse about the Holocaust and the Jewish people. By organizing my research around “well-developed and ordered themes,” which have connected “to form an integrated theoretical scheme” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.21), some motivations behind denying the Holocaust could be identified. A qualitative approach involving thematic analysis was appealing for this study as it encompasses a “depth of description and lack of reliance on *a priori* hypotheses” (Hine, 2000, p.42). This approach allowed me to get closer to fully understanding how Holocaust deniers interpret and organize the world around them.

Such thematic analyses nevertheless pose several disadvantages. As noted by Flick (1998), the methodology of thematic analysis is time consuming, as the approach requires the continuous extraction of themes from Holocaust denial websites and the subsequent coding of these themes. In addition, the interpretation of the Holocaust denial literature may be problematic, as it has been shaped in large part by my coding schedule, a challenge identified by Silverman (2000). However, as Strauss and Corbin

(1998) observe, this is often the case when building grounded theory. Moreover, these categories may contain several meanings, which may prove to be ambiguous, contradictory or hidden (Del Basio & Lewis, 1997). In addition, Del Basio and Lewis (1997) address issues of validity and reliability. Accordingly, although I may analyze such Holocaust denial literature fairly reliably, my analysis may not validly reflect the full meaning of the messages (Del Basio & Lewis, 1997).

The second half of the research consisted of six face-to-face interviews with practitioners in the field (two law enforcement officials, two representatives of anti-racist organizations, and two members of Jewish organizations). The face-to-face interview falls within the category of 'interactive methods' of research (Palys, 1997). Using this type of method offers several advantages, the most significant being its versatility and "the opportunity it provides to hear from a respondent directly" (Palys, 1997, p.145). Through face-to-face interviews, my participants were able to discuss their thoughts without my having to guess what they were thinking and to explain their comments without having me speculate about what their motives or intentions might have been (Palys, 1997). Face-to-face interviews further ensure that all the questions are answered (Del Basio & Lewis, 1997). In addition, Palys (1997) observes that "people will take [interview] questions at face value and do their best to respond to what [the researcher] asks them to do" (p.145).

There are, however, also disadvantages to conducting face-to-face interviews. Del Basio and Lewis (1997) and Palys (1997) note that the biggest disadvantages include the time and cost of such an undertaking. Face-to-face interviews tend to be quite lengthy and detailed, and require a greater depth of response than other interactive methods (Palys, 1997). Strauss and Corbin (1998) acknowledge the constraints of time, energy, availability of participants, and numerous other conditions that often affect the

collection of interview data. Conducting interviews over the summer months (May to August), in particular, proved to be quite difficult and time-consuming, as potential interviewees were either unavailable or had limited time to spare, due to holiday schedules. As a result, travel to additional cities (Ottawa and Toronto) was required to complete the collection of interview data.

3.4 Sample

The selection process to obtain my website and interview samples included the non-probabilistic sampling technique of purposive sampling. With purposive sampling, “people or locations are intentionally sought because they meet some criterion for inclusion in the study” (Palys, 1997, p.137). Although this method may have been statistically unrepresentative, it provided me with “useful information and provocative insights” (Palys, 1997, p.139) in understanding Holocaust deniers, their claims, and the messages they are sending to their audience.

Websites

I adopted an inclusive approach to data gathering, where all forms of electronic information (electronic reports, websites, electronic copies of books, pamphlets or newspaper articles, and the like) were sought and included as data sources. The Internet hate sites included were limited to those sites that discussed or denigrated the Holocaust or Jews in any way. Several key words were used within the search process, such as “Holocaust,” “Holocaust denial,” “Holocaust revisionism,” “gas chambers,” “Nazi Germany,” “Hitler” and “Jews.” These searches were conducted eight to ten times over

a two to three month period. In total, twenty-five unique websites and/or electronic literature were used in this study (see Appendix A for a list of these websites).³⁸

Interviews

The interview sample consisted of six interviews involving practitioners working in the areas of racism, antisemitism or hate (see Appendix B for a description of the individuals and organizations interviewed and the role they occupy in the fight against hate). Of these six interviewees, two were from Jewish organizations (Canadian Jewish Congress-Pacific Region³⁹ and the Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre), two from anti-racism organizations (Canadian Race Relations Foundation and the Canadian Human Rights Commission), and two from law-enforcement agencies (the New Westminster Police Department and Ottawa/Carleton Police Department). Representatives of Jewish organizations were sought for the purpose of this study, as they reflect the population of individuals most directly affected by Holocaust denial material. Representatives of anti-racism organizations were chosen as interview participants, as this study views antisemitism and Holocaust denial as one manifestation of racism and racist thought. Lastly, I decided to interview representatives of law enforcement agencies, as these individuals are most directly involved in the apprehension and prosecution of hate-motivated offences.⁴⁰

³⁸ It is important to note that other websites emerged from the Internet searches conducted. However, these particular websites could not be accessed, either because they no longer existed or were under construction. These websites included: *Annwn Publications*, *the Canadian Ethnic Cleansing Team*, *the European Foundation for Free Historical Research*, *the National Journal*, *Matt Giwer - Reflections on the Holocaust*, *Ostara Webserver*, *Revisionist Productions*, *Revisionism.com*, and *Roger Garaudy's website*. Furthermore, one Holocaust denial website, www.mimer.org, was accessible but could not be included within the sample, as it was written in another language with no English or French translations available on the website.

³⁹ This was a joint interview with two representatives of the Canadian Jewish Congress, Pacific Region.

⁴⁰ The information I collected provided me with the opinions of only a select few practitioners working in the area of hate crime, antisemitism or racism, and therefore cannot be generalized to all practitioners working in these areas – a concern identified by Del Basio and Lewis (1997). The

Ethical approval was obtained from Simon Fraser University. At the commencement of each interview, I presented the interviewee with a “study information document” (see Appendix C) and a consent form (see Appendix D) to review and sign, to ensure confidentiality and informed consent. After securing written consent from all participants,⁴¹ a brief statement about myself and the purpose of my study was provided. I informed my interviewees that their participation was voluntary and they would be able to withdraw it at any time; and I emphasized the fact that I would not identify them by name within the thesis. I notified all participants that any question that might offend or make them in any way uncomfortable could remain unanswered. I then asked each interviewee permission to tape record the session; all of them consented (see Appendix E for the interview questions). I also took brief notes of the interviewee responses, in the event of a tape-recorder malfunction or error. Before completing the interview, the participants were provided with contact information where they would be able to view the results of the study. To enhance the accuracy and reliability of the interviewee responses, each interview was transcribed on the day it was conducted.

3.5 Conceptual Baggage

According to Kirby and McKenna (1989), conceptual baggage refers to “information about the researcher that places her/him in relation to the research question and research process in an intimate and central way” (p.21). It was therefore important to acknowledge and accept my feelings and thoughts about the Holocaust denial literature I was engaging with, throughout the entire research process.

results obtained from interviewing law enforcement personnel, and representatives from anti-racist and Jewish organizations thus pertain only to the sample itself.

⁴¹ One participant provided me with conditional consent; a provision was included within the consent form that she be able to review any passages of the thesis in which she was quoted, to ensure that her words had not been misinterpreted or misconstrued in any way.

My own journey in the area of Holocaust denial began many years ago, in my second year of high school. I had heard the term “Holocaust” in passing during one of the classes I was taking. I had never heard the term before and was therefore curious as to what it was in reference to. Throughout the remainder of the day, I had asked some of my friends if they were familiar with the term. None of them were. Upon arriving home that afternoon, I rushed to our set of encyclopedia to look up this term nobody else seemed to know. I was shocked when I found the answer. I immediately thought, why had I not known about the events of the Holocaust? Why had none any of my friends known about them either? Why were us students not being taught about the Holocaust in school? From that moment, I embarked on my own educational journey that would eventually take me to the point in the Masters of Criminology program at Simon Fraser University where I had to choose a thesis topic. I decided it was time for me to investigate an unfathomable phenomenon - the denial of the Holocaust.

As noted by Sizemore (2004) what the qualitative researcher “knows” about the subject matter is based on “his (sic) perceptions, his personal experiences, and his own hard-won analyses” (p.537). My own conceptual baggage regarding Holocaust denial undoubtedly influenced the research process and research decisions. Most importantly, I chose to present the claims of Holocaust deniers examined in the various documentary materials (Internet websites and electronic documents) unrefuted, without superimposing my own critical commentary or counter arguments. I adopted this approach in an effort to avoid minimizing the true events of the Holocaust by structuring this study as a debate. The documented historical facts of the Holocaust cannot and should not be disputed. Therefore, I have chosen not to discuss the established history of the Holocaust or dispute Holocaust denial arguments in an effort to avoid giving value,

legitimacy, and voice to Holocaust deniers.⁴² Furthermore, I did not want to encourage this type of racist thinking. As stated by Hine (2000), “ethnographers should neither dismiss texts as distorted accounts nor accept them as straightforward truths, but should draw on their own ‘socialized competence’ in reading and writing to interpret them as culturally situated cultural artifacts” (p.51). I have conducted research on the events of the Second World War, specifically the events of the Holocaust, for many years and do not intend to encourage ideas or claims that promote the belief that the Holocaust is a historical fabrication and/or Jewish lie. I believe it is crucial that Holocaust denial claims be acknowledged, examined, and critically challenged, so as to illuminate the dangers posed by Holocaust deniers.

I also intended to do research that is meaningful and honourable. According to Kirby and McKenna (1989), listening to our instincts is a crucial component of the research process. These authors state that a researcher must “purposefully [recognize and embrace] the contradictions and questions that often make us the most uncomfortable” (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p.31).

Since I was embarking on a project that examines the views and ideas expressed by Holocaust deniers, it was vital to have acknowledged and followed my instincts throughout the process. Indeed, the entire study was conducive to uncomfortable feelings, due to the nature of my research subjects and the claims they espouse. It was nevertheless necessary to embrace these feelings, in order to fully understand the meaning and impact of Holocaust denial and the effect such hate material has on the Jewish community and Holocaust survivors. By validating the concern posed by Holocaust deniers, we may be able to better understand the claims

⁴² For direct refutation of the arguments and claims of Holocaust deniers, see Shermer and Grobman (2000) and The Nizkor Project at www.nizkor.com.

they make, how these claims may be classified as a reflection of hate and racism, and what can be done to protect society against the dangers posed by such literature. Moreover, I believe that the opinions emerging from interviews of individuals who may be directly or indirectly involved with the experience of Holocaust denial will facilitate this understanding.

3.6 Limitations and Contributions

As with most exploratory and unfunded research, I experienced time and resource constraints. The nature of content retrieved from the Internet made it difficult to locate a sample of all websites that address the Holocaust in a derogatory manner. Some websites addressing Holocaust denial literature were undoubtedly missed through the Internet searches performed. Furthermore, since the material on websites is constantly altered and/or updated, it was sometimes difficult to re-access Holocaust denial literature once retrieved from the original website address. It was also nearly impossible to distinguish and differentiate Holocaust denial websites originating from Canada, the United States or other countries, unless the origin was specified on the website.⁴³

Questions of reliability and validity would also relate to the coding of the literature found on Holocaust denial websites. Palys (1997) and Maxfield and Babbie (2001) note that all coding processes should be undertaken by more than one individual in order to ensure inter-rater reliability. Although inter-rater reliability is only a concern when a research project involves more than one coder, I nevertheless needed to ensure reliability and consistency of coding practices. Therefore, many hours were spent

⁴³ Only three websites appeared to originate in Canada, while three seemed to be European-based, and nineteen appeared to be of American origin.

coding and re-coding the websites. In addition, I coded all the data collected in the sample, regardless of whether or not they confirmed or refuted any assumptions I may have harboured.

With respect to the interviews conducted for this study, I was able to obtain only six participants within the timeframe that I had established. In addition, some individuals considered experts in the area of hate crime and Holocaust denial, and who would have contributed a great deal of knowledge for this research, were sought for interviews but were unable to comply due to time constraints of their own. It is also important to acknowledge that the responses of the individuals who were interviewed for this study would be biased, because of their passion about fighting hate and racism.⁴⁴

Aside from these constraints, another limitation of the research is the inability to access the motivations, opinions and beliefs of the Holocaust deniers directly. Interviews with Holocaust deniers would have undoubtedly added greater depth to the research. Furthermore, an analysis of the literature found on Holocaust denial websites cannot effectively assess the impact of such material on its audience. Additionally, my interpretations of the messages espoused on Holocaust denial websites and the motivations behind such denial may not always be accurate or may not reflect the subjectivities of those responsible for the websites. Nonetheless, the research that I was able to conduct will establish a foundation for future work in this area. The following two chapters detail the findings of the qualitative analyses of the website content and interviews.

⁴⁴ This bias does not however render the interviewee responses less meaningful or less important for this study. The opinions and experiences of individuals currently working to fight hate are imperative for an examination of Holocaust denial.

CHAPTER 4: THE DISCOURSE OF HOLOCAUST DENIAL

[Holocaust denial] always portrays itself or tries to ally itself with kind of a pseudo-science, tries to bring in some minor historical scholars to justify this type of research. The fact that they want to achieve academic credentials, disputing indisputable facts, and focusing all their energy and resources to discredit it, that's precisely the essence of Holocaust denial because, if one would come to the conclusion that the evidence is overwhelming, all that remains is just a question about the motive (CJC1).

Chapters Four and Chapter Five provide a descriptive overview and analysis of the research findings, shaped by the results of both the website and interview analyses. Chapter Four focuses primarily on the website analysis conducted. The chapter is divided into two main sections, reflecting the primary themes that emerged from the research. Section 4.1 presents the claims advocated by Holocaust deniers about the events of the Holocaust while Section 4.2 focuses on a key theme made that Germans, the general public, and Holocaust deniers themselves are the true victims of the Holocaust. It is important to note that these categories are not mutually exclusive – they can and often do overlap throughout the analysis.

4.1 Website Results

Twenty-five websites were examined for this portion of the research. Twenty of the websites are maintained and operated by specific hate organizations, representing the general views and beliefs of the organization as a whole. Only five websites are maintained and operated by specific individuals, where the websites serve as avenues for the expression of their own personal beliefs (see Appendix A). With the exceptions of the *Stormfront for Kids* and the *Stormfront for Women* websites, which specifically

target children and women respectively, all of the websites are directed and intended for consumption by the general public.

4.1.1 Claims of Holocaust Deniers

Holocaust deniers make numerous arguments in their questioning of the historical legitimacy of the Holocaust. As described in Chapter Two, the claims of Holocaust deniers comprise three categories: Holocaust denial; the 'Holocaust relativized' and the 'Holocaust trivialized' (Sneiderman, 1999). This classification scheme reflects the manner in which Holocaust deniers frame their arguments about the Holocaust, based on antisemitic and racist ideologies that reinforce their hatred of Jews. The manner in which the Holocaust is discussed and denigrated throughout the websites reflects these categorizations.⁴⁵ A complete summary of the claims made by Holocaust deniers throughout the twenty-five websites can be found in Appendix F. Before moving on to the discussion of the key themes that emerged from the website analysis, it is important to note that the twenty-five Holocaust denial websites examined for this thesis were not monolithic in the manner in which they denied the Holocaust. Rather, variations existed on a number of different levels. Most notably, the degree of denial and the extent to which this denial occurs varied among the websites.

⁴⁵ There are obvious limitations in relying on Sneiderman's model to speak about the claims espoused by Holocaust deniers on their websites, since doing so prevents me from discussing other themes that emerged from the website analysis. However, Sneiderman's classification scheme is most reflective of the arguments found on Holocaust denial websites and therefore appears to be the most appropriate model for an exploratory thesis on this topic. Some examples of other themes having emerged from the website analysis include, but are not limited to, the following: religious references and terminology, the advantage posed by the Internet, references to Zionism, discussion of other hate websites and hate literature, and discussion of and links to legitimate scholarly research.

4.1.1.1 Relativizing the Holocaust

As described in the literature review, one of Sneiderman's (1999) categorizations of antisemitic activity in relation to Holocaust denial is the relativization of the Holocaust. This category reflects one of the key themes that emerge from the analysis of the twenty-five Holocaust denial websites.⁴⁶ Twenty of the websites speak about the events of the Holocaust in this manner. The most common method of doing so is to affirm that the Holocaust is not a unique event in history, and that other governments and societies throughout history have also committed comparable acts. Holocaust deniers emphasize instances where other non-Jewish populations, such as "Indian tribes" throughout the United States and various ethnic minorities under Russia's dictatorship, have also suffered numerous tragedies and hardships in the past, as a result of government policies and/or genocidal practices.⁴⁷ This logic allows Holocaust deniers on these websites to conclude that the Holocaust should not be accorded any special attention. Rather, Holocaust deniers contend that other 'holocausts,' such as the white death camps of Stalin's Siberian slave labour camps or Pol Pot's killing fields in Cambodia, should be awarded greater attention and consideration. The relativization of the Holocaust is exemplified on the *Be Wise as Serpents* website:

Bad things happen to everyone, and claiming that your suffering deserves some sort of pity to a level beyond the respect that catholic sainthood has given people is so fucking self-centered that it makes us sick. You are not special because you suffered. Can you say Salem Witch Trials? Did the witch's (sic) get their own country after the church tried to exterminate them? Shut your self-serving mouths and get over it.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Refer to Chapter Two for a discussion of the technique identified by Sneiderman (1999) as the relativization of the Holocaust.

⁴⁷ <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/faq.html>

⁴⁸ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah4.html>

The Revisionist provides another example of how the Holocaust is relativized. The website explains that, even if the Holocaust occurred in the manner in which it has been historically recorded, Nazi Germany is nevertheless not the first and only regime to be responsible for such atrocities. In fact, the website asserts that the crimes committed by the Allies during the Second World War were far worse than those of the Nazis. The website argues “the United States murdered well over a million totally innocent civilians, mostly women and children, by deliberately roasting them to death.”⁴⁹ It is noted that even if they were to accept the claim that the Nazis had in fact gassed millions of people during the course of the Second World War, these crimes would have been “relatively humane, and painless and even civilized compared to the mass murder by incineration that the US inflicted deliberately upon well over a million civilians.”⁵⁰ In making such claims, Holocaust deniers are repudiating the Jewish experience of the Holocaust, in which the Jewish population of Europe was systematically targeted for mass extermination. Furthermore, in claiming that the Holocaust does not deserve any special consideration and should not be assigned special meaning, Holocaust deniers are also de-legitimizing the experiences of millions of other non-Jewish victims of the atrocities.

The relativization of the Holocaust involves two key strategies: condemning the condemners and blaming the victim.⁵¹ The technique of ‘condemning the condemners’ reflects the belief that Jews are themselves accustomed to violence and that they are often the perpetrators of such violence. Fifteen of the twenty-five websites spoke of the Jewish people in this light, as savage and violent criminals. For example, *Carlos Whitlock Porter* claims on his website that “Israel is a torture state, the ‘ethnic cleanser’

⁴⁹ <http://www.vho.org/tr/2003/1/Berg37-47.html>

⁵⁰ <http://www.vho.org/tr/2003/1/Berg37-47.html>

⁵¹ Sykes and Matza also spoke of this neutralization technique, which occurs when one individual shifts the blame onto the victims of the event (Cohen, 1993).

par excellence.”⁵² The websites also speak of the Jews as being involved in terrorist group activities and accuse the Israeli government of horrendous and unlawful crimes committed against innocent women and children. The *Canadian Heritage Alliance’s* website provides an illustration of this assertion:

Deir Yassin was a peaceful village the Jewish terrorist groups Etzel and Lehi attacked on the 9th of April 1948, and massacred its men, women and children. I do not want to repeat the gory tale of sliced off ears, gutted bellies, raped women, torched men, bodies dumped in stone quarries or the triumphal parade of the murderers.⁵³

The Institute for Historical Review provides another illustration of such condemnation, supporting their belief that the Jews were actually the worst offenders within the Nazi concentration camps and comparing them to common criminals in prisons today:

the cruelest denizens of the camps were not the guards but the prisoners themselves. Common criminals of the same stripe as those who populate US prisons today committed many villainies, particularly when they held positions of authority, and fanatical Communists, highly organized to combat their many political enemies among the inmates, eliminated their foes with Stalinist ruthlessness.⁵⁴

The act of condemning the condemners allows Holocaust deniers to shift the focus away from the claims that they are making and onto the actual victims of the Holocaust by portraying the latter as evil and ruthless people. In doing so, Jews lose their credibility and victim status in the eyes of the public, as they are considered to be just as cruel as the actual perpetrators of the Holocaust – the Nazi regime and its followers. Holocaust deniers will therefore claim that there is no reason to attribute special status to the

⁵² <http://www.cwporter.com/carlos.htm>

⁵³ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/shamir/vampire.html

⁵⁴ <http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/libcamps.shtml>

Holocaust or the victims of the Holocaust, as atrocities were committed on both sides of the war, at the hands of the Nazis, the Allies and the Jews.⁵⁵

The second strategy, blaming the victims of the Holocaust, can also be viewed as a means of denying the responsibility non-victims share for permitting and contributing to the success of the Holocaust. Ten out of the twenty-five websites fit into this category. *The Zundelsite*, for example, asserts “there seems to be something about the Jews that brings forth a plenitude of animosity on the part of people amongst whom they live.”⁵⁶ It is emphasized throughout the websites that there is something innately and biologically different about the Jewish people that sets them apart and causes other ‘races’ to detest them. The websites declare that Jews should accept responsibility for their own victimization, as they provoke feelings of hostility onto themselves, mainly through their continuous attempts to gain sympathy. The *Adelaide Institute* illustrates this technique of blaming the victim:

I detest many Jews, meaning simply that I do not wish to socialize with them, for the simple reason that they are deliberately obnoxious - they cultivate their obnoxiousness so as to provoke dislike so they can maintain their complaints of victimization so as to play upon the consciences of those that possess such a thing and who are unaware they themselves are the victims of the Jewish game.⁵⁷

Holocaust deniers also insist that the Jewish people are at fault for their persecution because, throughout history, they have refused to conform to the dominant ideologies of those individuals or societies who were in power, political or otherwise. The *Canadian Heritage Alliance* demonstrates this argument:

⁵⁵ The discourse of binary polarization, as identified by Henry and Tator (2000), is apparent here, whereby certain groups, in this instance the Jews, are labelled as the “other” and societal relationships are consequently categorized into “us” versus “them” dichotomies.

⁵⁶ http://www.zundelsite.org/english/basic_articles/nutshell.html

⁵⁷ <http://www.profane-justice.org/>

... in the Greek Hellenistic period no other nation denied the gods of its (sic) neighbours [...]. None of the people refrained from dining at the table with their neighbours and from partaking in the sacrifices offered to their gods except the Jews. None of the peoples refused to send gifts to its neighbours (sic) temples, except the Jews. None of the peoples was unequivocally hostile to intermarriage except the Jews.⁵⁸

Numerous forms of racist and antisemitic thought are reflected in the contention that Jews are to blame for the victimization they have endured. The discourse of denial, a discourse in which certain minority groups are considered culturally, morally or physically inferior to other groups (Henry & Tator, 2000), is often found in modern forms of racist ideology, and can be applied to Holocaust denial.⁵⁹ The religious, racial and nationalistic differences between Jews and non-Jews are employed as factors which legitimize their victimization.

Thus, by constructing the Jew as “other,” racially, religiously or otherwise, a discourse is created which reinforces antisemitic ideology, thereby uniting other antisemites and hate mongers under the same agenda. Consequently, the act of blaming the victim allows Holocaust deniers to deny or minimize their own societal, personal and moral responsibility for the events of the Holocaust and the persecution of the Jewish people. This minimization, in turn, relativizes the experiences of Jews and many other victims of the Holocaust and the events that were facilitated by the compliance of Germans and others who failed to intervene during the Second World War.

The over-use of Holocaust terminology was identified both in the literature and by the interviewees as a means of relativizing the Holocaust. Chapter Two demonstrated how the over-use of the word “Holocaust” serves to de-legitimize the Holocaust and re-

⁵⁸ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/unknown/expulsions.htm

⁵⁹ Refer to Chapter Two for a discussion of the discourse and practice of “othering.”

victimize those emotionally connected to the Holocaust in any way (Moses, 1997). This over-use of the term is reflected in the websites and is identified as problematic by some of the participants. The Holocaust denial websites often refer to other 'holocausts' that have occurred over the years. In fact, the very spelling of the word has been identified as problematic. It has been argued that, unless referring to the systematic and calculated murder of six million Jews, Roma and others during the Second World War, the word "holocaust" should never be capitalized.⁶⁰ The *Historical Review Press* is but one website that expresses the belief that the Jewish "holocaust is wrought with forgeries" and refers to the "crimes against humanity perpetuated by the Allies" as constituting "a real Holocaust."⁶¹ The *Zundelsite* contends that spelling the term with a capital "H" implies that it was "a unique, monumental, over-arching, perhaps even the central historical event of our century if not epoch."⁶² Holocaust deniers are thus opposed to such terminology. However, since the word was coined to refer to the Shoah (the Hebrew word for the Holocaust), it is argued that any other reference used to describe other mass exterminations or destructions of populations of people would be inappropriate (CJC1).

4.1.1.2 Trivializing the Holocaust

The trivialization of the Holocaust is another key and important theme emerging from the analysis of the Holocaust denial websites. This category delimits the abundance of claims that are made by deniers to contradict the historical facts of the Holocaust. As discussed in Chapter Two (Lipstadt, 1993; Sneiderman, 1999; Shermer &

⁶⁰ Although the Holocaust denial websites included in this study often refer to the Jewish experience of genocide as the "holocaust" and other genocides as "Holocausts," this practice was inconsistent among the twenty-five websites.

⁶¹ <http://www.ety.com/HRP/rev/htaming.htm>

⁶² http://www.zundelsite.org/english/basic_articles/nutshell.html

Grobman, 2000; Evans, 2001) and reflected in participant responses, outright denial is not the primary means used by Holocaust deniers on their websites to contradict the events of the Holocaust. The most common method used by Holocaust deniers to accomplish their ideological and political goals is to trivialize or minimize the events of the Holocaust, as well as the memories and experiences of victims of the Holocaust, so as to question their historical validity and relevance. The Holocaust deniers on these websites accomplish this trivialization by contesting the validity of the facts surrounding certain events that are generally accepted to have occurred throughout the period of Nazi occupation. The relativization of the Holocaust reinforces the image of the Jew as monstrous, evil and alien, the epitomized image of the devil in human form. The trivialization of the Holocaust simultaneously informs and feeds off this portrayal, reinforcing and promoting stereotypes and myths about the Jews that portray them as unworthy of any consideration or acknowledgement of their suffering.

Holocaust deniers employ numerous strategies in their attempts to trivialize the Holocaust, including 1) applying humour and satire, 2) employing scientific investigations and evidence, 3) attacking the historical fact that extermination methods were used, 4) challenging the presence of an extermination policy, and 5) poking holes in the testimony of survivors/bystanders of the Holocaust and confessions of Nazi soldiers.

1) One way to minimize the memories and experiences of the victims of the Holocaust is to poke fun at them and create jokes designed to lessen the importance of what actually occurred. This is probably one of the most disturbing methods used by deniers, as it serves to inflict deliberate emotional harm upon those individuals who have connections to victims or events of the Holocaust. Nine of the twenty-five websites used humour in such a way and provided satirical essays and/or editorials in an effort to trivialize the Holocaust. A passage excerpted from *Save the Humans* illustrates how

satire is used in the trivialization of the Holocaust. The editorial posted on this website emphasizes the need for the Holocaust to be remembered by future generations:

What we need is a 24-hour Holocaust channel. Five Oscar-nominated Holocaust movies a year isn't enough. We need 365 days a year of Holocaust movies. With Holocaust commercials. For things like Holocaust theme parks, Holocaust dance clubs, and Holocaust-flavored breakfast cereals. Just to make sure we don't forget the Holocaust, we should tattoo the word "Holocaust" underneath the eyelids of newborn babies. For little boys, a Holocaust ceremony could replace circumcision. It could be the "Holocausting", followed by a ceremonial viewing of the Holocaust memorial video, followed by a drive back home over the Holocaust Memorial Bridge. To hurry home and eat the turkey. Cooked "Holocaust style", of course.⁶³

This website also vivifies the relativization of the Holocaust, implying that many 'holocausts' have occurred in the past and will continue to occur in the future. The message is nevertheless couched within a satirical account of the Holocaust and, as such, trivializes the significance of the atrocities that took place. The *Save the Humans* website suggests, "we could have competing Holocausts. We could have Holocaust superbowl, where Holocausts vie against other Holocausts for Holocaust world championships. We could build Holocaust societies, and even alternate Holocaust realities, where Holocausts walk around, have jobs, and die in the Holocaust."⁶⁴ This reference is undoubtedly meant to inflict harm and evoke an emotional response from Jews, further de-legitimizing their experiences and memories of the Holocaust.

Numerous jokes pertaining to the Jewish people and the Holocaust can also be found throughout the websites. The *Six Chimneys* website provides a graphic illustration of the trivialization of the Holocaust through the use of humour, as the website is entirely devoted to such content. Some of the jokes that appear on the website include:

⁶³ <http://www.savethehumans.com/culturebashing/outbursts/schindler/index.shtml>

⁶⁴ <http://www.savethehumans.com/culturebashing/outbursts/schindler/index.shtml>

What is the difference between a Jew and a pizza? The pizza doesn't scream when you throw it in the oven.⁶⁵

Why did Hitler kill himself? He got his gas bill.⁶⁶

Why did the Auschwitz shower heads have 12 holes? Because Jews have 10 fingers!!⁶⁷

What's the difference between a ton of coal and a thousand Jews? Jews burn longer.⁶⁸

Two Jewish children are sitting on top of a roof near a chimney. A passer-by asks, 'What are you doing there?' 'We are waiting for our parents.'⁶⁹

As the above illustrates, using humour and satire in describing the events of the Holocaust is one technique by which to trivialize and minimize the events of the Holocaust, the memories and experiences of victims and survivors of the Holocaust, and the Jewish community as a whole.⁷⁰ In addition, these jokes reinforce and transmit harmful stereotypes that draw on existing offensive caricatures of the Jew, such as the belief that they are greedy, devious, and conspiratorial (Porat, 1999; Tsesis, 2002; WUJS, 2002). Such defamatory jokes also explicitly and implicitly proclaim the superiority of non-Jewish groups, thereby distancing the latter from the alleged attributes of the Jews (Tsesis, 2002). Holocaust deniers thus manipulate language and Holocaust imagery in numerous ways to support the claims they make about the Holocaust. A key concern is that individuals may, in turn, incorporate such language into their daily

⁶⁵ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah2.html>

⁶⁶ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah2.html>

⁶⁷ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah3.html>

⁶⁸ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah3.html>

⁶⁹ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah3.html>

⁷⁰ See Chapter Two for a discussion of how humour is utilized to reinforce racist and antisemitic discourse, as noted by Riggins (1997), Lecouteur and Augoustinos (2001), Tsesis, (2002), and Sizemore (2004).

speech, thus informing the manner in which they understand the phenomenon of Holocaust denial.

2) Holocaust denial websites also make use of investigations and experiments (usually conducted by fellow Holocaust deniers) to assert that certain historical facts about the Holocaust that society accepts as truth are fabrications.⁷¹ The websites portray the denial of the Holocaust as a science, whereby mathematical formulas and calculations are applied to demonstrate the unreliability of historical records relating to the Holocaust. Such scientific evidence is employed as a means of supporting the claims made by Holocaust deniers by discrediting the Holocaust's historical legitimacy and validity. Thirteen of the twenty-five websites use the results of various scientific experiments to support their claims that certain events of the Holocaust never took place, or that they have been misinterpreted or exaggerated. These websites make reference to numerous studies examining concentration camp crematoria and gas chambers, and present some of the major findings of these studies on their websites or through web links to other denial websites. For example, the websites often refer to studies conducted by Fred Leuchter, Germar Rudolf, David Cole and Ditleb Felderer, all of whom concluded that the gas chambers in concentration camps throughout Europe could not have been utilized and/or were unsuitable for extermination purposes.⁷² Many of the websites provide comprehensive and in-depth calculations to demonstrate the impossibility of using gas chambers for homicidal purposes, including calculations concerning combustion rates of gases within the crematoria chimneys and mathematical

⁷¹ The Leuchter report is the "scientific" investigation used most frequently among the websites to discredit the historical facts of the Holocaust. The results of his study purportedly illustrate that no evidence exists to support the existence and suitability of gas chambers for the purpose of mass destruction and murder.

⁷² <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/faq.html>

formulas pertaining to the amount and types of fuel as well as the intensity of heat necessary for the cremation of human bodies.⁷³

The reliance on scientific experiments and investigations to further Holocaust denial arguments and beliefs is but one method Holocaust deniers exploit to trivialize and ultimately deny certain events of the Holocaust. Scientific and mathematical formulas are also applied to Holocaust deniers' discussion of concentration camp conditions and the existence of extermination methods and techniques implemented as a function of a Nazi policy aimed at the systematic annihilation of millions.⁷⁴

3) As another means of trivializing the Holocaust, deniers often attack the historical fact that extermination methods were utilized, methods that have traditionally been described by survivors of the Holocaust as well as historians who study this period of history. This is such an elaborate and widespread argument employed by Holocaust deniers that it deserves special mention and consideration. In attacking the utilization of methods generally believed to have been used by the Nazis over the course of the Second World War, Holocaust deniers attempt to shed doubt on the belief that any method of extermination was used at all. In this way, they question the accepted fact that millions of Jews and other populations were systematically murdered by the Nazi regime. To illustrate this contention, consider the statement made by the *Campaign for Radical Truth in History*:

In order to ascertain who is right, the orthodox historians or the revisionists, one must resolve the crucial question of the gas chambers.

⁷³ <http://www.vho.org/tr/2004/1/Mattogno73-78.html>

⁷⁴ Other trivialization strategies employed by Holocaust deniers on their websites include: the questioning of tattooing methods and tools implemented in concentration camps for the identification of prisoners, the existence (or non-existence) of human remains in the concentration camps designated for mass murder, European Jewish population statistics before and after the war, the absence of documentary proof, and challenging the fact that human by-products were used for industrial and commercial purposes.

(When referring to "gas chambers," I always mean homicidal ones, not the delousing chambers which were found in all concentrations camps and were often called "gas chambers" in German wartime documents.) If the homicidal gas chambers did not exist, there was no holocaust, because there was no murder weapon, and the six million figure has to be drastically reduced, as the several million gassed Jews were non-existing people.⁷⁵

The three extermination methods most commonly challenged by the Holocaust denial websites are the use of gas chambers, crematoria, and diesel exhaust vans, with the gas chambers being the most widely contested. Sixteen websites incorporate this assertion. There are several arguments made by these websites concerning the existence of such an extermination method. Some Holocaust denial websites claim that gas chambers never existed at all. As stated by *David Duke*, "the Nazis did have a system of concentration camps, but there were no gas chambers for mass murder in them."⁷⁶ The *Institute for Historical Review* also asserts this belief. The website states that "concerning the gas chambers there is nothing: no contract for construction, not even a study, nor an order for materials, nor a plan, nor an invoice, nor even a photograph."⁷⁷ Others claim that, although they may have existed, they were not used for extermination purposes, but rather for delousing to enhance the health of the concentration camp inmates. As such, Holocaust denial websites argue that gas chambers were needed to fight the spread of diseases and were not part of a plan to annihilate the Jewish population and other undesirables. The websites therefore turn to an examination of the substance used in the gas chambers to bring about death – Zyklon B – claiming that Zyklon B was a fumigant and not a killing agent.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/03.htm>

⁷⁶ <http://www.davidduke.com/library/race/revisionism1.shtml>

⁷⁷ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/gaschambers.html>

⁷⁸ <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/faq.html>

Challenging the historical record concerning the use of the crematoria is another approach enlisted by deniers to dispute the authenticity of extermination methods described by survivors and historians. Eight of the twenty-five websites address concentration camp crematoria. Most Holocaust denial websites claim that the crematoria were a necessary response to disease and epidemics throughout the concentration camps. According to the websites, in order to stop the spread of these diseases, it would have been necessary to burn and incinerate the bodies of the dead. The Holocaust denial websites explain that many discrepancies exist within the historically accepted version of the use of crematoria to dispose of murdered corpses. They therefore assert that these historical inconsistencies prove the deniers' argument that crematoria were not employed in the way described by survivors and historians. The most prevalent argument for the insistence that the crematoria were not intended for the objective of mass murder is the assertion that it would have been impossible to cremate the number of people who are alleged to have been cremated. *Carlos Whitlock Porter* elaborates on this contention and insists that,

The mere fact that it requires one to one-and-one-half hours to cremate a corpse, even in the most modern crematory oven, should be enough, in itself, to bring down the whole Hoaxoco\$t house of cards. Indeed, one of my worst errors as a revisionist was to over-estimate the capacity of crematory ovens; ovens I thought capable of 16 cremations a day (as compared to hundreds or even thousands per day, according to the Jews) were, in reality, capable of merely 3 or 4.⁷⁹

The websites further assert that, in cremating the bodies of those ravaged by disease, the Nazis were providing a great service, thereby treating the dead with a "modicum of respect – even when many of the dead were Jews."⁸⁰ By questioning the function of concentration camp crematoria, Holocaust deniers justify their belief that the

⁷⁹ <http://www.cwporter.com/carlos.htm>

⁸⁰ <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/nazigaschambers.html>

Nazi regime never intended crematory ovens to be enlisted for the systematic extermination of millions of Holocaust victims. Holocaust deniers further attempt to delegitimize many of the historical accounts of the Holocaust and employ this argument as ‘evidence’ to question the very basis of the Holocaust.

Deniers also attempt to dispute the existence of diesel exhaust vans converted into makeshift gas chambers by the Nazi regime for the murder of Jews and others. While only six websites made this argument, it is important to note that most of the websites do not contest the fact that people were killed in makeshift gas chambers, but only that other means would have been more effective to accomplish this task. The websites claim that the Nazi regime would have never decided to take such a route to gas their victims to death. The *Campaign for Radical Truth in History* supports this argument, stating that diesel exhaust would have been an “extremely cumbersome and inefficient method, for the exhaust gasses are poorly suited as murder weapons due to their high oxygen and very low carbon monoxide content.”⁸¹ As such, individuals locked in these vans would have suffocated before the carbon monoxide could have taken effect. Death would therefore have been extremely slow and agonizing.⁸²

These Holocaust denial websites also invoke ‘evidence’ from the safety records of British coal mines to purport that the exhaust from diesel vans is not harmful to human beings. Although some websites acknowledge the potential hazards of exposure to diesel gas, others contest the actual harmful effects of the gas. As reflected on *The Revisionist* website, “no person has suffered any harmful effects either temporarily or permanently as a direct result of breathing any toxic gas emitted from any vehicle

⁸¹ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/09.htm>

⁸² <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/09.htm>

powered by a diesel engine.”⁸³ Although the argument against the use of diesel vans as a method of extermination is not a dominant means of questioning the extermination methods used throughout the Holocaust, it nevertheless contributes to the trivialization of the Holocaust.

In attacking the existence of extermination methods, Holocaust deniers are attacking every fact connected to the act of extermination – the existence of concentration camps, the number of people murdered in these camps, the presence of an official extermination policy, and the presence of homicidal intent on the part of the Nazi regime. Thus, impugning the existence of extermination methods thereby trivializes the Holocaust and de-legitimizes the significance of the atrocities for the world.

4) Holocaust deniers also employ their argument that inmates of Nazi concentration camps were not systematically murdered to support their claim that no official order had ever been given for the extermination of the Jewish population of Europe. Most Holocaust denial websites acknowledge the fact that Jews did suffer immense tragedy during the Second World War and that the Nazi regime was antisemitic, resulting in the persecution of the Jews and unfair legal practices against them. However, what the websites contest is that the Nazi regime pursued a systematic and genocidal plan for the extermination of the Jewish people in Germany and the rest of Europe. The assertion that there is no evidence or documentation to support the existence of an official extermination policy is found on twelve of the twenty-five websites.

There are several arguments made with respect to the alleged non-existence of an extermination policy. The first argument involves the meaning of the word “Endlösung” or “Final Solution” in Nazi documents. Holocaust denial websites argue that

⁸³ <http://www.vho.org/tr/2003/1/Berg37-47.html>

the traditional meaning ascribed to the “Final Solution” by historians – namely, the extermination of the Jewish people – has been misinterpreted or misrepresented. According to *Arthur R. Butz*, the “Final Solution” was “a program of evacuation, resettlement and deportation of Jews with the ultimate objective of expulsion from Europe.”⁸⁴ Most of the websites maintain that many Jews lost their lives during this process of transportation and relocation and not as a result of an official extermination policy. As maintained by the *Holocaust Historiography Project*,

The conditions under which this population transfer took place were not ideal and were in some cases inhumane or even cruel. Executions took place. Many families and communities were shattered in the process. It is shameful, but something very different from an intentional mass murder of the Jews.⁸⁵

A second argument for the non-existence of an official extermination policy is that the concentration camps located throughout Europe were actually work or transit camps and not extermination camps. To illustrate this point, Holocaust deniers claim that the physical and manual labour of the Jews was a crucial component of the war effort and was therefore necessary for the survival and success of the German war industry. Hence, as stated by *Stormfront*, “it would have been counter productive to exterminate them.”⁸⁶

Holocaust deniers also focus much attention on describing the conditions of these concentration camps in an effort to support their assertion that these camps were not intended to fulfill homicidal objectives. Fourteen of the twenty-five websites contend that the conditions of the concentration camps have been grossly exaggerated and portrayed in a negative light by numerous historians over the decades. Holocaust

⁸⁴ <http://pubweb.acns.nwu.edu/~abutz/di/intro.html>

⁸⁵ <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/faq.html>

⁸⁶ http://www.stormfront.org/truth_at_last/holocaust.htm

deniers maintain that documentary and photographic evidence exists to indicate that concentration camps actually contained numerous amenities, services, and recreational facilities for the support and entertainment of the inmates. According to the websites, camp facilities included hospitals, diet kitchens, orchestras, post offices, theatres, sculpture classes, art classes, universities, cinemas, brothels, religious facilities, libraries, swimming pools, sports facilities, coupon incentive systems, complaints offices, systems of strict discipline for guards and inmates, in-camp courts and jails, maternity wards, and child daycare centres.⁸⁷ Clearly, denying the severity of camp conditions and implying that inmates in these camps were privy to hotel-like facilities and amenities perpetuate the trivialization of the true nature of the Holocaust and the manner in which inmates were treated.

Finally, the fact that Jews and other populations designated for extermination survived the war is further employed as evidence by Holocaust deniers that a policy of annihilation never existed. Holocaust deniers are claiming that, if an extermination policy had actually been implemented, no Jews would have survived the war to tell about it. According to Holocaust deniers, survivors of the Holocaust “are, in fact, living proofs that the purported systematic slaughter of the Jews did not take place.”⁸⁸ Anne Frank and her family are often provided as an example in this regard. Holocaust deniers argue that the experiences of the Frank family do not corroborate the official facts of the Holocaust. According to Holocaust denial websites, if there had been an extermination policy, the entire Frank family “would have been gassed at Auschwitz on arrival.”⁸⁹ Clearly, the mere fact that people survived the Holocaust is sufficient evidence for

⁸⁷ <http://www.ety.com/HRP/pol/auschwitzauction.htm>

⁸⁸ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/06.htm>

⁸⁹ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/06.htm>

Holocaust deniers in their attempts at disproving the historical fact that millions of Jews perished.

5) Poking holes at the testimony and confessions given at various trials regarding the events of the Holocaust is another means by which Holocaust deniers trivialize the Holocaust on their websites. Nine of the twenty-five websites attack the validity of the testimony and confessions on the current historical record. The most common argument refers to the unreliability of eyewitness testimony. The websites imply that the eyewitness testimony provided by Jewish survivors about German atrocities is not only unreliable, but also blatantly untrue.

The confessions of Nazi soldiers who partook in the atrocities of the Holocaust are also contentious according to Holocaust deniers. Deniers insist that most, if not all, of these confessions were coerced (normally through the use of torture techniques) and that Allied authorities also threatened the lives of the families of these soldiers if they did not confess to having participated in the extermination plan.⁹⁰ The *Zundelsite* provides numerous examples of the types of torture used by the Allied forces to obtain false confessions, including beatings, brutal kickings, knocking out teeth, breaking jaws, solitary confinement, food deprivation, spiritual deprivation, and promises of acquittal.⁹¹

Holocaust deniers extend this argument to the Nuremberg war crime trials, describing the trials as representing a miscarriage of justice. The websites claim that because unreliable and false testimony was utilized within the trial proceedings and because coerced confessions were left unchecked and admitted into evidence, the Nuremberg tribunal's findings are inaccurate. Furthermore, Holocaust deniers argue

⁹⁰ <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/faq.html>

⁹¹ <http://www.zundelsite.org/english/101/english1012.html>

“many postwar ‘war crimes’ trials have given explicit, authoritative judicial legitimacy to the Holocaust extermination story.”⁹² It is for this reason that Holocaust deniers maintain that the Nuremberg trials represent a historical injustice, as much of the evidence advanced at the trials was unfounded and untrue.

As this section has demonstrated, Holocaust denial websites present an abundance of claims directed at the trivialization of the events of the Holocaust and the memories of its survivors. The act of trivializing the Holocaust thus holds great importance as it minimizes the significance of the Holocaust and the historical lessons the event harbours for all of us. The trivialization of the Holocaust has serious implications for the perpetuation of racism and antisemitism and the proliferation of hate in society. The depiction of Jews reinforces the perception of their inferiority and the belief that their suffering should not be accorded any acknowledgement or special consideration. These views illustrate the racist and antisemitic thought found on these websites⁹³ and legitimize the perpetuation of exclusionary practices that led to the Holocaust in the first place.

⁹² http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v12/v12p167_Webera.html

⁹³ It should be noted that Holocaust deniers undertake comprehensive and exhaustive efforts to disguise their racist and antisemitic roots. Holocaust deniers attempt to mask their true intentions in the promotion of antisemitic thought throughout their discourse of denial and mask the antisemitic roots of their arguments, making it virtually impossible for the ignorant and uneducated to decipher the antisemitic arguments from the claims they make about the Holocaust. They attempt to accomplish this goal in a variety of ways: Holocaust deniers try to confuse their audience by using tautological arguments in their attempts to minimize the Holocaust; they insert certain accepted historical facts and solid historical scholarship surrounding the events of the Holocaust within their own arguments, making it difficult for readers to differentiate and identify the claims espoused specifically by Holocaust deniers; and they claim that their questioning of the legitimacy of the Holocaust merely reflects a search for historical truth and validity. By disguising their true intentions, Holocaust deniers can also influence others into adopting their antisemitic ideologies. By framing their arguments under other motives and masking their antisemitism through various means, Holocaust deniers are able to inflict harm onto the Jewish population in a way that no physical act can – by targeting Jews at both the emotional and intellectual levels and, in turn, refusing Jews all the pain, suffering, and grief that they or their ancestors have had to endure historically, simply because they were of Jewish origin. Although this form of antisemitism is manifested in such a way that does not coincide with the traditional conception of antisemitic-motivated behaviour – physical attacks, graffiti, the burning of

4.1.1.3 Literal Denial of the Holocaust

While the above discussion demonstrates that Holocaust denial strategies most often encompass attempts at relativizing and trivializing the Holocaust, these websites also make frequent allusions to the Holocaust as a complete historical fabrication. Seventeen websites engaged in a literal denial of the Holocaust. Direct quotations have been extracted from these websites to exemplify this mode of total denial. Such terms and references include, but are not limited to, the following: the Holocaust/extermination legend; the Holocaust story; the most macabre lies of all time; eyewitness and survivor fairytales; the Holocaust Leviathan; the Holocaust fraud/myth; the Holocaust swindle; the Big-Lie; the hoax of the twentieth century; the sinking Holocaust ship; the Holofoax; a gigantic financial-political swindle; and the unifying myth of modern Jewry.

It is important to note that this literal denial of the Holocaust can also be conceptualized under another neutralization technique conceived by Sykes and Matza – namely, the denial of injury (Cohen, 1993). As discussed in Chapter Two, denial of injury is reflected in the statements and beliefs of Holocaust deniers to the effect that the Jews have exaggerated and even outright lied about their experience during the Holocaust. In this way, Holocaust deniers reject the claim that the Jews have been (and continue to be) victimized, thereby challenging the physical and emotional injury that the Nazi regime inflicted on them. The websites attempt to justify this argument by denying Jews victim-status and attempting to dispute the historical validity of the Holocaust.

synagogues, etc. – it is nevertheless a very direct and overt manifestation of hatred and prejudice against the Jews. As reiterated by one of the interviewees, “if one begins to strip down the layers of motives, of reasons for it, what remains is a strong prejudice against the Jewish people, for a variety of purposes. So, the movement in itself is not meant to achieve any justifiable academic goal, it is to ... inflict as much damage as possible onto the status of the Jewish community” (CJC1).

Nineteen of the twenty-five websites refer to the “Holocaust industry” as the driving force behind the Holocaust fabrication, an industry that is allegedly built upon and feeds off such lies and is integral to the financial pursuits of Jewish people. The websites speak of this “Holocaust industry” in numerous ways to illustrate their assertions, the most common being that Jews complain about and use the Holocaust as a tool for financial and political gain. With respect to this argument, Jews are often portrayed as greedy and money-hungry. *Be Wise as Serpents* illustrates this point well. Their assertion is that

It is more than just financially advantageous to actively promote the Jewish "Holocaust". In point of fact there are untold millions of dollars that have been and still are being generated by its endless promotion. We also observe powerful persons & groups that continue to viciously stifle out any and all information that reveal the many discrepancies that have been - and continue to be - documented...⁹⁴

This purported use of the Holocaust for some kind of gain has also been referred to as “the Holocaust cult,” “the Holocaust racket,” and “Holocaustomania,”⁹⁵ by Holocaust denial websites, pointing to the belief that this “Holocaust industry” continues to be perpetuated through extortion, power, politics, money, revenge and hate, mostly on the part of the Jews.⁹⁶ This focus on Jewish greed is not new – it proliferates old views of Jews dating back centuries, a historical perspective that continues to this day (Prager & Telushkin, 1983; Mock, 1996; WUJS, 2002).

Holocaust denial websites also claim that the Jews use the Holocaust as a method of constantly reminding others of their victimization, as a means of instilling guilt in non-Jewish people. They contend that this emphasis on Jewish victimization is

⁹⁴ <http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/holocaust.html>

⁹⁵ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.html>

⁹⁶ <http://www.zundel.org/english/101/english1018.html>

another method by which they are able to gain sympathy. The *Canadian Heritage Alliance* describes how Jewish people have managed to appeal to both American and European sensibilities:

The Holocaust has proven to be an indispensable ideological weapon. Through its deployment, one of the world's most formidable military powers, with a horrendous human rights record, has cast itself as a victim state, and the most successful ethnic group in the US has acquired victim status.⁹⁷

Many of the websites state that non-Jews have a particular weakness for this guilt and therefore Jews, “along with peoples of other races, have sensed this weakness and exploited it in many ways.”⁹⁸ Most websites further speak of how the Holocaust has been made into a religion by the Jews, therefore rendering the Holocaust closed to debate or criticism. They claim that its transformation from a historical event into a religion protects the Holocaust from scrutiny and critical analysis and shields Jews from the wrath of society. Holocaust deniers maintain that if the public were to discover the truth about the Holocaust – that it never occurred, at least not in the manner in which Jews portray it – society would be outraged.⁹⁹

Holocaust denial websites often point to the influence of the Jewish media in their discussion of the Holocaust industry. Fifteen of the twenty-five websites speak of the influence of Jews over the media, and the dangerousness of having one group controlling something as powerful as the media. The argument is that, because Jews control the media, they are therefore the ones who determine and dictate its content. Numerous websites provide examples of companies that have fallen under Jewish control, including Time Warner, Walt Disney Company, ABC, CBS and NBC Television

⁹⁷ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/shamir/vampire.html

⁹⁸ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/stele/jewish.html

⁹⁹ <http://www.vho.org/tr/2003/1/Manon83-97.html>

Networks, ESPN, Viacom, DreamWorks SKG, The Associated Press, The Newshouses, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Post.¹⁰⁰ These websites thus encourage the public to be critical of the media, in order to protect society from such a Jewish influence.

These websites insist that “Holocaust brainwashing” is occurring in schools, television, movies and books throughout the world. It is the contention of Holocaust denial websites that the media promote the accepted historical version of the Holocaust, thereby furthering and exacerbating the “Big Lie” and keeping the Holocaust story alive. These websites further argue that the Jewish-controlled media continually ignore or omit documents, pictures and video footage that display healthy, well-fed inmates in Nazi concentration camps during World War II,¹⁰¹ or any other piece of evidence that may disprove or contradict the official version of the Holocaust.¹⁰² Thus, Holocaust denial websites claim that the media are accustomed to keeping the Holocaust in the forefront and readily in the minds of many, by pointing to the endless amount of “Holocaust-oriented television news stories and specials, the documentaries and ‘docudramas,’ the books (both fiction and non-fiction), the magazine articles, movies and plays” which are promoted on a daily basis by powerful Jewish interests.¹⁰³ In addition to this constant stream of Holocaust-informed programs and the like, these websites maintain that the media portrayal of the Jews further reinforces the belief that they are helpless victims and should be awarded special attention.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ <http://www.stormfront.org/index.htm>

¹⁰¹ <http://www.cwporter.com/partthre.htm>

¹⁰² <http://ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.html>

¹⁰³ http://www.davidduke.com/awakening/chapter15_01.html

¹⁰⁴ <http://www.ety.com/HRP/jewishstudies/holoimportance.htm>

Holocaust deniers claim that the Holocaust industry, as promoted by the media, thrives because of the presence of a Jewish conspiracy to cover up the true facts of the Holocaust and ultimately to control the world.

Ten of the twenty-five websites refer to such conspiratorial plans on the part of the Jews. They refer to terms such as “Jewish world domination”¹⁰⁵ and a Jewish “New World Order.”¹⁰⁶ Six of the ten websites that articulate such a conspiracy theory also use a common example as proof of this Jewish conspiracy geared toward world domination: the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. *Be Wise as Serpents* explains the nature of the *Protocols*: “they are indeed the global plan of world conquest put forth by Jewish leaders in a series of meetings held in Basle, 1897, at the time of the First Zionist Congress.”¹⁰⁷ These plans “were said to have been worked out whereby Jews, were to corrupt the entire Christian civilisation, and on the ruins of Christendom erect a world state ruled over by Jews and Freemasons.”¹⁰⁸

As can be seen, Holocaust deniers enlist the “Holocaust industry” to legitimize their argument that the Holocaust is a Jewish-controlled myth. This claim is an expression of antisemitism that reinforces many of the myths typically associated with the Jew. The stereotype of the Shylock Jew and the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* inform and perpetuate such discourse (WUJS, 2002). The literal denial of the Holocaust and the discourse of the Holocaust industry induce others into believing their accusations of Jewish fraud, Jewish greed and Jewish world control and domination (Porat, 1999; Tsesis, 2002; WUJS, 2002).

¹⁰⁵ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/wolfking/report.html

¹⁰⁶ <http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/holocaust.html>

¹⁰⁷ <http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/protocol.html>

¹⁰⁸ <http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/protocol.html>

Clearly, the discourses through which Holocaust deniers write about the Holocaust shape how the audience interprets the messages these websites espouse and how these messages relate to racist thought. The relativation, trivialization and literal denial of the Holocaust exemplify the different methods deniers use to disseminate their views through the Internet.

4.1.2 Holocaust Deniers as the Real Victims

*The Holocaust is the greatest hate campaign ever waged against a civilized people (Six Chimneys).*¹⁰⁹

Another key finding of this research is the assertion by Holocaust deniers that those who dare to question the accepted version of the Holocaust are the 'real' victims of hate, discrimination, persecution and, not infrequently, prosecution. In twenty-three of the twenty-five websites, Holocaust deniers claim that they have been victims of "vicious physical, intellectual, [and] legal attacks."¹¹⁰

A fourteen-year-old webmaster provides one example of such purported ill-treatment, as he pleads with the public who access his website not to expose him to the continuous stream of hateful message he receives regularly:

Lately I have been getting very vile messages with subjects varying from mutilating random white people, to stomping my brains in. Well I am getting sick of reading these nasty hate filled messages. I would really appreciate it if the people visiting my site would please keep this in mind, if your thoughts towards me are as sick, and vile as some people, please keep them to yourself. After all, I am only fourteen years old and I really do not need your hateful thoughts in my head.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ <http://www.holocaustianity.com/shoah6.html>

¹¹⁰ <http://www.vho.org/aaargh/engl/engl.html>

¹¹¹ <http://www.stormfront.org/index.htm>

Holocaust deniers assert that Jewish organizations are responsible for many of these attacks, which range from murder threats to libel, and often complain about these verbal attacks on their websites. Examples of such attacks include Robert Faurisson being accused of “intellectual dishonesty,” Ernst Zundel being accused of being “Canada’s prime practitioner of Holocaust denial,” and David Irving being labelled as “Nazi propagandist.”¹¹² *Carlos Whitlock Porter* also relates his experience of victimization on some of the websites, describing the suffering he had to undergo, due to his unconventional beliefs about the Holocaust:

On 23 September 1998, the Belgian social security system took me to court and bankrupted me, making it impossible for me to work; two lawyers advised me to disappear. I am now separated from my family for the first time in 26 years. On the bright side, this renders me conveniently judgement-proof for further proceedings; all they can do is imprison me. I sometimes wonder how many years they have sentenced me to in absentia without telling me about it.¹¹³

Carlos Whitlock Porter has actually placed a message on his website, asking people not to send hateful messages or engage in hateful behaviour against him -- or any other Holocaust denier for that matter. The message states simply: “do not threaten us please – that is illegal.”¹¹⁴ Holocaust denial websites note that many Holocaust denial organizations have been targeted and victimized by such “hate” activity. For example, the *Institute for Historical Review’s* main office and warehouse were destroyed, at an estimated property loss of \$400,000, “including tens of thousands of books, rare documents, irreplaceable files and expensive office equipment.”¹¹⁵ In addition, the *Institute* has received “numerous death threats by telephone and mail, extensive property damage, five relatively minor fire bombings, one drive-by shooting and two

¹¹² <http://www.stormfront.org/index.htm>

¹¹³ <http://www.cwporter.com/carlos.htm>

¹¹⁴ <http://www.cwporter.com/stateofp.htm>

¹¹⁵ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.html>

physical assaults.”¹¹⁶ Other examples of victimization provided throughout the Holocaust denial websites include derision from historians and authors, court fines, imprisonment, assault, arson attacks against homes and offices, loss of employment, loss of pensions, revocation of academic degrees, exclusion from entering some countries, expulsion from other countries, and having printing and Internet operations shut down.¹¹⁷

The legal repression of Holocaust deniers is frequently cited throughout the twenty-five websites. Holocaust deniers resent the restrictions they claim are imposed on their rights to freedom of speech. The *Campaign for Radical Truth in History* is but one website that identifies numerous cases of Holocaust deniers and revisionists who were sentenced to prison terms because they expressed their opinions about the Holocaust or other historical events.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, numerous websites state that, once these individuals are arrested, charged, and brought to trial, they are not permitted to properly defend themselves. The *Campaign for Radical Truth in History* declares, “a revisionist who sticks to his views in court usually faces a particularly severe punishment because of his ‘obstinacy’ and ‘unwillingness to repent,’ where prosecutors at trials often violently interrupt the defendant and refuse to hear witnesses for their defence.”¹¹⁹ Once they get to the point of a court trial, claim the deniers, they find themselves in a hopeless position.

These websites also express the belief that Germany has also been a victim of the fabrication of the Holocaust story and the continued attempts of Jewish people to keep the Holocaust in the limelight. As asserted by the *Historical Review Press*:

¹¹⁶ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/fewfacts.html>

¹¹⁷ <http://www.corax.org/revisionism/misc/faq.html>

¹¹⁸ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/05.htm>

¹¹⁹ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/05.htm>

The Jewish holocaust-fraud against the German people is unforgivable. All Jews are responsible (i.e. not guilty) for the Holocaust hoax perpetrated on the Germans, just as the Jews made all Germans responsible (again, not guilty) for the so-called Holocaust, real or imagined.¹²⁰

Some of the websites go as far as to maintain that Germany had no desire to enter into a war and was not the cause of most of the violence, and that Germans were merely the victims of neighbouring aggression.¹²¹ According to Holocaust deniers, the Germans have been demonized and portrayed as evil, in order to support the Jewish fabrication of the Holocaust and the portrayal of Jews as “totally innocent victims.”¹²² Meanwhile, Holocaust deniers stipulate that “non-Jews [are depicted as] morally retarded and unreliable beings who can easily turn into murderous Nazis under the right circumstances.”¹²³ Holocaust deniers therefore believe that the principal victims of the Holocaust fraud are the German people, who have allegedly been hated by Jews and others since the end of the Second World War.¹²⁴ They further maintain that Jews are taught to foster hate against the Germans: “every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate – healthy, virile hate – for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German. To do otherwise would be a betrayal of the dead.”¹²⁵

The supposedly coerced confessions extracted at the Nuremberg trials from Nazi prisoners are often referenced by Holocaust deniers, who insist that these trials were a reflection of the abuse and victimization against those of German descent. One website actually describes the Nuremberg trials as “a high grade lynching party for Germans.”¹²⁶

¹²⁰ <http://www.ety.com/HRP/rev/htaming.htm>

¹²¹ <http://www.ety.com/HRP/walshcomments/20010620.htm>

¹²² <http://ihr.org/leaflets/bothsides.html>

¹²³ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/bothsides.html>

¹²⁴ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/gaschambers.html>

¹²⁵ <http://ihr.org/leaflets/bothsides.html>

¹²⁶ <http://www.codoh.com/ads/adsdebate.html>

Other sites maintain that some prisoners were falsely prosecuted and convicted of crimes and thus were victims of injustice. It is further asserted on these websites that those who question the validity of historical facts are “relegated to the margins of society,” labelled dangerous, and thus hated by most.¹²⁷ Due to this ostracization, Holocaust deniers claim that “most avenues of communication are shut off” and their freedom of expression stifled. Holocaust deniers therefore maintain that a censorship campaign has been launched on behalf of the Jewish community in an effort to muffle anyone who examines and questions the accepted facts of the Holocaust and Second World War.¹²⁸ Holocaust deniers note that individuals who challenge the accepted version of events pay a high price for their decision to engage in a search for historical truth. The websites assert that, worldwide, censorship has already infiltrated university and college campuses, places where freedom of expression and intellectual scrutiny should be developed and encouraged. They further point to the fact that many viewpoints and ideas are barred from discussion and open debate. Within these venues, they declare, “even obvious facts and realities, when they are politically unacceptable, are denied and suppressed.”¹²⁹ Holocaust deniers state that this censorship is made possible by the existence of a Jewish-controlled system of Western democracies, which “resorts to brute force in order to silence [...] dangerous heretics.”¹³⁰ The websites are adamant in demonstrating that the Jews are at the root of the censorship of critical ideas. As declared by the *Canadian Heritage Alliance*,

Ironically those who are now the censors and the ones who are trying to destroy non-Jewish philosophical, religious, political and social thought are primarily some Jews. You'd think that those Jews who are trying to

¹²⁷ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/carol/whiteout.html

¹²⁸ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/carol/whiteout.html

¹²⁹ <http://www.codoh.com/ads/adsdebate.html>

¹³⁰ <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/15.htm>

ensor free speech of non-Jews would have learned something from history, but apparently they didn't.¹³¹

The *National Alliance* website notes the extent to which Jewish lobbies have ostensibly infiltrated organizations to increase their control over those who deny the Holocaust. To illustrate this take-over, they assert that Jews have managed to engineer the implementation of laws that “in some countries, make it a crime to express skepticism about the Holocaust.”¹³² They also comment on the move from mere censorship to repression.¹³³ As stated by the *National Alliance*, “if they can't embarrass you into silence, they turn to the politicians and demand laws to make you shut up.”¹³⁴ The websites identify the many countries that have implemented such laws, including most European nations, Canada, and Australia.¹³⁵

This depiction of Holocaust deniers and the German people as the true victims of a “Holocaust fraud” at the hands of the alleged Jewish conspiracy has serious consequences for the perpetuation of antisemitism. The discourses of denial found in democratic societies such as Canada are documented by Henry and Tator (2000). These authors assert that such discourses maintain and reinforce hierarchies based on artificial categorizations of superiority and inferiority and refuse to acknowledge how racism persists at cultural, institutional and individual levels. The discourse of reverse racism is most applicable here, where the dominant majority (namely, non-Jews) claim that they are now the true victims of oppression and exclusion (Henry & Tator, 2000). In doing so, Holocaust deniers deny any legitimate claims Jews may have as victims of

¹³¹ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/millard/think.html

¹³² <http://www.ihr.org/index.html>

¹³³ <http://www.ihr.org/index.html>

¹³⁴ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/fs973c.html>

¹³⁵ <http://www.vho.org/tr/2004/1/Rudolf39-44.html>

hate. This refusal to acknowledge Jewish suffering reinforces the notion that Jews are 'inferior' people.

Clearly, several factors inform antisemitic feelings towards the Jewish people, as reflected on the Holocaust denial websites examined for this study. Through their arguments, Holocaust deniers allude to the fact that Jews have been successful in the financial and business worlds, regardless of the fact that they have been persecuted recurrently through the course of history and have survived numerous attempts at assimilation. As such, a certain amount of resentment can be detected in Holocaust deniers' attempts to repudiate the victim status of Jews and in the belief that Jews are attempting to censor their beliefs.

Holocaust deniers are also resentful of the fact that laws are being enacted to prosecute them making the denial of the Holocaust a crime. In fact, one website speaks to this issue in an attempt to justify its beliefs and refute accusations of hatred, stating that "resentment is not hatred – it is a natural response to a false accusation."¹³⁶ This resentment towards the Jewish people is also evident in attempts to relativize the Holocaust and depict Jews as sub-human, and thus unworthy of consideration.

Hate, fear, and resentment represent clear motives for denying the Holocaust. Consequently, Holocaust deniers' assertions about the Holocaust and about Jews are not based on rational foundations (Riggins, 1999; LeCouteur & Augoustinos, 2001; Tsesis, 2002). Holocaust denial has no factual basis, as no serious academic or historian would argue against the historically established facts. Jews have always been the targets of stereotypes that set them aside from the rest of the population and depict

¹³⁶ www.adelaideinstitute.org/newsletters/n200.htm

them as a threat to the social order, using the same techniques and strategies as Holocaust deniers on their websites.

Upon close examination of Holocaust denial arguments, a key contradiction is identified. Through the relativization, trivialization and literal denial of the Holocaust, Holocaust deniers simultaneously construct the Jew as the “same” and as the “other” on their websites. Holocaust deniers attempt to persuade others into thinking that Jews are not unique and are therefore undeserving of any special consideration, guilt, or sympathy because they have suffered. This argument is necessary in order to remove Jewish victim status. However, in order to depict them as a threat to the dominant social order, Holocaust deniers must also portray the Jew as the “other” and emphasize the numerous ways in which Jewish values, culture, morality, and religion are different from those of the majority group. The simultaneous portrayal of the Jew as the “same” and the “other” is thus a necessary contradiction in order for Holocaust deniers to accomplish their ideological goals.

Beliefs in White supremacy¹³⁷ and National Socialist ideology¹³⁸ also inform Holocaust denial discourse. Holocaust denial can therefore be viewed as politically motivated, in that Holocaust deniers seek to reinstate a political platform designed for the discrimination and ultimate expulsion of the Jews from society.

¹³⁷ An ideology based on White supremacy considers white people as intelligently, ethically, spiritually and biologically superior to all other races, especially to mixed races (Kinsella, 2001). Exponents of this ideology therefore advocate keeping white “blood” pure and oppose racial mixing (Kinsella, 2001). White supremacist beliefs have much in common with the tenets of National Socialism.

¹³⁸ National Socialism is also referred to as Nazism or Hitlerism, as the term is often used in connection with the regime and dictatorship of Nazi Germany (1933-1945) (Gregor, 2000). This ideology views the Aryan race as intellectually, morally, culturally and biologically superior to all other races, especially the Jewish ‘race’ (Gregor, 2000). The right to eliminate inferior races is thus central to National Socialist ideology.

Hatred of the Jewish people is necessary in order for Holocaust deniers to claim racial superiority. As Tsesis (2002) notes, “hate speech is essential for popularizing hate groups” and the political platforms for which they stand (p.101). Holocaust denial websites insist their “White”¹³⁹ culture and heritage must be cherished and preserved, “as they are the direct descendents of the Adamic man made in the image of [Yaweh], in the garden of Eden.”¹⁴⁰ This language, suggesting the inferiority of other races, with specific emphasis on the Jewish ‘race,’ attributes negative connotations to words that exemplify the Jewish culture and experience. Holocaust denial websites employ colourful terminology in their manipulation of the English language, which is already loaded with racially-charged words. Throughout the websites, Jews are referred to as “the Sworn Enemy of Christianity,”¹⁴¹ an “element of decadence and destruction,”¹⁴² and “the literal child of Satan [and] the natural enemy of the White race [and] children of God.”¹⁴³

Holocaust deniers also attempt to re-write history, in an effort to assert their superiority. They engage in a form of pseudo-history, seeking to support their own personal or political agenda. They reject critical thinking and the gathering of historical truth in order to “sanitize a whitewashing of political beliefs” (CHRL). Holocaust deniers are seeking to exonerate the image of Hitler as well as the vision and the accomplishments of the Third Reich and the military heroism of Germany. If they are

¹³⁹ Many of the Holocaust deniers on these websites identify themselves as forming part of the “White” majority. References to “White” heritage and “White” culture are therefore common throughout the Holocaust denial websites examined in this study.

¹⁴⁰ <http://www.aryannationsknights.com/socy2.htm>

¹⁴¹ <http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/bewise.html>

¹⁴² <http://www.ety.com/tell/books/jglife/jgtoc.htm>

¹⁴³ <http://www.aryannationsknights.com/socy2.htm>

successful in convincing others that the Holocaust never took place, Hitler and the Nazi regime could once again be praised for their military brilliance and accomplishments, without having negative images of genocide associated with them. If Holocaust deniers were to succeed in this goal, they could make National Socialism acceptable once again and bring us back to a period based on ideologies of racial hierarchies and social Darwinism. As noted on the *National Alliance* website,

We need a strong, centralized government spanning several continents to coordinate many important tasks during the first few decades of a White world: the racial cleansing of the land, the rooting out of racially destructive institutions, and the reorganization of society on a new basis. The central task of a new government will be to reverse the racially devolutionary course of the last few millennia and keep it reversed: a long-term eugenics program involving at least the entire populations of Europe and America.¹⁴⁴

In this way, today's society could once again organize itself into categorizations of racial superiority and inferiority, with Whites (Aryans) at the top of the racial ladder and Jews at the very bottom. The acceptance of a National Socialist political agenda would also make a second Jewish Holocaust feasible, as elimination of inferior or competing 'races' is an important component of such a political ideology (Gregor, 2000).

This promotion of exterminationist ideals, especially with regard to the Jews, is a recurrent message on Holocaust denial websites. Many of the websites included in this study advocate for either the extermination or expulsion of Jews or other ethnic minorities, in preparation for a racial war. The sites regularly invoke terms and phrases like the following: "regaining control,"¹⁴⁵ "time to blast our enemies,"¹⁴⁶ "shuffling toward

¹⁴⁴ <http://www.natvan.com/what-is-na/na2.html>

¹⁴⁵ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/>

¹⁴⁶ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/>

the slaughterhouse,”¹⁴⁷ “smell the blood,”¹⁴⁸ “fashion for genocide,”¹⁴⁹ “stand still, little lambs,”¹⁵⁰ “kill’em, kill’em all!,”¹⁵¹ “attack! attack! attack!”¹⁵² and “fight them fang-and-claw in EVERY WAY POSSIBLE!”¹⁵³ The *Aryan Nations* website epitomizes this exterminationist ideology. The website declares,

get a clue from history... There are good Jews and bad Jews. The good Jews are all 6 feet under and soon all Jews will be good Jews! Keep up the GREAT work, Hamas! I wake daily to listen to see how many Jews have been taken out in that snake pit called Israel. Instead of 16 it should be 1,600! I long for the day when this cleansing is seen on a worldwide scale!¹⁵⁴

The *Canadian Heritage Alliance* provides another example of this desire for the execution of a second Holocaust. Their belief is that “such people should simply be killed on the spot whenever and wherever they are found. More than that, the people who promote and encourage this extreme individualist mind-set through their control of the media should be exterminated root and branch as a class.”¹⁵⁵ Violence against Jews and other ethnic minorities as well as the promotion of genocidal policies can therefore be seen as the ultimate goals of Holocaust denial.

Through their websites, Holocaust deniers intend to sanitize hate, antisemitism, and racism within society, teach intolerance, and make it acceptable for others to turn their heads, avert their eyes, ignore the presence of such ideologies, and forget the lessons of history. The Internet exacerbates these efforts by allowing Holocaust denial

¹⁴⁷ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/>

¹⁴⁸ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/>

¹⁴⁹ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/>

¹⁵⁰ <http://www.natvan.com/free-speech/>

¹⁵¹ <http://www.stormfront.org/index.htm>

¹⁵² http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/review/october/2001-4.html

¹⁵³ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/review/october/2001-4.html

¹⁵⁴ <http://www.aryan-nations.org/>

¹⁵⁵ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/pierce/hell.html

literature free reign over whomever it may come into contact with and whomever it can affect. Hate groups have been especially successful in recruiting young people into these movements (Kinsella, 2001). Holocaust denial literature thus poses an additional danger, as there are a limited and ever-shrinking number of Holocaust survivors left alive to educate future generations by recounting their stories and experiences of persecution.

Evidently, the themes emerging through the analysis of Holocaust denial websites reflect the dominant messages Holocaust deniers attempt to convey to the individuals who access their websites. These themes are interesting and informative, as they demonstrate the racist and antisemitic ideology of Holocaust deniers who contribute to these websites. The relativization, trivialization and literal denial of the Holocaust are avenues by which Holocaust deniers are able to promulgate their messages of hate and belittle the experiences and memories of victims and survivors of the Holocaust. In addition, denying the victim status of those who both perished and survived further denigrates these memories and experiences, re-victimizes Jewish people, and delegitimizes the suffering they have endured. The findings indicate that the most efficient way for Holocaust deniers to promote their hatred and contempt for the Jews is not to deny the existence of the Holocaust in its entirety, but rather to minimize these atrocities along with the memories and experiences of the Jews who experienced them. Holocaust denial literature on the Internet is consistent with the findings of studies on works of published Holocaust denial material¹⁵⁶ and how such material can be conceptualized as a reflection of hate, racism and antisemitism.

¹⁵⁶ The website findings are best upheld by Sneiderman's model.

Summary

Qualitative analyses of the twenty-five Holocaust denial websites illustrate the manner in which Holocaust deniers speak about the Holocaust, the messages they advocate on their websites, and the stereotypes they promote about Jewish people to further their claims. This chapter demonstrates that Holocaust denial is an extremely complex phenomenon, comprised of ideologies that encompass a wide range of claims, all of which serve to relativize, trivialize and deny the Holocaust (and the murder of millions of Jews and other undesirables), while obliterating their victim status. Moreover, the many different strategies and techniques employed by Holocaust deniers make the task of challenging their claims very difficult. Chapter Five continues this discussion and analysis, focusing primarily on the interviews conducted.

CHAPTER 5: WORKING AGAINST HATE

The 'War on Memory' [...] takes many forms. In daily life, and especially in politics, the 'blatant beast' of slander and defamation is among the most deadly of these. Extended into the writing of history it relies on ignorant or deliberate and expedient falsification, abetted by prejudicial stereotypes and ethnic or national myths. As Walter Benjamin observed, the dead are not safe from politics (Hartman, 2002, p.38).

This chapter continues discussions of the conceptualization and implications of Holocaust denial, by focusing on the findings from the interviews conducted. In this chapter, I argue that Holocaust denial should be conceptualized as a direct reflection of hatred, informed by racist and antisemitic thought. The implications Holocaust denial has for the Canadian criminal justice system and the law's ineffectiveness in combating this form of hatred are also discussed. In addition, the need for education, as identified by the interviewees, is detailed. Finally, I examine the website and interview results in relation to other research and literature on the topic, to demonstrate how this study's findings are congruent with and expand on previous studies conducted in the area of racism, antisemitism, hate crime and Holocaust denial.

5.1 Interview Results

Along with the examination of Holocaust denial websites, as mentioned in Chapter Three, I conducted six interviews for this thesis. Two interviews were undertaken with law enforcement agents, two with Jewish organizations, and two with anti-racism organizations. The six interviewees had accumulated varying levels of experience in the field of hate crime, particularly in the area of antisemitism and Holocaust denial, ranging from six months to twenty-one years. Most of the interviewees

appeared to have a personal interest in fighting hate crime generally, and Holocaust denial specifically. This section offers a descriptive overview and analysis of the main themes emerging from the interviews.

5.1.1 Conceptualizing Holocaust Denial

It's a sophisticated concept, because it's so perverse. I mean how many people would go around and say that Quebec doesn't exist (CJC1).

The term "Holocaust denial" is not easily defined. It signifies different things to different people and encompasses a wide range of behaviours and assertions. Furthermore, it is not always easily identified or understood, as the motivations behind the denial of the Holocaust are often inconsistent. All of the interviewees described Holocaust denial as a belief system guided by antisemitism and strong prejudice against Jewish people. Since the ideological basis for Holocaust denial is antisemitism, it is also comprised of behaviours and tautological arguments, which reinforce common antisemitic myths and misconceptions about the Jews. As asserted by one of the interviewees, "you can never argue with a Holocaust denier because he'll go right back and say the only information you're getting is from the Jewish community," since Holocaust deniers believe that the Jewish community is manufacturing stories about the Holocaust to feed their own interests and to gain sympathy and financial profit from others (PO1).

Although the term Holocaust denial implies the literal denial of the events comprising the Holocaust and the belief that the Holocaust never occurred, as the analysis of the websites demonstrates, the majority of Holocaust deniers do not literally deny the events of the Holocaust. Rather, the denial of the Holocaust encompasses a full range of claims, from the argument that it never occurred to the belief that Hitler was

justified in his actions, all of which undermine the severity and impact of the events of the Holocaust (CJC2). These findings are consistent with the opinions of the interviewees, who also point out that Holocaust deniers use a variety of arguments other than literal denial to express their views:

... you've got outright denial, that the Holocaust never happened, that the six million Jews are living on an island somewhere with Elvis. You know, and then you've got revisionists, well that there weren't really gas chambers, [and arguments of the sort], and then you also have the people that are minimizing the Holocaust. Then you also have people like Norman Finkelstein, who write a book about the Holocaust industry, claiming that the Jewish community [takes advantage of and] is using the Holocaust in order for financial gain, in order to oppress other people. So you've got, I think, a whole spectrum. You can't say it's all denial because some people acknowledge, yes, there was a horrible event, that people were put into camps, but they weren't concentration camps, they were work camps, so it's not minor... (CJC2).

Another interviewee (PO1) notes that, while Holocaust denial began with the outright denial of the Holocaust, it has shifted to the minimization of the Holocaust for two main reasons. First, he states that the outright denial of the Holocaust is not easily accepted by the general public due to the overwhelming historical evidence that supports the occurrence of these horrible atrocities. Thus, once Holocaust deniers realized that such an argument “couldn’t stand in water” and that they could not maintain their credibility in making such claims, they decided instead to minimize what had actually happened during the Holocaust (PO1). This assertion is also made by another interviewee: “you know, it’s like saying the earth is flat – no one is going to deny the Holocaust without being considered a nutcase” (HEC). Second, the participant notes that a Holocaust denier’s belief in Hitler’s conviction and his ability to remove the Jewish plague from Europe mandates minimization techniques. He argues that most Holocaust deniers are supporters of Hitler and Hitler’s belief in the inferiority of the Jewish race. To then say that the Holocaust never occurred would translate into disbelief in Hitler’s vision and his

accomplishments in this regard. As stated by the interviewee, “[Hitler] is God in their eyes, he’s everything” (PO1). Thus, if they were to deny his achievement, they would be disavowing him and his ability to carry out his plans of extermination. Therefore, the only way to satisfy this contradiction is to minimize the historical legitimacy of the Holocaust (PO1).

Holocaust deniers go to extreme lengths to disavow the amount of suffering the Jews have undergone. These actions and ideologies surrounding the questioning of the historical legitimacy of the Holocaust are a direct product of an antisemitic belief system. All of the interviewees support this assertion. As one interviewee states, “any expression of Holocaust denial is, you know, by definition, an expression of antisemitism. ...I sort of view it as the basis, or the *raison-d’être* of Holocaust denial is to attempt to denigrate the memory of Jews who were killed and everyone else who was killed during the Holocaust. So yes, at its very base, it is to me, an expression of antisemitism” (CHRL).

Although antisemitism is one manifestation of racist ideology, it is important to note that antisemitism has not always been conceptualized by practitioners in the field (and by the public) as falling within the scope of racism. Some envision antisemitism as constituting a separate and unique form of prejudice (Mock, 1996). Supporters of this position argue, “Jews, though they can be from many different racial backgrounds, are primarily white and members of the power structure, and thus cannot be victims of racism” (Mock, 1996, p.120). Others would disagree, acknowledging the powerful racist component present within antisemitic ideologies (Mock, 1996). The responses of the interviewees reflect the debate over how antisemitism is conceptualized and understood. According to the interviewees, the confusion that exists with respect to this issue is two-fold. Historically, the prejudice and discrimination expressed towards the Jews were

founded in religious doctrine. As noted by one interviewee, “if you look at white supremacists' websites, they will tell you right at the top that Canada is a Christian country. In this sense, the encounter with the Jews comes through the religion” (CJC1). Thus, in the religious context, the Jews were hated, because they refused to conform to the dominant religious institutions and ideologies of the time. Similarly, although the Jews have been racialized over the centuries, they do not constitute a racial group, as they do not form a visible minority. Another interviewee notes, “in the more recent theoretical parlance on anti-racism, Jews, in various times and places and contexts in the world, have been, have become, a racialized minority, so there's definitely a racial component. I mean, certainly, that's what Hitler and the Nazis tried to do and this certainly pre-dates him, you know, it's this genetic [argument]” (RRF). The *Canadian Heritage Alliance* provides an example of this form of racialization. As noted on their website, “although many Jews have obtained White genes such as blue eyes, there still exists the prominent Jewish prototype of dark hair, swarthy features, koala eyes, and a large hooked nose.”¹⁵⁷

Clearly, Holocaust denial is informed by antisemitic ideology and a zealous hatred of the Jewish people. I would further argue that Holocaust denial should be viewed as a manifestation of racism, falling under the broader category of human rights violations, as its practice reflects the ideological and behavioural assumptions of racism, as discussed in Chapter Two and reflected in participant responses.

¹⁵⁷ http://canadianheritagealliance.com/news_opinion/articles/stele/jewish.html

5.1.2 Effectiveness of the Law: Combating Hate and Prosecuting Holocaust Deniers

All the interviewees expressed an in-depth knowledge of the Canadian *Criminal Code* legislation with regard to hate-motivated incidents and the limitations of the *Criminal Code* in prosecuting and convicting hate offenders. Many of the interviewees regarded Holocaust denial as a form of hate crime, since they believe it is primarily motivated by hatred of Jews. This finding is consistent with Jenness and Grattet (2001) and Perry's (2001) definition of hate crime, as the claims made by Holocaust deniers reproduce and reinforce racialized hierarchies within society and are used as instruments of intimidation and control. Although Holocaust denial is conceptualized as a manifestation of hate, our legal practices have not been able to adequately control its spread. The problem is further exacerbated with the knowledge that Holocaust deniers are aware of the boundaries of the law in putting forth their messages of hate and antisemitism and therefore use the law to their advantage (RRF).

According to both police officers interviewed for this study, when it comes to the specific *Criminal Code* provisions relating to hate crimes, the strongest component of these provisions is section 718 (2), which allows increased sentencing if it is found that the offence in question was motivated by hate. However, they note that the types of offences most often prosecuted under this section involve charges and convictions of assaults, mischief, or property damage (PO1 and PO2). In fact, as one interviewee notes, "95% of hate crimes in Canada [involve] an act of violence or an act of property damage as a mitigating factor of hate" (PO1).

Hence, hate-motivated offences are generally viewed as consisting of assaults and property offences against a specific minority group or any other visible manifestation

of hatred or prejudice against that group.¹⁵⁸ Since Holocaust denial is not an act of physical violence, it is not always conceptualized as constituting a hate crime. One interviewee comments on why Holocaust denial is not easily identified or prosecuted under the legal definition of a hate crime: “I think that because [an] assault does fall under the *Criminal Code* [it’s easily identified as a hate crime], whereas these others you know, someone wants to deal with print, with the press council ..., it’s not a criminal offence, unless you can show a pattern” (RRF). The denial of the Holocaust, however, is an emotional and intellectual assault against Jews and an attack on their history. In order for Holocaust denial to fall within the provisions, language, and definitions set out in the *Criminal Code*, an individual would most likely have to physically assault a Jew (or commit a property offence against a Jew – vandalism, arson, and the like), while proclaiming his or her belief that the Holocaust is a historical fabrication. Such an offence is unlikely to occur in this manner, thus rendering the content and material found on Holocaust denial websites untouchable by the Canadian *Criminal Code*.

The nature of most hate-motivated crime is further mirrored in police and court statistics of the average number of charges and prosecutions in these cases. The literature demonstrates that most criminal charges and convictions for hate crimes do indeed consist of property offences such as vandalism and graffiti where hatred was the motivating factor behind the crime (B’nai Brith Canada, 2002). When asked if Holocaust denial falls within the legal categorization/definition of a hate crime, one interviewee maintains:

... it doesn’t always, unfortunately. Because what you have to do is, it has to be more than just someone saying, “well, you know, I really think that the Holocaust is greatly over-exaggerated”. I mean, that’s an opinion, you know. I hate to say that but ... we [are the ones who] define

¹⁵⁸ The types of offences most likely to be successfully prosecuted under these provisions are hate crimes that involve some form of physical assault, graffiti or harassment.

that as Holocaust denial. That's not necessarily hate-motivated behaviour. It could be ignorance, it could be, you know. So, we can't just generalize. But, we do need more efforts to show ... that [such] behaviour is part of a profile [of hate-motivated behaviour] (RRF).

The limitations of sections 318 and 319 of the *Criminal Code*, comprising the three forms of hate crime: 1) advocating genocide; 2) the wilful promotion of hatred and 3) the public incitement of hatred are noted by another interviewee:

the problem is, with 318 and 319, first of all, logistically, we have to get permission of the attorney general, which is a huge delay administratively. You have to wait for your crown to review the case, to accept your arguments, and then your crown has the petition the [Attorney general's office] in Toronto, to have it accepted and there it's reviewed again. So, it's a lengthy process, we've gone through it, it's not very quick. And then at the end of the day, if they say no, then what do you have left? (PO2).

He identifies the danger in pursuing a case that fails to get approval from the Attorney General to continue the prosecution process. He explains that the process often backfires and, in turn, it empowers the individual who is being investigated. The interviewee asserts "now they get a response back [from the police] saying, 'no, we can't touch you'" (PO2), encouraging further similar offences.

The language used within the definition of the hate propaganda sections also presents various challenges in the prosecution of hate-motivated offences. The definition of "wilful," as found within the 319 (2) section involving the wilful promotion of hatred, is one example. The case of *R. v. Buzzanga and Durocher*¹⁵⁹ served to clarify the definition of "wilfully" as stated within the legislation, asserting that its meaning cannot be restricted to the intention to promote hatred. The court determined that the meaning of "wilfully" encompassed "the means as well as the final objective where the accused person foresaw that it was certain or substantially certain to result from an act

¹⁵⁹ *R. v. Buzzanga and Durocher* (1979), 49 C.C.C. (2d) 369.

one committed in order to achieve some other purpose” (Suriya, 1998, p.53). In this sense, an offender would also need to foresee the consequences of his or her decision to engage in the promotion of hate. Wilful intent (*mens rea*) is therefore a precondition for an offence to fall within this section of the hate propaganda provisions.¹⁶⁰ Material posted on the Internet proves doubly problematic for the prosecution of hate under the legislation, when considering the restrictions placed upon this definition.¹⁶¹ The nature of such a medium is such that messages will be passed along from one email address to another, where the original sender of the email is unaware of the number of people his or her message may reach.

The language found within section 319 (1) of the *Criminal Code* presents a similar challenge. The “public incitement of hatred” provision stipulates that an individual is guilty of a criminal offence if he or she communicates statements in any public space and “incites hatred against any identifiable group where such incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace” (Department of Justice, 2004). However, questions remain regarding definitions of public space and whether the Internet is included within this definition. Although the Internet is composed of numerous networks and sub-networks connected throughout the world, hate literature distributed through this medium would be nearly impossible to prosecute, even if it were to be covered by the legislation. In order to successfully invoke this provision, it would be necessary to prove that hate material found on the Internet has led to a breach of the peace. As noted by one interviewee in this study, it is extremely difficult to determine if a breach of the peace on the Internet

¹⁶⁰ Recklessness would therefore also be excluded.

¹⁶¹ In 1984, the Special Committee on Visible Minorities in Canadian Society (and the Special Committee on Pornography and Prostitution, in 1985) recommended the removal of the word “wilfully” as a requirement of Section 319(2). The Committee on Racial and Religious Hatred of the Canadian Bar Association opposed this recommendation (Suriya, 1998). Regardless of the support of various organizations, the requirement of wilful intent remains unchanged.

has occurred, as it is often impossible to establish the identity and intent of the offender (PO2). He asks,

...how do you create a breach of the peace on the Internet? You have no idea who's offended ... I sent a message, you know I think I sent it to you, but in the meantime, you send it off to a hundred people, who sends it off to a hundred people. I didn't mean to offend anyone else, but now I have a whole group of people that I didn't know I had offended. How does that cause a breach of peace? It doesn't (PO2).

Thus, if this component is absent, a charge cannot be laid against an individual under this section. It is apparent that Section 319 (1) of the *Criminal Code* may hinder the prosecution of hate-motivated offences.

Controlling hate material, especially Holocaust denial on the Internet, is a difficult task for legal institutions as well as practitioners working in the field. The overwhelming task of developing a more efficient means to regulate this material is reflected in one interviewee response: "I just don't know how you would do it. It's a total cyberlord's land and I know the government's been wrestling with this for quite some time. I mean it would be great if the Canadian government threw up some barriers around the country in terms of the Internet, but then how do you stop the international Internet?" (PO2). This participant also notes the problematic nature of the Internet in terms of tracking the promotion of hate material. He declares,

... what we've found is that [often] the identifier is not necessarily the person who sent the message. What is becoming a common trend is messages are skipped throughout the world, often various different computers, so it may look like I sent you an email directly, but in fact it skipped a few other countries, latched on to my email addresses and boom, it looked like I sent you an email when in fact I didn't. So then how do I prove that chain back? How do I find a computer in Africa that was skipped from China that skipped from Sweden? You can't. And that's, the Internet is mind-boggling, the power of it. And it's a good power, and it can be a nasty, evil power. It depends on how it's being used. So, how you monitor it? Not a clue – other than unplugging it from a wall (PO2).

When it comes to prosecutions of hate on the Internet, one interviewee explains that “the two sections [318 and 319 of the *Criminal Code*] are useless” (PO2) while another interviewee asserts “in and of itself, Holocaust denial, overt Holocaust denial, should automatically fall under [the provisions of section] 319” (CHRL). He contends that the prosecution of Holocaust denial on the Internet should also be covered by a new amendment that has emerged under the anti-terrorism legislation (CHRL). Unfortunately, because Holocaust denial material is often posted on various websites over the Internet, it remains untouched by the criminal justice system.

Another problem with imposing controls, legal or otherwise, reflects the current debate over an individual’s right of freedom of expression as guaranteed by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (Section 2b) and the limitations placed on this right. All of the interviewees acknowledged the fact that the Internet can be a powerful tool for promoting hate and antisemitism and emphasized the dangers inherent within this medium, especially when it comes to controlling access to information.

When questioned about whether additional legal measures should be implemented to combat hate-motivated activities, nearly every interviewee spoke about the need for a balance between such regulation of expression and an individual’s Charter rights. This balancing act, as asserted by one interviewee, is crucial in maintaining the right for any individual to express their views and opinions in the fashion they choose, without infringing on the rights of others to do the same (CJC1). But, with respect to freedom of expression, a fine line exists that cannot and should not be crossed. One interviewee addresses the careful balance that is needed to uphold the right to freedom of expression: “being a police officer, I have a criminal line I look at ... and it's a huge argument I have with a lot of people sometimes, they say, well how can you let websites like that [continue], they have not crossed the criminal line, but how can

you let websites like that on. Because their freedom of expression is just as protected as my freedom of expression” (PO1). Another interviewee describes the problems associated with regulating speech: “if you are controlling one section of speech, then you are controlling all sections of speech, which is contrary to the Charter” (PO1). In addition, when hate speech emerges on the Internet, it often originates in other countries where the Canadian authorities do not have the authority to begin an investigation.

Unfortunately, Holocaust deniers are well aware of the limitations of the law in prosecuting them and in shutting down their websites.¹⁶² Holocaust deniers therefore rely on these deficiencies in the law to promote their antisemitic messages of hate and further their ideological and political goals. Again, the limitations of Canada’s criminal justice system in prosecuting hate-motivated offences on the Internet are evident.

All the interviewees also expressed knowledge of the human rights legislation aimed at prosecuting hate offenders.¹⁶³ They pointed to the legislation as a potentially effective and useful means for prosecuting hate-motivated offences that may not fall under the Canadian *Criminal Code* provisions. As one interviewee states:

[w]ell, you look at the definition for 319 and it only has 5 categories, right: race, religion, colour, ethnic origin and [most recently] sexual orientation. [Section] 718 has 11 categories. And the Human Rights Commission has like 25 categories, [which encompasses a lot more], so I like directing people there. And, the good thing about the Human Rights legislation,

¹⁶² In fact, many of the websites examined for this study speak of their constitutional rights and insist that censorship of the material and publications they promote infringes upon their freedom to express their opinions. *Be Wise as Serpents*, for example, addresses this issue at length: “we are no longer able to decide for ourselves what we should be reading or even what we should be thinking. This is pure and absolute nonsense ... and not only is it an assault on our intelligence, but a direct assault upon the essential freedoms inherent in every one of us. We cannot allow this to happen. If we do, we submit to total censorship and slavery” (<http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/holocaust.html>). This sentiment is reasserted on the *Zundelsite*. As Ernst Zundel avows numerous times on his site: “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” (<http://www.zundelsite.org/ez.html>).

¹⁶³ One respondent (CHRL) possessed an in-depth knowledge of the legislation.

because it's opened up a little more, they can ban [entire] organizations from printing [hate material], where the courts can only ban an individual, and an individual only (PO1).

Another advantage of using human rights legislation is that the Canadian Human Rights Commission is able to consider an established pattern of behaviour or offences in the prosecution of a certain individual (RRF). Therefore, previous incidents of hate-motivated activity can be used as evidence in a subsequent offence, to establish a pattern of hate-motivated behaviour (RRF). In addition, it was noted that once an order or verdict has been handed down by the Canadian Human Rights Commission, the order gets registered under federal court, thus making the breach of that order a criminal offence (PO1).

However, there are limitations to this legislation as well. The Canadian Human Rights Commission has done little to facilitate the laying of complaints and charges, and thus has been successful only because individuals have made use of it (CHRL). One interviewee elaborates on this point:

The complaints take forever to investigate, the investigators are dealing with a very large amount of files and they don't have enough time to devote to these kinds of resources, the Commission hasn't devoted adequate resources to training their staff to deal with these kinds of complaints, and I don't think there's a real understanding at the Commission about why these complaints need to be taken seriously and why they need to be extradited (CHRL).

Furthermore, the Canadian Human Rights Commission has done very little to enforce judgements rendered against individuals (CHRL). Once again, the onus is placed upon individual citizens, leaving the effectiveness of the Commission in question. According to the same interviewee, "even if individuals do have the success of obtaining these judgements, if the Commission isn't going to do anything to assist the person in what are essentially public interest complaints, in enforcing the decision, then they are virtually

meaningless” (CHRL). This ineffective enforcement of judgements sends the message that Holocaust deniers are free to spread their hateful messages or to commit hate-motivated offences, as it is unlikely that penalties will be enforced against them for engaging in such activities.

It appears that both the *Criminal Code* and human rights legislation put in place to protect society against hate-motivated crimes are not always successful tools in the fight against hate. When these tools are implemented to the furthest extent, they can be successful, especially in sending the message that hate-motivated activity will not be tolerated in Canadian society and that individuals will be held accountable for their actions. However, when they are not enforced efficiently, they will only serve to sanitize the promulgation of hate and hate-motivated incidents in Canadian society. One interviewee comments on the potential of the *Criminal Code* and Human Rights legislation in this fight against hate, with a particular emphasis on the Canadian *Criminal Code* provisions:

I believe it could be an effective tool, but I don't think it is used as often as some would like it, and you get a lot of buck passing. You get the police saying well, you know, it's the attorney general that we need consent from and so it's their fault. You get the attorney general saying, we need hard evidence and we need more, and so they're both right in that sense. I mean, I still do believe in the attorney general's consent being needed, because otherwise, everything is hate. And as they say, if everything is hate, nothing is hate. So there does have to be a system of checks and balances, but having said that, I think that the implementation of the legislation that we have can and should be more effective (RRF).

Although several interviewees have identified limitations in the Canadian *Criminal Code* and human rights legislation designed to fight hate, they are optimistic that legal alternatives remain with which to fight hate crime and Holocaust denial. However, the legislation still has a long way to go to ensure its effectiveness and efficiency.

5.1.3 Need for Education and Awareness: the Canadian Context

All of the interviewees commented on the fact that Canadians are unaware of key events in history such as the Holocaust (and the subsequent denial of the Holocaust), and of related issues affecting Canadian society. There was a consensus among the interviewees that high schools, which they identify as the primary institutions that should be providing such education, are seriously deficient in this area.

The interviewees agreed that most Canadians are not sufficiently aware of the presence of antisemitism in Canada, partly because Canadians do not truly understand antisemitism in all its forms and manifestations. One interviewee comments on the fact that most people's vision of what an antisemite would look like would involve someone wearing a white robe with a peaked white hat (PO1). He also explained that Canadians generally think that antisemitism is not a pressing problem in Canada since it is not a main focus of the media (PO1). Another participant argues that, aside from some high-profile incidents, "there's a broad ignorance" on the part of Canadians about the role of antisemitism in Canadian society (RRF). In fact, an acknowledgement of Holocaust denial only emerges when trials such as those of Ernst Zundel or James Keegstra are discussed in the public light.

There was also a general acknowledgement among the interviewees that Canadians are not knowledgeable about the different manifestations and implications of hate speech and the extent to which hate-motivated activity occurs throughout the country. One interviewee asserts that the people who are informed about the issue are also those individuals and organizations currently involved in the fight against hate. In effect, hate-motivated offences are not easily identifiable, as their ideological foundations

are not understood. Furthermore, hate-motivated incidents are often under-reported to the police. As reported by one interviewee,

Approximately one in ten hate crimes are reported to the police. You know, if there are 500 hate crimes reported in British Columbia, that means there are actually 5,000 [hate crimes occurring]. And 4,500 of them, we don't have. We have no idea that they happen (PO1).

It was noted by one interviewee that the emphasis placed on an individual's right to free speech, as guaranteed under the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, may prove to be problematic when trying to understand what constitutes hate and hate speech and may further complicate how such concepts are understood by the Canadian public (CJC2). The line between hate speech and the simple expression of personal opinion is sometimes blurred.

It is also necessary for the Holocaust to be understood and examined, as it is a blueprint for other genocides that have occurred over the years, such as the genocides in Armenia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Iraq. One participant states that it is insufficient to educate individuals solely on the Holocaust. He contends that what needs to be studied and explained are the commonalities among different nations and societies that have engaged in acts of genocide (PO1). According to the interviewee,

I think we're sort of missing the boat when it comes to Holocaust and how it got to that point. 'Cause, everybody says well, Hitler killed all the Jews. Well, no, a society killed all the Jews. Hitler was just the catalyst to do it, right. That belief system, that Jewish-run Germany belief, was there long before Adolf Hitler came into power in 1933, right. Like, it was there already, they just needed somebody to hold the light up to it and say, look it, this is what we should do about it (PO1).

Another interviewee agrees that Canadians need to receive more than just information that describes what occurred during the Holocaust and why it has occupied such a pivotal place within the history of the Jewish people. The participant explains that the

Holocaust needs to be contextualized in relation to the history of Jews and the persecution they have endured for centuries:

[there is] far more information [provided] on the Holocaust, mind you, than on the history of the Jews for instance, which is often missing the point because you are teaching about the consequences of antisemitism, as horrific as they are, which sometimes leaves one with the question, but why? Why in the first place? (CJC1)¹⁶⁴

The interviewees further explain that we must also acknowledge the manner in which imagery associated with the Holocaust is manipulated to inflict harm upon the Jewish community. One interviewee addressed this issue, noting that other organizations or agencies utilize Holocaust imagery as a public relations campaign to illustrate the significance of their own plight – for example, by referring to abortion as a “holocaust of fetuses” (CJC2). The manipulation of language, combined with the misuse and over-use of Holocaust-related terminology and imagery can further re-victimize the Jewish community. As another interviewee maintained, it is important to ensure that practitioners working in the struggle against racism, as well as members of the public, do not use the language set up by Holocaust deniers to re-victimize Jews: “people who are really effective in Holocaust education ... make a point of ensuring that they do not use that kind of language ... [or] that kind of attitude, so that you don’t get defensiveness that leads to denial and so that nobody, as a result, ends up stereotyping all Germans” (RRF). In this way, misusing the term Holocaust and its associated imagery and reinforcing myths and stereotypes about the Jews can be viewed as subtle, but extremely harmful manifestations of antisemitism.

¹⁶⁴ In effect, another interviewee notes that this concept can be translated to the education Canadians receive surrounding Canada’s own history, especially in relation to the cultural genocide of the Native peoples (CJC1).

Furthermore, human rights legislation needs to become a priority. One interviewee explains,

it's not just about the Holocaust or the Second World War, it's about intolerance and the way we treat people, and that has to start at a very early age. And the Holocaust is just an example of, if we don't deal with intolerance and accepting people for who they are and respecting differences, then yes, we can probably seep back into another example (PO2).

As demonstrated above, the need for education is a dominant theme that emerged from the interviews. Furthermore, the views expressed by the six interviewees about hate speech, hate crime, Holocaust denial and the implications these have for society are extremely useful in gaining insight into the issues faced by those individuals and organizations committed to fighting hate. Their opinions are an important contribution in determining and implementing workable solutions to the problem. Challenging the antisemitic ideology of Holocaust deniers as espoused on their websites, and the methods by which they transmit these views could ultimately affect the dissemination of such hate over the Internet. Refining the current legislation to encompass ideologies and practices of Holocaust denial could also be effective. Furthermore, educating individuals about the events and implications of the Holocaust could safeguard against the perpetuation of Holocaust denial.

Summary

Qualitative analyses of the six interviews illustrate how practitioners in the fields of racism, antisemitism, and hate conceptualize the phenomenon of Holocaust denial; the effectiveness of the law in combating such hate; and why Holocaust denial has had a continued presence in Canadian society. This chapter further demonstrates the danger inherent in allowing Holocaust denial literature to circulate over the Internet, as it calls into question the historical validity and legitimacy not only of the Holocaust, but of all

other historical events as well. In addition, such material often falls outside of the scope and boundaries of the Canadian criminal justice system, further perpetuating the problem. Chapter Six discusses ways in which society may be better able to fight Holocaust denial, particularly through Holocaust and human rights education; details the implications of Holocaust denial for the whole of society; and concludes with suggestions for future research in this area.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION: COMBATting HATE AND HOLOCAUST DENIAL

I have tried to keep memory alive, [...] I have tried to fight those who would forget. Because if we forget, we are guilty, we are accomplices (Ellie Wiesel quoted in B'nai Brith Canada, 2001, p.16).

6.1 Strategies for Change

As documented in Chapter Five, all of the individuals interviewed for this study asserted that education of youth and others in society is the single most important factor in the struggle against hate and Holocaust denial. Individuals need to be educated regarding the events and implications of the Holocaust, the extent to which racism and antisemitism are present in Canadian society, how hate develops, why these beliefs are unacceptable, and the effects of hate-motivated activity. In addition, human rights instruction and education about the repercussions of intolerance must form the foundation for any educational efforts targeting hate. It is only through the increased effort to incorporate multicultural, anti-racist and human rights pedagogy in our schools that this fight can be successful (RRF).

The League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada¹⁶⁵ has incorporated education into their platform for combatting hate and Holocaust denial. They advocate three levels of action in their platform: protection, prevention and partnership (B'nai Brith, 2001). Protection involves the vigorous enforcement of the laws that already exist to combat Holocaust denial and other forms of hate crime (B'nai Brith, 2001). Prevention

¹⁶⁵ See Chapter Two for more information on B'nai Brith.

speaks to the need to educate people at all levels: students, professionals, teachers, professors, and so forth (RRF; B'nai Brith, 2001). Partnership refers to the need for effective community coalitions to speak out against Holocaust denial, other hate-motivated activity and their implications (RRF; B'nai Brith, 2001). The role of community-based organizations in preventing, monitoring, advocacy, providing services to victims, and documenting hate-motivated activity is indispensable (B'nai Brith, 2001). In addition, the internationalization of the Internet necessitates efforts that are international in scope.

This analysis of Holocaust denial websites and interviews re-emphasizes the importance of education in understanding the complexity of Holocaust denial arguments. The term "Holocaust denial" can be very misleading as it implies that the main argument of Holocaust deniers is that the Holocaust never occurred in any way, shape, or form. As evidenced in this thesis, a wide range of claims are encompassed within Holocaust denial arguments, the majority of which relativize or trivialize the events of the Holocaust and the experiences of Jewish people. It is therefore important that the term used to describe the organized attempt to discredit the Holocaust encompass the true nature of Holocaust denial. The current term also fails to sufficiently depict the political and ideological motivations of Holocaust deniers. Thus, terms like Holocaust minimization or Holocaust bashing,¹⁶⁶ as coined by Sneiderman (1999), may be more useful in helping to identify the major claims and motivations of Holocaust deniers. By implementing a term that more accurately reflects the true nature of Holocaust denial arguments, individuals who may not have been educated in the events of the Holocaust and the subsequent denial of the Holocaust will not be misled by the term "denial." As one

¹⁶⁶ This term may also aid in the identification of the fact that Holocaust denial is one manifestation of racism, as the term has also been used to describe other types of hate crimes, such as "gay bashing."

interviewee states, “there’s a big difference, there’s very, very, very few people, ... actually, the term is misleading, because most people are Holocaust minimizers, they’re not Holocaust deniers. And so, it’s very important to make that distinction, and we are much more *en garde* for that” (HEC).

Other policies and practices are also necessary in challenging Holocaust denial literature on the Internet. Existing legislation needs to be expanded to include provisions that would encompass Internet-specific legislation. Self-regulation of Internet Service Providers (ISPs) would render it more difficult to spread hate through the Internet, either by refusing to provide service to Holocaust deniers and other hate mongers, or by providing ratings and filtering of offensive web material (De Santis, 1998; Goldschmid, 1999/2000).

Uniform hate crime definitions and policies applicable to all provinces, combined with a mandated policing response across the country (which would include the collection of statistics), could also make a difference. Currently, there is no consistency regarding hate crime definitions and policies among police agencies in different Canadian provinces. According to a 2001 study conducted by Derek Janhevich, which included a sample of 34 police departments across the country, “twenty-four [police departments] had actual hate crime policies and three had some type of related policy” (p.20). With regard to definitional issues, “twenty-four agencies [had] incorporated an actual definition of hate crimes, while two departments used a related type of definition” (Janhevich, 2001, p.20). In addition, different police agencies currently mobilize diverse strategies for the regulation of virtual hate. The advantage of a national policy and implementation strategy is that enforcement of Canada’s hate crime legislation would become mandatory for all federal and provincial police agencies, and this enforcement

would be more consistent throughout the country.¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, such strategies would provide a more complete and accurate collection and depiction of hate crime data in Canada.

6.2 Holocaust Denial as a Societal Problem

Holocaust denial is definitely a problem... trying to deny a significant piece of history, something that changed the world as we know it, and especially Europe, I think that is very scary and if we allow people to change that without being challenged (PO2).

Holocaust denial is an attack on the historical validity and relevance of the Holocaust experience. Holocaust deniers not only deny or minimize the events of the Holocaust, but they also disavow any moral authority to the victims who perished at the hands of the Nazi regime as well as those who survived. Nevertheless, Holocaust denial should not be viewed as constituting merely a Jewish issue and a Jewish problem to combat. As noted by one interviewee, “the Holocaust really wasn’t just significant to the Jewish group, there were a lot more people involved in [those atrocities]” (PO2). As the literature regarding the effects of hate crime demonstrates, Holocaust denial material instills a sense of fear not only in the individual victim of the offence, but also in the entire community to which the victim belongs (Perry, 2001).

These attacks on the history of the Jewish people and on the atrocities that took place are pivotal to the Jewish community and the Jewish experience. Yet, they should also be considered as an assault on all of us. One interviewee identifies how dangerous denial of the Holocaust truly is for everyone. She maintains, “anything that is a distortion, you know, to a degree that it affects people’s critical thinking is an ideology that is distortion. I mean, education isn’t feeding someone what to believe, it is teaching

¹⁶⁷ The fact that hate crime policies are not consistently enforced throughout the country points to the disjuncture that exists between hate crime policy and practice.

them how to think” (HEC). In this sense, Holocaust denial materials and other hate materials slowly destroy the manner in which people think and their ability to challenge information that is neither based on historical fact nor originates from a credible source, especially when such information is accessible on the Internet. The interviewee further elaborated on this point: “we aren’t here to tell [students] how to think. And when you ... cross the line from education to indoctrination, then you have crossed the line into telling people what to think” (HEC).

Accordingly, Holocaust denial also represents an attack on all history, and on the manner in which it is produced and transmitted. Lipstadt (1993) and Shermer and Grobman (2000) have both commented on how the denial of the Holocaust and the questioning of its historical legitimacy tear at the very fabric of society and how knowledge is collected and transmitted throughout history. Holocaust deniers are not only challenging the legitimacy of one historical period, they are also launching an assault against the concepts of truth and memory as we know them, and ultimately, the power of reason (Lipstadt, 1993). As stated by Shermer and Grobman, “we are dealing not just with history, but with pseudohistory – the rewriting of the past for present personal or political purposes” (2000, p.5). As such, Holocaust denial represents “an affront against history and how the science of history is practiced” (Shermer and Grobman, 2000, p.251).

If the Holocaust was a product of hate, racism and antisemitism against an entire population of people, then the denial of the Holocaust must be viewed in this same light.

As one interviewee states,

Holocaust denial, in its original form, is a really particular, unique phenomenon, because there are very few, as you probably know, movements that even have starch followers and supporters that create their own institution that are based on some sort of historical

misrepresentation or some revision of historical fact. There are no, for instance, major institutions to support, you know, believers in the flat earth, or even the Armenian genocide does not have the same amount of adherent that would create the whole movement ... but the Holocaust is so pivotal, so enormous that it is really promoting a tremendous amount of resources to maintain it, cultivate it (CJC1).

The promulgation of material that denies or minimizes the Holocaust and its implications for human history is intended to re-victimize those who perished in the Holocaust and the survivors who tell their stories to this day. It is an attack on historical memory. "It is an attempted destruction of souls living in recollection" (Ferrarotti, 1994, p.3). Thus, there can be no question that hatred (of Jews in particular and other subaltern groups more generally) forms the core of the ideology informing Holocaust denial arguments. In minimizing the Holocaust, Holocaust deniers also dispute the deaths and sufferings of millions of non-Jewish victims: Roma, homosexuals, the mentally disabled, political undesirables and the like. As stated by David Matas, "the Holocaust was the murder of six million Jews, including two million children. Holocaust denial is a second murder of those same six million. First their lives were extinguished; then their deaths. A person who denies the Holocaust becomes part of the crime of the Holocaust itself" (Globe & Mail, 1992).¹⁶⁸

6.3 Contributions and Future Research

This study contributes to the literature on hate crime, and to our knowledge about Holocaust denial on the Internet. As previously mentioned, there has been limited research done in the area of Holocaust denial. Holocaust denial on the Internet, specifically, has gone unexplored. This study, though exploratory, demonstrates the

¹⁶⁸ This quote can also be found on the *Institute for Historical Review's* website at <http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/denial.html>.

need for continued research on Holocaust denial, its motivations, and repercussions. The findings of this study illuminate the arguments and claims made by Holocaust deniers on their websites and the ideology informing such hate literature. This thesis also draws attention and alerts others to the dangers posed by Holocaust denial, especially on the Internet.

Future research in this area could include interviews with Holocaust deniers themselves. Lipstadt (1993) and Shermer and Grobman (2000) have met with Holocaust deniers. These discussions have shown their value in discerning the motivations and arguments of Holocaust deniers. The analysis of the twenty-five Holocaust denial websites examined for this thesis permits me only to make informed speculations about the motivations behind Holocaust denial. In-depth face-to-face interviews with the Holocaust deniers themselves might serve to illuminate their true intentions.

A comparison of Holocaust denial literature with denial literature of other genocides would also prove to be extremely informative.¹⁶⁹ One genocide having experienced a similar phenomenon of *organized* denial is the atrocities that occurred at Nanking from December 1937 to March 1938, at the hands of the Japanese (Yin & Young, 1997; Shermer & Grobman, 2000). According to Yin and Young (1997), “to this day the Japanese government has refused to apologize for [this atrocity, calling it a fabrication], and a significant sector of Japanese society denies that [it] took place at all.” An analysis of the discourse of the Japanese denial of the genocide at Nanking (or other genocides) compared with the discourse of Holocaust denial may provide additional insights into the methods and motivations of official denial.

¹⁶⁹ It would also be interesting to investigate how Holocaust denial, or the denial of any other genocide, may be conceptualized as an attempt at the cultural genocide of an entire people.

As an exploratory study, this thesis contributes to the fields of criminology, sociology, law, and communication. The findings have demonstrated the importance of research in this area as Holocaust denial websites perpetuate the spread of racist and antisemitic ideology, affecting the whole of Canadian society and remaining virtually untouched by our Canadian criminal justice system.

Holocaust denial is not an assault on the history of one particular group. Though denial of the Holocaust may be an attack on the history of the annihilation of the Jews, at its core it poses a threat to all who believe that knowledge and memory are among the keystones of our civilization. Just as the Holocaust was not a tragedy of the Jews but a tragedy of civilization in which the victims were Jews, so too denial of the Holocaust is not a threat just to Jewish history but a threat to all who believe in the ultimate power of reason.

Deborah Lipstadt (1993)

APPENDIX A: LIST OF WEBSITES

Websites operated by specific hate organizations:

L'Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerre et d'Holocauste (AAARGH)
<http://aaargh.vho.org/>

Adelaide Institute
<http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Aryan Nations
<http://www.aryan-nations.org>

Aryan Nations of the Ku Klux Klan
<http://www.aryannationsknights.com>

Be Wise as Serpents
<http://www.iahushua.com/BeWise/bewise.html>

Campaign for Radical Truth in History
<http://www.hoffman-info.com>

Canadian Heritage Alliance
<http://www.canadianheritagealliance.com>

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)
<http://www.codoh.com>

Focal Point Publications
<http://www.fpp.co.uk>

Historical Review Press
<http://www.ety.com/HRP/rev/idx.htm>

Holocaust Historiography Project
<http://www.corax.org/revisionism>

Institute for Historical Review (IHR)
<http://www.ihr.org>

National Alliance
<http://www.natvan.com>

The Patriot
<http://www.patriot.dk/english.html>

Save the Humans
<http://www.savethehumans.com>

Six Chimneys
<http://www.holocaustianity.com>

Stormfront
<http://www.stormfront.org>

Stormfront for Kids
<http://kids.stormfront.org>

Stormfront for Women
<http://women.stormfront.org>

The Revisionist
<http://vho.org>

Websites maintained and operated by individual persons:

Arthur R. Butz's website
<http://pubweb.nwu.edu/~abutz>

Carlos Whitlock Porter's website
<http://www.cwporter.com>

David Duke's website
<http://www.davidduke.com>

John C. Ball's website
<http://www.air-photo.com>

The Zundelsite
<http://www.zundelsite.org>

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW DEMOGRAPHICS

Each of these organizations and interviewees has specific roles and interests in combatting hate in Canada. The Canadian Jewish Congress, Pacific Region was established in 1918, at a time when the Jewish minority in Canada was “facing tremendous amounts of discriminatory laws and values for the full acceptance of society” and where Jews faced “major stumbling blocks” in order to participate in the larger society” (CJC1). Although the organization focuses largely on matters affecting the Jewish community, it also deals with issues affecting human rights, multiculturalism and anti-racism (CJC2). The organization has a direct role in combatting hate, specifically Holocaust denial. The organization seeks to confront the phenomenon of Holocaust denial, whether it is on the Internet or hand-delivered by “various groups, associations, presentations, [or] films” (CJC1).

The Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre focuses on education and commemoration as mandates of their organization – objectives which are viewed as being interconnected (HEC). The organization accomplishes these mandates in a number of ways, which include but are not limited to: holding public events aimed at the education of adults, entering schools and providing Holocaust education to youths from Grades 6 through 12, developing curriculum, training teachers, and other similar types of programs (HEC). In doing so, the Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre continually provides students and the public with “overwhelming evidence of the historical truth of the Holocaust” through “survivor testimony, exhibits, films and images” (HEC). The Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre occupies an indirect role in challenging Holocaust denial material, as it is not actively engaged in the fighting against such hate literature. In fact, the Centre has implemented a specific policy for its employees, against engaging in any type of debate with Holocaust deniers or refuting Holocaust denial literature.

The Canadian Race Relations Foundation’s mandate is one of “public education, and research” aimed at fighting all forms of racism, including, but not limited to, Holocaust denial. However, the Foundation’s contact with Holocaust denial literature is limited. The organization often “comes across [Holocaust denial] only in the way that the public would” (RRF).

The Canadian Human Rights Commission is comprised of up to eight commissioners, two of whom are employed on a full-time basis. These commissioners have the role of ensuring the resolution of individual complaints and approving policies within the Human Rights Commission (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2004). The Commission has within its power the ability to initiate complaints against any individual or group who espouses hate in any form (CHRL). Although the Human Rights Commission has an indirect role in challenging hate and Holocaust denial, the representative from the Commission included as a participant in this study occupies a direct role in this task, as he has chosen to challenge hate and fight Holocaust denial as an individual citizen.¹⁷⁰

¹⁷⁰ This interviewee is currently employed as an investigator for the federal government, and worked formerly for the Human Rights Commission as a lawyer doing investigations and

The duties of the New Westminster police hate crime unit are two-fold. The unit is mandated to 1) identify, investigate and prosecute hate crime occurrences within the New Westminster area, and 2) report such occurrences to the British Columbia Hate Crime Unit (PO1). Within this first mandate, once a hate crime has been investigated and identified as such, the information is then forwarded to the crown attorney, in order to obtain approval for a criminal charge against the offender (PO1).¹⁷¹ The second mandate ensures that there is systematic collection of hate crime incidents and the circumstances surrounding those incidents, throughout the province of British Columbia. The interviewee's position within the unit dictates that he review all reported hate crimes and liaise with the crown attorney's office to ensure that they are prosecuted properly (PO1). In addition, the interviewee works regularly as a uniformed officer, with the added emphasis on gathering and disseminating information on organized hate groups and hate incidents within New Westminster (PO1). The participant also monitors the Internet for hate material. The New Westminster Police Department occupies an indirect role in challenging Holocaust denial, specifically on the Internet, as it deals with all occurrences of hate activity in the New Westminster area and aid in the gathering of intelligence on such activity at the provincial level.

The hate crime unit, operating in Ottawa for well over ten years, specializes in and investigates hate-related and hate-based activities. This unit has three mandates: 1) outreach and education, 2) criminal investigations, and 3) the gathering of intelligence (PO2). The first mandate of the unit involves communication with various community groups as well as the education of police officers, specialized law enforcement units, external partners or community groups, about hate-motivated activities (PO2). The second mandate places emphasis on "investigations that are believed to be of a hate-motivated type criminal offence" (PO2). The final mandate necessitates continual knowledge and awareness of organized hate groups, such as white supremacist and Neo-Nazi groups, and their activities (PO2). Again, this hate crime unit occupies an indirect role in fighting and challenging Holocaust denial; the Ottawa-Carleton hate crime unit does not encounter Holocaust denial material regularly (PO2).

prosecutions of human rights complaints (CHRL). The participant continually monitors hate group activity in Canada, with a specific focus on the Internet, on his own time. Furthermore, he initiates complaints against hate mongers as an individual citizen (CHRL).

¹⁷¹ In British Columbia, charge approval rests solely with the Crown Attorney.

APPENDIX C: STUDY INFORMATION DOCUMENT

Research study title: The Web of Hate: An Exploratory Study of Holocaust Denial on the Net

Place: Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Who are the participants (subjects) in this study?

The non-probabilistic procedure of convenience or haphazard sampling will be used to determine whom the participants in the research project will include.

Various law enforcement agencies and anti-racist and Jewish organizations will be contacted by telephone in the hopes of recruiting anyone who may be interested in participating in the research. A total of 6 participants will be sought (2 members of law enforcement, 2 members of an anti-racist organization and 2 members of a Jewish organization).

What will the participants be required to do?

The participants being sought for inclusion in the research include two members of law enforcement, two members of Jewish organizations, and two members of anti-racist organizations. The participants will be required to respond to interview questions, providing their opinions and thoughts regarding Holocaust denial on the Web in Canada, and the types of remedies they think should be used to ameliorate the problem in Canada.

Overall Goals of Study

1) To examine the ideas, images, and literature found on hate websites and how these ideas, images and hate literature can be categorized as a reflection of hate.

2) To demonstrate how antisemitism can be conceptualized in relation to Holocaust denial.

3) To ascertain how certain individuals or groups (law enforcement personnel, Jewish organizations, anti-racist organizations) understand and identify the problem of Holocaust denial, particularly on the Web.

4) To demonstrate/illustrate the main tenets of Holocaust deniers.

5) To provide a proper analysis and discussion of the presence of Holocaust denial on the Web.

6) To illustrate the increasing danger of the presence of such material on the Web and how it serves as a promotion of hatred.

7) To provide suggestions as to how Canada can more effectively combat hate speech, especially Holocaust denial.

8) To demonstrate the inefficiency of the Canadian law and criminal justice system in prosecuting those who promulgate hate speech.

9) To explore new terrain. Holocaust denial on the Internet specifically has never been examined; the research will thus illustrate yet another avenue through which deniers can promote hateful messages. Interviews with individuals who may deal with implications of Holocaust denial will also provide a new perspective on the issue, as opinions regarding Holocaust denial have yet to be explored.

Risks to the participant, third parties or society:

There are no foreseeable risks to participants at this time.

Benefits of study to the development of new knowledge:

Holocaust denial on the Internet is a phenomenon that has yet to be explored in great depth. In writing this thesis, I hope to provide some suggestions as to how Canada can more effectively combat hate speech, with a particular focus on Holocaust denial. The results of this thesis, in pointing to the current problems with the criminal justice system in prosecuting those who promulgate hate speech, may be helpful in demonstrating the inefficiency of the Canadian law in this area. There is definite potential for a policy to be developed that addresses such issues affecting contemporary society. In addition, the hope is to alert people to the dangers of the Internet, specifically when looking at Holocaust denial, and how there is a need to regulate hate material that can be found through such a medium.

These are some of the contributions that this thesis may have for the study of society and the law. With the specific focus of examining hate literature such as Holocaust denial on the Internet, new terrain can be explored. Previous research has examined Holocaust deniers using printed documentation, published works, or through the deniers' affiliations. By focusing on Internet websites, this thesis will allow such material on the Internet to be analyzed and demonstrate another avenue by which deniers can promote their hateful messages. In addition, the supplementary interviews of representatives from law enforcement agencies, anti-racist organizations, and Jewish organizations will provide a perspective never before explored. These interviews will reveal the thoughts and opinions of those currently working in the field of hate crime, and the types of remedies they think should be used to ameliorate the problem.

How confidentiality and anonymity will be assured if applicable:

None of the participants in the study will be identified by name within the write-up of the interviews or in the thesis. In addition, all transcripts and recordings of the interviews will be destroyed once the analysis of the data and write-up of the thesis has been completed.

Approvals that may be required from agencies, communities or employers:

N/A

Statement of Professional Ethics if consent procedure 2b is chosen and any other information or contingencies that may be appropriate:

N/A

Persons and contact information that participants can contact to discuss concerns.

Daniela Di Giacomo
ddigiaco@sfu.ca
604-XXX-XXXX

OR

Wendy Chan
wchane@sfu.ca

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT BY PARTICIPANTS IN A RESEARCH STUDY

The University and those conducting this research study subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of participants. This research is being conducted under permission of the Simon Fraser Research Ethics Board. The chief concern of the Board is for the health, safety and psychological well-being of research participants.

Should you wish to obtain information about your rights as a participant in research, or about the responsibilities of researchers, or if you have any questions, concerns or complaints about the manner in which you were treated in this study, please contact the Director, Office of Research Ethics by email at hweinber@sfu.ca or phone at 604-268-6593.

Your signature on this form will signify that you have received a document which describes the procedures, possible risks, and benefits of this research study, that you have received an adequate opportunity to consider the information in the documents describing the study, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study. Any information that is obtained during this study will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by the law. Knowledge of your identity is not required. You will not be required to write your name or any other identifying information on research materials. Materials will be maintained in a secure location.

Title: **The Web of Hate: An Exploratory Study of Holocaust Denial on the Net**
Investigator Name: **Daniela Di Giacomo**
Investigator Department: **Criminology**

Having been asked to participate in the research study named above, I certify that I have read the procedures specified in the Study Information Document describing the study. I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the personal risks to me in taking part in the study as described below:

Risks to the participant, third parties or society:

There are no foreseeable risks to participants at this time.

Benefits of study to the development of new knowledge:

Holocaust denial on the Internet is a phenomenon that has yet to be explored in great depth. In writing this thesis, I hope to provide some suggestions as to how Canada can more effectively combat hate speech, with a particular focus on Holocaust denial. The results of this thesis, in pointing to the current problems with the criminal justice system in prosecuting those who promulgate hate speech, may be helpful in demonstrating the inefficiency of the Canadian law in this area. There is definite potential for a policy to be

developed that addresses such issues affecting contemporary society. In addition, the hope is to alert people to the dangers of the Internet, specifically when looking at Holocaust denial, and how there is a need to regulate hate material that can be found through such a medium.

These are some of the contributions that this thesis may have for the study of society and the law. With the specific focus of examining hate literature such as Holocaust denial on the Internet, new terrain can be explored. Previous research has examined Holocaust deniers using printed documentation, published works, or through the deniers' affiliations. By focusing on Internet websites, this thesis will allow such material on the Internet to be analyzed and demonstrate another avenue by which deniers can promote their hateful messages. In addition, the supplementary interviews of representatives from law enforcement agencies, anti-racist organizations, and Jewish organizations will provide a perspective never before explored. These interviews will reveal the thoughts and opinions of those currently working in the field of hate crime, and the types of remedies they think should be used to ameliorate the problem.

Procedures:

The participants being sought for inclusion in the research include two members of law enforcement, two members of Jewish organizations, and two members of anti-racist organizations. The participants will be required to respond to interview questions, providing their opinions and thoughts regarding Holocaust denial on the Web in Canada, and the types of remedies they think should be used to ameliorate the problem in Canada.

I understand that I may withdraw my participation at any time. I also understand that I may register any complaint with the Director of the Office of Research Ethics or the researcher named above or with the Chair, Director or Dean of the Department, School or Faculty as shown below.

Department, School or Faculty: Chair, Director or Dean:
Criminology Paul Brantingham

8888 University Way,
Simon Fraser University,
Burnaby, British Columbia, V5A 1S6, Canada

I may obtain copies of the results of this study, upon its completion by contacting:

Daniela Di Giacomo
ddigiaco@sfu.ca
604-XXX-XXXX

OR

Wendy Chan
wchane@sfu.ca

I have been informed that the research will be confidential.

I understand that my supervisor or employer may require me to obtain his or her permission prior to my participation in a study of this kind.

I understand the risks and contributions of my participation in this study and agree to participate:

Signature: _____

APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Organization

1.
 - a) What is the purpose of your organization?
 - b) What are the guiding principles?

2.
 - a) What position do you hold?
 - b) What role do you have within the organization?
 - c) How long have you been working for the organization?

3.
 - a) Does your organization have a role in fighting hate and challenging Holocaust denial?
 - b) Do you encounter such material on a regular basis?
 - c) If not, do you feel this should be changed?

Definitional

4. Have you heard of the term Holocaust denial before?

5. How would you define/conceptualize the phenomenon of Holocaust denial?

6.
 - a) What do you think Holocaust denial entails (the main tenets of denial)?
 - b) What kind of claims do you think are being made by deniers of the Holocaust?
 - c) What persons or groups do you think are actively involved in the denial of the Holocaust?

7.
 - a) How recent of a phenomenon do you believe Holocaust denial is?
 - b) How many years has it been present in Canada? in other parts of the world?
 - c) Where does it stem from?

8. Do you think there is a relationship between Holocaust denial and antisemitism?

9. What do you think causes people to want to deny the Holocaust?

Legal

10.
 - a) Do you think antisemitism is a problem in Canadian society?
 - b) Do you think Holocaust denial is a problem in Canadian society?
 - c) Do you think it is a problem that hate material can be published on the Internet, specifically Holocaust denial material?
 - d) How do you feel about the increasing accessibility of the Internet to Canadians?
 - e) Do you think there is a need to prosecute/control such material on the web?

11.
 - a) Are you aware of the laws that are currently in place in the Canadian *Criminal Code* to combat hate speech?
 - b) Do you think Holocaust denial should be categorized as a hate crime?
 - c) Do you think that Holocaust denial on the web/in print falls under the provisions of the *Criminal Code*?
 - d) If so, in what instances?
 - e) Do you think the present law is an effective tool in combatting hate crime and hate speech?

Education

12.
 - a) Do you think Canadians are aware of the extent to which antisemitism is present in Canadian society?
 - b) Do you think Canadians are sufficiently educated about hate speech and its implications? Why or why not?
 - c) Do you think Canadians are sufficiently educated about the events of the Holocaust? Why or why not?
 - d) Do you think Canadians are aware that there are people who deny the Holocaust? Why or why not?
 - e) Would you comment on the relationship between racism and antisemitism. Do you think antisemitism is generally viewed as falling within the scope of racism?
 - f) Do you feel that antisemitism education is marginalized within the greater goals of anti-racism education? In other words, do you feel that Holocaust education gets the same attention within the framework of the anti-racism movement or does it get pushed aside?
 - g) Should it be included within the anti-racism movement being pursued in schools today?
 - h) If so, does this hurt the goals and abilities of organizations to educate Canadians about the Holocaust and Holocaust denial?

Policy Change

13.
 - a) What suggestions can you make as to how Canada can more effectively combat hate speech?
 - b) What suggestions can you make as to how Canada can more effectively combat Holocaust denial?

14. What suggestions can you make as to deal with Holocaust denial literature on the web?

15. Are there any other questions that I have left out that I should be asking for research in this area?

APPENDIX F: CLAIMS MADE BY HOLOCAUST DENIERS

| Categories | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Claims of Deniers | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Relativizing the Holocaust | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Condemning the Condemners | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Blaming the Victim | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The Holocaust as a Lie, Story, Hoax | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| The Holocaust Industry | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Media Propaganda | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Conspiracy Theory | | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Holocaust Deniers as Victims | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Censorship | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Discrimination | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Nazi Germany | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Categories | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Trivializing the Holocaust | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Holocaust Humour & Satire | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scientific Investigations | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Extermination Methods | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gas Chambers | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cremation | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Diesel Vans | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Extermination Policy | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lack of Foreign Acknowledgement | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Population Statistics | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camp Conditions | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tattooing | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Human Remains | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Soap Stories, etc. | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Documentation | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Photographs | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Testimony/Confessions | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Legend: List of Websites

1. Aaargh
2. Adelaide Institute
3. Arthur R. Butz
4. Aryan Nations
5. Aryan Nations of the Ku Klux Klan
6. Be Wise as Serpents
7. Campaign for Radical Truth in History
8. Canadian Heritage Alliance
9. Carlos Whitlock Porter
10. Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust
11. David Duke
12. Focal Point
13. Historical Review Press
14. Holocaust Historiography Project
15. Institute for Historical Review
16. John C. Ball
17. National Alliance
18. The Patriot
19. Save the Humans
20. Six Chimneys
21. Stormfront
22. Stormfront for Kids
23. Stormfront for Women
24. The Revisionist
25. The Zundelsite

REFERENCE LIST

- Abella, I. (1982). None is Too Many : Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys.
- Abella, I. (1990). A Coat of Many Colours: Two Centuries of Jewish life in Canada. Toronto : Lester & Orpen Dennys.
- Abt, V. and Hirsch, C. (1994). Deconstructing Antisemitism. Submitted to the American Sociological Association 1994 Annual Meeting. Location Unknown.
- Anderson, T. and Kanuka, H. (2003). E-Research: Methods, Strategies and Issues. San Francisco: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Bannerji, Himani. (1995). Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism. Toronto, Canada: Women's Press.
- Bannerji, Himani. (1993). Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics. Toronto, Canada: Sister Vision Press.
- Baym, N. (1995). The emergence of community in computer mediated communication *in* Jones, S. (Ed.). Cybersociety: Computer Mediated Communication and Community. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 35-68.
- Befu, H. (1999). Demonizing the "Other" *in* Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 17-30.
- Benz, W. (1999). The Motivations and Impact of Contemporary Holocaust Denial in Germany *in* Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, p.336-348.
- Bercuson, D. (1985). A Trust Betrayed: the Keegstra Affair. Toronto: Doubleday Canada.
- Best, S. and Kreuger, B. (2004). Internet Data Collection. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

- B'nai Brith Canada. (2003). 2003 Audit of Antisemitic Incidents. Downsview, Ontario: League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://bnaibrith.ca/publications/audit2003/audit2003-00.html>.
- B'nai Brith Canada. (2002). 2002 Interim Audit of Antisemitic Incidents. Downsview, Ontario: League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/pulications/audit2002/interim2002.html>.
- B'nai Brith Canada. (2001). Taking Action Against Hate: Protection, Prevention and Partnerships: A Training Manual for Individuals, Institutions and Community Groups. Toronto: League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada.
- B'nai Brith Canada. (1996). Audit of Antisemitic Incidents. Downsview, Ontario: League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://bnaibrith.ca/publications/audit-96/audit.96htm>.
- B'nai Brith Canada. (1993). Audit of Antisemitic Incidents. Downsview, Ontario: League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://banibrith.ca/publications/audit-93/audit.93htm>.
- Boehlefeld, S. (1996). Doing the Right Thing: Ethical Cyberspace Research. The Information Society, 12, p.141-152.
- Borrowman, S. (1999). Critical Surfing: Holocaust Denial and Credibility on the Web. College Teaching, 47 (2), p.44-48.
- Branham, C. (1997). Evaluating Web Pages for Relevance. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.english.ttu.edu/kairos/2.2/news/youcanuse/craig/page04.html.
- Brem, S. (2002). Analyzing Online Discussions: Ethics, Data, and Interpretation. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 8 (3). Online Journal Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=3.
- British Columbia Hate Crime Team Status Report. (January 1999 to June 2000). Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.pssg.gov.bc.ca/end_hate_crime/.
- Brunner, J. (1999). Canada's use of Criminal and Human Rights Legislation to Control Hate Propoganda. Manitoba Law Journal, 26, 299-317.
- Burrin, P. (1999). Nazi Antisemitism: Animalization and Demonization *in* Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 267-293.

- Butler, A., Elliott, T., & Stopard, N. (2003). Living up to the Standards we Set: A Critical Account of the Development of Anti-Racist Standards. Social Work Education, 22 (3), p.271-282.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (2004). About Us. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.chrc-ccdp.ca/about/mandate-en.asp>.
- Clarke, S. (1999). Splitting Difference: Psychoanalysis, Hatred and Exclusion. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 29 (1), 21-35.
- Cohen, S. (2001). States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Cohen, H. (1999). The Significance and Future of Racially Motivated Crime. International Journal of the Sociology of Law, (27), 103-118.
- Cohen, S. (1993). Human Rights and Crimes of the State: the Culture of Denial. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 26, p.97-115.
- Corelli, R. (1995). A Tolerant Nation's Hidden Shame. Maclean's, 108 (33), p.40-44.
- Davies, A. (Date Unknown). An Enduring Problem in Western Society. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://archives.marshall.edu/~altany/rst205a-0001-list/0325.html>.
- Del Basio, M. & Lewis, A. (1997). A Guide to Social Science Research. Scarborough, Ontario: ITP Nelson.
- De Santis, H. (1998). Combatting Hate on the Internet: An International Comparative Review of Policy Approaches. Hull: Department of Canadian Heritage and Department of Industry.
- Essed, P. (1990). Racism in Today's Societies *in* Essed, P. Everyday Racism: Reports from Women of Two Cultures. Claremont, California: Hunter House, 7-37.
- Evans, R. (2001). Lying About Hitler: History, Holocaust, and the David Irving Trial. New York: Basic Books.
- Ferrarotti, F. (1994). The Temptation to Forget: Racism, Anti-Semitism, Neo-Nazism. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Flick, U. (1998). An Introduction to Qualitative Research. London: Sage Publications.

- Ford, H. (1920). The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem. Dearborn, Michigan: The Dearborn Publishing Company.
- Friedlander, H. (2000). German Law and German Crimes in the Nazi Era *in* Schwartz, B. The Holocaust's Ghost: Writings on Art, Politics, Law and Education. Edmonton: The University Of Alberta Press, p.283-289.
- Green, D., Abelson, R., & Garnett, M. (1999). The Distinctive Political Views of Hate-Crime Perpetrators and White Supremacists *in* Prentice, D. & Miller D. (Eds.). Cultural Divides: Understanding and Overcoming Group Conflict. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, p.429-464.
- Glaser, J., Dixit, J., and Green, D. (2002). Studying Hate Crime on the Internet: What makes Racists Advocate Racial Violence. Journal of Social Issues, 58 (1), p.177-193.
- Green, D., Glaser, J., & Rich, A. (1998). From Lynching to Gay Bashing: The Elusive Connection Between Economic Conditions and Hate Crime. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, p. 82-92.
- Green, D., Strolovitch, D., & Wong, J. (1998). Defended Neighborhoods, Integration, and Racially Motivated Crime. American Journal of Sociology, 104, p.372-403.
- Goldschmid, R. (1999/2000). Promoting Equality in the Information Age: Dealing with Internet Hate. Vancouver: Canadian Jewish Congress, Pacific Region.
- Gregor, N. (2000). (ed.). Nazism. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamm, M. (1994). Conceptualizing Hate Crime in a Global Context *in* Heiner, R. (ed.). Criminology: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Los Angeles: West Publishing Company, p.91-108.
- Hartman, G. (2002). The Longest Shadow: In the Aftermath of the Holocaust. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hate/Bias Crime Policy Guide. (2000). End Hate Crime. Vancouver: Ministry of Attorney General and Human Rights, p.1-17.
- Henry, F. & Tator, C. (2003). Racial Profiling in Toronto: Discourses of Domination, Mediation, and Opposition. Submitted to the Canadian Race Relations Foundation. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.crr.ca/EN/Publications/ResearchReports/pdf/ePub_Racial_Profiling_Final_Draft.pdf.

- Henry, F. & Tator, C. (2000). The Theory and Practice of Democratic Racism in Canada *in* Kalbach, M. & Kalbach, W. Perspectives on Ethnicity in Canada. Toronto: Harcourt Canada, 285-301.
- Herring, S. (1996). Computer-Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social, and Cross-Cultural Perspectives. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Hine, C. (2000). Virtual Ethnography. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Internet World Stats. (2005). Internet Usage Statistics – The Big Picture: World Internet Users and Population Stats. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>.
- Janhevich, D. (2001). Hate Crimes in Canada: An Overview of Issues and Data Sources. Canadian Center for Justice Statistics [and] Statistics Canada.
- Jenness, V. & Grattet, R. (2001). Making Hate a Crime: From Social Movement Concept to Law Enforcement Practice. New York: Russell Sage.
- Johnson, J., Rush, S., & Feagin, J. (2000). Doing Anti-Racism: Toward and Egalitarian American Society. Contemporary Sociology, 29 (2), p.95-110.
- Jones, S. (1999). (Ed.). Doing Internet Research: Critical Issues and Methods for Examining the Net. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Kallen, E. & Lam, L. (1993). Target for Hate: The Impact of the Zundel and Keegstra Trials on a Jewish-Canadian Audience. Canadian Ethnic Studies, 25, (1), p.9-24.
- Katz, S. (1999). Mass Death under Communist Rule and the Limits of “Otherness” *in* Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 267-293.
- Keating, F. (2000). Anti-Racist Perspectives: What are the gains for Social Work? Social Work Education, 19 (1), p.77-87.
- King, S. (1996). Researching Internet Communities: Proposed Ethical Guidelines for the Reporting of Results. The Information Society, 12, p.119-127.
- Kinsella, W. (2001). The Web of Hate: Inside Canada’s Far Right Network. Toronto: Harper Collins.
- Kirby & McKenna. (1989). Experience, Research, Social Change: Methods from the Margins. Toronto, Ontario: Garamond Press.

- Kramer, L. (2004). B.C. Pledges to Shore up Hate Crime Unit. The Canadian Jewish News: Internet Edition. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cjnews.com/viewarticle.asp?id=2484>.
- Kulaszka, B. (1992). Did Six Million Really Die?: Report of the Evidence in the Canadian "False News" Trial of Ernst Zündel, 1988. Toronto: Samisdat Publications.
- Lauder, M. (2001). False Perceptions of an Inclusive Society: A Century of Racism and Hate in Canada. Canadian Content. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://collection.nlc-bnc.ca/100/201/300/cdn_content/2002/02-01-07/.
- LeCouteur, A. & Augoustinos, M. (2001). The Language of Prejudice and Racism *in* Augoustinos, M. & Reynolds, K. (ed.). Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict. London: Sage Publications, p.215-230.
- Levin, B. (2001). History as a Weapon: How Extremists Deny the Holocaust in North America. American Behavioral Scientist, 44 (6), p.1001-1031.
- Levy, R. (1991). Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts. Lexington, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Lipstadt, D. (1993). Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory. New York: The Free Press.
- Locke, V. and Johnston, L. (2001). Stereotyping and Prejudice: A Social Cognitive Approach *in* Augoustinos, M. & Reynolds, K. (ed.). Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict. London: Sage Publications, p.107-127.
- Mann, C. & Stewart, F. (2000). Internet Communication and Qualitative Research: A Handbook for Researching Online. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Matas, D. (2000). Bloody Words: Hate and Free Speech. Winnipeg: Bain and Cox, Publishers.
- Matas, D. (2000). Countering Hate on the Internet: Recommendations for Action *in* Schwartz, B. The Holocaust's Ghost: Writings on Art, Politics, Law and Education. Edmonton: The University Of Alberta Press, p.483-495.
- Maxfield, M. & Babbie, E. (2001). Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology (3rd Ed.). Canada: Wadsworth Thomas Learning.

- McPhail, B. (2000). Hating Hate: Policy Implications of Hate Crime Legislation. Social Services Review, p.635-653.
- Mock, K. (2000). Holocaust and Hope: Holocaust Education in the Context of Anti-Racist Education in Canada *in* Schwartz, B. The Holocaust's Ghost: Writings on Art, Politics, Law and Education. Edmonton: The University Of Alberta Press, p.465-482.
- Mock, K. (1998/99). Countering Anti-Semitism and Hate in Canada Today. The Nizkor Project. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://nizkor.org/hweb/people/m/mock-Karen/countering-hate.html>.
- Mock, K. (1996). Anti-Semitism in Canada: Realities, Remedies, and Implications for Anti-Racism *in* James, C. (Eds.). Perspectives on racism and the Human Services Sector: A Case for Change. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, p.120-134.
- Mock, K. (1994). Victim Impact of Racially Motivated Crime. Currents, 8 (2), p.32-33.
- Moses, R. (1997). Some Sociopsychological and Political Perspectives of the Meaning of the Holocaust: A View from Israel. Israeli Journal of Psychiatry Relational Science, 34 (1), p.55-68.
- Neuman, N. (2004). Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Toronto: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Orwell, George. (1949). Nineteen Eighty-Four: A Novel. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Ostow, M. (1996). Myth and Madness. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Palys, P. (1997). Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives (3rd Ed.). Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Patwardhan, Padmini. (2004). Exposure, Involvement and Satisfaction with Online Activities: A Cross-National Comparison of American and Indian Internet Users. Gazette: The International Journal for Communications Studies, 66 (5), p.411-436.
- Perry, B. (2001). In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes. New York: Routledge.
- Popping, R. (2000). Computer-Assisted Text Analysis. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

- Porat, D. (1999). The Protocols of the Elders of Zion: New Uses of an Old Myth in Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 267-293.
- Prager, D. & Telushkin, J. (1983). Why the Jews: The Reason for Antisemitism. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Razack, Sherene. (1998). Looking White People in the Eye: Gender, Race, and Culture in Courtrooms and Classrooms. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Riggins, S. (ed.). (1997). The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse. London: Sage Publications.
- Ristock, J. & Pennell, J. (1996). Community Research as Empowerment: Feminist Links, Postmodern Interruptions. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Roy, J. (2000). Acknowledging and Defining Racism. Prepared for the Canadian Race Relations Foundation. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.amachi.biz/divers-files/en/pub/faSh/ePubFaShAckRac.pdf>
- Roy, P., Granatstein, M., and Takamura, H. (1990). Mutual Hostages : Canadians and Japanese during the Second World War. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Roy, P. (1989). A White Man's Province : British Columbia Politicians and Chinese and Japanese Immigrants, 1858-1914. Vancouver : University of British Columbia Press.
- Schalit, J. (1997). Shoah's What Jew Got: The Critique of Antisemitism has been Emptied of its Utopian Content. Bad Subjects, 33. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://bad.eserver.org/issues/1997/33/schalit.html>.
- Schul, Y. and Zukier, H. (1999). Why do Stereotypes Stick? in Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, p.31-34.
- Schwartz, B. (2000). The Holocaust's Ghost: Writings on Art, Politics, Law and Education. Edmonton: The University Of Alberta Press.
- Schwartz, D. (1999). Antisemitism and Other-ism's in the Greco-Roman World in Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 267-293.

- Sheehan, K. (2002). Online Research Methodology: Reflections and Speculations. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 3 (1). Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.jiad.org/vol3/no1/sheehan/index.htm.
- Shermer, M. and Grobman, A. (2000). Denying History: Who says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why do they Say it? Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sheth, A., and Handa, A. (1993). A Jewel in the Frown: Striking Accord Between India/n Feminists in Bannerji, Himani. (1993). Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics. Toronto, Canada: Sister Vision Press.
- Silver, W., Mihorean, K. and Taylor-Butts, A. (2004). Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 24 (4). Statistics Canada, p.1-19.
- Silverman, D. (2000). Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sizemore, D. (2004). Ethnic Inclusion and Exclusion: Managing the Language of Hispanic Integration in a Rural Community. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 33 (5), p.534-570.
- Sneiderman, B. (1999). Holocaust Bashing: The Profaning of History. Manitoba Law Journal, 3 (26), 319-334.
- Statistics Canada. (2004). The Daily: Household Internet Use Survey. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/040708/d040708a.htm.
- Statistics Canada. (2003). Internet Use in Canada. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/56F003XIE.
- Strauss & Corbin. (1998). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Suriya, S. (1998). Combatting Hate?: A Socio-Legal Discussion on the Criminalization of Hate in Canada. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Tan, J., and Roy, P. (1985). The Chinese in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.
- Thompson, A. (1997). For: Anti-Racist Education. Curriculum Inquiry, 27 (1), p.7-44.
- Tsesis, A. (2002). Destructive Messages: How Hate Speech Paves the Way for Harmful Social Movements. New York: New York University Press.

- Vidal-Naquet, P. (1992). Assassins of Memory: Essays on the Denial of the Holocaust. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ward, P. (2002). White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Toward Orientals in British Columbia (3rd Ed.). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ward, P. (1982). The Japanese in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.
- Ward, P. (1972). White Canada Forever: British Columbia's Response to Orientals, 1858-1914. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.
- Weimann, G. & Winn, C. (1986). Hate on Trial: The Zundel Affair, the Media, and Public Opinion in Canada. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press.
- White, R. & Perrone, S. (2001). Racism, Ethnicity and Hate Crime. Communal/Plural Journal of Transactional and Cross-Cultural Studies, 9, (2), p.161-181.
- Wistrich, R. (1999). (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.
- Wistrich, R. (1999). Xenophobia and Antisemitism in the New Europe: The Case of Germany *in* Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, p.349-363.
- WUJS: The World Union of Jewish Students. (2002). Antisemitism: A Handbook. Jerusalem, Israel: Education Department of the Jewish Agency for Israel, p.1-71.
- Yin, J. & Young, S. (1997). The Rape of Nanking: An Undeniable History in Photographs. Chicago: Innovative Publishing Group, Inc. Summary retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.tribo.org/nanking/>.
- Zukier, H. (1999). The Transformation of Hatred: Antisemitism as a Struggle for Group Identity *in* Wistrich, R. (ed.). Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 118-130.

Statutory Laws

- Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, enacted as Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (U.K.), 1982, c.11. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/charter>.
- Canadian Human Rights Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. H-6. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/H-6/>.

Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46. Retrieved from the World Wide Web:
<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46>.

Legal Cases

R. v. Buzzanga and Durocher, (1979), 49 C.C.C. (2d) 369.