

Contents

Contributors	xi
Preface	xiii
Introduction	xvii

PART ONE **From Genocide to Denial** 1

1. Law's Holocaust Denial: State, Memory, Legality 3
David Fraser
 1. Introduction: Law's Holocaust/Law's Amnesia 3
 2. Blind in the Left Eye: Weimar, Law's Republic and Denial 11
 3. Holocaust and Legal History 19
 4. Memory Laws and Law's Memory 22
 5. Memory/Law-Memory Laws 27
 - 5.1 The loi Gayssot 29
 - 5.2 Lois Mémoires 30
 - 5.3 The Armenian (Genocide) in French Law 39
 6. Conclusion 47
2. From Trying the Perpetrator to Trying the Denier and Back Again: Some Reflections 49
Lawrence Douglas
 1. The Logic of the Law: Denier as Perpetrator 49
 2. The Risks of Trial: Perpetrator as Denier 60
 3. Trying the Perpetrator to Answer the Denier 65

PART TWO **Balancing Denial Prohibition** 75

3. Holocaust Denial and Hate Speech 77
Robert A. Kahn
 1. The Problem of "Bare" Denial 77
 2. A "Minor Province of Censorship?" 79

3.	Judging Hate by Its Content	82
4.	Is Bare Denial Hateful?	84
5.	The Limits of Traditional Hate Speech Laws	86
6.	The Perils of Blanket Denial Laws	90
7.	Bringing “Hate” Back In	94
7.1	Past Hate as a Rationale for Genocide Denial Laws	95
7.2	Past Hate as a Justification for anti-Denial Laws in European Jurisprudence	96
7.3	Past Hate as a Yardstick for Future Genocide Denial Laws	100
8.	Holocaust Denial Laws and Blasphemy	103
9.	Conclusion	106
4.	Defending Truth: Holocaust Denial in the Twenty-First Century	109
	<i>Kenneth Lasson</i>	
1.	Holocaust Denial	112
1.1	The Nature of Denial	113
1.2	Denial in the Twenty-First Century	113
1.3	Denial in the Middle East	116
1.4	Confronting Denial	122
1.5	The Academic Voice	123
1.6	Books	124
1.7	Holocaust Denial and Political Correctness	125
2.	Historical Aspects of Free Expression: Framers and Revisionists	128
2.1	Principles of Liberty	129
2.2	The Right of Access	133
2.3	Arguments in Deference to Freedom of Expression	136
2.4	Arguments in Favor of Regulating Hate Speech	140
2.5	The Experience Elsewhere	144
	1. <i>Canada</i>	144
	2. <i>England</i>	146
	3. <i>France</i>	146
	4. <i>Sweden</i>	147
	5. <i>United States</i>	147
3.	The Quest for Truth in a Free Society	148
3.1	Ignorance and Education	148

- 3.2 Liberty and Responsibility 151
 - 3.3 Toward a More Responsible Press 152
- 4. Summary and Conclusion 153
- 5. The Criminal Protection of Memory: Some Observations About the Offence of Holocaust Denial 155
 - Emanuela Fronza*
 - 1. Law as Protection Against Oblivion: Punishing Holocaust Denial as Part of a General Trend 155
 - 1.1 Les “Lois Mémoires” and the Crime of Denial 156
 - 2. Denial as an Offence 160
 - 3. Deniers on Trial 167
 - 3.1 History as *Res Judicata*: the Holocaust as a “Historically Established Fact” and Garaudy v. France 168
 - 3.2 History on Trial: “the Correct Method” and the Theil Case 170
 - 3.3 Claims About Facts and Claims About Values: the Spanish Tribunal Constitucional’s Judgement of Partial Unconstitutionality 172
 - 4. The Judge as Historian? 175
 - 5. Denial as an Attack on the Founding Ethical Pact and the Need for a *Long Road* of Memory 178

PART THREE **Ruling Denial Prohibition 183**

- 6. The Law of Holocaust Denial in Europe: Toward a (qualified) EU-wide Criminal Prohibition 185
 - Laurent Pech*
 - 1. The Situation Before 9/11: United in Diversity 187
 - 1.1 The Principle: The Lack of Criminal Provisions Prohibiting the Denial of the Holocaust 188
 - 1.2 The Exception: The Express Criminalization of Holocaust Denial in “Militant Democracies” 190
 - 1. *Punishing the “Auschwitz Lie” in Countries Haunted by Their Dark Past: The Example of Germany* 190
 - 2. *Punishing Holocaust Denial in a Context of Extreme-Right Resurgence: The Example of France* 198

3. *Decriminalizing the Denial of the Holocaust in a “Non-Militant” Democracy: The “Surprising” Judgment of the Spanish Constitutional Court* 206
2. Holocaust Denial Laws Before the European Court of Human Rights: From a Low Standard of Scrutiny to the Absence of any Scrutiny 210
 - 2.1 The Principle: The Freedom to Express Offensive, Shocking, or Disturbing Information or Ideas 210
 - 2.2 The Holocaust Denial Exception: No Freedom to Deny “Clearly Established Historical Facts” 213
 1. *The Initial Approach: A Minimalist Degree of Scrutiny Under Article 10 ECHR Interpreted in Light of Article 17 ECHR* 213
 2. *A More Radical Approach: Holocaust Denial as an Abuse of Right* 217
3. The Triumph of the Militant Democracies’ Camp: The 2008 EU Framework Decision on Combating Certain Forms and Expressions of Racism and Xenophobia by Means of Criminal Law 223
 - 3.1 The Lack of a Universal Consensus 223
 - 3.2 A Long Time in the Coming: The 2008 EU FD on racism 226
7. Denial of the Holocaust, Genocide, and Crimes Against Humanity: A Comparative Overview of Ad Hoc Statutes 235

Martin Imbleau

 1. Introduction 235
 2. Deniers’ Intent and Tactics 237
 3. Scope of Ad Hoc Statutes 241
 - 3.1 Historical Events Targeted 241
 - 3.2 From Complete Denial to Moral Equivalence—The Spectrum of Ad Hoc Statutes 244
 - 3.3 The Event and the Rules of Evidence 246
 - 3.4 Formal Legislative Establishment and References to International Tribunal Decision 249

4. An Overview of Ad Hoc Statutes and Other Approaches 255
 - 4.1 Ad hoc Statutes in Europe 255
 1. *Germany* 255
 2. *France* 257
 3. *United Kingdom* 259
 4. *Austria* 260
 5. *Switzerland* 261
 6. *Belgium* 261
 7. *Spain* 261
 8. *Other European Countries* 262
 - 4.2 North America 263
 1. *Canada* 264
 2. *United States* 265
 - 4.3 Israel 267
5. Standardization of Ad Hoc Approaches in Europe 267
6. Requirements to Prosecute Denial as a Form of Hate Speech: Are Ad Hoc Statutes Justified Infringements of the Freedom of Speech? 269
7. Future Developments: The Cases of Japan, Rwanda, and Former Yugoslavia 273
8. Conclusion 275
8. The Denier's Intent 279

Thomas Hochmann

 1. A few "psychological" considerations 281
 - 1.1 Bare Denial as a Hidden Racist Attack 281
 - 1.2 Denial as a Way to Fame 282
 - 1.3 "Bona fide" Denial as Fanaticism: The Wishful Thinking of a Racist 283
 - 1.4 The Repercussions of State Denial 287
 2. Psychology of Denial Without a Specific Statute 289
 - 2.1 Assessment of the Methodology 289
 - 2.2 Other Techniques: Inferring Bad Faith 293
 1. *Common Knowledge* 293
 2. *The Denier's Racism* 294
 3. Explicit Prohibition of Denial and the Denier's Intent 298
 - 3.1 Legislative Discretion 303

3.2 Intent and Consequences	305
1. <i>Some Distinctions</i>	305
2. <i>Looking for a Normative Support for the Dogma of Intent</i>	307
3. <i>“Substantial” speech regulations</i>	308
4. <i>“Consequential” speech regulations</i>	311
5. <i>Result: Irrelevance of the speaker’s intent</i>	312
6. <i>The Possibility of Making an Extra Requirement</i>	313
4. Conclusion	317
Index	321