

# Contents

## Part I Historical Denialism as a Criminal Offence: Origins and Development

<b>1 The Birth of the Crime of Historical Denialism . . . . .</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Origins of the Phenomenon . . . . .	4
1.1.1 Historical Denialism and Revisionism . . . . .	4
1.1.2 A Brief History of Historical Denialism . . . . .	7
1.2 Origins of the Offence . . . . .	9
1.2.1 Evolution of the Criminal Offence . . . . .	11
1.2.2 Criminal Law and Remembrance Laws . . . . .	20
1.3 The Relationship Between Law and Memory . . . . .	21
1.4 The Leading Role of Criminal Law . . . . .	22
1.4.1 Memory as Collective Redefinition of a Common Past . . .	24
1.4.2 Collective Historical Memory as an Ethical Pact . . . .	25
1.4.3 Memory, Law and Punishment . . . . .	27
1.5 Historical Denialism, Anti-Terrorist Legislation and the Protection of Collective Historical Memory . . . . .	31
1.6 Criminalising Dissent Versus Protecting Consensus . . . . .	36
References . . . . .	38
<b>2 The Crime of Historical Denialism and International Law . . . . .</b>	<b>51</b>
2.1 The International Obligation to Criminalise Historical Denialism . . . . .	51
2.1.1 International Level . . . . .	53
2.1.2 EU Level . . . . .	55
2.1.3 The 2008 Framework Decision . . . . .	56
2.1.4 European Convention of Human Rights . . . . .	62
2.2 The Relationship Between Criminal Law and Memory . . . . .	66
References . . . . .	67

## Part II Denialism in Practice

<b>3 Criminal Law and Memory</b>	73
3.1 Criminal Law and Historical Memory	74
3.2 The French Experience: The Legislator and Judge as Memory Makers	75
3.2.1 Lois Mémorielles	76
3.2.2 The First-Ever Crime of Historical Denialism: The <i>Gayssot</i> Act	78
3.2.3 From the Holocaust to the Armenian Genocide: The <i>Boyer</i> Bill	83
3.2.4 The Role of the Legislator and Freedom of Speech Before the French Courts	89
3.2.5 Constitutional Developments	90
3.2.6 Protecting Historical Research Methodology: The <i>Theil</i> Case	94
3.3 The European Court of Human Rights	96
3.3.1 ‘Clearly Established Historical Facts’: The <i>Garaudy</i> Case	96
3.3.2 ‘Fact’ and ‘Legal Qualification of Fact’: The <i>Perinçek</i> Case	99
3.4 Courts of Memory	112
3.4.1 Enshrining Memory	115
3.4.2 Manufacturing Memory	117
References	119
<b>4 Criminal Law and Free Speech</b>	125
4.1 ‘Fact’ and ‘Opinion’: The German Federal Constitutional Court	125
4.1.1 The German Legal Framework	126
4.1.2 From the <i>Deckert I</i> to Criminal Offence	127
4.1.3 The Law of 28 October 1994	128
4.1.4 Punishable Acts	130
4.1.5 Scope	131
4.1.6 Public Nature and Potential to Disturb the Public Peace	132
4.1.7 The Federal Constitutional Court Decision	134
4.2 ‘Fact’ and ‘Value’: The Spanish Constitutional Court	138
4.2.1 The Spanish Legal Framework	138
4.2.2 The Decision of the Constitutional Court	144
References	152
<b>5 Conclusion</b>	157
5.1 Criminal Law as a Warden of Memory	157
5.2 The Reversal of Manifest and Latent Functions	159

5.3 The Return of Ethics? . . . . .	162
5.4 An Attack on the Ethical Pact . . . . .	165
5.5 In Defence of the Non-Criminal Protection of History . . . . .	168
References . . . . .	173
<b>Appendix . . . . .</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Bibliography . . . . .</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>Index . . . . .</b>	<b>213</b>