2

NARRATIVE
Tales Retold

The various projects undertaken to videotape Holocaust survivors' life histories rest on the conviction that these narratives constitute unrivaled resources about the genocide, whether for the eyewitness information they provide or for the morally galvanizing impact the narratives can have on others, especially through the medium of video. These projects vaunt their recordings as "raw documents" with an unrivaled immediacy and authority,[1] surpassing the abundance of other narrative sources on the same events, including official reports, journalistic accounts, wartime diaries or letters, memoirs, literary works, and analyses by historians or other scholars. Thus the videotaping project of the Holocaust Education Foundation, established in Chicago in 1983, hailed its recordings as "authentic, first-hand testimonials" that were "unrehearsed, unedited, and often never before told." The project's creators championed video for its ability to bridge the past and present: not only in making "history come alive" but also in redressing wrongs of the past by enabling survivors to say what "they could have spoken at an earlier time if only there had been listeners" and even by "giv[ing] voice to the thousands who were killed and were unable to speak."[2] Video, in effect, was envisioned as undoing past injustices, such as ignoring survivors, as well as reanimating the past and even the dead.

The salience accorded to survivors' eyewitness accounts of the Holocaust does not rest on a long historical precedent. Historian Alexandra Garbarini notes that the extensive reports from victims of anti-Jewish violence in Ukraine

during the Bolshevik Revolution and Russian Civil War generally met with public incredulity. This response necessitated "establishing a credible account of the pogroms," because

> the evidence did not speak for itself. Experts reading documents, not documents on their own, established the truth about these pogroms. . . . The victims of the Ukrainian pogroms could not speak, either in person or in writing, in an unmediated fashion by dint of having simply "been there." Their accounts were crucial evidence, but they needed to be vouched for and presented by "experts" recognized as having authority to speak on behalf of the victims.[3]

Following this precedent of collecting evidence to be scrutinized by dispassionate professionals, intensive efforts to collect eyewitness accounts from Holocaust survivors began in the immediate aftermath of World War II.[4] However, the high regard now publicly accorded their recollections emerged later. As historian Annette Wieviorka observes, these early projects were largely "closed to the outside"—that is, they were undertaken not to be presented to a general public but to provide resources for scholars and jurists. Similarly, the early postwar publications of individual or collective memoirs of prewar life and wartime experiences addressed an audience that primarily consisted of the authors' cohort of fellow survivors and refugees. Wieviorka postulates that the widely followed war crimes trial of Adolf Eichmann in 1961 marked the "advent of the witness" by situating survivor testimony at the center of the prosecution's case against Eichmann.[5] This strategy was intended as much to instruct an international public about the Holocaust as to provide evidence against the defendant, if not more so. The Eichmann case is now widely cited as a threshold event in public consciousness of the Holocaust, significant not simply for increasing awareness of the genocide but for shaping how it has come to be conceptualized as a discrete episode of history, distinct from narratives of Nazism or World War II, and one in which Jews both figure centrally as subjects and play a leading role in its narration.

The Eichmann trial marks a shift more in the reception of Holocaust narratives than in their production, which by 1961 had established their own repertoire of topics and conventions of storytelling. These tropes were reinforced by the considerable extent to which survivors' narratives were created for an audience largely composed of other tellers of similar stories and often were

the product of collective memory projects. Moreover, the narratives that Jewish Holocaust survivors produced during the first postwar decades draw on precedent narrative practices, ranging from liturgical and literary works and scholarly studies to autobiography, diary keeping, and oral storytelling.[6] These models continued to inform the narratives offered in survivor videotaping projects. Nevertheless, the life stories that survivors relate on video differ substantially from earlier narratives in several key respects, even though interviewees often iterate certain Jewish storytelling conventions and address similar topics, such as observing religious traditions or establishing a new life after moving to another country.

Social contexts play defining roles in determining which stories people choose to tell and how they relate their stories. In her analysis of East European Jews' narrative traditions, folklorist Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett characterizes their storytelling—whether a Hasidic rebbe's spiritually charged relating of tales to his followers, a parent's parable offering moral instruction to a child, or a group of adults trading stories on related topics during casual conversation—as a practice that "always seems to occur as part of another activity."[7] The narratives that Holocaust survivors offer in these collections of videos, by contrast, do not emerge from within other activities but rather are initiated as entities unto themselves and as singular occasions for storytelling, undertaken for the express purpose of being recorded. As literature scholar Aleida Assmann notes, "In the case of video testimony . . . the purpose of preserving and storing a narrative is inscribed into the very genre. From the start, its function is to transform the ephemeral constellation of an individual voice and an individual face into storable information and to ensure its communicative potential for further use in an indefinite future."[8]

Similarly, there are noteworthy distinctions between survivor narratives and those offered by elderly Jewish immigrants, such as the community studied by Barbara Myerhoff in the 1970s. She characterized her subjects, who had immigrated to the United States from eastern Europe at the turn of the twentieth century, as "an invisible people, marginal to mainstream American society, an impotent group—economically, physically, and politically."[9] Their personal histories, told largely to one another, Myerhoff argued, constituted a self-reflexive act of validating their lives in response to being largely ignored or held in low regard. The videotaping of Holocaust survivors' stories took place under quite dif-

ferent circumstances, as their collective public stature was rising in renown and esteem, defined in large measure by their ability to offer eyewitness accounts of extreme experiences. Indeed, widespread use of the term *survivors*, which connotes tenacity, to identify this cohort epitomizes the transformation of its stature by the end of the 1970s. In the immediate aftermath of World War II, these people were typically referred to in language that signaled their deprivation and liminal status: refugees, Europe's homeless, displaced persons, and, within the Yiddish-speaking community, *sheyres hapleyte* (rescued remnants).

A series of other interrelated factors distinguish these survivors' videotaped life stories from earlier works of Jewish autobiography as well as from other Holocaust accounts. To begin with, the videos offer narratives within the rubric of the interview—that is, a unilateral dialogue, with one person asking questions, the other providing answers. The protocols for interviewing Holocaust survivors in these videos typically strive to "give the initiative to the witness. The witnesses are the experts in their own life story, and the interviewers are there to listen, to learn, and to clarify."[10] Yet even as interviewers are instructed to be "unobtrusive" enablers of narrative "flow,"[11] their questions—and their very presence—shape survivors' storytelling.

Similarly, the use of video to document these interviews informs what survivors tell their interviewers and how they do so. As literature scholar James Young notes, video foregrounds the process of remembrance by recording "both the witness as he makes his testimony and the understanding and meaning of events generated in the activity of testimony itself." Consequently, observers of these videotapes "become witness not to the survivors' experiences but to the making of testimony."[12] Video's ongoing documentation of survivors' every utterance foregrounds attention to the act of narration for interviewees as well. The presence of the camera, microphone, and lights, in addition to the videographer and other technicians, reminds survivors that they address their narratives beyond the immediate audience of the interviewer to unseen future listeners.

The film equipment and crew also serve as a tacit reminder that the survivor's interview is not an isolated undertaking but part of a collective project, to be housed and cataloged alongside the accounts of other survivors and eyewitnesses to the Holocaust. The larger project further shapes survivors' storytelling, whether explicitly or obliquely, through its protocols, which may impose certain standards on the narrative, such as asking all survivors

to answer the same questions or to tell their life story in chronological order. Moreover, as surviving the Holocaust is the reason for being interviewed, it becomes the center of the life history, which survivors as well as interviewers generally periodize into sections "before," "during," and "after" the genocide.

Both survivors and interviewers may also assume that the personal narrative, as part of a collective undertaking, bears the onus of offering more than an account of the interviewee's own life and therefore should include recollections of a sizable number of people (members of extended families and acquaintances from prewar communities, especially those who did not survive the war) and discussions of events beyond the survivor's direct experience, including the Holocaust writ large. Similarly, the various parties involved in documenting survivor narratives may regard them as having a value beyond what this undertaking provides to the survivors themselves, whether validation, catharsis, or satisfaction in knowing that their stories will be preserved for posterity. Because these narratives are esteemed as providing information to historians, moral guidance to the young, and retorts to Holocaust deniers, survivor videos are often referred to as "testimonies," invoking this term's implication of bearing witness in a legal proceeding or making a religious avowal.

In the United States, the first efforts to videotape Holocaust survivors' life histories were part of a larger turn in the American public sphere toward privileging the accounts of eyewitnesses to history, as opposed to the analyses of experts, in works of social history and public culture. The popularity of documentary films composed largely of eyewitness interviews and eschewing scholarly experts or omniscient narrators, notably the Academy Award-winning *Harlan County USA* (1976), exemplifies this turn. Anthropologists and gerontologists advocated for the value of life review among the aged, especially Myerhoff's influential study *Number Our Days*, which promoted the universal value of telling one's personal history as "equipment for living."[13] The advent of amateur videotaping equipment in the mid-1970s enhanced the democratizing of both telling and documenting life histories through a medium that was closely, if sometimes contentiously, associated with television, then the mass medium with the largest audience in America and elsewhere in the West.[14]

Initiatives to document survivors' life histories also reflected a growing public interest in the Holocaust, especially in North America and western Europe, driven by widely seen films and telecasts; a growing inventory of pub-

lished works of history, memoir, and fiction; and the expansion of Holocaust education in secondary and higher education. Even though many thousands of survivor narratives had already been collected, in one form or another, since the war's end, support nonetheless grew for new projects to record survivors' stories on videotape. These efforts were motivated in part by desires to gather additional information about the Holocaust from sources esteemed as unrivaled, including survivors who might have never before told their story publicly. Intensifying this desire were mounting concerns that the time remaining for documenting the stories of the aging population of survivors was limited. Supporters of these projects championed the medium of video as offering new possibilities for engaging the public, especially younger generations, in recognizing the importance of the Holocaust. Thus the Fortunoff Archive validated the choice of video as "crucial . . . for the education of students and community groups in an increasingly media-centered era."[15]

Even as opportunities for survivor storytelling in the public sphere continued to proliferate—in public education and memorial programs, documentary films, museum installations, and guided trips to sites in Europe associated with the Holocaust—the special value accorded to these videos as providing survivors' "first-hand" narratives, often told "for the first time," endured. Yet the high regard for survivor interviews as exceptional resources has overlooked the extent to which these life histories are informed by other narratives. Over the decades, many survivors have encountered other accounts of the Holocaust in works of history, memoir, fiction, and drama, as well as in museums, films, telecasts, courses, and lectures. As is true of all storytellers, the ability of these men and women to tell stories of their wartime experiences has been shaped in large measure by exposure to earlier narratives. And as eyewitness accounts of the Holocaust have become increasingly sought after, many survivors have had ample opportunities to tell their personal histories, sometimes doing so in multiple forms: writing memoirs, giving interviews to print or broadcast journalists, and speaking in classrooms, houses of worship, or other public forums, as well as participating in these video projects. This is especially the case for survivors interviewed for the VHA, which was inaugurated almost fifty years after the end of the war.

Though survivors who have never told their stories before garner special recognition, attention should be paid to the value of interviewees who have re-

lated their life histories repeatedly. Scholars of these interviews might fret that, in such instances, "too often . . . the survivor delivers 'the usual spiel,'"[16] but multiple opportunities to relate stories enable tellers to refine and enrich their narratives, incorporate insights gained over years of reflection, and establish their reputation as skilled storytellers. Disciplinary differences may inform scholarly predilections. The story never before told may attract greater attention from a historian or psychologist, who is interested in heretofore undisclosed information or the possible cathartic value of its revelation. By contrast, the story told repeatedly can have special appeal for an anthropologist, folklorist, or literature scholar, for whom the craft of storytelling is of interest in its own right.

The following case studies examine VHA recordings in which survivors' life histories are informed by other narratives. First, interviews in which survivors discuss the 1993 feature film *Schindler's List* offer personal histories that engage an established Holocaust narrative of wide renown at the time these interviews were recorded (and which is also a work with a special connection to the establishment of the VHA). Second, interviews with famous survivors entail relating an oft-told personal narrative; moreover, as celebrities, they offer metadiscussions of telling one's life story as part of the narrative. These case studies challenge assumptions that the interviews' value lies primarily in the uniqueness of their content or the spontaneity of their telling. Rather, the interviews examined here are noteworthy for what they reveal about the telling of one's life history as a deliberate and multivalent enterprise, responsive to other narratives.

Survivors on *Schindler's List*

Listening to others' stories about the Holocaust has been a fixture of survivors' lives from the war years onward. During the war Jews suffering under Nazi persecution anxiously sought out information from others while they struggled to understand what was happening to them as members of a people targeted for annihilation. In the war's aftermath, survivors listened to each other's stories in order to learn the fate of family members and acquaintances, to grasp the scope of the genocide, and to grapple with the challenge of making new lives for themselves. Giving evidence to researchers or collaborating on *yizker-bikher* helped forge a sense of communion among the cohort of survivors during the early postwar years, even as they dispersed to new homes around the

world. Survivors who related their wartime experiences in public—whether through printed memoirs, press interviews, court testimonies, or commemorative events—had often read or heard other survivors' stories. As works about the Holocaust grew in number and variety over the years—autobiographies, histories, novels, films, broadcasts, museum installations, courses of study, and so on—survivors could attend to an ever-widening array of narratives on the subject. Some survivors devoted much effort to following this burgeoning phenomenon and engaged new works on the Holocaust critically. In fact, Holocaust survivors' negative responses to public works on the topic have sometimes become newsworthy events in their own right.[17] By the time survivors were interviewed for the VHA in the 1990s, they were likely to have incorporated other accounts of the Holocaust in some way—including critical reactions to them—into an understanding of their own wartime experience. Even survivors who had never before told their life story had had decades to contemplate how they might do so.

In a singular way, the VHA makes it possible to consider how survivors' personal histories are shaped by other Holocaust narratives: the Archive indexes those moments when interviewees discuss films in general and one film in particular, *Schindler's List*. (Although this is the only individual film about the Holocaust that the VHA indexes, it is not the only film referenced in interviews.)[18] The VHA database lists 118 interviews during which interviewees mention *Schindler's List*; all but three are videos of Jewish Holocaust survivors.[19] Most of these survivors (77) are interviewed in English, and of these, 23 are *Schindlerjuden*.[20] This set of interviews provides an unusual opportunity to examine how a considerable number of survivors directly reference the same Holocaust narrative, within five years of its initial presentation to the public, in the course of telling their personal histories, all recorded according to the protocols of the same project. Examining this body of material thereby contributes to a more general understanding of how individuals, caught up in epochal events that have become the subject of extensive public attention, engage this history and its mediation in the course of relating their personal narratives.

III

The unique place of *Schindler's List* in the VHA's index exemplifies the film's special relationship with the Archive. Because Steven Spielberg was inspired to

establish the VHA as a result of talking with Holocaust survivors while making *Schindler's List*, the Archive is part of the film's extensive epiphenomena. During the months following its premiere in December 1993, *Schindler's List* engendered an array of responses unusual in their scope, even for a film by a major director that had achieved critical as well as financial success. Early on, *Schindler's List* received considerable attention in the United States as something more than a feature film, marking a watershed event in Holocaust remembrance and in Spielberg's career.[21] To some extent, the film's creators invited this response by conceiving and presenting *Schindler's List* as a cinematic work of exceptional stature that, unlike what its producers characterized as "your average feel-good 'date' movie," would deliver viewers a morally charged, galvanizing experience.[22] To that end, in 1994 Spielberg's production company, Amblin Entertainment, offered free theatrical screenings of *Schindler's List* to American high school students, planned in conjunction with Facing History and Ourselves, a Holocaust education organization.[23]

However, some responses to *Schindler's List* were clearly not sought by its creators. Members of the anti–abortion rights group Massachusetts Citizens for Life provoked controversy when they attempted to exploit a screening of the film for students in Great Barrington by distributing literature to them about what the organization denounced as "America's Holocaust."[24] More notorious was a public screening of *Schindler's List* in Oakland, California, on Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday in 1994, during which a group of students, most of them African Americans, were asked to leave the movie theater after laughing during a scene in the film in which a German officer shoots a Jewish prisoner. The students' behavior and their ejection from the cinema quickly became the subject of debate in national media.[25]

Schindler's List was implicated in American politics, including the controversial use of a clip from the film in a campaign advertisement by a candidate for sheriff in Virginia, and US Representative Tom Coburn's protest, in 1997, against airing the film on broadcast television because of its disturbing content.[26] Even the announcement that Ford Motor Company would sponsor this telecast proved somewhat provocative.[27] As *Schindler's List* was distributed internationally, its reception prompted more debate, notably in Germany and Poland.[28] In the Middle East, the film's first Israeli audiences objected to the use of the modern Hebrew song "Yerushelayim shel zahav" (Jerusalem of gold) in

the opening of the film's epilogue (another musical selection was substituted for subsequent screenings in Israel),[29] and several countries in the region with majority Muslim populations refused to show *Schindler's List* altogether.[30]

The most elaborate responses to *Schindler's List* were realized in other cultural works. Some of them capitalize on the film's acclaim, notably "Schindler's List" tours of Cracow and environs, in which participants visit sites where the wartime events depicted in the film took place as well as locations where the film was shot, thereby obscuring the distinction between actual events and their reenactment.[31] Other works interrogate *Schindler's List* as a work of Holocaust remembrance. A 1994 episode of the American sitcom *Seinfeld* both lampoons the outsized heroism of the film's protagonist and flouts its stature as a moral touchstone in public culture, as Jerry Seinfeld's friends and family are shocked to discover that he and his girlfriend were necking during a screening of *Schindler's List*—that is, behaving as if it were "your average feel-good 'date' movie."[32] In the mid-1990s the Israeli sketch comedy program *Hahamishia ha-kamerit* (Hebrew: "The chamber quintet") featured a skit that mocked the much-vaunted verisimilitude of *Schindler's List* while parodying Claude Lanzmann's 1985 documentary *Shoah*. In this skit an interviewer, similar to Lanzmann, speaks with an interviewee, who relates a narrative that "sounds like a stereotypical 'Holocaust' story" of standing in line with others on a cold night, waiting, surrounded by "barbed-wire, dogs, guards." Then, the interviewee explains, a car pulled up and a man emerged and began shouting. When the interviewer asks if that was Schindler, the other replies, "What Schindler? Spielberg!" and thereby reveals that the "interview" is with an actor describing the ordeal of making *Schindler's List* and not with a survivor recalling actual wartime experience.[33]

French filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard assails *Schindler's List* in his 2001 film *Éloge de l'amour* (*In Praise of Love*) as his "prime negative object," according to J. Hoberman, by dint of the "totalizing re-creation of World War II and the Holocaust" in Spielberg's film, epitomizing American misappropriations of the European past.[34] For his 2003 video piece titled *Spielberg's List*, media artist Omer Fast interviewed Poles who had played Jews as extras in *Schindler's List*. Interview segments are shown simultaneously on two adjacent screens, each with English-language subtitles offering slightly different renderings of what the Polish interviewees are saying. Their recollections of filming scenes

set in the Cracow ghetto and the Płaszów labor camp seem to resemble survivors' recollections of actual wartime experiences—as in the aforementioned *Ha-hamishia ha-kamerit* skit—and thereby destabilize the viewer's understanding of what is actually being remembered. Amid this complex intersection of public debates and cultural phenomena concerning *Schindler's List* and its implications for remembering the Holocaust, survivors of this genocide faced the VHA's cameras in the mid-1990s to relate their personal histories.

The English-speaking survivors who discuss *Schindler's List* during their interviews for the VHA generally do so at one of two different points: either in accounts of the war years (this is especially true of *Schindlerjuden*) or toward the end of the interviews, when, according to VHA protocols, survivors are asked general, "reflective questions" about their lives, including "questions concerning faith and meaning, dreams, and messages to future generations."[35] Several survivors with no direct connection to Oskar Schindler refer to Spielberg's film while recounting wartime events in order to compare their own experience with a scene in the film, citing it as an analogue they assume is familiar to the interviewer. Sia Hertsberg describes witnessing deportations of children in

Photograph of survivor Celina Biniaz, a *Schindlerjude*, at a preview screening of the film *Schindler's List*. Biniaz's VHA interview concludes with her discussion of this photograph. Provided by the USC Shoah Foundation.

Riga: "When they were taking the children, I remember in *Schindler's List* he showed that the children were taken by a truck, but an open truck, and ours was a closed one."[36] Ritta Silberstein, a native of Romania, who was interned in Auschwitz as well as in a concentration camp in Czechoslovakia, says of watching *Schindler's List*, "This is my life. I worked in the factory, like Schindler, thanks to him, they are alive, and the same was with me, thanks to my *Meister* [i.e., foreman], I am alive. . . . This is exactly—you saw the movie? Then you know how the life was."[37] Other survivors also ask their interviewers whether they have seen the film, not only establishing this as a shared experience but also reversing, if briefly, the role of interviewer and interviewee.

Survivors who were rescued by Schindler reference *Schindler's List* in their wartime narratives for reasons that are both more specific and more complex. These *Schindlerjuden* variously validate, enhance, or challenge the film as a widely familiar chronicle of events in which they participated. Whereas the film has an acknowledged authority, so do these survivors, though of a different kind, and in the course of their interviews the two are juxtaposed. So, too, if implicitly, are the limits of each source's authority.

Some *Schindlerjuden* readily identify their own experience with scenes in the film. When asked to recount her arrival in Auschwitz, Marianne Rosner explains:

> We had to go to the gas chamber, not the gas chamber, to the shower—Matter of fact, when I saw *Schindler's List*, the movie, and I saw . . . the scene in the shower, with the women—you remember, did you see the film?—I was looking for myself. Because we went through exactly the same thing. We were standing there in the shower, and we were looking is there going to come water or is there going to come gas. We didn't know. Exactly the same. When I was looking, I was thinking—Oh, that must be me![38]

Rosner's initial confusing of the gas chamber with the shower in her narrative recalls the film's suspenseful juxtaposition of these two sites and the respective fates that awaited prisoners in each location. Her account of "looking for myself" in the film extends this conflation of remembering her own experience in Auschwitz with what she saw enacted on screen. Even as she acknowledges the distinction between the two, Rosner seeks her "self," transformed into a dramatic character, in *Schindler's List*. The survivor's subjectivity, a much-vaunted

attribute of these interviews generally, seems to be in limbo, searching for realization in a virtual simulation of her "self." Similarly, the distinction between the actuality of being a prisoner at Auschwitz and its reenactment is obscured; rather, they are "exactly the same thing."

Later in the interview, Rosner explains how she and her husband, Henry, were involved in the making of *Schindler's List*. In addition to appearing with other *Schindlerjuden* in the film's epilogue, both were portrayed as characters in the wartime drama:

> We were played by Polish actors, Henry as the musician—a matter of a fact, Mr. Spielberg was so nice, he cut out a scene from the film where Henry played [at] a party by [Amon] Göth, [commandant of Płaszów labor camp,] where one German officer committed suicide. Henry played a song, "Sad Sunday." . . . This was a song where people used to commit suicide. . . . And Henry claims . . . that he had . . . some kind of a suggestive power that, when . . . he played this song for the . . . German [officer], maybe ten times or twelve times in a row, over and over again, . . . until this guy, he [i.e., Henry] hypnotized him. He [i.e., the German officer] went out on the patio and he took out his revolver and he shot him[self]. And they had filmed that. But somehow they cut it out. But they sent me this cutout. I have it.[39]

As she recounts an episode of her husband's past, narrated in Keneally's book and evidently included in the original shooting script of *Schindler's List*, Rosner merges this incident and its mediation.[40] Indeed, she mentions the episode's staging for the film before relating the incident itself. Similarly, Rosner's championing of her husband's purported powers to drive one of their captors to commit suicide merges with her pride in the privileged relationship that the couple enjoys with Spielberg. Not only does she have insider information on the making of *Schindler's List*; she has an outtake from the film unseen by the public. Rosner, in effect as an auteur, offers her own alternate "cut" of *Schindler's List*, restoring her husband's heroic act to the film's narrative.

When *Schindlerjuden* discuss *Schindler's List*, they more often focus on differences between the film and their recollection—even when they identify themselves as portrayed in a scene. Roman Ferber claims he was the boy shown hiding in the sewer during the liquidation of the Cracow ghetto ("You're looking at him right now") and then promptly critiques its depiction in the film: "There

were two of us [boys] and three girls. But we didn't ever jump in, that was . . . commercialized in the movie, we just hid in the toilet . . . , and we standed on poles on the side. The stench was terrible. But had we jumped in, like it's shown in the movie . . . I would have been dead today, because it was about sixteen, eighteen feet deep."[41] When John Armer is asked his impression of the film, he characterizes it as "90, 95 percent correct" and then enumerates its flaws:

> I can't see [Abraham] Bankier [i.e., the office manager of Schindler's factory,] in it; . . . he wasn't mentioned at all. Maybe . . . he didn't want to be mentioned. . . . I don't know why he was not mentioned at all. Must be some purpose in it. . . . I don't remember the incident with the man with the one arm. . . . There was no such a man in Emalia [i.e., Schindler's factory in Cracow], otherwise I would know it. . . . I think they made it up to make him [i.e., Schindler?] even better.[42]

As Armer lists these discrepancies, he offers possible rationales for them. Like other survivors, Armer has to reconcile *Schindler's List* with his own recollections, and in the course of the interview this reckoning becomes part of his personal narrative.

The discussion of *Schindler's List* between a survivor and an interviewer sometimes reveals their different understandings of the film in relation to its historical subject, as when Stella Eliezrie interviews Leon Leyson, another *Schindlerjude*:

> Eliezrie: Without getting you in too much trouble, was there anything blatantly incorrect?
>
> Leyson: In the movie?
>
> Eliezrie: Yes.
>
> Leyson: . . . In my opinion, those who were depicted as camp or ghetto police, Jewish ghetto police, were glossed over too lightly.
>
> Eliezrie: What should have been said?
>
> Leyson: Well, a little bit should have been put in that these were not your casual friends, your next-door neighbors, . . . but, . . . in some cases, they were vicious people.
>
> Eliezrie: Were these Jews?
>
> Leyson: Yes. . . .
>
> Eliezrie: Were they forced to be vicious?
>
> Leyson: Well, not really. . . . That's the sad part of it, of course.[43]

The interviewer is both interested in the survivor's critiques of *Schindler's List* and anxious about their implications. One is left to wonder what kind of trouble Eliezrie thought might be visited upon Leyson for discussing the film's inaccuracies.

Schindlerjuden demonstrate a need to reckon not only with the film's narrative but also with its origin. Several discuss what they know about how Spielberg's film or Keneally's book was realized, explaining their participation in the process or absence from the results. Helena Jonas Rosenzweig, who was one of two Jewish maids working in Göth's villa at Płaszów, reports that her family and friends were upset that she was not mentioned in Keneally's book. Rosenzweig rationalizes that everyone involved in the actual events could not be included as a character, "otherwise the book would never end and the stories would never end." Of her absence from both the book and the film, she remarks, "It doesn't matter; the story is there."[44] In her account, Rosenzweig's actual experiences vie with fiction's parameters of character and plot, ultimately yielding to them. At the same time, Rosenzweig affirms her place in "the story," an implicit master narrative.

Several survivors discuss the politics of creating both Keneally's book and Spielberg's film, explaining, for example, how Keneally first learned about Schindler from Poldek Pfefferberg, a *Schindlerjude* whom the writer met in 1980 at Pfefferberg's leather goods store in Los Angeles. (Keneally dedicated the book both to Schindler's memory and to Pfefferberg, "who by zeal and persistence, caused this book to be written"; Spielberg also thanked Pfefferberg upon accepting an Academy Award for the film.)[45] When an interviewer asks Victor Dortheimer, another *Schindlerjude*, how true *Schindler's List* is to actual events, he discusses omissions and disparities at length, including the number of people originally on the list and how they got on it, the more limited role that Schindler's bookkeeper, Itzhak Stern (portrayed by Ben Kingsley in the film), actually played during the war, and, to Dortheimer's mind, Pfefferberg's self-serving involvement in the creation of *Schindler's List*: "This film is made under the influence of . . . Pfefferberg. . . . The film is from his point of view, and he came . . . to us [in the factory in 19]44, [he was there for] just a few months, which is nothing. . . . He wanted to be most important. . . . I met Pfefferberg . . . [at the] premiere [of the film]. . . . I said [to him], 'You are a bloody bluffer.'" Nevertheless, Dortheimer acknowledges that, "thanks to him [i.e., Pfefferberg], *Schindler's List* exists. He was the initiator of the film."[46]

Because of Pfefferberg's strategic role in the realization of *Schindler's List*, survivors' acquaintance with him sometimes becomes a topic of interest during their interviews. When Maryla Susser recalls the school she attended before the war as a girl in Cracow, she mentions Pfefferberg to interviewer David Brotsky:

> Susser: Our gym teacher was that Poldek . . . , who lives now in Los Angeles, and met that Connelly [i.e., Keneally] and told him about the Holocaust, and *Schindler's List* was based on him, so, he was my teacher.
>
> Brotsky: What do you remember about him?
>
> Susser: Oh, he was wonderful, wonderful! . . . I saw him in New York, when he came to our, you know, gathering, and he looked wonderful, and also in Israel I saw him [at a survivors' gathering]. . . .
>
> Brotsky: What type of a person was he before the war?
>
> Susser: He was good looking, tall, very jolly, and he was very friendly, very nice person; we all loved him. All the girls were in love with him!
>
> Brotsky: How much older was he?
>
> Susser: Oh, he was—now he's, I don't know, eighty-five or so—Well now, the 1939. . . .[47]

Susser thus takes the initiative to return the interview from a discussion of Pfefferberg to the story of her own life.

The various ways that survivors imbricate *Schindler's List* into their accounts of wartime events they experienced suggest that they did not simply watch the film differently from other people but in effect saw a different film, into which they integrated their remembrances during the act of watching. A particularly striking example occurs in the interview with Benek Geizhals as he discusses the scene in *Schindler's List* where Schindler appears on horseback, watching the liquidation of the Cracow ghetto. Geizhals notes that in the background of the shot is a "red building," which belonged to his family, and he remarks, "I know this spot very well."[48] Geizhals can "see" a red building while watching the film, but other viewers cannot do so, of course, as it was shot in black and white. Geizhals's remark seems to validate a comment that Spielberg made when explaining his decision not to film *Schindler's List* in color: "I think color is . . . real to the people who survived the Holocaust, but . . . my own experience with the Holocaust has been through black-and-white documentaries. I've never seen the Holocaust in color. Even though I've been there, it's still black

and white in my eyes."[49] For Spielberg, who was born in America after World War II, the Holocaust exists as a cinematic phenomenon of the black-and-white era. At the same time, he understands the Holocaust as a *topos* (stating, "I've been there") that he can visit but not enter fully, unlike survivors, for whom it exists "in color" both as an actual experience and in its mediation.

III

Survivors' discussions of *Schindler's List* that occur toward the end of their VHA interviews are more wide-ranging. Often they praise the film, some comparing it favorably to other films or telecasts, including *The Diary of Anne Frank* (1959), *The Garden of the Finzi-Continis* (1970), the *Holocaust* miniseries (1978), *Shoah* (1985), and *Escape from Sobibor* (1987). Several interviewees compliment Spielberg on *Schindler's List* as they thank him for recording their personal histories. By implicitly linking the two media works, the former making the latter possible, survivors obliquely acknowledge the mediated nature of their interviews.

The praise *Schindlerjuden* offer about the film and its director sometimes extends to describing the public acclaim these survivors garnered following the release of *Schindler's List*, as the press and public sought out Jews who had been rescued by Schindler. Chaskel Schlesinger recalls that after he was interviewed for a local television report in Chicago, "right away the *Sun-Times*, the *Tribune*, everybody started calling."[50] Leopold Rosner reports, "We had been invited eight times for the premieres, six times in Melbourne, in Canberra, Sydney, and again in Melbourne."[51] Some *Schindlerjuden* recall their contact with Schindler in the postwar years or with Spielberg in connection with the film as a source of pride. Abraham Zuckerman recounts his postwar relationship with Schindler, of whom he sculpted a bust that he gave to Spielberg. Among family pictures that are typical of what other VHA interviewees select to be filmed at the end of their interviews, Zuckerman presents snapshots he and Schindler took of each other with signs of streets bearing Schindler's name as well as pictures of filming the epilogue of *Schindler's List*.[52] In this sequence of personal photographs, Zuckerman's life history embraces both Schindler and his celebrity.

Other survivors discuss watching *Schindler's List* as a landmark event in their lives, whether it motivated them to record the interview or inspired their family members to learn about the Holocaust or from it. Esther Fiszman lauds

Photograph of Oskar Schindler by a sign for a street bearing his name, taken by survivor Abraham Zuckerman. In his VHA interview, Zuckerman discusses his postwar relationship with Schindler. Provided by the USC Shoah Foundation.

the "enormous lot of good" that *Schindler's List* "has done . . . for the young people" by citing a personal story:

> My son was dating a Canadian Vietnamese girl, lovely human being, a really beautiful person—he went to see the film with her, and [then he said,] "I decided to call it a day, that we can't." . . . I don't think that he would have called it a day if not [for] the film. . . . I don't know who decided—I think they both decided together, that they couldn't do it to me, or he couldn't do it to his heritage. I've never asked.[53]

Nor does Fiszman probe the connection between her son's watching *Schindler's List* and doing what his heritage—or his mother—apparently expected of him. In her narrative, the film's moral power to prevent intermarriage is implicitly self-evident.

In recounting their watching of *Schindler's List*, some interviewees link the film with information, affect, or remembrance concerning the Holocaust. Laura Hillman explains, when asked whether she ever found out what happened to her mother during the war, "When I saw *Schindler's List*, . . . I suddenly realized

that my mother ended the way it's shown in the movie."[54] David Halpern recalls that, as he watched *Schindler's List*, "I felt I was in it, I was hiding in there, when I saw those kids hiding in the toilet, in the shot, I felt I'm in there with them. . . . I couldn't sleep that night, . . . what I went through, and here they made a picture like that, I couldn't believe it."[55] George Hartman describes crying when he saw *Schindler's List* as a "curious" response: "When . . . seeing the reality you don't cry, there's nothing to cry about, you know you're going to die tomorrow probably, you see all this horror. . . . When that's happening, it doesn't have any emotional impact. It's only when I see it now, when . . . everything is normal, and I look at this horrible film, which was really much better than what I went through, . . . it's much more emotional than actually being there."[56] For Hartman, the film's affective power is not its verisimilitude but rather its difference from the actuality, with regard not only to time and place but also to the structuring of catharsis provided by a work of drama.

The disparity between cinematic representation and the remembered past engenders reflections among some *Schindlerjuden* on the film's form, genre, or content. Lore Smith describes watching *Schindler's List* as feeling "like being on the outside and looking into something here. And when I was looking at it, I couldn't believe that this is—I was there. And still to this day, I couldn't believe it. Of course, I must say that it was worse than it was portrayed. But I understand in order for people to be able to accept the film, it needed to be done the way it was done. I still feel that documentaries are better."[57] Smith doesn't explain why she holds documentaries in higher esteem but suggests that she believes this genre resolves the disparity between actuality and how it is represented in fictional film, which strives to render its representation "acceptable" to audiences but induces an uncanny experience for her.

Harriet Solz also reflects on the implications of cinematic genre in order to reconcile the disparity between *Schindler's List* and her actual experiences as well as to come to terms with the film's public success despite this difference:

> So, the movie I couldn't wait to see. But when I came out from the movie, I was really disappointed. So my daughter calls me, and she says, "Ma, you went through so much? You never told me what you went through. . . . " So I said, . . . "This is nothing what they showed in the movie." And then I've been thinking about that movie a lot. And I came to a conclusion: That it's not a Holocaust movie. This is a

> biography of Schindler. If he [i.e., Spielberg] would have put more morbid scenes into the picture, people wouldn't have seen it. Like this, that movie woke up the whole world, which he did a marvelous job. But really the movie is a biography of Schindler, who saved us our lives, and [for] which he deserves it.[58]

In the course of these discussions of *Schindler's List*, survivors offer impromptu thoughts on the nature of mediating Holocaust narratives generally. Even as they praise the film, several survivors note the discrepancy between their actual experience and the medium's capacity to represent the Holocaust, citing the greater enormity of the actuality as well as the element of time. Israel Arbeiter explains that *Schindler's List* was the "closest that I have ever seen to the truth" of what happened in Auschwitz, but "it gives you only about five, or ten, or fifteen minutes. . . . I went through this five years." He questions whether any writer or filmmaker could represent the genocide in its full extent, "day in and day out. . . . How can this be shown?"[59]

Sometimes survivors and their interviewers debate the issue of cinematic verisimilitude and its limits. After Karol Saks talks about his gratitude to the people in France who hid him during the war, Mark Turkeltaub asks Saks whether he has seen *Schindler's List*:

> Saks: Yes.
>
> Turkeltaub: Here it is, fifty years after the war—just in your opinion, how did that affect you after all this time, seeing on the movie screen what happened?
>
> Saks: It's a very, very hard movie to take. It affected me to the point where I saw myself sometimes among these children. So I'm sure that thousands of people like me could see themselves, standing there in these lines. . . .
>
> Turkeltaub: It's probably very hard to recreate in a movie, you know, what really—
>
> Saks: Well, as much as you can recreate, I mean, you can't have the authenticity, so to speak, the reality, but as much reality as you can give, I think this movie had a tremendous amount of, of realism.

Rather than pursuing this discussion of cinematic realism (perhaps as it was not his reason for raising *Schindler's List* in the first place), Turkeltaub returns to Saks's personal history, asking, "Why do you think you survived?"[60]

In these reflections, survivors sometimes engage the trope that the Holocaust is an event that tests the limits of representation. Zoltan Gluck struggles with this notion as he recounts his deportation to Auschwitz:

> It's almost impossible to describe. I have seen the movie *Schindler's List*, this was one of the closest to the situation what . . . I went through, anyway, the closest to the reality. . . . I have seen many movies about that, but nothing came close enough to say, "Oh, it happened like this." That's impossible, to get it so close, what really happened over there. *Schindler's List* was one of the closest, what I could say that was close—still not close enough, I mean, not perfectly close, but close. It was unbearable, really, I mean, just imagine.[61]

For Gluck, the act of imagining addresses the unbridgeable gap between the Holocaust's actuality—whether for those who experienced it or for others—and its representation in *Schindler's List* (or any other mediation). Yet other survivors find in *Schindler's List* a productive impetus to imagining as a point of entry to remembrance. Goldy Zylberszac-Junger, who spent the war in hiding in Belgium, commented, when speaking of a relative who had died during the war, "You know, there was a movie from Spielberg, . . . and you saw a little . . . blond girl with a red dress? Everybody imagined it's something from them—me, I imagined it's my niece."[62] And Horst Senger, who had fled Germany during the war, reflected on the film's impact on survivors: "The remaining people who come from that era, some see things, they now see illustrated in detail, of what they read about that perhaps were unimaginable, really, but the movie made it—made it imaginable. The movie made the details."[63]

❚❚❚

Interviewees' discussions of *Schindler's List* complicate the notion that these videos offer straightforward presentations of survivors' recalled experience of the Holocaust. Their references to the film demonstrate the extent to which these memories are not only contingent, responsive to the context in which the interviews took place, but also permeable, given how readily this feature film is incorporated as a referent. The facility with which survivors integrate *Schindler's List* into their personal histories might seem to confirm some observers' anxieties about the film's impact on Holocaust remembrance generally or on video interviews with survivors in particular. Walter Reich, a former

director of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, decried what he termed the "'Schindlerization of Holocaust memory,' which may suppress stories that refuse life-affirming and heart-warming conclusions."[64] Similarly, Holocaust studies scholar Noah Shenker posits the "cinematic origins" of the Shoah Foundation by connecting *Schindler's List*, as "a redemptive story cut from the cloth of classical Hollywood cinematic conventions," to the Archive's protocols, arguing that "Spielberg's film serves as a source narrative for the VHA, linking the archival project with [the film's] own narrative stakes in hope and tolerance." Shenker also suggests that the form of "Classical Hollywood Cinema" informed the Shoah Foundation's objectives of maintaining "narrative continuity" and that periodizing the interviews into prewar, war, and postwar segments mirrors the "three-act structure" of this cinematic genre.[65]

The interviews with survivors cited above do not validate these concerns that *Schindler's List* in some way imposes or coerces saccharine, uplifting, or conformist storytelling. Rather, *Schindler's List* figures in these survivors' narratives as a highly variable catalyst, interacting with wartime memories, other mediations of the Holocaust, and the context of the interview itself. The film can figure in a survivor's interview as a shared narrative, a master narrative, or an alternate narrative; the film's creation can become a source of satisfaction, contention, or anxiety; watching the film can be characterized as a landmark event, an encounter with an aesthetic model, or an artistic challenge.

However, survivors' discussions of *Schindler's List*, in which their engagements with the film inform the process of remembrance and become part of their life narratives, do raise questions about the widespread investment in survivor interviews as accounts of unparalleled immediacy and authority, thereby prompting a reconsideration of how to ascertain their value. First, survivors' references to *Schindler's List* evoke the moment in which these interviews were recorded. By the mid-1990s, survivors had been exhorted to tell their stories in public for two decades by an international proliferation of interviewing projects, museums, educational programs, and the like. The VHA, one of the most recent of these undertakings, interviewed survivors who were informed by years of this demand and by exposure to multiple models of storytelling, including filmed or published personal narratives of other survivors.

Some VHA interviewees attest to relying on other mediations for an understanding of their own past. Dorit Whiteman, who had fled her native Austria

before the start of the war, recalls that she first became aware of the "real full extent" of the Holocaust in a movie theater in the United States: "I remember going by myself to the newsreel, and they showed some pictures [of conditions in liberated concentration camps] . . . , and I remember . . . being totally, totally horrified."[66] Harriet Solz recalls that when Keneally's book came out, "I didn't want to read it. So my daughter bought the book and was reading. And she called me up to ask questions. I said . . . , 'I don't really remember a lot. Let me go read the book.' And still I have a lot of questions, which—I remember certain things differently, but I'm not sure, I was too young to—I looked at things differently, and everything."[67]

Given how avidly many survivors attend to representations of the Holocaust (as some of these interviewees report), it is likely that the narratives they offered for the VHA are among those most extensively informed by other mediations, whether of individuals' wartime experiences or of the Holocaust writ large. Notwithstanding the videos' form—unedited, recorded in an austere aesthetic—they are no less mediated than any other representation of the Holocaust. But the extent to which mediation defines these undertakings does not undermine these interviews' significance. Rather, attending to mediation reveals their value as palimpsests of memory, which by its nature both prompts and integrates the act of mediation.

Second, these references to *Schindler's List* are of special value because they do not only arise when interviewees construct their wartime narratives. The film is also part of some survivors' metanarratives, explaining why they tell their story—to offer eyewitness accounts of the genocide, moral exhortation, or a legacy for future generations—or reflecting spontaneously on the issue of experience versus representation, life versus art. Rather than offering clarifying insights, survivors voice an honestly inchoate awareness that their interviews are situated amid a complex, dynamic array of Holocaust mediations and their metadiscussion as well as the actuality of survivors' own experience and its recall. Indeed, the same aesthetic issues arise in the aforementioned "Schindler's List" tours, the *Seinfeld* episode, the *Ha-hamishia ha-kamerit* skit, Godard's film, and Fast's video piece, as these works, each in its own way, interrogate *Schindler's List.*

The interviewees cited above, especially the *Schindlerjuden*, repeatedly remark that the film cannot represent wartime experiences comprehensively.

Survivors distinguish among competing narratives—"my," "his," or "her" story vis-à-vis "the" story—implicitly juxtaposing various individual survivors' accounts with a master narrative. Survivors leave unspecified what might constitute that master narrative—a scholarly history? a documentary film? an abstract ideal?—or who facilitates its telling. Nor are survivors self-conscious about their own agency as narrators. They seem more aware of the complex of contributions that went into the making of *Schindler's List* (reflecting on the roles played by Spielberg, Keneally, Pfefferberg, and others) than of their own stories' video documentation (such as the impact of the interviewer, camera operator, or VHA protocols).[68]

Indeed, while survivors probe the aesthetic limitations of *Schindler's List* in relation to the actuality of the Holocaust, they do not subject their own narratives to the same scrutiny. Their attention to the discrepancies between *Schindler's List* and the actual events of the Holocaust is tellingly selective. Especially noteworthy is the fact that, though these survivors discuss the length of the film, the verisimilitude of its setting or its actors, and the accuracy of information in its plot, they fail to mention language, including the fact that the film is largely in English. Of course, they, too, have been mediating their own wartime experiences in English—which none of them spoke as a first language and which, in most cases, they learned after the war. If these survivors' discussions of *Schindler's List* address the metaissues of narrating the past, they seem to be limited to scrutinizing retellings of the Holocaust other than the ones that the survivors themselves are in the midst of creating. Rather, they assume the task of narrating their lives unself-consciously, whether it is something they have never done before or have undertaken repeatedly.

Survivor as Celebrity

Most Holocaust survivors interviewed for the VHA or other similar projects were "ordinary" people—that is, they were not famous or members of a social, political, economic, or cultural elite—before World War II, when, as members of civilian populations targeted for persecution by Nazi Germany, they were caught up in extreme, life-threatening circumstances. After the war, these survivors typically strove to establish new "ordinary" lives for themselves, after having been abruptly and cruelly deprived of the context and means of leading

such a life as they had known it before the war. Holocaust survivors often found themselves at the war's end without a family, community, or country; lacking in education, language fluency, job skills, capital, or other means of support; and coping with physical or mental ailments. In light of these daunting circumstances, the ability to become "ordinary" people in radically new milieus constitutes an extraordinary accomplishment in its own right.

Among the many thousands of interviews in the VHA are a small number conducted with individuals of renown. They include people recognized for accomplishments apart from being Holocaust survivors, such as actor Robert Clary (best known for appearing in the 1960s American sitcom *Hogan's Heroes*), Rebbetzin Esther Jungreis (the founder of Hineni, an Orthodox Jewish outreach organization), US Representative Tom Lantos, and psychologist and media personality Ruth Westheimer.[69] In addition, the VHA includes interviews with a number of people well known for being Holocaust survivors. By the time they were interviewed for the Archive, they had already related their wartime experiences in widely known books or films. Among these survivors are Abraham Bomba, whose interview about the Treblinka death camp figures prominently in Claude Lanzmann's documentary *Shoah*, and Leopold Page (known before the war as Poldek Pfefferberg), the initial source for Thomas Keneally's book that is the basis for the film *Schindler's List*. The VHA also includes an interview with Binjamin Wilkomirski, author of the 1995 book *Fragments: Memories of a Wartime Childhood*. Shortly after the interview was recorded, this widely read autobiography was exposed as fraudulent, and Wilkomirski's actual identity as Bruno Dössekker (né Grosjean), who is neither a Jew nor a victim of Nazi persecution, was established.[70]

Some survivors interviewed for the VHA had become well known for their commitment to causes directly related to the Holocaust, including Benjamin Meed, founder of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, and Simon Wiesenthal, long famous for his efforts to track down fugitive Nazi war criminals. Other interviewees have turned their public recognition as survivors toward causes less directly connected to Holocaust remembrance, such as Gerda Weissmann Klein, the subject of the award-winning documentary *One Survivor Remembers* (1995), based on her memoir *All but My Life*. In 2008 Klein founded Citizenship Counts, a nonprofit organization committed to promoting the value of citizenship among American youth.[71]

Oren Baruch Stier, *Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003).

68. Plato, "Phaedrus," trans. Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff, in *Plato: Complete Works*, ed. John M. Cooper (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), 551–52.

69. Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. Richard Howard (1981; repr., New York: Hill and Wang, 2010), 91.

70. Betsy Sparrow, Jenny Liu, and Daniel M. Wegner, "Google Effects on Memory: Cognitive Consequences of Having Information at Our Fingertips," *Science* 333 (August 5, 2011): 776, 778.

71. Alan Rosen, *The Wonder of Their Voices: The 1946 Holocaust Interviews of David Boder* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 20.

72. See *Filmer la guerre, 1941–1946: Les Soviétiques face à la Shoah* (Paris: Mémorial de la Shoah, 2015).

73. See, e.g., Laura Jockusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

74. See Edward R. Murrow, "Broadcast from Buchenwald," in US Holocaust Memorial Museum, *1945: The Year of Liberation* (Washington, DC: US Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1995), 114–15.

75. See Shandler, *While America Watches*, chap. 1.

76. See Rosen, *Wonder of Their Voices.*

77. See "Voices of the Holocaust," http://voices.iit.edu (accessed September 24, 2015).

78. For the script and audio recording of *The Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto*, see "AJC Radio, Audio Recordings and Scripts: Jewish Holiday Broadcasts, Yom Kippur," http://www.ajcarchives.org/main.php?GroupingId=4140 (accessed September 17, 2015).

79. On this episode of *Reunion*, see "Yiddish Radio Project: Siegbert Freiberg's Story," 2002, http://www.yiddishradioproject.org/exhibits/reunion/ (accessed September 17, 2015).

80. See Shandler, *While America Watches*, chap. 2.

81. See, e.g., Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*, trans. Jared Stark (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

82. Shandler, *While America Watches*, 91.

83. See "About the Yad Vashem Archives," www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/archive/about_archive_whats_in_archive.asp; Yad Vashem Collection of Testimonies, "Listing of the Record Groups in the Yad Vashem Archives," www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/archive/pdf/list_of_record_groups.pdf (both accessed November 20, 2012).

84. Fewer than one hundred of these interviews were videotaped. The collections of the Center for Holocaust Studies, Documentation, and Research, including these interviews, were moved from Brooklyn to the Museum of Jewish Heritage (MJH) in 1989. The MJH undertook its own project of videotaping interviews with Holocaust survivors from 1989 to 1994. E-mails to author from Bonnie Gurewitsch, archivist/curator, Museum of Jewish Heritage—A Living Memorial to the Holocaust, New York, November 26 and 27, 2012.

85. Michele Langfield and Pam Maclean, "Multiple Framings: Survivor and Non-survivor Interviews in Holocaust Testimony," in *Memories of Mass Repression: Narrating Life Stories in the Aftermath of Atrocity*, ed. Nanci Adler, Selma Leydesdorff, Mary Chamberlain, and Leyla Neyzi (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2011), 202.

86. Amit Pinchevski, "The Audio Visual Unconscious: Media and Trauma in the Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, *Critical Inquiry* 39, no. 1 (Autumn 2012): 144.

87. See Joanne Weiner Rudof, "A Yale University and New Haven Community Project: From Local to Global," Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University, 2012, http://web.library.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/local_to_global.pdf (accessed September 17, 2015).

88. Judith Miller, *One, by One, by One: The Landmark Exploration of the Holocaust and the Uses of Memory* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990), 273.

89. See Shandler, *While America Watches*, 184–99.

90. J. Hoberman, *Film after Film: Or, What Became of 21st Century Cinema?* (London: Verso, 2012), 4.

91. Fred Ritchin, *After Photography* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009), 19.

92. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "The Electronic Vernacular," in *Connected: Engagements with Media*, ed. George E. Marcus (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 45.

93. Daniel L. Schacter, *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past* (New York: Basic Books, 1996), 16, 34, 40–41.

Chapter 2

1. Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 42.

2. Lenore Blum et al., "Tellers and Listeners: The Impact of Holocaust Narratives," in *Lessons and Legacies: The Meaning of the Holocaust in a Changing World*, ed. Peter Hayes (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 316–17.

3. Alexandra Garbarini, "Power in Truth Telling: Jewish Testimonial Strategies before the Shoah," in *Kinship, Community, and Self: Essays in Honor of David Warren Sabean*, ed. Jason Coy, Benjamin Marschke, Jared Poley, and Claudia Verhoeven (New York: Berghahn, 2014), 175.

4. See, e.g., Laura Jockusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

5. Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*, trans. Jared Stark (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 51, 57.

6. See, e.g., David G. Roskies, ed., *The Literature of Destruction: Jewish Responses to Catastrophe* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989).

7. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "The Concept and Varieties of Narrative in East European Jewish Culture," in *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, ed. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 284.

8. Aleida Assmann, "History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony," *Poetics Today* 27, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 270.

9. Barbara Myerhoff, *Remembered Lives: The Work of Ritual, Storytelling, and Growing Older*, ed. Marc Kaminsky (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 233.

10. "Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies: About," http://web.library.yale.edu/testimonies/about (accessed February 22, 2015).

11. Shoah Foundation Institute, *Interviewer Guidelines* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 2007), 10, available at "Collecting Testimonies," http://sfi.usc.edu/explore/collecting_testimonies (accessed September 17, 2015).

12. James E. Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), 159, 171.

13. Barbara Myerhoff, *Stories as Equipment for Living: Last Talks and Tales of Barbara Myerhoff*, ed. Marc Kaminsky and Mark Weiss (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007).

14. On the interrelation of video and television, see James M. Moran, *There's No Place Like Home Video* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), especially chap. 4.

15. Fortunoff Video Archive, "About the Archive: Our Concept," http://www.library.yale.edu/testimonies/about/concept.html (accessed February 22, 2015).

16. Michael Rothberg and Jared Stark, "After the Witness: A Report from the Twentieth Anniversary Conference of the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale," *History and Memory* 15, no. 1 (2003): 88.

17. Consider, e.g., the fallout in advance of the exhibition *Mirroring Evil: Nazi Imagery/Recent Art* at The Jewish Museum in New York in 2002. See, e.g., Jeanne Pearlman, "Mirroring Evil: Nazi Imagery/Recent Art Case Study: The Jewish Museum, New York City," http://animatingdemocracy.org/publications/case-studies/visual-arts#jewish museum (accessed September 18, 2015).

18. The VHA index also identifies nineteen interviews that reference *Der Führer schenkt den Juden eine Stadt* [Hitler gives a city to the Jews], a 1944 German propaganda film presenting a falsely positive image of the Terezín concentration camp.

19. Other interviewees may discuss *Schindler's List*, but their references are not listed in the index, e.g., Leopold Page, IC 293, the *Schindlerjude* who inspired Thomas Keneally's book, and Moshe Bejski, IC 23848, another *Schindlerjude*, whose interview is the longest in the VHA at almost sixteen hours.

20. In addition, twelve interviews are in Hebrew, seven in Russian, six in Spanish, five in Hungarian, four in Polish, two in German, and one each in Dutch and Greek.

21. See Jeffrey Shandler, "*Schindler's* Discourse: America Discusses the Holocaust and Its Mediation, from NBC's Miniseries to Spielberg's Film," in *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on "Schindler's List,"* ed. Yosefa Loshitzky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 153–68.

22. USC Shoah Foundation, *Testimony: The Legacy of "Schindler's List" and the USC Shoah Foundation* (New York: Newmarket Press/HarperCollins, 2014), 140.

23. See Jeffrey Shandler, *Jews, God, and Videotape: Religion and Media in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 108–10.

24. "Religious Right Responds to 'Schindler's List,'" *Freedom Writer*, June 1994, http://www.publiceye.org/ifas/fw/9406/schindler.html.

25. See Shandler, "*Schindler's* Discourse," 163.

26. See Michael Janofsky, "Increasingly, Political War of Words Is Fought with Nazi Imagery," *New York Times*, October 23, 1995, A12; CNN.com, "After Rebuke, Congressman Apologizes for 'Schindler's List' Remarks," February 26, 1997, http://web.archive.org/web/20010710041119/http://www.cnn.com/US/9702/26/schindler.debate/.

27. See Stuart Elliott, "Ford Will Travel High Road with Adless 'Schindler's List,'" *New York Times*, February 21, 1997, D1, D4.

28. See, e.g., Liliane Weissberg, "The Tale of a Good German: Reflections on the German Reception of *Schindler's List*," in Loshitzky, *Spielberg's Holocaust*, 171–92.

29. See Haim Bresheeth, "The Great Taboo Broken: Reflections on the Israeli Reception of *Schindler's List* in Israel," in Loshitzky, *Spielberg's Holocaust*, 193–212.

30. Bernard Weinraub, "Islamic Nations Move to Keep Out 'Schindler's List,'" *New York Times*, April 7, 1997, www.nytimes.com/1994/04/07/movies/ islamic-nations-move-to-keep-out-schindler-s-list.html.

31. See Shandler, *Jews, God, and Videotape*, 125–27.

32. This episode of *Seinfeld*, titled "The Raincoats," first aired on NBC on April 28, 1994.

33. Eyal Zandberg, "Critical Laughter: Humor, Popular Culture and Israeli Holocaust Commemoration," *Media, Culture and Society* 28, no. 4 (2006): 572–73.

34. J. Hoberman, "Invisible Cities," *Village Voice*, September 3, 2002, http://www.villagevoice.com/film/invisible-cities-6412722.

35. Shoah Foundation Institute, *Interviewer Guidelines*, 6, 8.

36. Sia Hertsberg, IC 14139, seg. 54.

37. Ritta Silberstein, IC 24365, seg. 73.

38. Marianne Rosner, IC 24958, seg. 61.

39. Marianne Rosner, segs. 99–100. The original Hungarian lyrics to this 1933 song, "Szomorú vasárnap," also known as "Gloomy Sunday," are by László Jávor, set to a melody composed by Rezső Seress. The song was purported to induce a suicidal melancholia in some listeners.

40. See Thomas Keneally, *Schindler's List* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982), 240–41.

41. Roman Ferber, IC 43707, segs. 70–71.

42. John Armer, IC 3638, segs. 75–77.

43. Leon Leyson, IC 8916, seg. 159.

44. Helena Jonas Rosenzweig, IC 23626, segs. 168–69.

45. Keneally, *Schindler's List*, 7.

46. Victor Dortheimer, IC 22469, segs. 167–68.

47. Maryla Susser, IC 26484, segs. 22–23.

48. Benek Geizhals, IC 11349, seg. 62.

49. Quoted in Curt Schleier, "Steven Spielberg's New Direction," *Jewish Monthly* 108, no. 4 (1994): 12.

50. Chaskel Schlesinger, IC 1680, seg. 90.

51. Leopold Rosner, IC 17372, seg. 91.

52. Abraham Zuckerman, IC 3190, seg. 109.

53. Esther Fiszman, IC 1350, segs. 62–63.

54. Laura Hillman, IC 1208, seg. 74.

55. David Halpern, IC 34094, seg. 98.

56. George Hartman, IC 10110, seg. 57.

57. Lore Smith, IC 40685, seg. 223.

58. Harriet Solz, IC 1491, seg. 123.

59. Israel Arbeiter, IC 18588, segs. 174–76.

60. Karol Saks, IC 11374, seg. 92.

61. Zoltan Gluck, IC 12812, seg. 48.

62. Goldy Zylberszac-Junger, IC 38333, seg. 135.

63. Horst Senger, IC 9557, seg. 87.

64. Rothberg and Stark, "After the Witness," 89.

65. Noah Shenker, *Reframing Holocaust Testimony* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015), 112, 119, 125.

66. Dorit Whiteman, IC 34738, seg. 151.

67. Harriet Solz, seg. 123.

68. Something of an exception to this is Israel Arbeiter, who discusses the impossibility of providing a full account of even a single day of his wartime experience (segs. 174–76).

69. Robert Clary, IC 95; Esther Jungreis, IC 518; Tom Lantos, IC 25591; Ruth Westheimer, IC 43928. Clary and Westheimer are included in a 2015 online feature by the *Hollywood Reporter* of eleven Holocaust survivors who have worked in the entertainment industry. See "Hollywood's Last Survivors," http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/features/holocaust-survivors/ (accessed December 18, 2015). This online feature includes information about the Shoah Foundation.

70. Abraham Bomba, IC 18061; Leopold Page, IC 293; Binjamin Wilkomirski, IC 29545. On Wilkomirski, see Stefan Maechle, *The Wilkomirski Affair: A Study in Biographical Truth*, trans. John E. Woods (New York: Schocken Books, 2001).

71. Benjamin Meed, IC 50584; Simon Wiesenthal, IC 35104; Gerda Weissmann Klein, IC 9725. Klein's memoir is *All but My Life* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957); on Citizenship Counts, see http://citizenshipcounts.org (accessed March 17, 2014).

72. The VHA index identifies 1,489 interviewees who discuss "Holocaust education," of whom 1,389 are Jewish Holocaust survivors.

73. *One Day in Auschwitz*, dir. Steve Purcell, https://www.youtube.comwatch?v=mZYgzW2fSoo (accessed December 12, 2015).

74. The documentary was aired on PBS in February 4, 1981, followed by an edited version shown on *ABC News Closeup* on July 28, 1981.

75. Imperial War Museums, "Hart-Moxon, Kitty (IWM Interview)," http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/80016100 (accessed September 18, 2015).

76. Nadine Wojakovski, "Holocaust Memorial Day: Who Will Teach Them When We Are Gone?" *Jewish Chronicle*, January 29, 2016, http://www.thejc.com/lifestyle/lifestyle-features/152911/holocaust-memorial-day-who-will-teach-them-when-we-are-gone.

77. Kitty Hart, *I Am Alive* (London: Abelard-Schuman, 1961), 8–9.

78. Primo Levi's *Se questo è un uomo*, first published in Italian in 1947, was reissued in 1957; the first English-language edition is *If This Is a Man*, trans. Stuart Woolf (New York: Orion Press, 1959). Elie Wiesel's *La nuit*, a reworking of his Yiddish memoir *Un di velt hot geshvign* [And the world was silent] (Buenos Aires: Tsentral-farband fun poylishe yidn in Argentine, 1956), was first published in French in 1958; the first English-language edition is *Night*, trans. Stella Rodway (New York: Hill and Wang, 1960).

79. Hart, *I Am Alive*, 13, 33.

80. Ibid., 20, 10, 120.

81. Peter Morley, *A Life Rewound: Memoirs of a Freelance Producer and Director* (New Romney, UK: Bank House Books, 2010), 225.

82. Ibid., 226–27.

83. Ibid., 228.

84. Ibid., 231, 233, 234.

85. Kitty Hart, *Return to Auschwitz: The Remarkable Life of a Girl Who Survived the Holocaust* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1981), back dust jacket, 14.

86. Ibid., 11–12, 20.

87. Ibid., 9.

88. Kitty Hart-Moxon, IC 45132, segs. 427, 428, 452–53.

89. Kitty Hart-Moxon, segs. 474, 512–13, 475.

90. Kitty Hart-Moxon, segs. 485, 489.

91. Hart, *I Am Alive*, 57–59.

92. *Kitty: Return to Auschwitz*, dir. Peter Morley [documentary film], Yorkshire Television, 1979. My transcription.

93. Hart, *Return to Auschwitz*, 66–67.

94. Ibid., 71–72.

95. *Kitty: Return to Auschwitz*. My transcription.

96. Kitty Hart-Moxon, segs. 158–60.

97. Deborah Schiffrin, "We Knew That's It: Retelling the Turning Point of a Narrative," *Discourse Studies* 5, no. 4 (2003): 541.

98. Kitty Hart-Moxon, segs. 507, 515.

99. Lawrence L. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 41.

Chapter 3

1. Judith Miller, *One, by One, by One: The Landmark Exploration of the Holocaust and the Uses of Memory* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990), 268.

2. Flora Benveniste, IC 47902, segs. 1–2.

3. Alan Rosen, *The Wonder of Their Voices: The 1946 Holocaust Interviews of David Boder* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 202, 203.

4. As cited in ibid., 209, incorporating Rosen's emendations to Boder's original transcription. The interview, which took place in Paris on August 4, 1946, can be heard at Voices of the Holocaust, http://voices.iit.edu/interviewee?doc=zgnilekB (accessed July 28, 2016).

5. Rosen, *Wonder of Their Voices*, 208–9, 202–3.