

INTRODUCTION

TOWARD A MICROHISTORY OF THE HOLOCAUST

Claire Zalc and Tal Bruttman



Applying a narrow focus to the study of the “Final Solution” is not, strictly speaking, a new approach. A similar process was adopted even during the conflict itself through early attempts to understand what was taking place. Vasily Grossman, for example, entered Polish territory in the summer of 1944 embedded as a journalist with the Red Army. They traveled to Treblinka, where he undertook a study to help him comprehend the true nature of a place of which virtually nothing remained aside from some debris and a few scattered fragments of human remains. Originally published in 1944, his report, *The Treblinka Hell*,¹ represents a novel effort to compose an immediate history of a killing center. Grossman’s study helped him better understand the fate of the Jews walled up in Polish ghettos, as well as the wider fate of most of the Jewish inhabitants of the rest of Europe. Retracing in minute detail the history of this individual—and extremely singular—site allowed Grossman to imagine the fate of the entire continent’s Jewish population.

A vast body of historiographical research on the Holocaust has developed since then. The overall framework of this research, which focuses broadly on the devastation of European Jews, was well established beginning with the pioneering studies by Léon Poliakov² and Gerald Reitlinger³ in the early 1950s, whose work was followed by that of Raul Hilberg and Saul Friedländer.⁴ Studies conducted in the 1980s and 1990s

tended to be smaller scale, focusing on local or regional contexts such as Riga, the Lublin district, or Belarus.⁵ These more fine-grained studies provided a better understanding of the mechanisms used to implement the Final Solution and often provided clearer views of a far vaster whole.⁶ For the past decade, studies focusing on a single camp or ghetto or a particular roundup, city, convoy, family, or battalion have contributed to a deep renewal of Holocaust studies.⁷ It should be acknowledged, however, that the implications and historiographical relevance of this microhistorical shift have not been critically examined. The fundamental question, however, is whether there really are matters of substance to renew in this field. Hasn't everything already been said? How will microhistory enrich the history of the Holocaust?

Our idea of assembling a series of microhistorical approaches to the Holocaust within a single edited volume was inspired by a desire to reconsider the intellectual, heuristic, and archival operations underlying this tectonic shift in the scale at which the destiny of European Jews is currently being studied. The generic expression "microhistory of the Holocaust" designates a multitude of processes that adopt different orientations, ask different questions, and explore a vast and complex history that swept through nearly all of the European continent. The studies approach the field from a variety of angles and utilize a range of methodologies. There is as yet no single agreed-upon definition of this strand of historiographical research, which began in the late 1970s and expanded during the 1980s. Without risking a single definition, it should be remembered that this historiographical movement calls into question the certainties of earlier historiographies, notably the grand explanations based on economic or cultural determinations, by granting renewed importance to individual practices and experiences. It involves criticizing not only the inadequacy of the categories used by a self-styled "total" history, but also emphasizing the importance of the different scales of the phenomena in their own right. It gives increased attention to the categories of actors, the strategies of individuals and small groups, as well as to ways of writing history.

While micro-level studies have proliferated around the world, valid questions can be raised about the effects of this change of scale on the production of knowledge.⁸ Indeed, microhistory cannot be reduced to monographs or to local history or histories. What is at issue here is clearly to move away from the metaphor of grand history as a puzzle composed of the accumulation of small monographs focusing on such and such locality or histories centering on specific micro-moments. The change of scale entails a change of paradigm in the way of writing history.

When we refer to microhistory, we are echoing the appeal of the Italian pioneers of the 1980s—Carlo Ginzburg, Giovanni Levi, Carlo Poni, and others—who concentrated on smaller units and spaces. Reducing the level of analysis increases knowledge, because smaller spaces can better elucidate the complexities of decision-making, help reestablish the “space of the possible,” show how reality was experienced at the individual level, and ultimately provide more compelling insights into the events that contemporaries faced in their day-to-day lives. Francesca Trivellato has issued a useful reminder to maintain the distinction between *la microstoria*, which was developed by Italian historians, *microhistoire à la française*, and microhistory, as it is understood by Anglophone historiographers:⁹ the first is compatible with both empiricism and self-reflexivity; the second, in the tradition of the critical turning point pursued by the journal *Les Annales*, has called for a socioeconomic meaning of changing scales; while the American reception has placed more emphasis on notions of agency and narrative history.¹⁰ Although the disjunctions within this “microhistorical” trend are considerable, the questions raised by the change of scale, as well as its effect on the writing of history, nevertheless take on particular resonance and intensity concerning the historiography of the Holocaust.

In order to reflect on the contributions of changing scale in writing Holocaust history, we organized an international conference at the École normale supérieure entitled “Changer d’échelle pour renouveler l’histoire de la Shoah/Changing Scale: Exploring the Micro History of the Holocaust” (5–7 December 2012).¹¹ The call for papers aroused a revelatory enthusiasm for these types of approaches: choices had to be made from among the 150 paper proposals from twenty-two different countries. In the end, the conference brought together 47 contributors from eleven countries. After attempting to benefit from the strengths of microhistorical processes, primarily using French examples, the fundamental necessity for us as editors of this volume was to examine various national historiographies by extending the analytical spectrum well beyond French borders.

The contributions that we have selected for this project are engaged in a reflexive process that critically appraises the advantages, as well as the limitations, of their particular contexts; they emphasize questions of source and method in order to promote a reflection on what and how such approaches contribute to the overall historiography of the Holocaust. We decided to give special priority in this volume to texts that make it possible to question the actual effects of a change of scale on the writing of history and the concrete ways in which it can be implemented: What sources lend themselves to this? How can hitherto

neglected archives be used to shed light on certain issues? How can quantitative analysis be used in local situations? Is it possible, and if so under what conditions, to adopt the classic methodologies of social history for controversial questions and matters of memory, and more specifically for the Shoah, which is largely defined by its exceptional nature? The selected texts thus entail an overall reflexive dimension, both with regard to sources and methodology as well as to the consequences of variations in focal point. Our intention is not to claim that monographic studies, which can be very provocative, are merely bricks for constructing a “grand historical narrative” of the Holocaust. Quite the contrary—such studies decenter the gaze. Shifting the level, or scale, of analysis reveals the diversity and complexity of processes by deconstructing an entire monolithic approach without limiting oneself to the borders of a particular locality or group. A microhistorical approach systematically involves situating oneself within a broader whole and within relationships to other scales in order to understand the context of a particular case, reproducing “the range of the possible,” and placing the emphasis on distortion of the general.

For this reason, assembling the approaches represented in this volume seems promising. By encouraging comparison, casting light on the differences between cases, reminding of the diversity of historiographical approaches, and always interrogating that which is general, the process invariably departs from the most local level by questioning the nature of established boundaries: What is a family? A group? A ghetto? A Jew? By studying the epistolary relations among different members of the Katz family—Jews trying to flee Austria in the late 1930s—Melissa Jane Taylor (chapter 2) shows how family dynamics are redefined by the context of anti-Semitic persecution; the emigration projects that unfolded according to different scales and chronologies redraw the outlines of the family, especially the role of children. The in-depth study of the trajectories of 304 young men under the age of sixteen (including Elie Wiesel, who arrived in Buchenwald from Auschwitz on 26 January 1945) enables Kenneth Waltzer (chapter 3) to reflect on the social firmness of this group, through analysis of the solidarity and social relations present within it.

It must be clearly asserted from the very beginning that the question is not representativeness, but instead the normal exception, which is both difficult and stimulating. The “exceptional normal,” to use Edoardo Grendi’s expression, is probably one of the most cited and transformed slogans of microhistory: it entails remembering that what is in question is not representativeness but the additional information generated by analysis conducted on the microscale.¹² Focusing attention on an indi-

vidual, local setting, or situation different from the average or the norm can reveal the dynamics and help us understand them. For instance, the extraordinary case of Richard Frank, studied by Christoph Kreutzmüller (chapter 1), is both exemplary and exceptional. At a time when all emigration was forbidden for Jews (beginning in October 1941), Frank succeeded in December 1942 in officially reaching Switzerland from Germany by way of a succession of circumstances. It nevertheless demonstrates the existence of certain cracks in the Nazi political machine, through which certain rare individuals were able to slip. Similarly, the case of Jews from the city and environs of Lens, studied by Nicolas Mariot and Claire Zalc (chapter 5), is in no way representative of the French situation, for half of the Jewish community was deported, a figure that is significantly higher than the national average of 25 percent. The intention is not to choose a representative or emblematic case, but on the contrary to attempt to understand why the situation in Lens was exceptional. How can one understand the incredible harshness of the persecution there?

Microhistory is not synonymous with local history, disconnected from the whole in which it unfolded. On the contrary, it is a history placed in perspective and linked to the decisions, choices, and deeds that intervened at different levels, from the international to the “grassroots.” As a result, we have chosen contributions that specifically consider this dimension. For example, Waltzer’s contribution reveals the role of solidarity in the survival process by focusing on the relations between these boys. Places are also explored by the microhistorical approach, notably borders: based on the case of Budapest, where buildings and even isolated apartments became elements of the ghetto, Tim Cole and Alberto Giordano (chapter 6) show that the image of the ghetto, so frequently associated in representations with a space of segregation and concentration enclosed by walls, such as the Warsaw ghetto, was much more malleable and dispersed, and hence more complex to analyze.

Without necessarily summarizing the framework of Italian *microstoria*, we argue in favor of a nondogmatic approach, in which the micro does not suffice unto itself, but is articulated at other levels to create a whole. The contributions presented here are never confined to a limited space. If, for example, a project addresses the Jews of Lens, as does the contribution by Nicolas Mariot and Claire Zalc (chapter 5), it also entails references to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Germany, the Saar, Paris, and the many other origins of the Jews of a northern French city, as well as their destinations. It also means following their flight through Occupied France to the free zone, to Périgueux, Toulouse, and occasionally to Switzerland, or their arrests in Poitiers, their detentions,

their deportations to Auschwitz, and in some cases their return to Lens. The dozens of locations explored in this volume, situated principally if not exclusively in Europe, are in fact highly diverse: Berlin, Vienna, Szczepietyn, Auschwitz, the Buna, Buchenwald, Warsaw, Cologne, Łódź, Pinsk, Białystok, Budapest, Échirolles, Łuków, Mielec, Ostrów Mazowiecka, Czernowitz, Birkenau, Siedlce, Majdanek, Flossenbürg, Moldova, Parzew, and Lublin, as well as Paris. Studies at the grassroots level can highlight facts that transcend a specific local framework to shed light on the broader context. In his investigation of the execution of three Jews in Échirolles, near Grenoble, for example, Tal Bruttman (chapter 13) analyzes the specific acts themselves and the motivations of the ultra-collaborators who committed them in order to call attention to the many long-neglected assassinations of Jews that took place on French soil in 1944. His study also demonstrates that the Final Solution cannot be reduced to the arrest-deportation mechanism on which most historiographical studies of the period have focused. It also illustrates certain broader transformations of German policies in France over time.

In other words, the microhistorical focus brings new discoveries to light and humanizes abstract ideas. As Daniel Mendelsohn noted at the conclusion of his study *The Lost*:

“The Holocaust is so big, the scale of it is so gigantic, so enormous, that it becomes easy to think of it as something mechanical. Anonymous. But everything that happened, happened because someone made a decision. To pull a trigger, to flip a switch, to close a cattle car door, to hide, to betray.”¹³

Microhistorical approaches help us bridge the gap between the deeply personal approaches of the Holocaust that sometimes characterize the literary field, including the work of Daniel Mendelsohn, and the collective destiny of vast numbers of communities and immense populations. On one side is embodied history, and on the other, the abstraction of vast numbers. But more than that, these approaches also lead us to reintroduce the individuals, as well as a certain degree of flexibility, into our understanding of the process—both the name and the game, as Ginzburg and Poni put it.¹⁴ As Jeffrey Wallen says in his text (chapter 17), “microhistory has the potential to change the pictures we have of the Holocaust: not only to substitute a finer and more complex understanding for the set of better-known names, places, and events, but to help us rethink the boundaries and oppositions that structure our understanding.”

Still, the goal is not exclusively to embody “great history” within individuals or the “local,” whether they were the residents of an apartment building, street, or neighborhood. Diving into the details of decision-

making processes and revealing the behaviors of a range individuals who were persecuted—or were agents of persecution—allow us to see lively debates in an entirely new light. For instance, the implementation of the measures that made the Dorohoi and Galați pogroms possible, along with their actual execution, is interpreted by Alexandru Muraru (chapter 14) in the broader context of the Romanian-Soviet confrontation by also going down to the regional and local levels, with each shedding light on the others. Leon Saltiel (chapter 4) shows that although the destruction of the cemetery of Thessaloniki took shape during the Nazi occupation, the project had been part of city reorganization plans since the mid-1920s. Local authorities consequently used the German presence to implement their project; one could thus speak of the “opportunity effect” of anti-Semitic policy, which made it possible to disregard the protests of the Jewish community of Thessaloniki, in order to raze and obliterate their graves.

Placing oneself at the level of an *Einsatzgruppe*, a brigade of gendarmes, or a police battalion, as Christopher Browning did,¹⁵ makes it possible to offer a different interpretation of the mechanisms of obedience and decision-making. It raises the question of conformism, but in a novel way, along with questions about authority, constraint, and the implementation of decisions emanating from various ranks. This involves many perspectives and just as many questions. A similar case reconstructed by Markus Roth (chapter 12) is the massacre conducted by a police battalion in Ostrów Mazowiecka in November 1939, whose early date raises many interesting questions and whose mechanisms are not easy to grasp. Tomasz Frydel (chapter 9) uses the example of the Rzeszów region to show the setting in which violence against Jews, as well as those who came to their aid, took place. The mechanisms of control implemented by the German occupier through the imposition of various responsibilities and burdens on local populations constituted an essential tool in the *Judenjagd*, the hunt for Jews. These mechanisms are interpreted from the point of view of both the executioners and the victims. The interaction of the executioners with the populations from which they came also represents a field of its own, which is highlighted by Vladimir Solonari (chapter 10), whose analysis of southwestern Ukraine extends into the very hearts of households.

The microhistorical level also alters perspectives from the point of view of the victims. Immersing oneself in a ghetto, reconstructing a family’s escape and emigration, or following the persecution trajectories of a convoy of deportees step-by-step throughout the genocidal process offers a glimpse into the spectrum of the possible. It is a way of retrieving the “spaces of the possible” as well as “the plurality of possible

futures,” to invoke fellow microhistorians; or, as the case may be, a way of showing the “spaces of the impossible” or the “plurality of impossible futures” by highlighting the role of the arbitrary, and of nooses as they were cinched ever tighter.¹⁶ These approaches allow us to question the relevance of concepts like strategy and agency at a particular moment in history, which is often understood as being in the grip of an ineluctable determinism. Above all, changing scales compels us to observe specific interactions and face-to-face contacts, which leads us in turn to envision differently the often-cited—and sometimes criticized—triad first mentioned by Raul Hilberg: perpetrators, victims, and “others,” that is, bystanders.¹⁷

Changing scales becomes particularly important, in our opinion, with the history of the Holocaust, as its ending tends to cloud our understanding of the processes underlying how it unfolded. Attempts to exempt oneself from teleological risk, and to some extent relinquish the historical omniscience that knows “the end of history”—along with placing oneself on the ground—thus enable us to consider individuals not as mere pawns on the checkerboard of the Final Solution. Their diverse voices and points of view call into question the many facets of what Marc Bloch called the “historian’s craft.”¹⁸

The question of the origins of this change in scales is central. If we ask questions about the historiographical moment in which we find ourselves, we might observe the profound influence of changes of context on the production of sources. For one thing, as time progresses, survivors are no longer present to tell us their itineraries or to offer eyewitness accounts. Furthermore, archives have largely become accessible due to international political changes in the 1990s and the collapse of Communist regimes. National shifts in policy have also played a role, for instance the Matteoli Commission and its repercussions in France, which resulted in the opening up of nearly all archives related to World War II without special permission (the so-called Jospin circular). The culture of memory has also played a significant role. For example, the massive operation to digitize the archives of the International Tracing Service (ITS) has made these documents available for consultation at archive centers in seven countries instead of only at Bad Arolsen. The opening of these archives has made the change in perspectives possible and has consequently encouraged the development of a host of new scholarly approaches. They are used by a number of authors in this volume, including Kenneth Waltzer, Nicolas Mariot, and Claire Zalc.

The stakes are significant for writing and transmitting the history of the Holocaust. But they are also important for the renewal of knowledge brought about by this shift in perspective. Such a shift in perspective is

implemented by Daniel Uziel (chapter 8), who shows how the testimonies of Holocaust survivors make it possible to present German industry as seen by those who were reduced to slavery within it.

Restricting the focal point promotes a method based on data and frequently cross-indexed sources—processes long called for by the pioneers of *microstoria* but that are not without their complications. What should be done, for example, with testimonies that diverge from each other? How should the archival sources created by the persecuting authorities be used? The quality, volume, and novelty of sources, archives, and testimonials used by researchers raise such new questions. How can hitherto neglected archives (e.g., administrative forms, newspapers, lists) be used in such a way as to help address particular types of questions? Wolf Gruner's use of a series of documents consisting of previously unexplored archives of the Reich police, corroborated with the oft-used ones of the Ministry of Justice, is one example (chapter 11). It enables him to bring to light a totally underestimated phenomenon, that of individual resistance by Jews in the Reich, from 1933 to the high point of the war. These sources make it possible to understand the attitudes of individuals, which when taken collectively represent a new dimension in the history of the Third Reich's persecution of Jews. Similarly, postwar judicial archives, in this case in Poland, constitute a source whose full importance is revealed by Jan Grabowski (chapter 7). These trials directed at "traitors of the Polish nation" make it possible to reconstitute on the ground—and even on the individual level—the fate of Jews in the General Government, especially those who had escaped from the ghettos with the launch of "Operation Reinhard." Andrew Kornbluth (chapter 15) also examines postwar Polish trials to show, in three specific cases, the evolution of judicial responses to crimes against Jews in Poland. Consequently, it is the connection between the micro level of the trial and the national level of political interpretations of the Holocaust in Poland that is explored.

The change in scale also has its origins in another set of sources, which has undergone important changes in recent years: witness testimonies. Since the 1970s, an important movement collecting witness accounts of persecution has been conducted. These testimonies—initially unheard, then used in a judicial context, and finally collected in large numbers for memorial purposes—have profoundly extended knowledge of the genocidal act.¹⁹ Yet for a number of years, things have changed with the prospect of seeing the survivors disappear. From that point forward, the gathering of testimonies intensified and was the subject of massive and systematic campaigns, such as that conducted by the USC Shoah Foundation Visual History Archive. A number of contributions

in this volume dwell on the specificities of using testimonies within a microhistorical approach. Jeffrey Wallen (chapter 17) explores the interrelations between the knowledge stemming from testimonies and those collected by an archival approach, through study of the Christianstadt camp. Hannah Pollin-Galay (chapter 16) demonstrates the importance of the context—and moreover the language—in which these testimonies were gathered, through the example of Lithuanian Jews born between 1918 and 1935 who share similar life stories but who testified to the Holocaust in two different contexts: in English in North America, and in Yiddish in contemporary Lithuania. The microhistorical lens once again calls for a reflexive and, in the best sense, critical use of these numerous and massive sources that offer many new avenues for research.

All of these contributions consequently tend to provide nuanced and diverse answers to the following questions: is it possible, and if so under what conditions, to employ classical social history methodologies to study controversial questions and aspects of memory, and more specifically the Holocaust, which has been defined mostly by its exceptionality? This volume is an initial effort in trying to answer questions such as these, but without claiming to cover every possible angle, approach, or method, because the field is so rich.

Translated from the French by John Angell and Arby Gharibian.

Notes

1. Vasily Grossman's article was published in the USSR in the journal *Znamya* in November 1944 and soon translated and published in French: *L'Enfer de Treblinka* (Grenoble: B. Arthaud, 1945); the English translation appeared thirty-nine years later as *The Treblinka Hell: Photographic Album of Martyrs, Heroes, and Executioners* (Tel Aviv: G. Aharoni, 1984).
2. Léon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate: The Nazi Program for the Destruction of the Jews of Europe* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1954; 1st edn in French 1951).
3. Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe, 1939–1945* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1953).
4. Raul Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961); Saul Friedländer, *The Years of Extermination: Nazi Germany and the Jews* (New York: HarperCollins, 2008).
5. Dieter Pohl, *Von der "Judenpolitik" zum Judenmord: der Distrikt Lublin des Generalgouvernements, 1939–1944* (Frankfurt am Main, New York: Peter Lang, 1993); Christian Gerlach, *Kalkulierte Morde: die deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Weissrussland 1941 bis 1944* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1999); Andrej Angrick and Peter Klein, *The "Final Solution" in Riga: Exploitation and Annihilation, 1941–1944* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), originally published as *Die "Endlösung" in Riga: Ausbeutung und Vernichtung 1941–1944* (Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006).

6. Regarding the contribution of the monographic approach to the analysis of Nazism, see the classic text by William S. Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town, 1930–1935* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965); Henry Huttenbach, *The Destruction of the Jewish Community of Worms, 1933–1945: A Study of the Holocaust Experience in Germany* (New York: Memorial Committee of Jewish Victims of Nazism from Worms, 1981); Klein and Angrick, *The “Final Solution” in Riga*; Pohl, *Von der “Judenpolitik” zum Judenmord*; Gerlach, *Kalkulierte Morde*; Panikos Panayi, “Victims, Perpetrators, and Bystanders in a German Town: The Jews of Osnabrück Before, During and After the Third Reich,” *European History Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (2003): 451–92.
7. To cite just a few: Christopher R. Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992); *Remembering Survival: Inside a Nazi Slave Labor Camp* (New York: WW Norton, 2010); Götz Aly, *Into the Tunnel: The Brief Life of Marion Samuel, 1931–1943* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007); Samuel Kassow, *Who Will Write Our History? Emanuel Ringelblum and the Oyneg Shabes Archive* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007); and Jan Grabowski, *Hunt for the Jews: Betrayal and Murder in German-Occupied Poland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).
8. We have borrowed the term “scale” from Jacques Revel. See Jacques Revel, ed., *Jeux d’échelles* (Paris: Editions de l’EHESS, 1996).
9. Francesca Trivellato, “Microstoria/Microhistoire/Microhistory,” *French Politics, Culture, and Society* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 122–134.
10. Among many references, we will cite the key texts for Italy by Giovanni Levi, “On Microhistory,” in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 93–113; and Carlo Ginzburg, “Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about It,” *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 1 (1993): 10–35. For France, see “Histoire et sciences sociales. Un tournant critique?” *Annales ESC* 43, no. 2 (1988): 291–93; Jacques Revel, “L’histoire au ras du sol,” in Giovanni Levi, *Le pouvoir au village: histoire d’un exorciste dans le Piémont du XVIIIe siècle*, trans. Monique Aymard (Paris: Gallimard, 1989), i–xxxiii; and Revel, *Jeux d’échelles*. For the American reception, see Sebouh David Aslanian, Joyce E. Chaplin, Ann McGrath, and Kristin Mann, “How Size Matters: The Question of Scale in History,” *American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (2013): 1431–72, as well as the pioneering work by Natalie Zemon Davies, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).
11. This conference, co-organized with Ivan Ermakoff and Nicolas Mariot, followed on the international study days from June 2011, whose proceedings were published by Seuil in the journal *Le Genre humain* in September 2012: Claire Zalc, Tal Bruttman, Ivan Ermakoff, and Mariot Nicolas, eds, *Pour une microhistoire de la Shoah* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, Series “Le genre humain,” 2012).
After this publication, the approach seemed incomplete to us; we noted the need for more comparisons with other parts of Europe where the Shoah was implemented, through an extension of the analytical spectrum. We would like to offer our warm thanks to the members of the Scientific Committee for this conference: Annette Wiewiorka, Maurice Olender, Jan Grabowski, Jan Gross, Dieter Pohl, and Omer Bartov, as well as our colleagues from the Organizing Committee, Ivan Ermakoff and Nicolas Mariot, with whom we developed the different stages of this undertaking.
12. Edoardo Grendi, “Micro-analisi e storia sociale,” *Quaderni storici* 35, no. 2 (1977): 506–20.
13. Daniel Mendelsohn, *The Lost: A Search for Six of Six Million* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006). The French edition is cited here: *Les disparus* (Paris: Flammarion, 2007), 601.

14. Carlo Ginzburg and Carlo Poni, "The Name and the Game: Unequal Exchange and the Historical Marketplace," in *Microhistory and the Lost People of Europe*, ed. Edward Muir and Guido Ruggiero, trans. Eren Branch, 1–10 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).
15. Browning, *Ordinary Men*.
16. Regarding these expressions, see Jacques Revel, "Micro-analyse et construction du social," in Revel, *Jeux d'échelles*, 15–36; and Pierre-André Chiappori and Maurizio Gribaudi, "La notion d'individu en microéconomie et en microhistoire," in *Le modèle et le récit*, ed. Jean-Yves Grenier, Claude Grignon, and Pierre-Michel Menger, 283–313 (Paris: Editions de la MSH, 2001).
17. Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders: the Jewish Catastrophe, 1933-1945* (New York: Aaron Asher Books, 1992).
18. Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (New York: Vintage Books, 1964).
19. Annette Wieviorka, *Déportation et génocide. Entre la mémoire et l'oubli* (Paris: Plon, 1992); and *L'ère du témoin* (Paris: Plon, 1998).

Bibliography

- Allen, William S. *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town, 1930–1935*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.
- Aly, Götz. *Into the Tunnel: The Brief Life of Marion Samuel, 1931–1943*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007.
- Angrick, Andrej, and Peter Klein. *The "Final Solution" in Riga: Exploitation and Annihilation, 1941–1944*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2009. Originally published as *Die "Endlösung" in Riga: Ausbeutung und Vernichtung 1941–1944* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006).
- Aslanian, Sebouh David, Joyce E. Chaplin, Ann McGrath, and Kristin Mann. "How Size Matters: The Question of Scale in History." *American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (2013): 1431–72.
- Bloch, Marc. *The Historian's Craft*. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.
- Browning, Christopher R. *Remembering Survival: Inside a Nazi Slave Labor Camp*. New York: WW Norton, 2010.
- . *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- Chiappori, Pierre-André, and Maurizio Gribaudi. "La notion d'individu en microéconomie et en microhistoire." In *Le modèle et le récit*, edited by Jean-Yves Grenier, Claude Grignon, and Pierre-Michel Menger, 283–313. Paris: Editions de la MSH, 2001.
- Friedländer, Saul. *The Years of Extermination: Nazi Germany and the Jews*. New York: HarperCollins, 2008.
- Gerlach, Christian. *Kalkulierte Morde: die deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Weissrussland 1941 bis 1944*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1999.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. "Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about It." *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 1 (1993): 10–35.
- Ginzburg, Carlo, and Carlo Poni. "The Name and the Game: Unequal Exchange and the Historical Marketplace." In *Microhistory and the Lost People of Europe*, edited by Edward Muir and Guido Ruggiero, 1–10. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Grabowski, Jan. *Hunt for the Jews: Betrayal and Murder in German-Occupied Poland*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.
- Grendi, Edoardo. "Micro-analisi e storia sociale." *Quaderni storici* 35, no. 2 (1977): 506–20.

- Grossman, Vasily. *L'Enfer de Treblinka*. Grenoble: B. Arthaud, 1945.
- . *The Treblinka Hell: Photographic Album of Martyrs, Heroes, and Executioners*. Tel Aviv: G. Aharoni, 1984.
- Hilberg, Raul. *Destruction of the European Jews*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.
- Huttenbach, Henry. *The Destruction of the Jewish Community of Worms, 1933–1945: A Study of the Holocaust Experience in Germany*. New York: Memorial Committee of Jewish Victims of Nazism from Worms, 1981.
- Kassow, Samuel. *Who Will Write Our History? Emanuel Ringelblum and the Oyneg Shabes Archive*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Levi, Giovanni. “On Microhistory.” In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, edited by Peter Burke, 93–113. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Mendelsohn, Daniel. *The Lost: A Search for Six of Six Million*. New York: HarperCollins, 2006.
- Panayi, Panikos. “Victims, Perpetrators, and Bystanders in a German Town: The Jews of Osnabrück Before, During and After the Third Reich.” *European History Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (2003): 451–92.
- Pohl, Dieter. *Von der “Judenpolitik” zum Judenmord: der Distrikt Lublin des Generalgouvernements, 1939–1944*. Frankfurt am Main, New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Poliakov, Léon. *Harvest of Hate: The Nazi Program for the Destruction of the Jews of Europe*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1954. First published in French 1951.
- Reitlinger, Gerald. *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe, 1939–1945*. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1953.
- Revel, Jacques, ed. *Jeux d'échelles*. Paris: Editions de l'EHESS, 1996.
- . “L'histoire au ras du sol.” In *Le pouvoir au village: histoire d'un exorciste dans le Piémont du XVIIe siècle*, by Giovanni Levi, i–xxxiii. Paris: Gallimard, 1989.
- Trivellato, Francesca. “Microstoria/Microhistoire/Microhistory.” *French Politics, Culture, and Society* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 122–34.
- Wieviorka, Annette. *Déportation et génocide. Entre la mémoire et l'oubli*. Paris: Plon, 1992.
- . *L'ère du témoin*. Paris: Plon, 1998.
- Zalc, Claire, Tal Bruttman, Ivan Ermakoff, and Mariot Nicolas, eds. *Pour une microhistoire de la Shoah*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, Series “Le genre humain,” 2012.
- Zemon Davies, Natalie. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.