

Introduction

NORMAN J. W. GODA

Historiographical discussion on the Holocaust in the past twenty years has focused on several factors concerning Jewish responses to the Nazis' policy of mass murder. One concerns the recovery of Jewish voices themselves through contemporary documents, diaries, and postwar testimonies, and their integration into broader Holocaust narratives. Another more complicated problem is to discern what Jewish narratives ultimately mean for the history of the Holocaust and for the longer continuum of Jewish history itself. The fifteen essays in this volume include recent work by leading scholars in the field, mostly from North America and Israel. They provide signposts concerning these problems ranging from ways of thinking about regional history to Jewish political identity in extremis.

The context of this discussion is extensive, stretching back to the war itself and including a number of historiographical trends, some intertwined, some strangely separated by internal sequestrations within the historical profession. They cannot all be explained here, even in part, and indeed, whole volumes in recent years have been dedicated to the broader historiography of the Holocaust and related questions of sources and approaches, to say nothing of arguments on individual questions.¹ But a sketch may be useful in providing some background to the essays that follow.

A small example may draw a larger picture. The Trial of the Major War Criminals at Nuremberg in 1945–46 was the first international inquiry into the crimes of the Nazi state. As the Soviets prepared their part of the case, concerning Crimes against Humanity, they included on their witness list the noted Yiddish-language poet Avrom Sutzkever, who survived the formation and ultimate destruction of the ghetto in Vilna, long a center of Jewish culture.

Notes for this section begin on page 11.

He had seen a great deal. His mother and newborn son were murdered. He had helped to rescue Jewish manuscripts from YIVO and other repositories before Alfred Rosenberg's Einsatzstab could destroy them. He survived by joining the resistance. And he wrote poems conveying what he had seen, including one, "A Wagon of Shoes," which predates many later artistic representations of the Holocaust through the medium of suddenly ownerless shoes of all sizes and types. Sutzkever had indeed witnessed a cartload of shoes in December 1941, and recognized those having belonged to his mother.²

Sutzkever was determined to testify, but just as important to him was *how* he would do so. "I will go to Nuremberg," he wrote in his diary in the middle of the trial in February 1946. "I feel the crushing responsibility that I bear on this journey. I pray that the vanished souls of the martyrs will manifest themselves through my words. I want to speak in Yiddish, any other language is out of the question.... I wish to speak in the language of the people whom the accused tried to exterminate.... May it ring out and may Alfred Rosenberg crumble...."³ Sutzkever seemingly hoped to reconstruct a history in its own language—a history that even antedated the Germans—and in front of the man who meant to destroy that very history. Nuremberg, of course, was the wrong venue. Sutzkever's testimony of nearly forty minutes (in Russian—no Yiddish translator could be found) has been virtually forgotten, as has the long silence at the beginning of the testimony, perhaps representing for Sutzkever the stifled Jewish voice.⁴ The episode goes unmentioned in most book-length accounts of the famous trial, lacking the initial staying power of testimonies by Nazi witnesses, included Adolf Eichmann's assistant Dieter Wisliceny, Einsatzgruppe commander Otto Ohlendorf, and Auschwitz Kommandant Rudolf Hoess. The subsequent U.S. trial of twenty-four Einsatzgruppen officers in 1947 and 1948 included no Jewish witnesses at all, even after Dina Pronicheva, a survivor of the September 1941 Babi Yar massacre, testified repeatedly and powerfully in the Soviet Union.⁵

The fate of Jews during the Holocaust was ancillary to the questions for which the Allies wanted answers.⁶ Even for the Soviets, Jewish testimony provided more in the way of useful international propaganda than it provided in terms of the guilt of individual defendants or in terms of serious historical inquiry under communism.⁷ And indeed the questions that came to haunt Nuremberg also troubled historians in the Atlantic world after they turned to the Holocaust in the 1960s and the decades that followed. Why and when did the Nazis decide on the mass murder of Europe's Jews? How was this terrible project carried to fruition? What was the mentality of the killers themselves?

The well-known result has been a tremendous amount of research through the lens of the perpetrators, including pointed discourse over the most vital questions. The issue as to when and why the Nazi state turned from persecution to mass murder was the subject of the debate between "intentionalists,"

who saw a top-down, ideological decision made no later than March 1941 and driven by Hitler himself, and “functionalists,” who viewed the decision as arising from failed forced emigration plans combined with institutional rivalries and apparent victory in the climactic war against the Soviet Union. In the 1990s, local studies by a new generation of German scholars suggested that no decision was “made” at all. Rather, a series of local decisions based on factors ranging from German resettlement patterns, labor needs, food supplies, and security concerns, while strangely devoid of a driving antisemitic impulse, emerged differently in variant locations, finally radicalizing and almost metastasizing into a continent-wide program.⁸

Equally vital is the discussion over perpetrator motivations. Its origins lie perhaps in 1946 with Eugen Kogon, who described the camp system as a machine that killed impersonally rather than through an individual “will to exterminate.”⁹ Hannah Arendt’s *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (1963) similarly painted Eichmann, a “desk murderer,” as a part of a larger, unthinking bureaucratic machine.¹⁰ Historians and scholars from other disciplines revisited the problem in the 1990s owing to the discussion over Christopher Browning’s *Ordinary Men*, which, in examining a reserve police battalion, cited sociological and psychological pressures that turned seemingly normal men into murderers, and Daniel Goldhagen’s *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*, which reintroduced German antisemitism into the equation but badly overstated the case.¹¹ The result was a series of historical studies revisiting the mentality, but also the bureaucracy, of murder, much of which overturned Arendt.¹² But there also emerged a quest in the social sciences for the genocidal mindset on the ground, which could, theoretically, be applied to mass killings from Africa to Southeast Asia.¹³

The outpouring of research on Nazi Germany has had additional, beneficial effects, including the approach of *Alltagsgeschichte*, which has discovered broad support among ordinary Germans not only for the regime but also for its antisemitic policies including beatings, plunder, and deportation.¹⁴ As Helmut Walser Smith has put it, the “vanishing point” in German history has shifted from 1933 and the question as to why the Weimar democracy failed, to 1941, when men in the state apparatus, in the field, and even in private homes seemingly embraced the notion of what Alon Confino calls “a world without Jews.”¹⁵ To be sure, the post-Cold War outpouring of explanations has sometimes been opaque. The explanation of the Holocaust as the outcome of “modernity” has left more questions unanswered than answered.¹⁶ The inclusion of the Holocaust in a postcolonial rubric of “genocide studies” has located commonalities between episodes of mass killing, but it has also obscured the unique aspects of the Final Solution ranging from the imagination of a global Jewish conspiracy to the carrying of genocide even to areas the Germans had no intention of colonizing.¹⁷

And what of the Holocaust's Jewish history? As Dan Michman, one of the contributors to this volume, put it in 1997,

Holocaust historiography, by now unimaginably extensive, deals with fragments or subtopics of the event itself. . . . Moreover . . . what is usually being explained, is the persecution of the Jews—confiscation of their property, forced emigration, and, ultimately, murder. The explanations differ, variously emphasizing Hitler's desire for world domination, rabid eliminationist anti-Semitism, racism, the almost apocalyptic clash between Bolshevism and fascism, the modern bureaucratic state and economic modernization, and modernity itself; but all these theories share one characteristic: the subject of the analysis is one-dimensional—the persecution or murder—and the explanation is placed linearly in German and/or European history. The Jews are thus perceived as an object, as 'raw material,' and of minor importance in any explanation of the 'event' as such.¹⁸

The problem is not the existence of Jewish sources or even of historical questions concerning the Jews. Thousands of Jews, for example, kept diaries during the war, and hundreds of these survive throughout the world in either published or unpublished form.¹⁹ It is also true, as recent scholarship has shown, that the notion of postwar Jewish silence borne of trauma is a myth.²⁰ Philip Friedman, a Jewish historian born in Lviv, virtually established the field of Holocaust Studies as a Jewish endeavor beginning as early as 1944. First in Poland, then in Western Europe, and ultimately in New York, he established guidelines for collecting testimonies and documents, launched bibliographical projects, and wrote historical accounts of his own, all of which expressed an interest, not only in Nazi persecution, but the reactions of Jewish communities in Europe and the U.S., as well as the behavior of local gentile populations.²¹

Nor was Friedman alone. Laura Jokusch has recently shown that up to two thousand Jewish survivors in no fewer than fourteen countries undertook grassroots documentation efforts immediately after the war that collected everything from documents to diaries to letters to photographs, as well as thousands of written survivor testimonies and questionnaires. "Most notably," Jokusch says, "they pioneered the development of victim-focused Holocaust historiography."²² *Landsmannschaftn* from destroyed shtetls, meanwhile, sponsored hundreds of Yizkor (memorial) books commemorating their lost communities in the decades following the war.²³ Thousands of additional recorded testimonies were eventually collected at Yad Vashem and, starting in the 1990s, at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, the Fortunoff Archive at Yale University, the Shoah Visual History Foundation in California, and in a number of other smaller repositories. Historians Donald Bloxham and Tony Kushner estimated in 2005 that there were roughly one hundred thousand victim testimonies of different types.²⁴ The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum has even begun to publish translated Jewish sources in the form of a comprehensive *Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos* and an important series of documentary volumes titled *Jewish Reactions to the Holocaust*.²⁵

What to make of it all? Can it create a coherent history of the Jews during the Holocaust? Partly, the problem lies, as Michman says, in the questions most historians have asked. Another concerns the disparate and multilingual nature of the Jews themselves. Nazi ideology notwithstanding, there was no central Jewish directorate. Save for charity agencies such as the American Jewish Joint Jewish Distribution Committee, whose transatlantic reach could hardly alter the course of the killing, Jewish responses could only be local in nature.²⁶ Another problem still lies in difficulties concerning the assessment of Jewish sources. Raul Hilberg, whose *Destruction of the European Jews* (1961) provided the first comprehensive examination of the bureaucratic destruction apparatus, found Jewish sources problematic. They were, he argued, subjective in a way that official records were not.²⁷ German historian Martin Broszat was similarly skeptical. In 1963 he attacked a book on the destruction of the Warsaw Ghetto written by Joseph Wulf, who survived the ghetto and then Auschwitz. Wulf used the ghetto archive of Emanuel Ringelblum as well as postwar testimony to incriminate Wilhelm Hagen, a German health official in Warsaw in 1942, who later became president of the Federal Republic's Health Office. Wulf, said Broszat, employed "incoherent documentation," and was more emotional than objective in his assumption that Hagen willingly contributed to the extermination machine.²⁸ As late as 1987, Broszat made the same methodological arguments in an exchange with historian Saul Freidländer, characterizing German holocaust historiography as objective and scientific, while Jewish accounts were, from a scientific point of view, overly clouded by "memory" and "sorrow."²⁹

Whatever problems existed in their assumptions, Hilberg and Broszat referred primarily to the contextualization of Jewish sources when describing the perpetrators, their motivation, and their place, active or passive, within the killing apparatus. Jewish historians besides Wulf, most notably Philip Friedman, indeed added perspectives on such questions in the years after the war. But Jewish historians also wrote on many other questions in the immediate postwar period, often more focused on Jewish history, ranging from family histories, to ghetto life in Warsaw, to partisan resistance, to Jews living under disabilities imposed by Vichy in Algeria.³⁰ Historians at YIVO, along with Israeli historians in the 1960s and 70s, performed more extensive monographic studies on the Holocaust that examined specific—and burning—questions concerning Jewish ghetto administration, Jewish society in major ghettos, the difficulties and formation of resistance movements among Zionist youth groups, and the reactions of Jews in the United States. These studies include German documentary sources and trial records, but also Jewish diaries and postwar memoirs as well as contemporaneous Jewish records when available.³¹

Yet there was, and there remains, a strange disconnect between Jewish perspectives and the aforementioned historiographical trends in North America and Europe. Michman refers to an "Israeli School" of Holocaust research,

which not only examines Jewish reactions during the Holocaust years, but also identifies antisemitism as the driving force behind Nazi persecution and mass murder. By and large, Israeli historians are skeptical concerning functionalist arguments concerning bureaucratic determinants of genocide and regarding more recent arguments about local determinants as causative factors in mass murder.³² Thus both Yehuda Bauer and Yitzhak Arad have recently measured local explanations for the Holocaust in the Soviet Union that emerged in Germany in the 1990s arguing that they unduly downplay the Nazis' worldview, which emanated from Berlin.³³ Arad's recent book, *The Holocaust in the Soviet Union* (2009), is a comprehensive history that uses German, Soviet, and Jewish sources to examine the interaction of German killing together with Jewish and Soviet responses. But Arad has no doubt that German extermination policies rested on ideological foundations, irrespective of the timing of different killing operations.

The gap between approaches is bridged in part by Saul Friedländer's masterful two-volume history *Nazi Germany and the Jews* (1997–2007), which calls for, and indeed shows, what might be accomplished through an approach that integrates the history of the Germans and the history of the Jews in the fateful years.³⁴ The time Friedländer spends on the Nazis, their ideas, planning, and mentalities, provides far more than a simple prelude to destruction. Friedländer gives us the concept of a "redemptive antisemitism" within the Nazi leadership along with an institutional, and yet personal, documentary sense of how ordinary Germans reacted to it, from the bureaucrats who obsessed over the proper interpretation of the Nuremberg Laws to the ordinary housewives who, during Kristallnacht, reveled in the despair of their once-fellow citizens. But Friedländer also, primarily through the use of Jewish wartime diaries, represents the Jews as something other than objects, and he does so throughout the European continent, particularly in his second volume, which covers the war years. As Mark Roseman puts it, Friedländer moves the Jews to center stage, whether in Berlin, Amsterdam, Paris, Warsaw, or Vilna. In so doing he paints the perpetrators through the terrified eyes of the victims. But he also demonstrates the critical inability of Jews to suspend their disbelief, thus adding to the explanation of the catastrophe, while providing an intimate look into the ways in which Jewish communities and individuals across the continent tried to function.³⁵

The memories of survivors have received a more positive assessment in recent years in terms of their reliability and in terms of the variety of aspects on which they shed light. Though they must be read with care, particularly if recorded decades after the fact, they are all we have to reconstruct many types of events for which there are no other sources, and as Doris Bergen has pointed out, they remain by and large unintegrated.³⁶ A deeper problem, however, is what David Engel has called an academic sequestration of the broader sweep of modern Jewish history from the years 1933 to 1945. Unlike historians of

Germany, who have struggled to place the Nazi period within the context of German history as a whole, historians of modern Jewry have viewed the Holocaust as an external rupture in their field of study. A reading backward of Jewish history from the Holocaust, so the argument goes, distorts rather illuminates the history of Jewish emancipation, acculturation, and economic development, to say nothing of Jewish politics from socialism to Zionism. Thus, says Engel, the Holocaust has never been integrated into the history of the Jews as it has been integrated into European history. Greater crossover, he says, would offer richer accounts of variant Jewish responses to mass murder, which ranged from the misreading of German intentions, to the acceleration of political and cultural fissures within Jewish communities, to various forms of spiritual, covert, and open resistance.³⁷

There are exceptions to this trend, of course. Postwar Zionist readings of modern Jewish history typically questioned the validity of emancipation, while seeing the Holocaust, or something like it, on the horizon.³⁸ But other work manages to avoid the teleology. Marion Kaplan's scholarship, for instance, shows that the responses of German Jews to the Nazi onslaught, particularly within the family unit, had their roots in the successful Jewish acculturation of the imperial period.³⁹ Yehuda Bauer's *The Death of the Shtetl* looks at the destruction of Jewish life in the Soviet-Polish borderlands from a pre-1941 perspective, explaining that Polish and Soviet rule eroded Jewish existence before the Nazis' arrival, and that to one extent or another, these trends conditioned local responses to the German campaigns of murder.⁴⁰ Antony Polonsky's sweeping three-volume history of the Jews of Russia and Poland from 1350 through the end of the Cold War follows a similar trend, integrating further the ways in which Jewish responses to the Holocaust in Poland and the USSR were rooted in historical and political developments in the decades before the war.⁴¹ But generally speaking, there remains much to think about with regard to the challenges of integrating the disparate strands of European history, Jewish history, and the history of the Holocaust, while also considering the variety of Jewish sources either not touched or not fully exploited.

The essays that follow certainly do so. Dan Michman, in an interpretive historiographical essay that seeks to understand current writing on the Holocaust, challenges recent trends in global scholarship that try to redefine and ultimately "tame" the event. It is insufficient, Michman argues, to place the Holocaust within the current rubrics of Genocide Studies, postcolonial paradigms of imperialism, or even more localized or regional studies of Eastern Europe's "Bloodlands." At its core, he argues, the Holocaust remains as Jewish as it was unprecedented, spanning the European continent and beyond, aiming at Jews in places where the Germans intended to settle, and in places, such as the Netherlands, where they had no interest in doing so. The nature of German antisemitism—which declared war against an imagined Jewish ethos as well as

the Jews themselves—was not defined by region or imagined German settlement patterns, but by the existence of Jews themselves. Timothy Snyder, who coined the term “Bloodlands” to denote the contested region between Hitler and Stalin, and who has argued that the heart of the Holocaust lay in this place, remains somewhat skeptical. Fourteen million persons died in this region, most of them not Jewish, under the overlapping power of Stalin and Hitler. The masses of bodies cannot be explained by German antisemitism (or by German sources) alone, nor can they be adequately explained through a microhistorical approach, now fashionable in Germany, that examines local German policies to the exclusion of a broader, interethnic, and interpolitical regional history that predated the arrival in 1941 of German killing squads. Such a regional approach would of course enrich our understanding of the violence as a whole, but it would also enhance how we write the Holocaust in Eastern Europe, since Jews throughout the Bloodlands experienced Stalin before they experienced Hitler and his local collaborators in Lithuania, East Galicia, and elsewhere. As politically aware actors in their own right, their response to the policies of the former helped to condition their understanding and their response to the latter. They did not have the luxury, enjoyed by scholars, of sequestering regimes by nationality on the one hand and political ideology on the other.

Their disagreements aside, Michman and Snyder both pose challenges for future research. On the one hand the comprehensive uniqueness of Germany’s war against the Jews cannot be minimized, lest it be misunderstood. On the other hand, it is the study of the Holocaust by locality within broader regions that provides us with a fuller mosaic of its smaller and larger pieces that make the whole richer, if not more easily researched and understood. In the meantime, we must find and then explain Jewish narratives not only within the unprecedented nature of German policies, but within the chronological context of Jewish politics, the Jewish understanding of interethnic relationships in Eastern Europe and beyond, and even perhaps Jewish lore. Here stands a steep challenge concerning sources as well as methodological approach, since we often confront sources that are fragmentary, isolated, or otherwise mutilated, themselves part of the destruction wrought by the war.

Yet the challenges can provide very rich rewards. Omer Bartov’s essay takes a tightly local approach with the town of Buczacz that is also fully integrated in terms of interethnic relations and broad in terms of chronological scope. We must, Bartov insists, understand the long-term collective ethnographic and political biography on the local level, as we also recover lost history by critically using all available sources, even those that were viewed skeptically in years past, including postwar survivor testimonies and the rich yet vastly underused Jewish memorial books from Buczacz and elsewhere. In Buczacz, we can see not only the local dynamics of the Holocaust and its tangled prehistory. We also understand the insufficiency of “modernist” explanations that emphasize

the dehumanization of the victims, for here they were killed face to face, as well as the somewhat facile explanations of genocide that accompanied the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, namely, that ethnic rivalries alone provide a disaster in waiting. Samuel Kassow's essay on Emanuel Ringelblum's almost miraculous Oyneg Shabbes archive in the Warsaw Ghetto argues something similar especially insofar as Ringelblum, as an historian of Poland's Jews, existed within a larger geographic, interethnic, and Jewish political milieu. Thus, aside from offering an invaluable source for the massive lost civilization of Warsaw's Jews, Ringelblum's archive cannot be understood properly without a sense of Ringelblum's prewar politics, based as they were on socialism, Zionism, and activism, an optimism for the future of Polish-Jewish relations, and a love and fascination with the ordinary within Jewish secular culture. Sara Bender's essay reminds us of the enduring value of comparative history. By juxtaposing the Białystok and Kielce ghettos, Bender demonstrates the importance of local political dynamics within Jewish communities themselves, and the importance of local Jewish leadership, which varied from ghetto to ghetto. Worlds of difference spanned the experiences of Herman Levy, the wholly ineffective chairman of the Kielce Judenrat, and Ephraim Barash, the more effective chairman of that in Białystok. The dynamics of the Jewish police also varied greatly in terms of corruption and origins. But, as Bender shows, the geography of the ghettos in terms of Jewish assets and the possibility of work mattered as well, helping to condition the responses of Jewish leaders. Stephen Bowman, in examining the Sonderkommando revolt in Auschwitz-Birkenau, argues that the Greek Jews leading the failed revolt perhaps did so under the shadow of Flavius Josephus himself, or at least medieval readings of Josephus, as well as nineteenth-century Greek lore, internalized by Greece's Jews, that emphasized a fight to the death. Bowman suggests that the Greek Jewish Birkenau revolt might one day, at least in a literary sense, take its place amid the Jewish canon of the Holocaust. Yet a broader and deeper Jewish historical narrative exists in Western Europe as well as in Eastern Europe. Bob Moore thus shows that Jewish self-help and escape networks in Western Europe, which must be integrated into the history of Jewish responses more broadly, absolutely hinged on contacts, connections, and relationships that existed before the war, even children's prewar summer camps. Thus in Belgium, as in the Bloodlands, the prewar history of Jews and their relationships with their neighbors must be understood if we are to grasp the Jewish experience of the Holocaust as a whole.

Other essays within this volume discuss the value of different Jewish sources more directly. Some concern contemporaneous sources and the kinds of perspectives that they provide. Alexandra Garbarini's assessment of Holocaust diaries as sources separates them methodologically from postwar Jewish testimonies. In the first place, they include in many cases the voices of those who did not survive the Holocaust itself. Perhaps more importantly, they pro-

vide a unique window into what Jews in different regions, at least on an individual level, understood concerning the new parameters of their lives, and the place of the Jews in Hitler's Europe more generally, as well as their reading of German intentions, which remained in many cases opaque at least until 1943. Similarly, Renée Poznanski provides a deep reading of Jewish Communist writing in wartime France from a new, post-Cold War perspective. She grapples with problems of Jewish ethnic and political identity in the Communist resistance, arguing that within the intellectual straightjackets imposed by Communist orthodoxy, Jewish Communists like Joë Nordmann struggled to find the space to understand and narrate the unique place of the Jews in the thinking of the German and Vichy French authorities. Thus can the underground, more so than in past years, be defined as a conscious-yet-difficult Jewish, as well as leftist, narrative.

Other essays remind us of the value of postwar Jewish testimony, and what it can add to the known as well as the unknown. Gordon Horwitz's reassessment of Mordechai Chaim Rumkowski, the elder of the Łódź Ghetto, is based partly on relatively new postwar sources and assessments, which place Rumkowski's decisions more firmly within the context of German brutality. In reexamining Rumkowski, often viewed as the least admirable of Jewish leaders during the war, Horwitz reminds us of that which we still do not know about the man, but also of the problem that Rumkowski shared with most Jews—the fundamental inability to suspend his own disbelief. Daniel Blatman's account of the death marches in 1945 show the true value of postwar testimony, without which we would know little to nothing of these episodes, which together comprise the final phase of the Holocaust itself. But beyond this, Blatman discusses what evacuated Jews themselves understood, namely, that the marches meant an end to the terrible, but at least knowable, routines of Auschwitz, thus strangely and horribly augmenting the precariousness of survival. Sara Horowitz similarly provides a close and fascinating reading of postwar testimonies. In confronting what she labels “deferred memory,” she discusses the most horrific and perhaps most repressed of recollections—the stifling and killing of infants in order to preserve the lives of Jews in hiding. Horowitz, in discussing the displacement of memory, also points to the ways in which it is, surely in this case, gendered, dealing as it does with eternal issues of maternity and paternity.

And finally, the essays in this volume concern the problematic nature of Jewish Holocaust memory in politics as well as in culture. Tuvia Friling's essay on Eliezer Gruenbaum confronts the controversial life and death of a Jewish-Communist-turned-Auschwitz-Kapo, whose father, Yitzhak Gruenbaum, was a leading Zionist and Israeli minister. The 1948 killing of Eliezer during Israel's War of Independence, probably by Israeli forces, was based on the assumptions of early survivor memory in Israel whereby the grey zones, later discussed by Primo Levi, simply did not exist.⁴² The effort of the father to rehabilitate the

son, even posthumously, revealed the fissures in Jewish society that reached back to the prewar period. Arieh Kochavi revisits the issue of Jewish pressure groups in the United States and Great Britain during and after the war, placing their pleas for rescue within the context of those of other pressures regarding everything from Allied POWs to Czech and Polish civilians to other displaced persons after the war. Finally, Michael Meng examines the ambivalent yet emotive power of film and text in postwar Germany and Poland, which represented Central Europe as a graveyard, but also as something living, containing everything from Polish scavengers searching for bits of gold in Birkenau in 1945 to overly emotive German manifestations of regret in our own years.

It is hoped that these essays will be useful to anyone interested in Jewish narratives during the Holocaust period, not only in terms of what happened to Jews, but with regard to the way Jewish sources might be read, analyzed, and integrated. I thank the contributors for their fine papers and for their patience and help during the editing process. I also thank Richard Breitman, Christopher Browning, Manuela Consonni, Olga Gershenson, David Engel, Nathan Stoltzfus, and Gerhard L. Weinberg for their thoughtful contributions and comments. Jack Kugelmass, the Director of the Center for Jewish Studies at the University of Florida was instrumental in bringing this work to fruition and had provided steady and friendly guidance to scholarship and programming at the University of Florida's Center for Jewish Studies. For their support of Jewish and Holocaust Studies at the University of Florida, I thank David and Nan Rich as well as Gary and Niety Gierzon. For their generous support for Holocaust Studies at the University of Florida and of the discussions that made this volume possible, I reserve special thanks for Norman and Irma Braman. And lastly, for their love, patience, and unending support, I thank my wife Gwyneth and my sons Grant and Lucas.

Gainesville, Florida, 2014

Notes

1. A sample includes Michael R. Marrus, *The Holocaust in History* (Hanover, NH, 1987); Dan Michman, *Holocaust Historiography: A Jewish Perspective—Conceptualizations, Terminology, Approaches and Fundamental Issues* (London, 2003); Dan Stone, *Constructing the Holocaust: A Study in Historiography* (London, 2003); David Bankier and Dan Michman, eds., *Holocaust Historiography in Context: Emergence, Challenges, Polemics, and Achievements* (Jerusalem, 2008); Tom Lawson, *Debates on the Holocaust* (Manchester, 2010); Dan Stone, *Histories of the Holocaust* (New York, 2010); Dan Stone, ed., *The Holocaust and Historical Methodology* (New York, 2012); Boaz Cohen, *Israeli Holocaust Research: Birth and Evolution*, trans. Agnes Vazsonyi (New York, 2012).

2. International Military Tribunal, *Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945—1 October 1946* (Nuremberg, 1947–49), vol. 8, 306.

3. Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*, trans. Jared Stark (Ithaca, 2006), 31–32.

4. Sutzkever's testimony almost surely did not turn out the way he had hoped, and his testimony in Russian might have been at the insistence of the prosecutors. See Christian Delage, "The Place of the Filmed Witness: From Nuremberg to the Khmer Rouge Trial," *Cardozo Law Review* 31, no. 4 (2009): 1087–12.

5. Karel C. Berkhoff, "Dina Pronicheva's Story of Surviving the Babi Yar Massacre: German, Jewish, Soviet, and Ukrainian Records," in *The Shoah in Ukraine: History, Testimony, Memorialization*, ed. Ray Brandon and Wendy Lower (Bloomington, IN, 2008), 291–317; Hilary Earl, *The Nuremberg SS-Einsatzgruppen Trial, 1945-1958: Atrocity Law and History* (New York, 2009).

6. Even when the Allies became interested in Jewish statements, it was for geopolitical reasons. In 1946, the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine interviewed Jews in Poland, Germany, France, Italy, and elsewhere to gauge the degree to which Palestine truly represented their only hope. U.S. counterintelligence agents also interviewed Jewish survivors in an effort to determine the degree to which Soviet agents had penetrated Jewish groups moving west from Poland and Romania. The counterintelligence aspect is an unexplored subject. On the Anglo-American Committee, see Amikam Nachmani, *Great Power Discord in Palestine: The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry into the Problems of European Jewry and Palestine, 1945-1946* (London, 1987).

7. Vladimir Prusin, "'Fascist Criminals to the Gallows!': The Holocaust and Soviet War Crimes Trials, December 1945-February 1946," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 17, no. 1 (2003): 1–30. See also Ilya Altman, "The History and Fate of the Black Book and the Unknown Black Book," in *The Unknown Black Book: The Holocaust in the German-Occupied Soviet Territories*, ed. Joshua Rubenstein and Ilya Altman (Bloomington, IN, 2008), xix–xl.

8. Analyses of the literature include Jan Philipp Reemtsma, *Charisma und Terror: Gedanken zum Verhältnis intentionalistischer und funktionalistischer Deutungen der nationalsozialistischen Vernichtungspolitik* (Frankfurt, 1994); Stone, *Histories of the Holocaust*, 64–112. Representative works include Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution* (Berkeley, CA, 1984); Richard Breitman, *The Architect of Genocide: Himmler and the Final Solution* (New York, 1991); Philippe Burrin, *Hitler and the Jews: The Genesis of the Holocaust* (New York, 1994); Götz Aly, "Final Solution": *Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the Jews*, trans. Belinda Cooper and Allison Brown (New York, 1999); Christian Gerlach, *Kalkulierte Morde: Die deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Weißrußland 1941 bis 1944* (Hamburg, 2000); Christopher R. Browning with Jürgen Matthäus, *The Origins of the Final Solution: The Evolution of Nazi Jewish Policy, September 1939-March 1942* (Lincoln, NE, 2004); Christoph Dieckmann, *Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in Litauen 1941-1944* (Göttingen, 2011). A synthesis of the recent German thinking is Peter Longerich, *Holocaust: The Nazi Persecution and Murder of the Jews*, trans. Shaun Whiteside (New York, 2010), which, despite its title, says very little from Jewish perspectives.

9. Kogon quoted in Nicolas Berg, *Der Holocaust und die westdeutschen Historiker: Erforschung und Erinnerung* (Göttingen, 2003), 570.

10. Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (New York, 1963).

11. Christopher R. Browning, *Ordinary Men Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York, 1992); Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York, 1996); Geoff Eley, ed., *The Goldhagen Effect: History, Memory, Nazism—Facing the German Past* (Ann Arbor, 2000); Leonard S. Newman and Ralph Erber, eds., *Understanding Genocide: The Social Psychology of the Holocaust* (New York, 2010). Owing to the Hamburg Institute of Social Research's *Wehrmachtsausstellung* of 1995, new work was also done on genocidal mindset in the German army. See Hannes Heer and Klaus Naumann, eds., *Vernichtungskrieg: Verbrechen der Wehrmacht* (Hamburg, 1995).

12. On the revision of the view of desk killers, see Bernard J. Bergen, *The Banality of Evil: Hannah Arendt and the Final Solution* (Lanham, MD, 1998); David Cesarani, *Becoming Eichmann: Rethinking the Life, Crimes and Trial of a "Desk Murderer"* (Cambridge, MA, 2006); Bettina Stangneth, *Eichmann vor Jerusalem: Das unbehelligte Leben eines Massenmörders* (Munich, 2011), and more generally Michael Wildt, *Generation des Unbedingten: Das Führungskorps des Reichssicherheitshauptamtes*

(Hamburg, 2002); Michael Thad Allen, *The Business of Genocide: The SS, Slave Labor, and the Concentration Camps* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2002); Catherine Epstein, *Model Nazi: Arthur Greiser and the Occupation of Western Poland* (New York, 2010).

13. For example, A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone, eds., *Colonialism and Genocide* (London, 2007); Olaf Jensen and Claus-Christian Szejnmann, eds., *Ordinary People as Mass Murderers: Perpetrators in Comparative Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2008).

14. For example Peter Longerich, “*Davon haben wir nichts gewusst!*”: *Die Deutschen und die Judenverfolgung 1933-1945* (Munich, 2007); Frank Bajohr and Dieter Pohl, *Massenmord und schlechtes Gewissen: Die deutsche Bevölkerung, die NS-Führung und der Holocaust* (Frankfurt, 2008); Peter Fritzsche, *Life and Death in the Third Reich* (Cambridge, MA, 2009).

15. Helmut Walser Smith, *The Continuities of German History: Nation, Religion and Race Across the Long Nineteenth Century* (New York, 2008); Alon Confino, *Foundational Pasts: The Holocaust as Historical Understanding* (New York, 2011).

16. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, new ed., (Ithaca, NY, 2000). See arguments in Stone, *Histories of the Holocaust*, 113–59. See also critique in Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT, 2002), 68–96.

17. See arguments in Stone, *Histories of the Holocaust*, 203–44; see also Donald Bloxham, *The Final Solution: A Genocide* (New York, 2009), and the Review Forum by Jürgen Matthäus, Martin Shaw, Omer Bartov, Doris Bergen, and Donald Bloxham in *Journal of Genocide Research* 13, no. 1–2 (2011): 107–52.

18. Michman, *Holocaust Historiography*, 59.

19. Alexandra Garbarini, *Numbered Days: Diaries and the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT, 2006); Alexandra Zapruder, ed., *Salvaged Pages: Young Writers' Diaries of the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT, 2004).

20. See especially the essays in David Cesarani and Eric J. Sundquist, eds., *After the Holocaust: Challenging the Myth of Silence* (London, 2012).

21. Roni Stauber, “Philip Friedman and the Beginning of Holocaust Studies,” in Bankier and Michman, *Holocaust Historiography in Context*, 83–102.

22. Laura Jokusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe* (New York, 2012), 9.

23. Sampled in Jack Kugelmass and Jonathan Boyarin, eds., *From a Ruined Garden: The Memorial Books of Polish Jewry*, 2nd ed. (Bloomington, IN, 1998).

24. Donald Bloxham and Tony Kushner, *The Holocaust: Critical Historical Approaches* (Manchester, 2005), 16.

25. Geoffrey Megargee, gen. ed., *The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 1933–1945*, 7 vols., (Bloomington, IN, 2009–); also see the museum’s *Jewish Responses to Persecution*, 5 vols. (Lanham, MD, 2010–).

26. Standard studies are by Yehuda Bauer, *My Brother’s Keeper: A History of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee 1929-1939* (Philadelphia, 1974); *American Jewry and the Holocaust: The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1939–1945* (Detroit, 1981).

27. Raul Hilberg, *Sources of the Holocaust: An Analysis* (Chicago, 2001), 47.

28. Berg, *Der Holocaust und die westdeutschen Historiker*, 594–99. Broszat referred to Joseph Wulf, *Das Dritte Reich und seine Völkerecker: Die Liquidation der 500,000 Juden im Ghetto Warschau* (West Berlin, 1961).

29. Berg, *Der Holocaust und die westdeutschen Historiker*, 614.

30. Early Bibliography in Jokusch, *Collect and Record*, 283–85.

31. Representative works include Isaiah Trunk, *Lodzsher geto: a historishe un sotsyologishe shtudiye* (New York, 1962); Trunk, *Judenrat: The Jewish Councils in Eastern Europe under Nazi Occupation* (New York, 1962); Yitzhak Arad, *Ghetto in Flames: The Struggle and Destruction of the Jews in Vilna in the Holocaust* (Jerusalem, 1981); Yisrael Gutman, *The Jews of Warsaw, 1939–1943: Ghetto, Underground, Revolt*, trans. Ina Friedman (Bloomington, IN, 1982). The Yad Vashem International Historical Conferences were also key in the assessment of Jewish historiographical progress. See

for example Yisrael Gutman and Cynthia J. Haft, eds., *Patterns of Jewish Leadership in Nazi Europe, 1933-1945: Proceedings of the Third Yad Vashem International Historical Conference, Jerusalem, April 4-7, 1977* (Jerusalem, 1979).

32. Dan Michman, "Is There an 'Israeli School' of Holocaust Research?," in Bankier and Michman, *Holocaust Historiography in Context*, 37–65. Michman himself is an exception to this trend. See most recently his *The Emergence of Jewish Ghettos During the Holocaust* (New York, 2011), which questions the degree to which ghettos were a preconceived prelude to destruction.

33. Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust*, 86–92; Yitzhak Arad, *The Holocaust in the Soviet Union* (Lincoln, NE, 2009), 131–32.

34. Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews: The Years of Persecution, 1933-1939* (New York, 1997); idem., *Nazi Germany and the Jews: The Years of Extermination, 1939-1945* (New York, 2007). A helpful essay defining an "integrated" history of the Holocaust is Saul Friedländer, "An Integrated History of the Holocaust: Some Methodological Challenges," in Stone, *The Holocaust and Historical Methodology*, 181–89.

35. Mark Roseman, "Holocaust Perpetrators in the Victims' Eyes," in *Years of Persecution, Years of Extermination: Saul Friedländer and the Future of Holocaust Studies*, ed. Christian Wiese and Paul Betts (New York, 2010), 81–100.

36. Doris L. Bergen, "No End in Sight? The Ongoing Challenge of Producing and Integrated History of the Holocaust," in Wiese and Betts, *Years of Persecution, Years of Extermination*, 289–309. An early positive assessment on spoken testimony is Lawrence Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory* (New Haven, CT, 1991). More recent assessments include Henry Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors: Beyond Testimony*, 2nd ed., (St. Paul, MN, 2010); Thomas Trezise, *Witnessing Witnessing: On the Reception of Holocaust Survivor Testimony* (New York, 2013); and on various memory sources, Christopher R. Browning, *Collected Memories: Holocaust History and Postwar Testimony* (Madison, WI, 2003); Zoë Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust: Identity, Testimony, Representation* (New York, 2006), and and the essays in Jürgen Matthäus, ed., *Approaching an Auschwitz Survivor: Holocaust Testimony and its Transformations* (New York, 2009); Nancy R. Goodman and Marilyn B. Meyers, eds., *The Power of Witnessing: Reflections, Reverberations, and Traces of the Holocaust* (New York, 2012). An example of practical application is in Christopher R. Browning, *Remembering Survival: Inside a Nazi Slave Labor Camp* (New York, 2010).

37. David Engel, *Historians of the Jews and the Holocaust* (Stanford, CA, 2010). See also the review forum of Engel by Alexandra Garbarini, "Reflections on the Holocaust in Jewish History," David Cesarani, "On the 'War' Between Holocaust Historians and Jewish Historians," and Richard I. Cohen, "Writing Jewish History After the Holocaust," in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 102, no. 1 (2012): 89–111.

38. For example David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789-1939* (New York, 1999).

39. Marion A. Kaplan, *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family and Identity in Imperial Germany* (New York, 1991); idem., *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (New York, 2009).

40. Yehuda Bauer, *The Death of the Shtetl* (New Haven, CT, 2011).

41. Antony Polonsky, *The Jews in Poland and Russia*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 2010–12).

42. Primo Levi, *The Drowned and the Saved* (New York, 1988), 36–69; also Jonathan Petropoulos and John Roth, eds., *Gray Zones: Ambiguity and Compromise in the Holocaust and Its Aftermath* (New York, 2005).