

MPC MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER

**Whose Memory is it Anyway?**  
**An Exploration of Forgotten Voices of the Holocaust**

Jessica Pollock

Dr. John Shiga

The Major Research Paper is submitted  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Professional Communication

Ryerson University  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

August 6, 2015

## **AUTHOR'S DECLARATION FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF A MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER**

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this Major Research Paper and the accompanying Research Poster. This is a true copy of the MRP and the research poster, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this major research paper and/or poster to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this MRP and/or poster by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I understand that my MRP and/or my MRP research poster may be made electronically available to the public.

## **Abstract**

During the Holocaust, Hitler and his Nazi Party were responsible for the systematic annihilation of millions of Jews, as well as the callous slaughter of additional minority groups such as Roma, Sinti, homosexuals, the physically handicapped, mentally ill and Jehovah's Witnesses. Nevertheless, in Western consciousness, the Holocaust has essentially become synonymous with Jewish history and destruction. As a result, the non-Jewish victim experience has been effectively diminished in popular culture. This MRP draws on literature in cultural memory studies and survivor testimonies available on YouTube to analyze the power struggle between non-Jewish minority groups that were persecuted in the Holocaust and their Jewish counterparts to understand why the former appears excluded from mainstream Holocaust narratives. The goal: to emphasize that the Holocaust was not merely a Jewish tragedy, but a profound calamity for humankind.

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to my supervisor, Dr. John Shiga, for his unwavering support and enthusiasm during my research and throughout the Master of Professional Communication program. I believe it is rare to find a mentor who is as dedicated and insightful as him. I would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Tiessen for his diligence and valuable contributions as a second reader.

To my grandparents: my inspiration to pursue an MRP on this subject matter. Each of them has truly defined what it means to be a survivor. Despite the horrors they went through when they were my age and younger, they instilled in me the expectation never to lose faith in humanity. This MRP bears witness to the Holocaust in honour of my grandparents and in memory of their loved ones, most of whom were taken from them far too soon.

## **Epigraph**

I swore never to be silent whenever and wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation. We must take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victims.  
Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented.

Elie Wiesel | Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech | December 10, 1986

## Table of Contents

Author's Declaration .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Epigraph .....	v
Introduction .....	1
Literature Review .....	3
Research Questions.....	17
Methodology.....	18
Limitations .....	27
Findings .....	29
Discussion .....	46
Conclusion .....	58
References .....	61
Appendix .....	70

## **Introduction**

The Holocaust was arguably one of the most odious genocides whereby European minorities were systematically dehumanized and persecuted. Once Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany in 1933, Jews especially fell victim to his antisemitic policies and racial ideologies until the final days of World War Two. In addition to the systemic annihilation of millions of Jews, Hitler and his Nationalist Socialist German Workers Party (Nazi Party) were responsible for the callous slaughter of additional minority groups such as Roma, Sinti, homosexuals, the physically handicapped, mentally ill and Jehovah's Witnesses (Johnson & Rittner, 1996, p. 124).

As the years have elapsed since the end of the Holocaust, communities and countries around the world recognized their obligation to commemorate the five-year long genocide that had transpired. Monuments and memorials were erected on territory that had been previously occupied by the Nazis in honour of those who suffered as a result of Hitler's dictatorship. Following suit, museums devoted solely to Holocaust education and genocide prevention were erected around the world in countries including but not limited to the United States, Israel, Argentina, Canada and Australia. As such, this global movement of institutionalizing Holocaust remembrance – which continues to the present day – generated a need to define what it meant to be a victim of the Holocaust and those groups that could be identified as such. Since Jewish communities and survivors were the ones to institute many inaugural memorialization

initiatives, the Holocaust has essentially become synonymous with Jewish history and destruction in Western consciousness. Consequently, the non-Jewish victim experience during the Holocaust has been effectively diminished and forgotten in popular culture.

This study seeks to explore this incongruity. Without undermining the significance of the suffering of Jews as the principal Nazi target, this paper utilizes existing literature in collective memory studies and survivor video testimonies to inform the arguments made and conclusions drawn. Accordingly, the focus of this MRP is to illuminate the power struggle between non-Jewish minority groups that were persecuted in the Holocaust and their Jewish counterparts to explore why the former appear excluded from mainstream Holocaust narratives.



## Literature Review

The umbrella term “cultural memory” revolves around the interplay and intersection of three types of memory: collective memory, material memory and individual memory (Erll, 2008, p. 4). Collective memory – the focus of this paper – is best halved into two time periods, namely, the era prior to World War Two and the memory boom of the 1980-1990s, a term coined by Andreas Huyssen. Contemporary use of the phrase “collective memory” can be traced back to Maurice Halbwachs who invented the term in 1925 in his seminal book, *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Memoire* (*Social Frameworks of Memory*). A history of collective memory prior to his scholarship reveals a paucity of research, thus giving rise to Halbwachs can be regarded as the founder of this field of study (Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy, 2011, p. 5). However, his work on collective memory was largely based on theories associated with Henri Bergson and Emile Durkheim. Bergson believed that the act of remembering was fluid and always changing, resulting in memory being a subjective phenomenon (Kern, 2003, p. 43). Durkheim claimed that societies’ ever-evolving nature played a central role in the formation of memory (Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy, 2011, p. 17). Halbwachs’ work addressed Bergson’s ideas through Durkheim’s sociological lens. He theorized that individual remembering could only take place within social contexts, since social beings shape memories with respect to their social identities (Halbwachs, 1992, p. 38). Individuals cannot escape societal influence from naturally and

continuously altering their memory, since memory “has no sense of the passage of time; it denies the pastness of its objects and insists on their continuing presence” (Novick, 2000, p. 4). According to Halbwachs, individuals still retain the agency to choose whether they want to actively remember or forget such memories.

Unfortunately, his untimely death in 1945 in the Buchenwald concentration camp led to a prolonged lull in collective memory scholarship (p. 3). While it is unclear whether this decades-long respite was related directly to Halbwachs’ passing or was merely coincidental, it was not until the 1980s that an influx of academics expressed renewed interest in the field spawning a memory boom.

Huyssen (1995) coined the term “memory boom” to describe the response among scholars and historians to a “waning of history and cultural amnesia” in Europe from the 1980s-1990s (p. 3-5, 9). This term has been continuously utilized by academics to the present day. Winter (2001), for example, succinctly describes the memory boom of the late twentieth century as “a reflection of a complex matrix of suffering, political activity, claims for entitlement, scientific research, philosophical reflection, and art” (p. 65). It is largely believed that the Holocaust was the primary impetus for what can be described as an enlightenment for cultural memory studies and collective memory in particular. During the post-Holocaust era and especially once survivors began to raise their voices to recount heart wrenching testimonies, historians were inspired to explore narratives and themes of memory and trauma. After World War Two, both nations and

individuals had no choice but to face their harrowing collective past filled with wartime grief and pain. Thus, in addition to employing Halbwachs' work as a theoretical foundation, I have organized the remainder of this section according to themes I have identified in the relevant literature. The first paramount area of research informing this MRP is the politics of victimization – including the subthemes resistance to being equal and quantifying victimization. The second major theme is the digitization of memory, also containing subthemes pertaining to YouTube and video testimonies.

### **Politics of Victimization**

Despite the significant scholarly progress in the field of collective memory studies during the 1980s-1990s, the memory boom also induced a culture of complaint and competition among various victim categories and identities (Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy, 2011, p. 33). Michael Rothberg (2009) recognizes that in contemporary societies, individuals are faced with the overwhelming problem of how to conceptualize different groups' histories of victimization (p. 2). While it may appear that academics who study collective memory latently desire all victim groups to be treated equally and justly, it is rare that one set of individuals receives the same attention as another (Kansteiner, 2002, p. 193). The reality is that even in the twenty-first century, just as there exists hierarchies within social milieus, races and sexes, victim groups are also ranked according to a range of socially inflected hierarchal criteria.

## ***Resistance to Being Equal***

With respect to the Holocaust in particular, there has been an ongoing debate amongst scholars pertaining to its historical and definitive uniqueness. The Holocaust itself is frequently “set against global histories of racism, slavery, and colonialism in an ugly contest of comparative victimization” (Rothberg, 2009, p. 7). Many believe that Jews experienced the Holocaust in the worst manner, considering the distinct circumstances Jews faced under Nazi rule and the enormous loss of six million by the end of the war. The late Jewish Holocaust survivor and self-professed Nazi hunter, Simon Wiesenthal, employed an unusually holistic view on Holocaust victimhood. He continually reminded individuals, “while all Jews were victims, the Holocaust transcended the confines of the Jewish community” (Berenbaum, 1990, p. 21). However, his credibility on this subject matter has been repeatedly questioned, since it has been argued that he displayed this perception to appeal to a broader public and thus advance his own pursuit of finding and subsequently prosecuting Nazi war criminals (Walters, 2009, p. 78). Moreover, in 1988, a study revealed that less than four percent of the information displayed at the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, California dealt with non-Jewish victims (p. 22). Thus, these “others” are more often than not “disqualified altogether from recognition,” or only acknowledged on a superficial level, despite prominent figureheads’ purported views (Elias, 1986, p. 32).

The majority of leading scholars and spokespeople in the realm of Holocaust remembrance are fixated on the preservation of a Judeocentric Holocaust narrative. The former director of the US Holocaust Memorial Council, Richard Krieger, even once advised that an argument could be made for treating the Holocaust as a uniquely Jewish event, although reasons for such a statement were never spelled out (Hancock, 1988, p. 45). Gerald Posner and John Ware's critically-acclaimed biography, *Mengele: The complete story* (1986) does not even list Roma or Sinti in its index considering the notorious Nazi doctor's particular obsession with experimenting on Romani twins. Similarly, Yehuda Bauer (1978) wrote that "Nazi policy against gypsies was more apparent than real" and that "not to realize that the Jewish situation was unique is to mystify history" (p. 36). In this case, it appears as though Bauer did not have ill intent but perhaps a lack of knowledge about the Romani experience during the Holocaust. Furthermore, Elie Wiesel (1979), Jewish Holocaust survivor and Boston University Professor Emeritus, has openly expressed his concern at the prospect of de-Judaizing the Holocaust, since "while not all victims were Jews, all Jews were victims destined for annihilation solely because they were born Jewish" (p. iii). The result according to this narrative: any diversion from the central narrative of the Jewish Holocaust can be considered a step toward the "murder of memory" (Linenthal, 2001, p. 196).

While Wiesel's statement is correct, powerful opinions like his that are often in line with other Jewish Holocaust survivors, Jewish community organizations, institutions

and like-minded historians have overpowered marginalized minority groups that lack the organized leadership and spokespeople to rally for adequate remembrance on their behalf. Some would even argue that this imbalance not only subdues non-Jewish victims and survivors, but also delegitimizes their experience during the Holocaust. By doing so, there are unwritten rules that emerge in determining how seriously we treat these minorities in comparison to Jews who underwent similar experiences. As a result, the research compiled for this MRP suggests that there is a significant unintended consequence of the immense efforts to memorialize the Jewish Holocaust experience; that is, there is a tendency in Holocaust literature and other practices of Holocaust remembering to depict Jews both as victims and survivors, while non-Jewish minority groups are reduced solely to victims and are rarely if ever depicted as having advanced beyond their wartime horrors.

### ***Quantifying Victimization***

Some scholars have noticed a tendency whereby people engage in competitive victimhood by quantifying victimization (Condry, 2010, p. 219). That is, victim groups of any kind of traumatic event tend to “maximize the quantification of [their] own suffering but also diminish countervailing or potentially ‘competitive’ numbers pertaining to other victims” (Dower, 1996, p. 79). Though this practice is oftentimes not malicious, it can contribute to the re-victimization of already damaged victim groups. Moreover, rather than bonding over shared hardships, such competition among Holocaust victim

groups produces a binary opposition between one dominant victim group – *Jewish* Holocaust victims – and its subordinate counterpart, namely, every other minority persecuted by the Nazis (Noor, Shnabel, Halabi, & Nadler, 2012, p. 352). The result of this inequality is what Ian Hancock (1988) refers to as “the struggle for history” (p. 46). In questioning the persistence of the attitude toward a solely Jewish Holocaust, he claims that it is “tasteless to engage in a one-upmanship of suffering or in some cases to quote numbers” (p. 46).

For instance, it is commonly reported that death tolls during the Holocaust amounted to eleven million people, an overwhelming six million of whom were Jewish while the remaining five million were made up of numerous minority groups, some of which are listed in the introduction of this paper (DeCoste & Schwartz, 2000, p. 554). While academics waver on the accuracy of the six million figure, further inquiry into the latter statistic reveals a hidden controversy. Stephen Castles estimates that the amount of Romani deaths alone may actually have been as high as 1.5 million, while fellow scholar, Mark Munzel, believes that figure to be closer to 4 million (Hancock, 2013, p. 114). Furthermore, the estimated number of mentally and physically disabled people who fell victim to the Nazi sponsored euthanasia program was upwards of 250,000 (Evans, 2004, p. 67). While these represent only a few of the non-Jewish death tolls, the standalone figures are startling.

It is unacceptable that these numbers remain largely unacknowledged in Holocaust discourse while the approximated number of Jewish deaths is widely known. This discrepancy is likely due to the constant entrenchment of "six million" as an abstract quantification of the Jewish experience in Holocaust literature. Yet, the ramification of this lack of attention and accuracy surrounding non-Jewish death tolls is that these individuals' memory and legacy become skewed. Nonetheless, Bohdan Wytwytzky offers an effective analogy to illustrate the relationship between Holocaust victims. Applying the circles of hell concept featured in Dante's *Inferno* to the Holocaust, Wytwytzky explains that Jews occupy the center of hell, while concentric rings extending outward incorporate other sets of victims. As such, "to comprehend the Jewish center, we must fully probe the ripple effects as well as the indisputable core" (Berenbaum, 1990, pp. 33-34). Wytwytzky's analogy offers individuals a clear visual depiction of Holocaust victimhood as well as one solution for better accounting for the diversity of groups that were persecuted.

### **Digitization of Memory**

It is often argued that digitization better preserves memory, democratizes the manner by which individuals access information and partake in the development of digital memory, while even "breathing new life into older institutions" that need a modern revamp (Kenney & Rieger, 2000, p. 2). Nonetheless, individuals' understanding of memory has been challenged by the rapid advancement of digital media and



technologies (Hoskins, 2009, p. 91). Jose van Dijck describes this new phenomenon when she observes that digitization represents more than just the transfer from analogue to digital; rather, it “encompasses everything from probing the mind to readjust our habitual use of media technologies, and from redefining our notion of memory all the way to substantially revising our concepts of self and society” (van Dijck, 2004, p. 364). Scholars have identified additional drawbacks that require consideration, namely that digitizing memory can raise new ethical concerns around authenticity and integrity. Similarly, because of the abundance of virtual content, digitization necessitates a new variety of curators and technologically informed archivists who are tasked with deciding what materials should be digitized for public consumption as opposed to those that should remain in the analogue sphere. As a result, individuals’ ability to choose whether they want to actively remember or forget memories, according to Halbwachs, can be deeply influenced by the biases of others.

### ***YouTube***

YouTube, arguably the most prominent video-sharing website, has evolved into a realm for an “immediate and intensely visual auditory present past” (Hoskins, 2009, p. 92). The sheer scale of YouTube makes it an important website for the study of digital memory. More than one billion unique users visit YouTube each month, watch 6 billion hours of video on a monthly basis and upload 100 hours of video to the website per minute (YouTube, 2014). Another salient fact demonstrating the influence and

prestige of YouTube on a global scale is that its website is localized in 61 countries and across 61 different languages (YouTube, 2014). As a platform capable of supporting the digitization of memory, YouTube truly does provide “a meaningful public domain for the articulation of otherwise marginalized private vernacular memories” for an international audience (Khiun, 2014, p. 512).

Still, as a platform for those wishing to publicize videoed memories, the digital footage uploaded onto the website gradually becomes less significant than YouTube itself, in terms of governing memory and practices surrounding the act of remembering. Les Roberts expands on this conundrum by adapting Marshall McLuhan’s renowned work in *The Medium is the Message: An Inventory of Effects* to the present day. In the digital age, Roberts (2014) explains that there exists a paradox of archival remembering in that “the more the past is anchored in a virtual domain the less the past is correspondingly lived as an embodied temporal praxis” (p. 274). That is, the platform itself – embedded in a broader set of cultural practices of remembering – is likely to do the remembering on individuals’ behalf. This can create issues with respect to people relying on platforms such as YouTube more than they depend on their own minds to preserve memories. As such, individuals subconsciously entrust the website to be an accurate, comprehensive, fair and objective gatekeeper of knowledge – a responsibility that neither humans nor digital technologies can ever adequately fulfill. Roberts’ work points to the importance of considering the ways in which

dominant historical narratives are challenged and reinforced in the context of digital network memory.

### ***Video Testimonies***

Pierre Nora, leading French historian in collective memory studies during the memory boom, wrote frequently about the democratization of memory. He explains that “memory is blind to all but the groups it binds [while] history... belongs to everyone and to no one, whence its claim to universal authority” (Nora, 1989, p.9). That is, history is – ideally – an objective series of events whereas memory is history’s subjective interpretation. In bygone times, the source of all historical archives originated from the memory of wealthy or famous families, the church and the state (Nora, 1996, p. 9). Presently, Nora claims that the act of reminiscing and recording testimony has become a trend whereby everyone now desires to document their own history and memory. His conviction rings especially true with respect to the Holocaust.

One of the earliest and most common forms of communicating memory is through oral testimony. David Boder, a native Chicagoan, is considered to be the first to have recorded oral testimonies of Holocaust survivors, resulting in his status as a trailblazer in the field of Holocaust studies. In 1946, merely a year after the Holocaust, Boder traveled to displaced person camps and refugee centers within Western Europe to conduct one hundred and thirty interviews amounting to ninety hours worth of testimony (Benmayor, 2012, p. 92). Although a small fraction of his interviews were with

non-Jewish survivors, the bulk were concerned with Jewish experiences, thus presenting a rationale for the disproportionate representation of Holocaust victims in the literature. Following in Boder's footsteps, Jerusalem's Holocaust history museum, Yad Vashem, began producing interviews and recording survivor testimony shortly after its establishment in 1953. However, it was not until 1973 that the first Holocaust video testimonial project emerged in partnership with Yale University (Hartman, 1995, p. 201). Today, American institutions such as the University of Southern California (USC) Shoah Foundation place a substantial emphasis on survivor video testimonials.

Unsurprisingly, these testimonies have long been critiqued for being too contrived. The very presence of an interviewer, cameraperson, archivist, technical support staff and possibly even family members of the survivor lead some to question the authenticity and reliability of those testifying under such circumstances. However, Lawrence Langer (1991) puts this concern into perspective by stating that "nothing is clearer in these narratives than that Holocaust memory is an insomniac faculty, whose mental eyes have never slept. Factual errors do occur... but they seem trivial in comparison to complex layers of memory" that can emerge (p. xv). This MRP has adopted the aforementioned treatment of Holocaust testimonies as human documents, not merely historical ones (p. xv). Though it is understood that one's memory can evolve and change over time, the survivor's stories and experiences utilized for this paper have not been meticulously fact-checked, since it is neither pertinent nor

appropriate to this particular study. Rather, this paper accepts survivors' words as reflecting subjective truths.

Nevertheless, digitizing preexisting video testimonies on accessible websites such as YouTube and filming new ones knowing that they may appear in online spaces changes testimonies' standard framework. These videos featuring a survivor telling his or her story in front of a dull or blurred backdrop rarely showcase any stylistic richness. As such, "the public nature of the archive alters the way in which these stories are told [and] the purpose for telling them" (Wake, 2013, p. 117). For example, now that thousands of video testimonies are available on YouTube, in the interest of raising awareness and facilitating education about the Holocaust, producers need to employ various techniques for capturing users' interest without diluting the video's substance. This leaves producers with the arduous responsibility – or temptation – of generating and preserving only the most meaningful videos, since some individuals may acquire the majority of their Holocaust-related knowledge from clips of testimony they come across online.

### **Gaps in the Literature**

My research has identified two major gaps in the literature. First, there is no shortage of Holocaust literature available on and offline. This is unsurprising, since the Holocaust was a definitive precursor to the birth of the memory boom. However, it is unsettling how little scholarship exists that concentrates on non-Jewish victims'

experiences. Some books and journal articles briefly mention that there were other minorities targeted and persecuted by the Nazis, but few elaborate into any meaningful detail. In comparison to the thousands of publications that revolve around the Jewish victim experience, my research to date has uncovered merely one academic book that is devoted to recounting the comprehensive non-Jewish victim narrative, namely, Michael Berenbaum's (1990) *A mosaic of victims: Non-Jews persecuted and murdered by the Nazis*. There are less than ten other publications of the same genre that are either written specifically about one victimized group – namely, Roma, Sinti or Poles – or are intended for children and preteens. Despite the historical nature of these books, they were all published in the late 1980s to early 1990s, leaving them outdated.

A second omission in the literature is the dearth of research examining Holocaust memory specifically in online spaces – especially on YouTube. With the growing trend of Holocaust museums and related institutions uploading survivor testimonies and other related videos on their YouTube channels, there is a need for further research and analysis concerning the impact of this material. Accordingly, it may seem natural to employ video analysis as a methodology for this paper. However, this MRP will be more focused on the content in testimonial videos as opposed to the style and composition of the videos themselves, since the majority of testimonies follow the generic structure described above. In veering away from video analysis, it was nonetheless fascinating to explore further the information disseminated through

testimonies on YouTube, since they play an integral role in shaping how international audiences remember the Holocaust.

As a result of these gaps and in conjunction with the preceding literature review of collective memory studies – the politics of victimization and digitization of memory in particular – I have set forth three research questions to guide this MRP:

**RQ1.** How are non-Jewish victims portrayed in comparison to Jewish victims of the Holocaust within video testimonies on Yad Vashem's YouTube channel?

**RQ2.** How are non-Jewish victims portrayed in comparison to Jewish victims of the Holocaust within video testimonies on the USC Shoah Foundation's YouTube channel?

**RQ3.** What is the significance of the results of RQ1 and RQ2 with respect to the future of Holocaust remembrance?

## **Methodology**

I have chosen to conduct a case study of two leading institutions in Holocaust memory and testimony recording located in Israel and the United States. It is beneficial to analyze these testimonies using separate research questions in order to best address the specific formats and traits unique to the individual institutions. It is also important to note that despite their primary sponsors, formal leadership and lay leaders, both of the organizations included in this sample do not have explicit religious mandates, nor are they affiliated with any denomination of any faith.

Yad Vashem was established in Jerusalem in 1953 as the “world center for documentation, research, education and commemoration of the Holocaust” (Yad Vashem, 2015a). As an internationally recognized Holocaust memorial site, Yad Vashem has placed value on written and video testimonies of survivors since its inception, now having collected over 36,000 testimonies (Yad Vashem, 2015b). In 2008, the institution launched English and Arabic channels on YouTube in honour of Holocaust Remembrance Day in Israel. In a statement, chairman Avner Shalev noted that these new channels will “make reliable information widely available to anyone who seeks to know more about this terrible chapter in human history” (Yad Vashem launches YouTube channels, 2008). Thus, based on the institution’s stated mandate and Shalev’s statement, Yad Vashem works to memorialize the totality of the



Holocaust, particularly via content that is publicly accessible on YouTube such as testimonies.

The USC Shoah Foundation – created by the famed Hollywood director Steven Spielberg after completing his 1994 film *Schindler's List* – is dedicated to making audiovisual interviews with survivors and witnesses of the Holocaust and other genocides a compelling voice for education and action (USC Shoah Foundation, 2015a). Its visual history archive is the largest digital collection worldwide containing nearly 52,000 eyewitness testimonies. Currently, approximately 1,200 of these videos are posted publicly on its YouTube channel and employed by individuals around the world as both informal and formal educational tools. Based on its continuous expansion on YouTube, it can be surmised that many more testimonies will be available online as time progresses (Bothe, 2013, p. 76).

In her discussion of the various approaches to the study of Holocaust testimonials, Zoe Waxman (2012) argues that it is “necessary to explore the mechanics of testimony – language, motivation, and tradition – as well as its social, political, and historical context” (p. 144). Waxman’s reasoning will be employed when answering the three research questions in that RQ1 and RQ2 will consider the former half of her statement, while RQ3 will focus in on the latter part.

In advance of investigating RQ1 and RQ2, I compiled lists of testimonial videos uploaded onto Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation’s respective YouTube

channels and divided the testimonies into three categories based on length. In order to have a wide sampling, for Yad Vashem's videos I created a list of every testimony between two to six minutes, between six to ten minutes and between ten to thirty minutes. These are the most common ranges, since the majority of testimonies on Yad Vashem's YouTube channel are excerpts from longer interviews. Comparatively, I divided the USC Shoah Foundation's videos into lists of those that are thirty to sixty minutes, ones between sixty and ninety minutes and another group of testimonies that are between ninety and one hundred and twenty minutes. When organizing the categorized lists, I assigned each video an ID number, recorded the title, length, date, amount of views and link of each video. I then employed randomizing software ([www.randomizer.org](http://www.randomizer.org)) to choose the sample from each category since this form of selection was most suitable for answering my research questions.

**Figure 1**  
**Yad Vashem sample**

	<b>Category A1</b> (2-6 minute testimonies)	<b>Category B1</b> (6-10 minute testimonies)	<b>Category C1</b> (10-30 minute testimonies)
<b>Total amount of videos</b>	369	68	27
<b>Amount of videos for random sample</b>	4	3	2

**Figure 2**  
**USC Shoah Foundation sample**

	<b>Category A2</b> (90-120 minute testimonies)	<b>Category B2</b> (60-90 minute testimonies)	<b>Category C2</b> (30-60 minute testimonies)
<b>Total amount of videos</b>	81	31	27
<b>Amount of videos for random sample</b>	3	2	1

The rationale for the sample – fifteen videos in total – was to choose the largest datasets from the largest categories and the smallest datasets from the smallest ones. Consequently, amongst Yad Vashem’s testimonies, A1 was the largest, thus making it the largest sample. Correspondingly, A2 was the most substantial of the USC Shoah Foundation’s categories, thus resulting in it being the largest sample. Moreover, since the total hours of video included from the USC Shoah Foundation’s YouTube channel are far more than Yad Vashem’s, the sample from the latter institution was increased by one in an attempt to keep the study as proportional as possible. This data collection technique reduced bias to a minimum by accommodating a range of different videos with varying lengths. I then streamed and viewed each testimony in the sample in order to carefully transcribe them. After typing the transcriptions, I did not revisit the videos themselves but rather the transcriptions became my main reference point. Studying

fifteen videos proved to be manageable under the project's time frame, while still being able to produce comprehensive results.

A qualitative content analysis was employed to address RQ1 and RQ2. In essence, content analysis can be defined as a "research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specific characteristics within text" (Stone, Dunphy, Smith & Ogilvie, 1996, p. 5). Robert Philip Weber (1990) explains that qualitative content analysis goes beyond merely counting words to examining language intensely for the purpose of classifying large amount of text into an efficient number of categories that represent similar meanings (p. 12). As such, a detailed codebook was developed in preparation for the analysis.

Two pillars of content analysis are reliability and validity. Klaus Krippendorff (1980) explains that three types of reliability pertinent to content analysis are "stability, reproducibility, and accuracy" (p. 130-154). Stability refers to the extent that results are invariable over time, while reproducibility alludes to the necessity that the same results could be produced by more than one coder (Weber, 1990, p. 17). Researchers, however, infrequently use accuracy in assessing reliability (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 131). Moreover, to declare that results from a content analysis are valid is to "assert that the finding does not depend upon or is generalizable beyond the specific data, methods, or measurements of a particular study" (Weber, 1990, p. 18). This MRP sought to

produce a content analysis that is both reliable and valid as per the methodological standard.

The codebook developed for this study includes aspects of both directed and conventional content analysis, since some codes were defined before the analysis and adapted from relevant literature, while others were defined during the analysis through observation (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1286). Thus, as the analysis progressed, five subthemes were developed – identity, representation, agency, relationships and additional narratives revealed in the testimonies. It is worth noting that coding the attention paid toward non-Jewish minorities focused on the groups mentioned in the introduction of this paper, namely, Roma, Sinti, homosexuals, the physically handicapped, mentally ill and Jehovah's Witnesses. These minorities were selected because such individuals identified with the aforesaid groups based on their heritage, sexual orientation, health or religious belief. Accordingly, these individuals were not "targeted because of what they did, [but rather,] because of what they were" (Feig, 1990, p. 162). There existed additional groups that were alienated and mistreated during the Holocaust for these and other reasons, but the minorities studied in this paper were among the most brutalized during the wartime years. Consequently, victims who were persecuted for different reasons such as political affiliation were omitted from the coding scheme for the purposes of this narrow study.

**Figure 3**  
**Codebook**

	Category	Significance	Value
Identity			
1	Minority Affiliation	Construction of survivor's identity based on which minority group he/she belongs to	1 - Jewish
			2 - Roma or Sinti
			3 - Homosexual
			4 - Physically Handicapped
			5 - Mentally Ill
			6 - Jehovah's Witness
			7 - not declared in video
Representation			
2	Any reference to non-Jewish minorities' situation/ experience during the Holocaust	Inclusion of non-Jewish minorities (ones listed above) in a survivor's testimony or lack thereof	1 - yes
			2- no
3	Attitude toward non-Jewish minorities' experience in the Holocaust	Survivor's attitude toward non-Jewish minorities shaping public perspective of their experience (multiple coding possible)	1 - empathetic
			2 - insensitive
			3 - indifferent
			4 - attitude is not evident
4	Narrative about non-Jewish minority	Validity given to narrative based on if survivor tells about first-hand interaction with non-Jewish victim vs. second-hand	1 - tells first-hand story/interaction about non-Jewish minority
			2 - tells second-hand story/interaction about non-Jewish minority
			3 - story/interaction is not present
Agency			
5	Non-Jewish minority depicted as active or passive	Depicting minorities as active or passive can influence how they are remembered (multiple coding possible)	1 - depicts non-Jewish minorities as active
			2 - depicts non-Jewish minorities as passive
			3 - depiction is not present
6	Survivor depicted as active or passive	Depicting oneself as active or passive can display how survivor thinks of him or herself and the minority group he/she identifies with	1 - depicts him or herself as active
			2 - depicts him or herself as passive
			3 - depiction is not present

7	Means of Survival	What a survivor attributes survival to can demonstrate different affordances victim groups had access to (multiple coding possible)	1 - family/friends
			2 - faith/religion
			3 - resistance/deception
			4 - fate
			5 - non-Jewish people's help/Righteous Among the Nations
			6 - means of survival is not mentioned
Relationships			
8	Themes of competitive victimhood between two or more minority groups	Presence of competitive victimhood can create a hierarchy between minorities	1 - themes of competitive victimhood are present
			2 - themes of competitive victimhood are not present
9	Quantifying Victimization	Using numbers and statistics to account for a set of victims can be particularly compelling	1 - Survivor specifies numbers/figures of Jewish people involved
			2 - Survivor specifies numbers/figures of non-Jewish people involved
			3 - quantification is not present
Additional narratives revealed in the testimonies			
10	Word used to describe the period between 1939-1945	Use of "Holocaust" could signify survivor's focus on Jewish experience; use of "war" could signify survivor's focus on the bigger picture	1 - Holocaust
			2 - War or World War Two
			3 - other
			4 - no word to describe the period is mentioned
11	Comments about memory	Rhetoric on the importance of memory and remembrance can be significant if survivor includes non-Jewish minorities in comments or only Jews	1 - comments on importance of remembering Jewish victims/survivors and their stories
			2 - comments on importance of remembering Jewish and non-Jewish victims/survivors and their stories
			3 - comments are not present
12	Remarks about the future	Forward-looking may indicate whether survivor includes only Jews or everyone in hope for a better future	1 - remarks made about a better future for the Jewish people
			2 - remarks made about a better future for humanity in general
			3 - remarks are not present

After deconstructing the survivor testimonies from Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation utilizing the codebook above and content analysis, in RQ3, I will argue that these testimonies work together to foster an imbalanced power struggle between Jewish and non-Jewish victims, resulting in the latter group being defined as permanent victims without being sufficiently represented as survivors according to the mainstream Holocaust narrative. Aspects of historical analysis as well as a review of the limited preexisting literature on the subject matter also augmented my argument in this section to interpret the significance of RQ1 and RQ2's results.



## **Limitations**

Several limitations of the proposed study are worth noting. First, the original project was set to include testimonies from the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's (USHMM) YouTube channel as a third institution to further diversify the study. However, the videos published on USHMM's YouTube page are not nearly as rich in content or quantity as Yad Vashem or the USC Shoah Foundation's are. Consequently, USHMM was removed from the project. After researching scores of Holocaust museums and memorials worldwide, it became clear that there are no other organizations that utilize YouTube as significantly as Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation.

Second, due to the scope and short time frame of the MRP and the diverging lengths of the two institution's testimonies on YouTube, it was not possible to devise a perfectly unbiased random sample. Nevertheless, the process employed during the data collection stage to generate the random sample allows for the least amount of bias given the circumstances, even though there is a slight overrepresentation of the USC Shoah Foundation's videos in terms of time. If there were unlimited time and funds to complete this project, every testimony contained on the two institutions' YouTube channels would be considered and the sample would be perfectly impartial. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

The limited nature of the MRP necessitates an argument with a clear focus. If this study were broadened, virtually every non-Jewish minority victimized during the Holocaust would be included in the coding scheme and analysis. Some of these additional victim groups that were not incorporated into this study are Poles, Ukrainians, political dissidents such as communists and socialists, individuals of African American descent and subsets of Catholic clergy (Linenthal, 1994, p. 429-430).

After transcribing each testimony from the random sample, it became immediately apparent that parts of the transcriptions would not be completely accurate due to each survivor's use of vocabulary. English was every survivor's second language, thus resulting in poor grammar and words often being interchanged with their mother tongue such as Polish, Yiddish, German or Hebrew. In fact, some of the videos in the random sample are actually spoken in different languages, but have English subtitles at the bottom that I relied on for the transcriptions. In order to maintain a high level of authenticity, I attempted to transcribe the interviews as closely as I could, but am aware that there may be some small discrepancies due to language.

## **Findings**

This section of the MRP will expound upon the results of the content analysis. In order to best answer RQ1 and RQ2 set out above, the findings were divided by institution – first based on the testimonies selected from Yad Vashem and followed by those gathered from the USC Shoah Foundation. Figures detailing the numbers and statistics derived from each code can be found in the appendix on page 70. An in-depth discussion of the significance of these results, informed by the literature review, will commence thereafter in accordance with RQ3.

### ***Identity***

#### Category 1 – Minority affiliation

Of the testimonies collected for this sample, all fifteen survivors featured in the videos self-identify as Jewish. This is relatively unsurprising as it is indicative of the mainstream Holocaust discourse that is partial to the Jewish victim experience and in line with the gaps in the literature identified on page 15. In fact, during the data collection stage, I was able to further trace this Judeocentric narrative beyond the sample itself.

After manually looking through the titles and descriptions of all the testimonies uploaded onto Yad Vashem's YouTube channel, not one video featured a non-Jewish Holocaust survivor at the time of writing. Similarly, of over one thousand testimonies on the USC Shoah Foundation's YouTube channel, merely three highlighted the

experience of non-Jewish survivors. However, only one of the three survivors, a Roma woman, was affiliated with a minority of relevance to this study while the other two were political prisoners during the war. After further research into the USC Shoah Foundation's visual history archive – where all of its testimonies are indexed – it became clear that its database was even more limited than its YouTube channel. While approximately 49,400 testimonies are of Jewish survivors, 400 feature Roma or Sinti survivors, 80 focus on survivors who identify as Jehovah's Witnesses and 8 are interviews with homosexual survivors (USC Shoah Foundation, 2015b). Non-Jewish survivors narrate less than 1% of the USC Shoah Foundation testimonies. While these archival statistics are staggering and necessary to mention at this point, they are merely peripheral to the study, since the focus of this MRP is on YouTube testimonies.

Nevertheless, it is apparent that a considerable emphasis on Jewish survivors' stories can lead to the silencing of the voices of non-Jewish minorities. Consequently, any relevant information pertaining to the latter's experiences in this analysis is derived from a Jewish survivor's perspective. In reference to RQ1 and RQ2, Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation's YouTube channels emphasize the Jewish experience in the Holocaust over the non-Jewish saga, which is evident in the proportion of videos featuring Jewish and non-Jewish minority groups.

## ***Representation***

### Category 2 – Reference to non-Jewish minorities' situation/experience during the Holocaust

For both institutions, the majority of survivors did not make mention of non-Jewish minorities in their testimonies, thus further limiting the information sought for this analysis. There are many contributing factors as to why this is the case, the most relevant of which will be explored in the discussion section commencing on page 46. While non-Jewish victims are alluded to in some of the videos, the mentions were quite brief and for the most part peripheral to the principal storyline. Nevertheless, these few remarks will be deconstructed in the next few sections.

### Category 3 – Attitude toward non-Jewish minorities' experience in the Holocaust

The occurrence of the “attitude is not present” code is highest in the results from both institutions, since only four survivors from Yad Vashem’s testimonies and merely two survivors from the USC Shoah Foundation’s even mentioned non-Jewish minorities at all. That said, the attitudes of these Jewish survivors toward non-Jewish victims differed more within Yad Vashem’s testimonies than the USC Shoah Foundation’s videos.

As an example, Sofia Latinskaia, a Ukrainian survivor interviewed in one of Yad Vashem’s videos, was coded as being both insensitive and indifferent to non-Jewish minorities experiences. The interviewer asked her if she knew anything about the fate

of the gypsies now referred to as Roma or Sinti. In response, Latinskaia (2014) answers, "I can't tell you, I only know that the Jews were murdered." This statement is significant and was applied to multiple dimensions of the coding scheme. In essence, she diverts all attention from the Roma and Sinti experience when asked and redirects the question back to the Jewish experience. Nevertheless, there were other survivors amongst those in the Yad Vashem testimonies that were more empathetic or simply indifferent to non-Jewish victims' plight.

Vernon Rusheen (2013) describes an instance where he saw people with intellectual and physical disabilities being loaded onto a truck. The driver would drive so fast that many of these individuals would fall off the vehicle, proceed to be knocked down and run over repeatedly until they died. When describing this horrific event, he empathizes by saying "it was just horrible, a horrible type of situation" (Rusheen, 2013). Moreover, Yehuda Bakon (2011) explains that upon arrival in Auschwitz concentration camp, he noticed people with a yellow-striped badge with three black circles. He later learned this signified that they were blind. His indifference shines through when he adds, "for a child of just Bar Mitzvah [approximately age thirteen] everything was new" (Bakon, 2011).

Despite the variation of attitudes coded within Yad Vashem's testimonies, the two survivors that mentioned non-Jewish minorities in the USC Shoah Foundation's videos were both indifferent to their situation. It is worth noting that some survivors'

indifference to their own Holocaust experiences or others' could be a result of the trauma they underwent and mechanisms they developed over the years to cope. Nevertheless, one of these survivors was Nathan Shapow, a Latvian survivor who was about fifteen years old during the Holocaust. He makes mention that "invalids" – presumably people with intellectual and physical disabilities – were taken from the ghetto he lived in outside of Riga, Latvia to the Rumbula Forest where they were all shot and killed (Shapow, 2009). He describes this instance very matter-of-factly in under one minute before he quite quickly returns to where he left off in telling his personal narrative. While the story he tells of the "invalids" is void of much emotion, the manner in which he tells the story suggests indifference rather than insensitivity. The former indicates disinterest or insufficient knowledge on the subject matter, while the latter implies a lack of sympathy. The second survivor, Penina Bowman (2012), outlines the mayhem of arriving at Auschwitz and mentions that there were black trucks waiting by the railroad tracks that inmates assumed were killing vans for those who were "sick or couldn't work." Both Shapow and Bowman mention non-Jewish minorities in short anecdotes that are not central to their testimonies, thus appearing particularly indifferent to the stories they share.

#### Category 4 – Narrative about non-Jewish minority

This code was designed with the assumption that the majority of those who include stories about non-Jewish victims in their testimonies would likely tell second-

hand accounts, only further removing legitimacy from these groups' experiences. However, the content analysis suggested that this assumption was not completely accurate. In fact, most of the survivors within Yad Vashem's videos – three of the four – told narratives of events they witnessed first-hand, thus allowing viewers to perceive these witnesses as credible.

Conversely, the narratives told by the two survivors from the USC Shoah Foundation's testimonies were both second-hand, thus possibly leading viewers to possibly question the veracity of the anecdotes. Accordingly, it appears inconsequential when a Jewish survivor recounts his or her own Holocaust experience for over an hour, but takes a mere minute or two to portray non-Jewish victims' experiences as he or she may have learned second-hand. This may also suggest a limitation of the institution's style of testimony recording at large.

### ***Agency***

#### Category 5 – Non-Jewish minority depicted as active/passive

Since some of the experiences the four survivors from Yad Vashem and the two survivors from the USC Shoah Foundation told about non-Jewish victims were particularly brief, there was not always sufficient information to assess their depiction of these people as active or passive. However, when it was evident, it became manifest that non-Jewish minorities were more often portrayed as passive.



For example, Rusheen's chronicle outlined on page 32 depicts the disabled as powerless and easily susceptible to cruel behaviour. Similar to Rusheen, Shapow does not attribute any agency toward the "invalids" that were led to their death in the Rumbula Forest. For the most part, Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation both underrepresent non-Jewish minorities in their testimonies accessible to the public on YouTube. Further, when these subjugated groups are referenced, they are mostly portrayed as passive and helpless. Again, there are numerous reasons why this is the case, many of which will be raised in the following discussion section.

#### Category 6 – Survivor depicted as active/passive

It can be argued that regardless of how survivors depict themselves in their testimonies, the act of bearing witness naturally moves them from "the status of powerless private victims to empowered public survivors" (Taft, 2013, p. 127). However, the majority of survivors interviewed from Yad Vashem portray themselves as active – six of the nine – while all six survivors from the USC Shoah Foundation testimonies were unanimous in describing themselves as such.

Subjects who present themselves as active typically emphasize their willingness and ability to cope, persevere and ultimately to survive. Mordechai Eldar (2008), a survivor featured by Yad Vashem, explains that while incarcerated at Mauthausen concentration camp in Austria, he had "stripped dead people of their shirts to be warmer" in order to survive. Comparably, Chaim Bareket (2013) describes how he and

his friends survived in hiding for seven months in a bunker filled with water after the Warsaw Ghetto uprising.

Survivors interviewed by the USC Shoah Foundation share similar experiences. Renate Vambéry (2012), for instance, discusses her family's foresight in fleeing their hometown of Stuttgart, Germany in 1937 (only four years after Hitler became German Chancellor) thus ensuring their survival. Walter Absil (2011) describes himself as the "Indiana Jones of the Holocaust," since he was constantly outwitting the Nazis by helping the Jewish underground resistance and migrating around Europe in disguise. This reference to popular media is also significant, since some survivors may frame their stories in particular ways to captivate contemporary audiences. Nevertheless, survivors like Eldar, Bareket, Vambéry and Absil shape their testimonies surrounding their pride in actively resisting or challenging Nazi orders and decrees. This creates a contrast between the manner in which survivors depict themselves – oftentimes as active – and how they portray non-Jewish minorities as passive.

#### Category 7 – Means of survival

While there are "as many ways of survival as survivors," survival tends to be attributed to the few causes that are included in this code (Rudof, 2006, p. 455). When survivors recount their Holocaust experience, their legacy of survival becomes an important topic of discussion. Those listening and viewing Holocaust testimonies are naturally interested in knowing how these people overcame such horrific

circumstances. In the context of this study, what a survivor attributes his or her survival to can demonstrate different resources Jewish people had access to as opposed to their non-Jewish counterparts.

Within Yad Vashem's testimonies, the only prominent means of survival raised by survivors were family/friends and resistance/deception. The former is a particularly valuable finding, as it is analogous to the USC Shoah Foundation's videos and indicative of the divide between Jewish and non-Jewish victims. During the Holocaust, many Jewish people were able to remain with one or more family members of the same gender and age range. Helga Esakoff (2012) details the harrowing experience of being transported from her home to Theresienstadt concentration camp. She explains that she owes her survival to her mother's resilience and maternal instincts throughout the process. Alternatively, if someone was whisked away from their family, it became ordinary to form familial type bonds with other Jewish people, since they shared common values, histories and attributes. When explaining the circumstances of hiding after the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, Bareket (2013), for example, describes a friend he met in the Pawiak Prison as a "brother more than a friend." Conversely, non-Jewish minorities, in general, were not as likely to stay with their family members throughout their Holocaust experiences or form as tight bonds with other victims around them. This is best described by using Edward Said's (1979) construction of "the Other" via the Occident and the Orient – the binary between powerful Westerners and inferior

Easterners (p. 12). In the context of the Holocaust, Hitler and Nazis would be characterized as the Occident, while the Jewish people are the analogous others. An unintended consequence of the Nazis "othering" the Jews is that disillusioned non-Jewish minorities were treated as peripheral threats and can best be labeled as "the other others". Survivor testimonies echo these categories.

A few survivors from both Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation testimonies also indicated resistance/deception as a means of survival. Resistance as a source of pride became particularly prevalent once distinguished authors and historians accused Jewish people after the Holocaust of being too complacent in the face of existential threats. Perhaps most notably, Hannah Arendt (1963) suggested victims shoulder part of the blame by arguing that Jewish councils should have better fought against the Third Reich. In response, many Jewish survivors pride themselves on the small or large acts of opposition they engaged in during the Holocaust, thus demonstrating their proactive attitudes. Shapow (2009), for example, explains in his testimony that he was not afraid to beg or steal, as he declares, "I did everything I could to survive. That's why I'm here." While the discourse surrounding Jewish resistance is common, virtually no conversation surrounding non-Jewish victims' opposition to Nazi policy is ever broached, further framing these individuals as passive and voiceless.

Another cause of survival popular amongst the survivors filmed by the USC Shoah Foundation was the help of non-Jews or the Righteous Among the Nations – an honour given by the State of Israel to those people that risked their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust (Novick, 2000, p. 180). Three of the six survivors in the sample attributed some form of gratitude toward non-Jews who either smuggled them black market items, adopted them as their own child or hid them in factories. In the testimonies, the discourse around non-Jewish people is quite polarizing. They are depicted either as virtuous heroes and heroines or as callous Nazi murderers and sadists. I question if building up non-Jewish individuals' third identity into the dialogue, namely, that some non-Jews were victimized as well is too confusing for the mainstream Holocaust narrative to tolerate. While Jewish people are distinguished as victims and survivors, non-Jewish people are most often described as Nazi collaborators or resisters. Simply put: Holocaust literature and testimonies oftentimes tell a simplified narrative of good and evil, leaving little opportunity for non-Jews' third victim identity to be considered.

### ***Relationships***

#### Category 8 – Themes of competitive victimhood between two or more minority groups

In this code, the results of the content analysis highlighted differences in the testimonials of the two institutions. Within Yad Vashem's testimonies, themes of competitive victimhood were minor. One explanation for this finding could be related

to the length of the videos. The testimonies Yad Vashem posts on YouTube are typically excerpts from longer videos that may reduce instances of competitive victimization and other themes. Nevertheless, Latinskaia's (2014) response after being asked about the Roma and Sinti's treatment in the Holocaust, "I can't tell you, I only know that the Jews were murdered," directly alludes to feelings of competitive victimhood. She discredits the Roma and Sinti experience by declaring her lack of knowledge about them and insisting on focusing her discussion on Jewish persecution.

In contrast, there is a greater emphasis on competitive victimhood in the USC Shoah Foundation videos, possibly due to their length and ample information to assess. Ralph Fischer (2009), recounting his time spent at the Gutenbrunn concentration camp in Austria, stated, "I am surprised I don't see the name of that camp [often], because thousands of Jewish lives were wasted over there." His language emphasizes that *Jewish* lives were wasted as opposed to using more inclusive or generalized vocabulary, thus demonstrating sentiments related to competitive victimhood. Moreover, when asked how she and her parents managed to survive the war, Celina Biniaz (2011) simply expressed, "you know, Jews tend to be survivors." While it may appear trivial at first glance, this statement reinforces a harmful hierarchy between victim groups. On account of the literature informing this MRP, seemingly innocuous statements like this may reinforce the dichotomy between Jewish

victims who have matured into thriving survivors and non-Jewish victims who continue to remain impotent victims.

#### Category 9 – Quantifying victimization

As opposed to the preceding code that was primarily based on qualitative competitive victimhood, this code analyzed the transcripts for competitive victimhood by focusing on numbers, figures and quantification. It was no surprise that not a single survivor quantified the amount of non-Jewish individuals involved in any part of their narratives. That said, quantifying Jewish people's victimization in various circumstances was noticeable in both institutions' testimonies; the USC Shoah Foundation's in particular.

Absil (2011) stresses the enormity of Jewish losses in France with statistics. In one case, he elucidates that the Vichy police collected 16,000 Jews from Paris, starved them prior to deporting them to various camps, thus leaving 3,500 Jews as orphans. These children were subsequently deported to Auschwitz even though Nazi orders had never specified to do so (Absil, 2011). Bowman (2012) comparably explains that toward the end of the war in 1944, 10,000 Hungarian Jews were deported to Auschwitz daily leading to over 400,000 Jewish deaths in a short period of time. These figures are compelling, especially when compared to the dearth of statistics regarding non-Jewish minorities in these testimonies. This also supports the argument formed in the

literature review, namely, that the latter remains invisible while statistics associated with Jewish victims and survivors are widely known.

### ***Additional narratives revealed in the testimonies***

#### Category 10 – Word used to describe the period between 1939-1945

Some categories of the content analysis did not render the results I predicted. One hypothesis I made at the inception of this project was that most survivors would likely refer to the period between 1939-1945 as the “Holocaust” as opposed to “war” or “World War Two”, further connoting an exclusively Jewish experience. However, contrary to my belief, within the Yad Vashem testimonies, only a single survivor, Eldar, employed a word to reference this time period and it was Holocaust. Nevertheless, since Eldar only represents approximately one tenth of the sample, this result is relatively insignificant. Again, due to the brevity of Yad Vashem’s videos (5-7 minutes long) there was less information to utilize in coding this category.

The majority of survivors from the USC Shoah Foundation testimonies did use the term “war” or “World War Two” when referring to this chapter in history. While this result was a surprise, I quickly concluded that these findings were logical. The etymology of the word Holocaust actually derives from the Greek word *holocaustos*, an adjective meaning “completely burned” and loosely understood as a “burnt offering” (Blurton, 2014, p. 343). The word was used for centuries to denote great massacres, particularly in Britain, and only appropriated in the 1960s to describe the Nazi-induced



genocide of Jewish people in particular (Niewyk & Nicosia, 2000, p. 45). As such, the word Holocaust began to be popularized in virtually every context, most notably by the American television docudrama released in 1978, appropriately called *Holocaust* (p. 40). Thus, it is understandable that the survivors featured in these testimonies would more naturally opt for the terms “war” or “World War Two,” since the word Holocaust was not deployed until decades after their victimization under Nazi rule.

#### Category 11 – Comments about memory

Upon adding this category about memory into the coding scheme, it was my desire to deliver intriguing results with respect to the intersection of mainstream Holocaust memory and survivors’ personal thoughts on remembrance. Not a single survivor from either institution commented on the salience of remembering the non-Jewish experience. All messages pertaining to memory only highlighted the Jewish victim experience and the manner by which memory will and can affect Jewish people.

Within the USC Shoah Foundation testimonies, half of the survivors reflected on the importance of memory, while the remaining three survivors offered no relevant comment. Bowman (2012) explains the necessity of teaching and remembering what she refers to as the “Holocaust lesson.” She then immediately compares the Holocaust to the story Jewish people retell during the holiday of Passover, namely, Jewish people’s enslavement in ancient Egypt and subsequent redemption by G-d (Bowman, 2012). While there are in fact striking parallels between the two historical periods,

Bowman's comparison of the Holocaust to a story in the Bible implicitly excludes non-Jewish minorities from the wartime years altogether. Moreover, the Passover account closes with the Jewish people gaining freedom and being liberated from the wrath of the Egyptians. Correspondingly, invoking this explanation reaffirms that the Jewish community as a whole survived despite the atrocities carried out by the Nazis. Again, neither Bowman nor any other survivor suggests any similar narrative for non-Jewish minorities that were equally victimized during the Holocaust. Thus, as was suggested in the literature review, Jewish people have graduated from being victims to being survivors, while non-Jewish minorities are fastened to their victim status in mainstream Holocaust discourse.

#### Category 12 – Remarks about the future

In accordance with the findings from the code above, I expected to discover similar results concerning survivors' remarks about the future, in that any relevant comments would likely be Judeocentric. With respect to Yad Vashem's testimonies, only one survivor made pertinent remarks directed toward a better future for Jewish people. Nonetheless, the vast majority of transcripts from this institution did not demonstrate any other noteworthy comments for this category.

Conversely, the majority of survivors filmed by the USC Shoah Foundation did speak to their hope for better times to come – specifically a better future for humanity at large. For example, three survivors all alluded to the horrors occurring in Bosnia at

the time, since their testimonies were recorded during the mid-1990s in the midst and aftermath of the Bosnian Genocide. Fischer (2009) explained that he believes the Holocaust should never happen again, but unfortunately "looking at the world today, especially what is happening in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the lesson has clearly yet to be learned." Vambery (2012) expressed disappointment in seeing what is happening in Bosnia, while professing that no one seemed to be doing anything to help. Lastly, Biniaz (2011) said she hated to see what is happening in Bosnia and that everyone should understand "we are all human beings; we eat the same way, drink the same way."

These comments are uplifting, since they articulate sentiments for a better future not exclusive to Jewish people. What is interesting, however, is that the results of this category are not in line with the literature review. The theme of resistance to equality elaborated upon on pages 6-8 explains the mainstream Holocaust discourse's partiality to the Holocaust as a uniquely Jewish genocide. There is then a significant inconsistency between the attitudes of Jewish survivors and the rhetoric espoused by Holocaust scholars and advocates for survivors' rights.

## **Discussion**

James Young (1988) aptly described both the importance and challenge with respect to Holocaust memory by stating “none of us coming to the Holocaust afterwards can know these events outside the ways they are passed down to us” (p. vii). Young’s statement demonstrates the significance of the vehicles used to transmit Holocaust remembrance to those who were not present during the wartime years. The statement also echoes sentiments expressed by Roberts and McLuhan (1964) in the foregoing literature review that suggest that the medium is often as significant as the content of the message itself (p. 5). Before drawing conclusions pertaining to the results of the content analysis, the findings from the study with respect to each institution will be reviewed.

### ***Yad Vashem***

While Yad Vashem was imperative to include in this study considering its long-standing reputation as the “world center for documentation, research, education and commemoration of the Holocaust,” the length of the testimonies on its YouTube channel proved to be somewhat problematic (Yad Vashem, 2015a). Since the videos ranged between 2-30 minutes, and were largely excerpts of longer testimonies, there was simply not always sufficient information to extrapolate useful results. This is especially apparent regarding categories 9, 11 and 12 in the findings section. Nevertheless, the testimonies from Yad Vashem featured more discussion surrounding

non-Jewish minorities than the USC Shoah Foundation's videos. This was surprising, as I originally expected the opposite since Yad Vashem, being located in Israel, might place considerable attention on Judaism or Israel's role in survivors' post-Holocaust lives. However, this was not the case as there was enough information to use from Yad Vashem's testimonies when coding for categories related to the discourse surrounding non-Jewish victims, namely, attitude toward non-Jewish minorities' experience in the Holocaust, the narrative surrounding non-Jewish victims and their depiction as active/passive.

### ***USC Shoah Foundation***

The testimonies assembled from the USC Shoah Foundation's YouTube channel were quite diverse and filled with relevant information. Since the videos were uploaded in full, I was able to watch the survivors come full circle in telling the story of their Holocaust experiences from beginning to end. The length of the videos, averaging between 30-120 minutes, provided an abundance of material to use for content analysis and proved to be easier to code than the abridged testimonies from Yad Vashem. As such, there was more information worth discussing in many of the categories, but specifically in categories such as quantifying victimization, comments about memory and remarks about the future. Nevertheless, there was less conversation regarding non-Jewish minorities in the USC Shoah Foundation's videos, putting forward little information for categories 2, 3, 4 and 5 in the findings section.

From the outset of the content analysis, it became apparent that the Jewish narrative took precedence over the non-Jewish victim experience in survivor testimonies. In fact, the first code used in this study demonstrates that 100% of the survivors interviewed in the testimonies collected from both Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation were Jewish. As discussed in previous sections, this immediately compromises the presence and power of non-Jewish minorities to describe their own experiences without an intermediary. Additionally, only 40% of the Jewish survivors featured in the testimonies from both institutions include any information about their non-Jewish counterparts during the Holocaust and such information at best was minimal. Nonetheless, there were particular reasons why the non-Jewish victim experience was discernibly neglected within these survivor testimonies, the most notable of which are outlined below.

### ***Restrictive structure of testimonies***

Survivor testimonies have been a point of contention since 1946 when Boder traveled to displaced persons camps and refugee centers within Western Europe to conduct early postwar interviews with Holocaust survivors (Benmayor, 2012, p. 92). As expounded in the literature review, only a small portion of his interviews were with non-Jewish survivors, thus initiating a disproportionate Jewish representation of Holocaust victims in survivor testimonies. Nevertheless, Boder paved the way for testimonies to be considered an important vehicle and primary source of “unfiltered” Holocaust

education. Unlike contemporary testimonies, Boder's methodology entailed asking "a person's name, age, and where they were when the war started, then allowed them to speak at will, without the constraints of preplanned interview questions" (Voices of the Holocaust, 2009).

Conversely, both Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation's testimonies are informed by pre-interview discussions and questionnaires (Kushner, 2006, p. 277).

Survivors are expected to follow a linear trajectory and "talk about their pre-war life, then about persecution and survival, next about the life they rebuilt after liberation and then to conclude with a message for the future" (Bothe, 2013, p. 84). Hence, survivors do not have much leeway to talk about their experience outside the confines of the questions being asked of them unless they choose to deviate from the conversation. As a result, the non-Jewish victim experience is underrepresented in testimonies, since interviewers rarely pose questions about it to survivors.

Additionally, many of the survivors choosing to record their testimony may not have ever engaged or interacted with their non-Jewish counterparts during the Holocaust. Accordingly, most of these individuals may find no reason to converse about other victimized minorities in their interviews. The result is that non-Jewish minorities are not only underrepresented in these videos as speakers, but also neglected within the discourse articulated by survivors during their testimonies.

### ***Limitations of YouTube as a platform***

Finding ideal platforms to archive Holocaust testimonies has always been an issue. Preservation, safeguarding authenticity, curation and staying up to date with technological advancements are constant concerns. In the case of this MRP, once Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation posted the testimonies publicly on YouTube, their audiences needed to be of paramount consideration. After all, the purpose of making a collection of testimonies accessible online is to allow and engage increased Holocaust education and remembrance. Those who curate and select the collection of online videos may have a tendency toward *Schindlerizing* Holocaust testimonies, namely, the practice of showcasing a survivor's tragedy and loss followed by a positive ending (Reich, 2006, p.466). In order to optimize interest, institutions such as Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation hook viewers by emphasizing the negative, while ending a testimony by highlighting a satisfying conclusion. While these institutions do not claim that their primary concern is to generate high levels of virality from their respective YouTube channels, any organization's objective when utilizing video sharing platforms is to maximize viewership and create a buzz concerning their causes, products or services. Despite the restrictive structure of the testimonies posted on YouTube and their failure to include sufficient information about the non-Jewish victim experience, online videos have the potential to attract a broad audience to Holocaust memory.



Since it joined the social network site in 2008, Yad Vashem's YouTube channel has garnered 6,357,806 views, while the USC Shoah Foundation, since 2009, has earned a total of 2,638,357 (Yad Vashem, 2015c; USC Shoah Foundation, 2015c). Given these impressive figures, the institutions may be overlooking important consequences surrounding the issue of the one-sided testimonies they are uploading. What is perhaps more interesting is the difference in viewership of testimonies that mention non-Jewish minorities versus those that maintain a Judeocentric narrative. A testimony from Yad Vashem featuring Latinskaia (2014), a survivor who makes brief reference to Roma and Sinti victimhood, has only 21 views while a video of the same length about Eldar (2008) who recounts his own Holocaust experience as a Jewish victim has 151,030 views. In addition, a testimony from the USC Shoah Foundation about Shapow (2009) telling a short story about the treatment of the physically and mentally ill received 2,813 views, while a video of comparable length about Biniaz (2011) and her memories as a Jewish victim accumulated 7,754 views. While these diverging statistics may or may not be coincidental, they are nevertheless fascinating because they suggest that the emphasis on the Jewish experience in testimonies is correlated with viewership. Accordingly, it is evident that YouTube has its limitations, since its primary tool for gauging success is to analyze statistics, namely, the amount of views or number of subscribers a video or channel garners. When taking a more qualitative approach in examining the content being disseminated, this MRP

demonstrates that the platform demands specific information communicated in a particular fashion to reap success. In this case, the videos that maintain a Judeocentric narrative are far more common and correspondingly result in more favourable statistics.

### ***Weak ties with non-Jewish survivors***

In order to outline the challenges in communicating with non-Jewish victims of the Holocaust, it is important first to focus on liberation. World War Two and the Holocaust came to a close in 1945 after American and Russian armies liberated Nazi-occupied territory (DeCoste & Schwartz, 2000, p. 84). Jewish survivors gradually began to piece their broken lives back together by searching for missing family members, starting families of their own, emigrating overseas and embarking on new career paths. While the process was certainly difficult and Jewish survivors were faced with countless struggles, non-Jewish minorities' liberation was especially complex. This subsection will focus primarily on Roma, Sinti and homosexual survivors, since there exists the most amount of information about their postwar experiences in comparison to other minorities included in this study that are even further disregarded in relevant literature.

The Roma and Sinti underwent prolonged hardships after 1945. Prewar anti-gypsy legislation was still in effect after the Holocaust and those unable to show authentic German citizenship papers after 1945 were incarcerated (Hancock, 1988, p. 53). Similar to homosexuals who remained oppressed under state law, Roma and Sinti were also subjected to Nazi and pre-Nazi laws after liberation. These individuals

continued to be devalued decades after the Holocaust when Germany began paying millions of dollars of reparations to Israel, Jewish organizations and individual Jewish survivors. Unsurprisingly, "gypsies as a group received nothing" (The Nazis' forgotten victims, 1979, p. 67). Hence, non-Jewish minorities who were persecuted during the Holocaust continued to suffer long after liberation.

Homosexuals were also alienated by a German penal code enacted in 1871, Paragraph 175, that states "an unnatural sex act committed between persons of male sex or by humans with animals is punishable by imprisonment; the loss of civil rights may also be imposed" (Paragraph 175). This provision remained intact until the late 1960s when it was amended and until 1994 when it was finally eradicated (Paragraph 175). As a result, homosexuals criminalized at the time came full circle from being victims of the German state to victims of the Holocaust and back again to victims of the state post-liberation. As Pierre Seel (2011) describes in his memoir about his experience as a homosexual in the Holocaust, after liberation "there was no public discussion about what had happened to homosexuals. Nothing [and no one] came to rescue me from my silence" (p. 90). As such, the omission of non-Jews' persecution in the survivor testimonies appears to be a symptom of the broader oppression of these minority groups.

In addition to these groups' post-Holocaust challenges – many of which continue to cast a shadow upon them to the present day – it has proven to be difficult

to identify survivors who affiliate with the minorities outlined in this study. This may be due to a lack of collective commemoration within these communities whereby “the historical memory of persecution was [rarely] relived and recreated anew” for future generations (Stewart, 2004, p. 565). Perhaps this dearth of major commemorative efforts is deliberate within some of these groups. Roma and Sinti, for instance, customarily build living environments that are “so temporary that they hardly bear a trace of the past,” since they “seem to celebrate impermanence” (p. 566). The consequence of their lifestyle in tandem with ongoing discrimination is that there is less value placed on remembering their history. Conversely, a lack of remembrance within the homosexual community could be related to the abundance of hardships they faced until the past several decades when a greater awareness for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights began to gain a well-deserved momentum. Until the late 1960s to early 1970s, it was difficult for homosexuals to unite publicly and rally for their collective acceptance and equal rights (Paragraph 175). As a result, homosexual Holocaust survivors had few opportunities or outlets to commemorate and share their experiences with others. Furthermore, because of these groups’ underrepresentation in historical discourse and lack of organization in advocating for themselves until the postwar period, institutions such as Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation likely had difficulty in identifying and contacting non-Jewish survivors to record their testimonies as compared to Jewish survivors, as will be elucidated upon below. Thus,

non-Jewish minorities' ongoing marginalization, unique post-Holocaust struggles, and social inferiority are reflected in their lack of presence within survivor testimonies.

### ***Strong ties with Jewish survivors***

It was arguably not until the infamous trial of Adolf Eichmann – the Nazi officer responsible for mass deportations of Jews to ghettos and concentration camps – beginning in 1961 in Jerusalem that Jewish survivors were encouraged to bear witness to their Holocaust experiences. While there was less of a stigma surrounding Holocaust survivors in North America, there existed significant pressure against survivors emphasizing victimization or expressing feelings of anger and sadness in Israel (Reich, 2006, p. 465). In the wake of Eichmann's capture by the Mossad (Israel's intelligence agency) and subsequent 56-day trial, more than one hundred survivors were called upon as witnesses (Cesarani, 2005, p. 262). This trial led to a deeper understanding of the Holocaust's effect on Jewish survivors in particular and increased acknowledgement of what these individuals underwent during the war. Since that time and particularly at present, Jewish identity has become synonymous and inextricably linked to Holocaust remembrance. Therefore, while the Jewish community may not intentionally "engage in a one-upmanship of suffering" by quantifying victimization or initiating competitive victimhood, as is evident in the content analysis, there exists a clear tension related to de-Judaizing the mainstream Holocaust discourse (Hancock, 1988, p. 46). Due to this resistance to being equal with other victim groups, many

leading scholars and spokespeople in the realm of Holocaust remembrance support the preservation of a Judeocentric Holocaust narrative, as elaborated upon in the preceding literature review.

Moreover, while marginalized minority groups often lack structured leadership and spokespeople to rally for equal remembrance on their behalf, the Jewish community in Israel and the Diaspora are exceptionally well-organized. Accordingly, institutions such as Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation can quickly ascertain exactly who to address and where to look when trying to access Jewish Holocaust survivors. They may contact synagogues, Jewish community centres or Jewish Federations that cater to congregations and networks of Jewish people, often including Holocaust survivors. In fact, when the USC Shoah Foundation was first established, it organized far-reaching media campaigns and grassroots efforts to contact survivors. However, “word of mouth became as powerful as any media campaign” once the initial interviewees participated and garnered high levels of mutual trust and respect during the process (USC Shoah Foundation, 2015d). Jewish communities are tight-knit and supported by a multiplicity of advocacy organizations, leading to word of mouth becoming the best method of communication for the institution in recording testimonies.

While there are many key players in the domain of Holocaust memory who openly express their concern with de-Judaizing the Holocaust, their worry is relatively

benign due to the predominant focus on Jewish victims and survivors in the mainstream Holocaust narrative. Thus, another salient reason as to why non-Jewish victims are blatantly ignored within survivor testimonies is that Jewish Holocaust survivors are simply more accessible and perhaps more open to sharing their experiences with a larger public beyond their own community. Nevertheless, the Jewish experience of the Holocaust could be communicated through more inclusive narratives and commemorative practices.

## **Conclusion**

The findings of this MRP are suggestive of a systemic problem in the representation of minority groups persecuted during the Holocaust. The results of the content analysis in tandem with the arguments made in the discussion above have implications for the future of Holocaust remembrance. Currently, only a half-truth is being promulgated within survivor testimonies due to the paucity of information disseminated about non-Jewish victims. There is no distinct method by which the Holocaust should be remembered, or which groups are given more attention than others. This fact reveals that the past truly is shaped by present day communication practices. That is to say, history is determined by its narratives.

Given that this year marks the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary since the end of the Holocaust, it is becoming increasingly important not only to encourage active Holocaust remembrance, but accurate commemorative efforts as well. Today, Holocaust survivors are passing away at unprecedented rates. This community is dwindling in size, making it increasingly difficult to film survivor testimonies and record these individuals' stories. Since non-Jewish minorities persecuted by the Nazis continue to be omitted from the mainstream Holocaust narrative, it is critical that institutions such as Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation make use of their resources and influence – both domestic and international – to confront this vexing issue before it is too late.



However, there are many ways to reincorporate the non-Jewish victim experience back into Holocaust commemorative efforts. As it becomes more difficult to access non-Jewish survivors, institutions can attempt to initiate contact and meaningful connections with second and third generations of non-Jewish victims of the Holocaust. While it is best practice to learn about the Holocaust from the personal experiences of a survivor, acquiring knowledge from a survivor's kin is certainly a viable alternative approach to Holocaust education. Moreover, Yad Vashem and the USC Shoah Foundation can consider diversifying their YouTube channels with more testimonies that feature non-Jewish survivors or at the very minimum, videos that contain more information about the non-Jewish victim experience. Considering the relatively linear structure of survivor testimonies expanded upon above, perhaps interviewers should pose additional questions to survivors about non-Jewish victims that they may have encountered and/or have knowledge about.

Years from now, when Jewish Holocaust survivors are no longer among us, it is their memory that will precede them for generations to come. I feel confident, based on current efforts and initiatives in place, that the international Jewish community will ensure that the legacy and lessons of the Holocaust are preserved and maintained. However, my trepidation revolves around how non-Jewish victims and survivors will be remembered and commemorated moving forward. If two of the major institutions operating to safeguard Holocaust memory are portraying an imbalanced

representation of Jewish and non-Jewish victims, what does the future hold regarding the latter's memory? On a personal, social and institutional level, we must move closer to perceiving the Holocaust not simply as a Jewish tragedy, but a profound calamity for all of humankind. Once steps are taken in this direction, I trust that Holocaust scholars, educators and survivors can embrace all survivors' differences in order to engage in and communicate a higher level of nondiscriminatory commemoration. After all, every Holocaust survivor – whether Jewish, Roma, Sinti, homosexual, physically handicapped, mentally ill or Jehovah's Witness – must be given a platform with which to bear witness for themselves and for those that were never given the opportunity. Every survivor deserves to tell a unique story of tenacity and triumph. Silence is not an option.

## References

- Absil, W. (2011, July 15). *Jewish survivor Walter Absil testimony*. Retrieved from [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=obWf\\_rKNapw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=obWf_rKNapw)
- Arutz Sheva (2008). Yad Vashem launches YouTube channels. Retrieved from <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/Flash.aspx/145687#.VUOdv3BzGc>
- Bakon, Y. (2011, February 6). *Deportation from Ostrava to Theresienstadt in September 1942 – Testimony of Yehuda Bakon*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qCD3-U1vEsU>
- Bareket, C. (2013, March 21). *After the uprising: Life among the ruins of the Warsaw Ghetto*. Retrieved from [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JY\\_uNT9F0kU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JY_uNT9F0kU)
- Bauer, Y. (1978). *The Holocaust in Historical Perspective*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Benmayor, R. (2012). Tracking Holocaust memory: 1946-2010. *Oral History Review*, 39 (1), 92-99.
- Berenbaum, M. (1990). The uniqueness and universality of the Holocaust. In M. Berenbaum (Ed.), *A mosaic of victims: non-Jews persecuted and murdered by the Nazis*. (pp. 20-36). New York: New York University Press.
- Biniatz, C. (2011, July 13). *Holocaust survivor Celina Biniatz testimony*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sUeSkFcTNgg>

- Blurton, H. (2014). 'The history of an incorrect term': Agamben, etymology and the medieval history of the Holocaust. *A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies*, 5, 336-345.
- Bothe, A. (2013). (Dis)Orienting memory: Shoah testimonies in the virtual archive. In J. Eckel, B. Leiendecker, D. Olek, and C. Piepiorka (Eds.), *(Dis)Orienting media and narrative mazes*. (pp. 73-92). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Bowman, P. (2012, March 24). *Jewish survivor Penina Bowman testimony*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dk2UMiYS4Xs>
- Cesarani, D. (2005). *Eichmann: His life and crimes*. London: Vintage Books.
- Condry, R. (2010). Secondary victims and secondary victimization. In S.G. Shoham, P. Knepper, and M. Kett (Eds.), *International handbook of victimology*. (pp. 219-250). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- DeCoste, F. C., & Schwartz, S., (Eds.). (2000). *The Holocaust's ghost: Writings on art, politics, law, and education*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Dower, J.W. (1996). The narratives of our humanity. In E. Linenthal & T. Engelhardt (Eds.), *History wars: The Enola Gay and other battles for the American past*. (pp. 63-96). New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Eldar, M. (2008, April 24). *Surviving the Holocaust: Mordechai Eldar's story*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fcfBTrNf2al>

Elias, R. (1986). *The politics of victimization: Victims, victimology and human rights*.

New York: Oxford University Press.

Epstein, R., & Friedman, J. (2002). *Paragraph 175*. United States: New Yorker Films.

Erll, A. (2008). Cultural memory studies: An introduction. In A. Erll & A. Nunning (Eds.),

*Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook*. (pp.

1-18). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Esakoff, H. (2012). *Deportation from Cologne to Theresienstadt in August 1943*.

*Testimony of Helga Esakoff*. Retrieved from

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_ARrWqUs51w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_ARrWqUs51w)

Evans, S.E. (2004). *Forgotten crimes: The Holocaust and people with disabilities*.

Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.

Feig, K. (1990). Non-Jewish victims in the concentration camps. In M. Berenbaum (Ed.),

*A mosaic of victims: non-Jews persecuted and murdered by the Nazis*. (pp. 161-

178). New York: New York University Press

Fischer, R. (2009). *Holocaust survivor Ralph Fischer testimony*. Retrieved from

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rqOAL-t9lk>

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. (L. Coser, trans.). Chicago: University of

Chicago Press.

Hancock, I. (1988). Uniqueness of the victims: Gypsies, Jews and the Holocaust.

*Without Prejudice: The EARFORD International Review of Racial Discrimination*,  
1 (2), 45-67.

Hancock, I. (2013). 1938 and the Porrajmos: A pivotal year in Romani history. *Global Dialogue*, 15 (1), 107-117.

Hartman, G.H. (1995). Learning from survivors: The Yale testimony project. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 9 (2), 192-207.

Hoskins, A. (2009). Digital network memory. In A. Erll & A. Rigney (Eds.), *Mediation, remediation, and the dynamics of cultural memory*. (pp. 99- 108). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S.E. (2005) Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15 (9), 1277-1288.

Huyssen, A. (1995). *Twilight memories: Marking time in a culture of amnesia*. New York and London: Routledge.

Johnson, M., & Rittner, C. (1996). Circles of hell: Jewish and non-Jewish victims of the Nazis. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 548, 123-137.

Kansteiner, W. (2002). Finding meaning in memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies. *History and Theory*, 41, 179-197.

- Kenney, A.R., & Rieger, O.Y. (2000). Introduction: Moving theory into practice. In A.R. Kenney & O.Y. Rieger (Eds.), *Moving theory into practice: digital imaging for libraries and archives*. (pp. 1-10). Mountain View, CA: Research Libraries Group.
- Kern, S. (2003). *The culture of time and space 1880-1918*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Khiun, L.K. (2014). Rewind and recollect: Activating dormant memories and politics in Teresa Teng's music videos uploaded on YouTube. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17 (5), 503-515.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kushner, T. (2006). Holocaust testimony, ethics, and the problem of representation. *Poetics Today*, 27 (2), 276-295.
- Langer, L. (1991). *Holocaust testimonies: The ruins of memory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Latinskaia, S. (2014, April 8). *Murder of Nezhin's Jews at the clinker-brick factory*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3uN0HkkXH7s>
- Linenthal, E. (1994). The boundaries of memory: The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *American Quarterly*, 46 (3), 406-433.
- Linenthal, E. (2001). *The unfinished bombing: Oklahoma City in American memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Niewyk, D.L., & Nicosia, F.R. (2000). *The Columbia guide to the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Noor, M., Shnabel, N., Halabi, S., & Nadler, A. (2012). When suffering begets suffering: The psychology of competitive victimhood between adversarial groups in violent conflicts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16 (4), 351-374.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de memoire. *Representations*, 26, 7-24.
- Nora, P. (1996). *Realms of memory: The construction of the French past*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Novick, P. (2000). *The Holocaust in American life*. New York: First Mariner Books.
- Olick, J.K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V., & Levy, D. (2011). Introduction. In J.K. Olick, V. Vinitzky-Seroussi & D. Levy (Eds.), *The collective memory reader*. (pp. 3-62). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reich, W. (2006). Unwelcome narratives: Listening to suppressed themes in American Holocaust testimonies. *Poetics Today*, 27 (2), 463-472.
- Roberts, L. (2014). Talkin bout my generation: Popular music and the culture of heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20 (3), 262-280.



- Rothberg, M. (2009). *Multidirectional memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the age of decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rudof, J.W. (2006). Research use of Holocaust testimonies. *Poetics Today*, 27 (2), 451-461.
- Rusheen, V. (2013, October 29). *Vernon Rusheen – deported from Berlin to Auschwitz on 26.02.1943*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XxjC6icFbDk>
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Seel, P. (2011). *I, Pierre Seel, deported homosexual: A memoir of Nazi terror*. Arizona: Basic Books.
- Shapow, N. (2009, July 13). *Holocaust survivor Nathan Shapow testimony*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kROlojk7JLw>
- Stewart, M. (2004). Remembering without commemoration: The mnemonics and politics of Holocaust memories among European Roma. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 10, 561-582.
- Stone, P.J., Dunphy, D.C., Smith, M.S., & Ogilvie, D.M. (1966). *The general inquirer: A computer approach to content analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Taft, M. (2013). *From victim to survivor: The emergence and development of the Holocaust witness 1941-1949*. London: Vallentine Mitchell & Co. Ltd.
- The Nazis' forgotten victims. (1979). *Time Magazine*, 3 (12), 67.
- van Dijck, J. (2004). Memory matters in the digital age. *Configurations*, 12 (3), 349-373.

Voices of the Holocaust. (2009). Project notes. Retrieved from

[http://voices.iit.edu/project\\_notes](http://voices.iit.edu/project_notes)

Wake, C. (2013). Regarding the recording: The viewer of video testimony, the complexity of copresence and the possibility of tertiary witnessing. *History & Memory*, 25 (1), 111-144.

Walters, G. (2009). *Hunting evil: The Nazi war criminals who escaped and the quest to bring them to justice*. New York: Broadway Books.

Waxman, Z. (2012). Transcending history? Methodological problems in Holocaust testimony. In D. Stone (Ed.), *The Holocaust and historical methodology*. (pp. 143-157). New York: Berghahn Books.

Weber, R.P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wiesel, E. (1979). *Report to the President*. Washington: President's Commission on the Holocaust.

Winter, J. (2001). The memory boom in contemporary historical studies. *Raritan*, 21 (1), 52-66.

USC Shoah Foundation. (2015a). About us. Retrieved from <https://sfi.usc.edu/about>

USC Shoah Foundation. (2015b). The archive. Retrieved from <http://vhaonline.usc.edu/about/archive.aspx>

USC Shoah Foundation. (2015c). About. Retrieved from

<https://www.youtube.com/user/USCShoahFoundation/about>

USC Shoah Foundation. (2015d). Collecting testimonies. Retrieved from

<https://sfi.usc.edu/vha/collecting>

Vambery, R. (2012, April 23). *Jewish survivor Renate Vambery testimony*. Retrieved

from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=blVvQQW5RpM>

Yad Vashem. (2015a). About Yad Vashem. Retrieved from

<http://www.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/index.asp>

Yad Vashem. (2015b). The visual center. Retrieved from

[http://www.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/visual\\_center/usc.asp](http://www.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/visual_center/usc.asp)

Yad Vashem. (2015c). About. Retrieved from

<https://www.youtube.com/user/YadVashem/about>

Young, J. (1988). *Writing and rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the consequences of interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

YouTube. (2014). Statistics. Retrieved from

<https://www.youtube.com/yt/press/statistics.html>

## Appendix

The following figures detail the results of the codebook used in the content analysis.

### **Identity**

Figure 4  
Minority affiliation

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Jewish	9	100%	6	100%
Roma or Sinti	0	0%	0	0%
Homosexual	0	0%	0	0%
Physically Handicapped	0	0%	0	0%
Mentally Ill	0	0%	0	0%
Jehovah's Witness	0	0%	0	0%
Not declared in video	0	0%	0	0%

### **Representation**

Figure 5  
Reference to non-Jewish minorities' situation/experience during the Holocaust

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	4	44.4%	2	33.3%
No	5	55.5%	4	66.6%

Figure 6

Attitude toward non-Jewish minorities' experience in the Holocaust

\*Multiple coding permitted

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Empathetic	2	18.2%	0	0%
Insensitive	1	9.1%	0	0%
Indifferent	3	27.2%	2	33.3%
Attitude is not evident	5	45.4%	4	66.6%

Figure 7

Narrative about non-Jewish minority

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
First-hand story/interaction about non-Jewish minority	3	33.3%	0	0%
Second-hand story/interaction about non-Jewish minority	1	11.1%	2	33.3%
Story/interaction is not present	5	55.5%	4	66.6%

### **Agency**

Figure 8

Non-Jewish minority depicted as active/passive

\*Multiple coding permitted

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Depicts non-Jewish minority as active	1	10%	0	0%

Depicts non-Jewish minority as passive	2	20%	1	16.6%
Depiction is not present	7	70%	5	83.3%

Figure 9  
Survivor depicted as active/passive

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Depicts him or herself as active	6	66.6%	6	100%
Depicts him or herself as passive	2	22.2%	0	0%
Depiction is not present	1	11.1%	0	0%

Figure 10  
Means of survival  
\*Multiple coding permitted

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Family/friends	3	30%	3	23.1%
Faith/religion	0	0%	2	15.3%
Resistance/deception	3	30%	3	23.1%
Fate	0	0%	2	15.3%
Non-Jewish people's help/Righteous Among the Nations	0	0%	3	23.1%
Means of survival is not mentioned	4	40%	0	0%

## ***Relationships***

Figure 11

Themes of competitive victimhood between two or more minority groups

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Themes of competitive victimization are present	2	22.2%	4	66.6%
Themes of competitive victimization are not present	7	77.7%	2	33.3%

Figure 12

Quantifying victimization

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Survivor specifies numbers/figures of Jewish people involved	3	33.3%	4	66.6%
Survivor specifies numbers/figures of non-Jewish people involved	0	0%	0	0%
Quantification is not present	6	66.6%	2	33.3%

## ***Additional narratives revealed in the testimonies***

Figure 13

Word used to describe the period between 1939-1945

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Holocaust	1	11.1%	1	16.6%
War or World War Two	0	0%	5	83.3%

Other	0	0%	0	0%
No word to describe this period is mentioned	8	88.8%	0	0%

Figure 14  
Comments about memory

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Comments on importance of remembering Jewish victims/survivors and their stories	1	11.1%	3	50%
Comments on importance of remembering non-Jewish victims/survivors and their stories	0	0%	0	0%
Comments are not present	8	88.8%	3	50%

Figure 15  
Remarks about the future

Code	Yad Vashem		USC Shoah Foundation	
	No.	%	No.	%
Remarks made about a better future for the Jewish people	1	11.1%	0	0%
Remarks made about a better future for humanity in general	0	0%	5	83.3%
Remarks are not present	8	88.8%	1	16.6%