Baruch Stier, Oren (2001): Framing the Witness. the Memorial Role of Holocaust Video Testimonies. In: Roth, John K.; Maxwell-Meynard, Elisabeth Levy Margot (Hg.): Remembering for the Future. The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide. Basingstoke: (Band 3), S. 189–204.

Bernadotte he could take whomever he wanted. See Marton, p.80. The Jewish Polish women were probably included with the Catholic Polish women, rather than vice versa.

21 Hannah Horon, interview with Susan Sapiro for Rochelle G. Saidel, New York, 8 December 1997, collection of the author. (All quotes by Horon are from this interview.)

22 Sosnowiec had a population of 130,000, including 20,805 Jews, at the time of the 1931 census. See Martin Gilbert, *Atlas of the Holocaust* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1993), p.32. The Sosnowiec Judenrat was established immediately after the German conquest on 6 September 1939. See Leni Yehil, *The Holocaust: The Fate of European Jewry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp.156, 207–209.

23 The Sosnowiec ghetto was liquidated in August 1943. See Yehil, p.448.

24 See, e.g., Yuri Suhl, *They Fought Back* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), pp.219–225.

25 The roommate that she mentions is Mina Goldstein, who is also part of this study.

26 Rachel Hocherman, interviewed by Rochelle G. Saidel, Berlin, April 1995, collection of the author. (All quotes by Hocherman are from this interview.)

27 No statistics are available to corroborate this.

28 Rosa Fajerstajn, interviewed by Anita Pinkuss and Anabela Sereno of the Divisão de História Oral do Arquivo Histórico Judaico Brasilerio, São Paulo, 12 June 1995, collection of the author and the Divisão de História Oral do Arquivo Histórico Judaico Brasileiro. The author thanks the Divisão de História Oral for sharing its archives, through an agreement with NEMGE – The Center for the Study of Women and Gender, University of São Paulo. (All quotes by Fajerstajn are from this interview.)

29 Regarding special problems of single women. see, e.g., Dalia Ofer, 'The Status and Plight of Women in the Lodz Ghetto', in *Women in the Holocaust*, Dalia Ofer and Lenore J. Weitzman, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp.123–142. A number of testimonies by interviewees for the larger Ravensbrück study of which this paper is a part also spoke of the difficulties of surviving without male protection in the ghetto.

30 For other stories of Jewish women who had to assume new roles and save their husbands, see, e.g., Marion Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp.50–73. A number of interviewees for the larger Ravensbrück study of which this paper is a part also spoke of rescuing their husbands from jail or concentration camp when it was still possible.

31 See, e.g., Myrna Goldenberg, 'Memoirs of Auschwitz: The Burden of Gender', in *Women in the Holocaust*, Dalia Ofer and Lenore J. Weitzman, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp.327–339; Brana Gurewitsch, *Mothers, Sisters, Resisters: Oral Histories of Women Who Survived the Holocaust* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press), 1998, pp.95–218; Judith Baumel, *Double Jeopardy: Gender and the Holocaust* (London: Vallentine Mitchell), 1998, pp.67–99; Sybil Milton, 'Women and the Holocaust: The Case of German and German-Jewish Women', in *Different Voices: Women and the Holocaust*, Carol Rittner and John Roth, eds. (New York: Paragon), pp.229–30. A number of testimonies by interviewees for the larger Ravensbrück study of which this paper is a part also spoke of bonding with real or adopted sisters in the camp.

FRAMING THE WITNESS:
THE MEMORIAL ROLE OF HOLOCAUST VIDEOTESTIMONIES[1]

Oren Baruch Stier

The video begins with familiar material: images from newsreels, old photographs, melancholy music, all evoking the difficult and disturbing history of the Holocaust. A disembodied voice comes over the images, sounding vaguely familiar. Soon, the images fade and are replaced by that of a distinguished-looking gentleman walking slowly through a high-tech media centre. And then we recognize him: Ben Kingsley, well-known actor and recent co-star of the Holocaust blockbuster *Schindler's List*. Though he looks 'normal' in this setting, we cannot help but think of him in his movie persona, Yitzhak Stern, the paradigmatic Jew of the film, standing-in then (and now?) for the impersonal mass of Jewish suffering of the Shoah. In this appearance, Kingsley represents, perhaps, the doubled (though in this case assumed) identity of the survivor, embodying two distinct strains of lived and remembered experience: life then, 'over there', and life now, 'over here'. The blurring and confusion is intentional: we are meant to conflate the two roles Kingsley plays and understand something about the frames of reference this video offers as a result.

This scene opens a short promotional video, 'Behind the Scenes' at Steven Spielberg's Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation (VHF), a project reportedly inspired by the director's work on *Schindler's List* and funded with seed money from the film's proceeds. As the tape shows, while Spielberg was making his film in Poland, survivors approached the director to tell their stories. The image is one of filmmaking as catharsis: an epic artistic project spawning a real-life correlate addressing the needs of survivors to bear witness and give testimony in unprecedented fashion, using the very latest technology.

'Behind the Scenes' at the Shoah Foundation is also an example of a certain type of promotional tape. Like most videos of its genre, it stars a noted Hollywood personality with some recognition value, it is about twenty minutes long, and it offers the image of a busy, bustling, professional operation. It is used in presentations to business and community meetings around the globe in order to build interest and, if possible, raise funding, for the massive costs of the project, by 'taking you back' into what the Foundation does and by portraying its enormity.[2] The goal of the VHF is to record, digitize, archive, and make accessible (via not-yet-but soon-to-be-developed technology) at least 50,000 testimonies of Holocaust 'survivors, rescuers, liberators, and witnesses so that the world will remember and learn from their legacy. This is a race against time.'[3] The promotional video starring Ben Kingsley, with a cameo appearance by Spielberg himself, offers a window not only onto the efforts of one archiving project that seeks to record and manage the overflow of available testimonial data, but reflects as well the contemporary cultural effort to capture, process, and render meaningful the unique,

highly individualized stories of those who were 'there'. The Shoah Foundation promotional video, which incorporates clips of survivors' testimonies, is therefore engaged in a process that mediates those testimonies to a wider audience. We can call this broad, multi-levelled process of mediation 'framing the witness'.

The concerns raised here have already been proposed by the media critic and cultural historian Andreas Huyssen, who asks: 'How ... do the technological media affect the structure of memory, the ways we perceive and live our temporality? As the visual media invade ever more aspects of political, cultural, and personal life, we may well want to ask what a postmodern memory would look like.... What of the institutions and sites that organize our social memory in the age of television?'[4] In other words, what difference might a video-archive of Holocaust testimonies make? This question has a particular urgency with respect to the social memory of the Holocaust, especially as the events of World War II recede beyond the half century mark and the witnesses to the horrors grow old and die, but also because, like it or not, the Holocaust is being represented more and more often in the visual media. For several reasons, therefore, a number of institutions have formed in recent years to attempt to capture the stories of survivors and others who had direct contact with the Holocaust, benefiting greatly from the timely availability of the medium of videotape recording, and indeed making the medium an asset. From the Fortunoff Video Archives for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale University to the Shoah Foundation, archivists, historians, videographers, interviewers, and computer technicians are 'racing against time' to preserve the stories of thousands of witnesses.

But Huyssen's questions only highlight the extent to which scholars are largely unprepared to consider the impact of new, technologically facilitated forms on the construction of memory and its institutional contexts. If we are to seriously engage the impact of projects like the VHF, we must necessarily examine the nature and style of the medium at the heart of such endeavours: videotaped Holocaust testimonies. We can do this by looking, in different ways, at the 'frame' constructed around the witness to the horrors of the Holocaust or otherwise implied by her presence and role as the one giving testimony. I therefore propose the interpretative rubric of framing in order to consider critically the various strategies of framing in which the principal players involved in the production of Holocaust testimonials are engaged. I want to think carefully about the roles these witness-actors play and how they are involved in framing activities. How, for example, does a survivor frame her own testimony even as she is giving it? How is that testimony framed by the activities of interviewers or camera technicians, or by the formal properties of the medium of video itself? How do *we* frame the witness by our own viewing strategies? And how does the institutional context establish yet another frame of reference and analysis? What, finally, do all these different frames tell us about the process of testimony, about the making of witness, about the medium of video, and about the ways we apprehend and comprehend the Holocaust now, over fifty years later? The 'frames of remembrance' we consider here ultimately constitute, in all their range and variety, a unique, compelling, and provocative genre of memorial activity that plays a crucial role in establishing the propriety of memory and, indeed, in making Holocaust memory matter.[5]

In the midst of this process let me articulate another frame. By taking a critical look at this very sensitive material, I do not mean to criticisze the witness herself. What she experienced we can never fully share, never really appreciate. Therefore, I suggest we circumscribe an area around the witness marking out a great respect. For while such circumscription is, for many, an automatic process, one that should itself be subject to scrutiny, it many nonetheless be demanded by the nature of witnessing itself.

Furthermore, let me be equally clear about the nature of the truth told in these videotapes and framed by their contexts: our attention to the strategies and politics of framing here does not and cannot throw into question the historical realities to which the testimonies refer. While there may be some debate over the usefulness to historiography of individual, personal, and fallible memories, the memories themselves are no less real because of such debate. The world into which we now are travelling is a real one, however mediated it may appear to be by technology or by the foibles and fallacies of individual remembrance. There is a great divide indeed between attending to the ways Holocaust memory is constructed and the grossly inaccurate assumption that such construction equals artifice. Particularly in the case of the videotaped Holocaust testimonies, memory remembers the real, and that is one of the reasons why it matters.

THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS

I wish to organize our frames of reference in the following manner. Envision, if you will, a television screen on which we may view a testimonial excerpt. Think of it as a literal frame for the testimony, and then consider it as a point of departure for two perspectival shifts, one that zooms in, and one that zooms out from the TV screen as frame. As we move inwards or outwards from our initial frame of reference we pick up other frames, even frames within frames, along the way. Moving inwards, for example, we encounter the formal, structural frame created by the camera technician, who generally focuses on the upper torso of the person giving testimony. Without this frame there would be no testimony, no mediation, nothing for us to watch. But this frame is also somewhat deceptive: it gives the illusion (partially true) that the witness is speaking directly to us, the viewers. This is a beneficial illusion, for it lends a sense of immediacy to the testimonial proceedings. In actuality, the witness is speaking to us through intermediaries: in the Yale tapes, there are usually two specially trained interviewers, often psychotherapists, just off-camera but nevertheless present in their gentle questioning, their subtle guidance of the narrative of testimony unfolding before our eyes.

Indeed, the testimonial narrative is the most salient frame of reference we have to consider. It might seem that the witness is hardly being 'framed' here as she tells her own story of her experiences before, during, and after the Shoah, over the course of the videotaped testimony. But let us consider the choices she makes as she gives her testimony, choices dictated in part by the structural context, in part by the interviewers, and in part by her own internal mediation process. James Young, the foremost expert on Holocaust memorials, gives us an idea of the complexity contained in the witness's narrative:

> 'Start at the beginning,' suggests the interviewer, at which point the survivor must determine where this beginning came. Was it when the family moved to Germany from Russia after World War I, or when they heard on the radio that Hitler was appointed chancellor, or was it *Kristallnacht*? Was it when the community was deported to the ghetto, or when they arrived at Auschwitz? Or does one's personal memory of the Holocaust actually begin on a collective basis centuries before, in the *Churban* of the First and Second temples and subsequent pogroms? And where then does one's testimony end? At liberation from the camps, or on one's arrival in Israel? When the tape runs out, or when the interviewer grows tired? Can memory ever have closure? Depending on where the beginning and end of testimony come, particular premises, conclusions, and meanings are created for the whole of testimony.[6]

Clearly, the narrative poles of Holocaust testimony complicate the simple 'frame' of that testimony and we must be sensitive to the ways such narratives are framed. What differences would be made if the witness began with her childhood, or her expulsion from school, or her deportation, or the last time she saw her parents on the ramp at Auschwitz?

Most of the time, survivors' stories begin with some words about their families and lives before the war, often moving soon thereafter to accounts of the circumstances under which the Nazi era first affected their own lives. For many of the accounts, this is followed by descriptions of deportations, of ghetto life, of separating from family members, of entering the camps. After descriptions of experiences in the camps, most tell of liberation, of journeys back to hometowns to try to find family members, of leaving Europe. In almost all of the videotapes at the Yale archive that I viewed[7] the survivors close by describing arrival in America and, with a quick jump to the present, by reflecting back on post-war life, on their children, and on the painful legacy of the past. But the testimony is rarely conveyed so smoothly, or with such regularity. Rather, we are witnesses to a journey over a bumpy and textured terrain of memory that each person traverses individually, an excursion that is anchored at both ends, with assistance from interviewers, by images of life before and after the war.

Beginning and ending in 'normalcy' thus frames the survivor's narrative in the familiar, setting 'Auschwitz' in the midst of a zone of relative comfort that eases the witness, and those accompanying her on her memorial journey, into and out of the more traumatic aspects of her experiences during the war. In addition, ending in the present can make the testimony relevant and vibrant for those of us who watch it, offering a continuous thread from then to now, there to here. We can thus begin to appreciate James Young's observations concerning a palimpsest – an image of one text superimposed upon another – created by the layers of narrative in video testimony.[8] It is because of these narrative layers – frames within frames – that, on one level at least, video testimonies are such richly textured memorial artefacts. We need to become sensitive to this texture, learn to carefully unravel the warp and woof of testimonial fabric, and see how the overall garment of memory is stitched together.

SEARCHING FOR LANGUAGE

The internal narrative – the survivor's own self-framing – is also shaped by a number of distinctive processes and characteristics. Most often, memory is converted into speech (and gesture, and silence, and a host of subtle visual cues) for the first time, and it is thus profoundly self-reflexive. This may often involve a process of self-translation: events experienced and processed in European languages are now expressed in the vernacular, usually English for the majority of the current archiving projects.[9] Thus, we watch as the testimony unfolds into a narrative, we see how the survivor struggles to find the right language to express her memory, how testimony is figured. The very process of transmitting memory is therefore another internal frame, as the witness frames her narrative for reception and comprehension, for herself, for the interviewers, for us, for posterity. This process involves linguistic and temporal reference points, and one of the unique aspects of such testimony is the shifting and blending of these frames of reference.

One particularly articulate woman, for example, finds herself as a medium or meeting point for a number of temporal, spatial, and linguistic frames of reference:

> My sister – I have one who is in St. Louis and I was the youngest of the three sisters whenever she sees me she still cries because I was growing and my spine was completely . . . curved out and I had no hair on my head and then one time there was . . . on a Sunday they were taking people . . . *links* and right and *links* and right and my sister found someplace a piece of red paper so she put it on my cheeks and she put some . . . two pieces of rags on my head so I won't look so devastating and . . . or devastated and she um . . . somehow I made it to my sister's.[10]

Here memory disrupts the orderliness of time and space, often inserting itself into temporal and spatial gaps and making such categories subservient to its own purposes. In survivor testimony, time and space often distort and conflate, so that presence in *this temporal* frame can quickly become presence in *that spatial* frame, there rather than here. Self-translation into testimony thus leaves gaps and eruptions behind that are themselves remarkably telling in their spontaneity, as in the example above where scraps of German intrude into the English language narrative frame. Needless to say, the video medium is particularly well suited to convey such convergences.

The search for adequate, appropriate language often relies on or incorporates metaphor and simile – figures of speech marked by the struggle to express what was frequently felt as other-worldly in a this-worldly context. Consider, in the following excerpt, Edith P., whose slightly perspiring face fills and even overflows the screen, so that her chin and forehead are cut off, while her voice and breathing are audibly laboured:

> Auschwitz, if I would like to describe it, I would say there is, there has not been, there has not been . . . [struggling to speak] people did not invent an expression what Auschwitz was. It was hell on earth and . . . the silence of Auschwitz was hell. The nights were hell and the days . . . somehow. . . . We got up at three o'clock in the morning and at four o'clock summertime or four-thirty when the sun came up, it was not like the sun, I swear to you it was not bright, it was always red to me, it was always black to me, it never said . . . never was life to me, it was destruction. The sun was never beautiful.[11]

The language is striking, and vaguely poetic. Young comments: 'Even if this survivor had never heard Paul Celan's "Todesfugue", the listener cannot avoid the literary allusion to the poem's first words, "Black milk of daybreak . . . ", itself a classic figure for the grotesqueness of this time. In these testimonies, the speakers necessarily figure their experiences as the images on the video screen inevitably figure the speakers themselves.'[12] Self-figuration is thus framed in the process of its unfolding.

The same woman, responding to her own reflections about Germans, conveys her feelings through recourse to a classical image of exile:

> How should I feel towards these people, who have . . . the greatest tragedy that they have done to us is . . . that they have unrooted us, we are a people without a past [she clenches her fists]. And I have been one among the very lucky ones, because I have a *beautiful* family who understands me, but we have been *unrooted* of our past, we had to bring up children . . . without mothers, without grandmothers.[. . .] They uprooted us; we have been *exiled*.[13]

The collective Jewish experience of Galut, of dispersion from one's roots, is here twisted to express a feeling of being exiled from one's own past; the survivor's loneliness is expressed as the exile from history and family. In this age of diasporization, of continued dispersion and dislocation of peoples and cultures, Edith P.'s combined reflection on the present and memory of the past bears special relevance and poignancy.

In one more example of this unique metaphorization process, itself a process whereby witnesses frame their experiences, survivor Martin S. offers a provocative image of self-figuration and -framing as he answers a question about a typical day in the labour camp:

> I hate to say this, but periodically, when I see . . . I go to Houston a great deal, and you can't get away from the cockroaches there, in the plants, and I see one dodging, I see myself, I can't bring myself to kill it [he smiles]. And I . . . I see myself in that . . . when I see sometimes on television, they show rats, and the way they're treating them and the way they dodge, I see myself that way. That was the typical day [he smiles]; that's all I can remember, this constant looking over my shoulder.[14]

What can we make of this difficult and disturbing description? Is Mr. S. aware that he is using the very same metaphor of dehumanization applied in actuality by the perpetrators themselves? Is his language a rehabilitation of an externally imposed figuration (as in the case of the pink triangle in the Gay rights movement), a successful and powerful moment of insight, an unwitting descent into self-victimization, a hackneyed cliché? In framing his experience in this way, in order to make it commensurable, Mr. S. is framing himself, offering a context in which he (and we) can understand his own experience. He thus incorporates his very being into the testimonial process, invoking what Young calls 'the ontology of testimony, [when] witness it quite literally being made before our eyes.'[15]

These images – language choices and ruptures, metaphors and similes, meta-historical and even mythic constructs – all examples of the inward-moving frame of the entire testimonial process, not only make video testimonies distinctive but also mark them with what can be called a vernacular poetics – an immediate, spontaneous, perhaps naive kind of figuration that makes the testimonies so truthful and so worthy of close analysis. And if this figuring in language of Holocaust experience emerges through what in a literary analysis would be considered cliché at times (rats and cockroaches, black suns, 'hell on earth') we must at least consider carefully the source and basis for such facile metaphors. Is it because such figures are already operative as icons in general culture? Is it because the survivor has no other words, because she does not and did not live in a figurative vacuum, then or now? Or is it because we as viewers are particularly sensitive to the appropriateness of Holocaust language, to the modes and manner of its expression?

These questions become more pronounced when our attention is drawn to the distinctions between literary and videotaped testimonies and the different kinds of languages used in each, each with its own rules and stylistic order (or disorder). They call to mind the crucial difference between the more spontaneous, vernacular expression of memory in the videotapes and the more highly crafted style of literary memoirs, with their inherent temporal buffer.

In this light we can consider the comments of Lawrence Langer, author of *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory*, the fruit of an eight-year study of and involvement with the Fortunoff Video Archive, who has argued that these testimonies are marked by what can be called an 'anesthetics'. By this suggestive term he refers to a certain distorted sensitivity required for one to be aware of the an-aesthetics and non-sense of Holocaust testimonies and the stories they embody.

> If we cannot find an aesthetics for Auschwitz, we must be content with what [Jean-François] Lyotard calls an 'anesthetics' . . . As anesthesia is the medical means for making one insensible, anesthetics deals with the art of the insensible (and in a related way, with the non-sensible), plunges us into the non-sense (not the nonsense) of the disaster, reminds us that no ordinary feelings will make us sensitive to the appeal of such an unprecedented catastrophe. If art is concerned with the creation of beautiful forms, Holocaust testimony, and perhaps Holocaust art as well, deals with the creation of 'mal-forms', though we may not yet have arrived at recognizing the legitimacy of this undertaking – to say nothing of the word itself.[16]

Part of the anesthetics of memory, then, involves the non-sense of the temporal layers and frameworks of the survivors' testimonies, captured on video in all their fullness. Such anesthetics point both to the clichéd style of figuration in the testimonies and to the possibly banal nature of their telling. But this non-sensical figuration is also anesthetic, in that it numbs those watching and listening. Langer's anesthetics thus remind us as well of the ways we ourselves, as viewers, are implicated in the non-sense of Holocaust testimony.

Such 'non-sense' also points to the ultimately contingent and inconclusive nature of Holocaust testimonies, especially as framed in and by videotape. Part of this stems from the very impossibility of testimony itself: the thing about which survivors struggle to give testimony – what we call Holocaust, Shoah, Churban – always eludes, at some critical stage, description and containment. Paradoxically, the events to which survivors are witnesses thus black out the witnesses' memory of them because of their traumatic impact. This constitutes a 'black hole' at exactly the place of the trauma's recollection: an impossible medium of silence through which any remembrance or forgetting must pass.[17]

This is illustrated by Dr. Fred O.'s testimony, given in 1987. Dr. O. was born in Poland in 1909; he speaks very expressively, using his hands often to accentuate his points:

> I still feel that, no matter what I said here, these episodes and things like that, these are only words, that try to describe emotions, feelings, situations, whatnot. But these are only words that are too feeble expressions of what really they should mean. You can't, you can't . . . you can't exteriorate from your deep well, deep hidden emotions, you can't exteriorate them and show them in words. It's impossible. There are things that will never be told, because they cannot be told. Like, like the other day, somebody said it's – here's a photograph of . . . let's say five hundred bodies, right in a concentration camp. You can see them, in one frame you can still, from far away you can see those piles of bodies. You have seen the pictures. But to say the six million perished in a similar way. There's no words. Six million . . . billion [sic] becomes a . . . two words: 'Six, million.' But what does it mean? Because you cannot multiply, in your mind, those five hundred by . . . what is it, 20,000 [I don't know] how many times it is, to have a conception of what it is six million. . . . I don't know, maybe a poet can do better justice.[18]

This struggle for the proper language in which to express these memories, beyond the issues of figuration already addressed, emerges in countless versions in these tapes.

Thus, the one giving testimony attempts to overcome this 'memory gap' by volunteering to mediate the trauma rather than control its out-flowing: what makes the witness an 'innovative figure' is his 'readiness to become himself a *medium of the testimony*.'[19] This makes of the initial trauma something akin to what astrophysicists call a 'singularity', an all-consuming point of origin from which the testimony ensues, a point before temporality, outside of which nothing exists. This is not only because survivors often narrate their experiences for the first time in these tapes, but also because this particular framework makes of their testimonial performance an entirely new event, even if they *have* told their stories before. As the testimony coaxes the narration of trauma from its silence, which always threatens to engulf it once more, a remarkably contingent performance is created. This performance bears a unique presence and present-ness, a space-time all its own: language itself here is 'in trial' (not 'on trial'), in practice, real and not abstract or theoretical,[20] tentatively articulating a singular temporal and spatial realm from which few escape to tell their tales. In this context, Dori Laub suggests that the

> listener to trauma . . . needs to know that the trauma survivor who is bearing witness has no prior knowledge, no comprehension and no memory of what happened. That he or she

> profoundly fears such knowledge, shrinks away from it and is apt to close off at any moment, when facing it. He needs to know that such knowledge dissolves all barriers, breaks all boundaries of time and place, of self and subjectivity. That the speakers about trauma on some level prefer silence so as to protect themselves from the fear of being listened to – and of listening to themselves. That while silence is defeat, it serves them both as a sanctuary and as a place of bondage. Silence is for them a fated exile, yet also a home, a destination, and a binding oath. To *not* return from this silence is rule rather than exception.[21]

Before the articulation of memory, there is no memory: its time and space have not yet been created. The silence that stands in its place is home and exile at one and the same time.

SPACE-TIME

This leads us to a more critical engagement with the witness's search for proper language and the subsequent disruption of the spatial-temporal frame of reference. Langer makes some sense of these narratives' space-time in terms of the ticking of two testimonial clocks:

> a time clock (ticking from then to now) and a space clock (ticking from there to here). They seek to sensitize our imaginations to twin currents of remembered experience. One flows uninterruptedly from source to mouth, or in more familiar historical terms, from past to present. The other meanders, coils back on itself, contains rocks and rapids, and requires strenuous efforts to follow its twists and turns. . . .[22]

Langer suggests that this dual movement can also be characterized in literary terms as the twin progression of story and plot. The former, the story, is the chronological narrative while the latter, plot, 'reveals the witness seized by instead of selecting incidents, memory's confrontation with details embedded in moments of trauma. . . . "Arrival at Auschwitz" is . . . tellable and told as both story *and* plot: Auschwitz as story enables us to pass through and beyond the place . . . while Auschwitz as plot stops the chronological clock and fixes the moments permanently in memory and imagination, immune to the vicissitudes of time.'[23] 'Plot' here bears a structural similarity to the 'black hole' 'singularity' of memory discussed above. As the twinned narrative told as story *and* plot folds in on itself, the result is the peculiarly fractured testimonial style of these tapes.

If, however, we nonetheless identify the 'story' of Auschwitz as the conventional narrative frame of reference and remembrance, Auschwitz as 'plot' becomes an alternative (but coterminous) frame, one that continually threatens to engulf the entire testimonial narrative. Listen to Sally H.:

> I have like a panorama in front of me, constantly. I could be in a room full of people. And . . . there was a time when I was, let's say in Skarzysko, where I didn't, I didn't talk at all. And . . . I just couldn't believe it, I just didn't talk. And then I was constantly talking after the war. Because then I realised I was afraid if I won't talk I'll see everything. . . . And even now, when . . . I vacuum or do some tedious household thing I always cry. I always see . . . I could be with a hundred people and if I sit quiet, it's just like a panorama with all that stuff coming through my head.[24]

This constant threat, this palpable presence of the past (Langer calls this persistence of memory 'durational time', distinct from chronological time), may not only disrupt the space-time of the survivor and her testimony, but it draws us in as well. Watching such accounts, we are no longer simply voyeurs (as if voyeurism were ever simple) but are ourselves implicated in the unfolding narrative. As participant observers to the remembering process, we cannot help but be drawn in.

This expands the frame of Holocaust remembrance created by the videotaped testimonial narrative outwards to frame us as well. If for Laub the frames of witnessing to the horrors of the Holocaust might be distinctly delineated – he 'recognize[s] three separate, distinct levels of witnessing in relation to the Holocaust experience: the level of being a witness to oneself within the experience; the level of being a witness to the testimonies of others; and the level of being a witness to the process of witnessing itself'[25] – here the dividing lines are blurred. Not only are the time and space of memory and the frames of testimony determined by and negotiated in the give and take between the survivor and her memories and between the survivor and her interviewers. The video medium ends up mediating a commemorative narrative negotiated between the survivor on one side of the screen and the viewer on the other. In fact, according to Laub, 'the listener (or the interviewer) becomes the Holocaust witness *before* the narrator does,'[26] once again suggesting the extent to which testimony disrupts the temporal frame.

It is important for us to consider this disruption carefully, for it appears to depend on three characteristics of the testimonial process: its contingent and inconclusive nature, its performative qualities, and its non-cognitive aspects. Together these come to mark testimony as something always in process, never finished, something which emerges in a negotiated space often without prior thought. Testimony, in its 'pure' form (if there ever were such a thing) appears to grow directly out of the survivor's trauma from which the memories speak themselves, as it were, with little intervention from the conscious intellect. This means, to elaborate on Laub's statement in the preceding paragraph, that the knowledge generated within the broad testimonial framework is also continually in process. As Laub and Felman note in their book's introduction, which seeks to articulate a relationship between testimony and 'culture' and thereby identify a sense of the past in the present: 'This is . . . a book about how art inscribes (artistically bears witness to) *what we do not yet know of our lived historical relation to the events of our times.*'[27] Holocaust videotestimonies, in the scene of their reception, offer precisely the epistemological content Felman and Laub, and the rest of us, seek.

Testimony, in this context, both deeply informs and involves the one who is witness to the *making* of testimony. Laub again:

> To a certain extent, the interviewer-listener takes on the responsibility for bearing witness that previously the narrator felt he bore alone, and therefore could not carry out. It is the encounter and the coming together between the survivor and the listener, which makes possible something like a repossession of the act of witnessing. This joint responsibility is the source of the emerging truth.[28]

This testimonial repossession is a literal re(-)collection, which also serves to gather together all the people invoked by the act of testimony into some kind of dialogic community. The result is that the nearly predatory presence of memory stalks us visitors to the process of an unfolding memorial narrative, and that literally and figuratively breaks the testimonial frame.

ZOOMING OUT

In fact, the frame of the survivor's testimony is 'broken' in a variety of ways. One might suggest that the very act of giving testimony is already a breaking free of the trauma of survival, that witnessing as a performative necessarily exceeds its own framework. Even survival itself can be construed as breaking the framework of the Nazi death-world, where testimony is a record of that eruption. Such eruption may break the bonds of historical accuracy: one woman's testimony, for example, includes a description of the famous Auschwitz uprising, in which she inaccurately describes the explosion of *four* crematorium chimneys, not just the one that was destroyed in the rebellion. Does this render her testimony invalid? No, but it does speak to a truth different from the one historians generally seek out: 'The woman's testimony . . . is breaking the frame of the concentration camp by and through her very testimony: she is breaking out of Auschwitz even by her very talking. She had come, indeed, to testify, not to the empirical number of the chimneys, but to resistance, to the affirmation of survival, to the breakage of the frame of death. . . . It is not merely her speech, but the very boundaries of silence which surround it, which attest, today as well as in the past, to this assertion of resistance.'[29] Laub here pays close and critical attention to the negative spaces of testimony: both to the silence that (almost) engulfs speech, and to the inaccuracies in the repossession of speech.

Breaking out of the frame of death in this way is essentially a distortion: testimonies necessarily feature the few (can we rightly call them lucky?) that survived, narrating the improbability of survival. We must remember that, contrary to what we see in ever-repeated yet endlessly original forms, these narratives represent a gross imbalance with respect to the great majority of those who did not survive and are therefore not able to give their testimony. Video archives preserve, therefore, a rarefied, select fraction of the total potential Holocaust memorial narratives that would be accessible were this a world beyond death. Though the majority of such narratives remain inaccessible, the testimonies that do exist function as memorial pointers gesturing in the general direction of those who cannot speak for themselves. The void of silence, therefore, which surrounds the testimony and out of which (or into which) the witness speaks, is also this distortion, this narrative imbalance. As testimonies pile up, we see them as ever-greater indicators of the black hole of testimony out of which most did not escape. Excess, in testimony, and in the excesses to which testimony points, can thus illuminate. We see therefore the degree to which the initial, internal frame of testimony hardly contains, upon closer scrutiny, the excesses of memory.

We return, therefore, to the image with which I began, zooming out now from the television screen rather than zooming in. If we envision that TV frame once more we can now consider the implications of the frames of reference on its other side, frames that might be more social or intellectual in nature, like the historical frame referred to above. Most interesting here are two positions on our side of the TV screen: the viewer's frame and the institutional frame. Consider: Are we simply passive observers, looking through the looking glass of history, safely separated in time and space from these events, untouched and untouchable? What are our own frames of reference and expectation? What are our presuppositions? *Can* we even relate to these witnesses?

For Dr. Dori Laub, as has been suggested already, the very nature of the testimonial process demands the eruption of the witness's narrative into the viewer's frame of reference, because it is the viewer who actually serves as the address for the testimonial transmission:

> The emergence of the narrative which is being listened to – and heard – is, therefore, the process and the place wherein the cognizance, the 'knowing' of the event is given birth to. The listener, therefore, is party to the creation of knowledge *de novo*. The testimony to the trauma thus includes its hearer, who is, so to speak, the blank screen on which the event comes to be inscribed for the first time.[30]

Testimonies of the Holocaust therefore *require* the presence of a viewer to whom the witness becomes bonded because of her role as other: 'Testimonies are not monologues; they cannot take place in solitude. The witnesses are talking *to somebody*: to somebody they have been waiting for for a long time.'[31] The otherness of the viewer is crucial, for the goal of generational transmission proposed by these archiving projects posits the existence of such an 'untainted' auditor, the blank screen or clean slate on which and for which the survivor gives her testimony.[32] It is important to note, however, that such an auditor is hardly and rarely untainted, for she brings to her side of the television screen her own interests and agenda, and her own preconceptions of the Holocaust. Memory can never make a 'first' impression here; in this context the wax writing pad of memory is never blank.

Martin S., the survivor who periodically goes to Houston and is reminded of his experiences when he sees cockroaches there, offers a suggestion in this regard:

> I would hate to think that my sitting here is just an academic exercise, because someone may be given a grant so that he may do additional research and thereby make a living. This is too painful. We *must* do something to change man [voice breaking] because I'm a very bitter man [voice almost gone, almost pleading look on face] [tape cut here].[33]

If we are merely voyeurs, therefore, we may be taking advantage of the witnesses and not responding sufficiently to the privilege of our position and our frame of reference. If we expect the survivor simply to remain passive, on his side of the television screen, then we are not being sensitive enough to our own roles in the memorial-testimonial process, roles that are invoked in the very act of testimony.

EXCESSIVE MEMORY

We also have to think responsibly about the institutional frame of reference. While we recognise the necessity of making these tapes available to the public in some form, we cannot help but wonder at the effect on Holocaust memory of the dissemination and distribution of such testimonies. To what do they testify? Is the viewer's imagination sufficiently malleable to accommodate the extreme horrors narrated at the core of the large majority of these tapes? One can assume, for example, that most of the publicly available tapes distributed by the Yale archive are used in an educational setting, with the requisite contextual frame provided by the teacher or other authority figure.[34]

What do we do, however, with the excess presented by the VHF? How does it enhance the memorial role of videotestimonies? We return, therefore, to the frame of reference with which we began. In light of the foregoing discussion, how do we now respond to the Hollywood-style 'packaging' of survivor testimony that appears to be part of the VHF programme, with a massive budget, high visibility, and over 50,000 testimonies recorded since 1991? I do not wish to offer some simplistic, elitist critique of the Foundation's project, but I do want to consider critically its operational framework and agenda in terms of present-day collection and categorization and planned future presentation and dissemination.

The VHF is involved in a project of setting the agenda for future Holocaust education and memorialization. In size and scope alone, it is poised to dominate the field of Holocaust videotestimonies. The Foundation currently holds over 100,000 hours of testimony in its 80-terabyte robotic archive, but this mass of data is useless without a mechanism for dissemination. What is the archive's strategy? For Matthew Chuck, the VHF's former manager of technologies, the VHF must devise a system for speaking directly to the personal interests and questions of those who search the archive via one of five initial 'repositories'. At these sites (the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, New York's Museum of Jewish

Heritage, Yale University, and Israel's Yad Vashem), a local 'cache' will provide instant access to about 300 testimonies, selected to respond to the presumed issues and concerns facing the particular visitor to that repository. Though Chuck, and the VHF as a whole, is reluctant to identify any particular 'agenda' at the heart of their project, he does say that the main thrust of the VHF is to amass a particular kind of evidence about tolerance for the sake of the future:

> It's easy to deny hearsay, it's not easy to deny 50,000 people looking you in the face and saying, 'This did happen to my grandmother, this did happen to someone I know, this happened to me.' And when we eliminate hearsay from history it's first-hand, and what we're doing, it's not just first-hand for our generation, it's first-hand for generations and generations and generations to come. When there are no survivors, we still have the ability to ask first-hand accounts. . . . If you want to look at it this way, fifty years from now, my grandkids can look in the eyes of the survivor and say, 'How did that feel?'[35]

This conceptualization of the role and function of the VHF archive sees it as thoroughly future-oriented; Michael Berenbaum, former President of the VHF, has said that the archive has been 'created for the age that is going to be.'[36] This is a form of time-travel, if you will, that will harness technology for the purpose of bringing a present-day version of the past into dialogue with the future. Indeed, it is an ambitious goal to envision videotestimony as so profoundly interactive, though it comes from a keen perception of the nature and possibility of the medium.

The VHF will thus liberate the stories of the survivors from the frames of reference that restrict their access and facilitate the passing on of these stories to everyone interested in hearing them. In this manner history, which is presented as something based on someone else's off-screen testimony, as it were, and therefore neither as compelling nor as reliable as something based on an on-screen account (hearsay vs. first-hand), is made popular and attractive to all members of general society. By means of technology, the evidence contained in survivor testimonies becomes present, accessible, and therefore incontrovertible, buttressed by the planned ubiquity of the VHF videotestimonies: Berenbaum wants to see this material in all the major cities, in universities – a vast, searchable, profoundly effective framework (Berenbaum has called it a 'skeleton') by which all can participate in constructing a history of the Holocaust.

As Berenbaum sees it, the VHF is therefore involved in creating a 'people's history', where 'quantity solves the problem of quality.' In this respect the VHF is driven by a broad, almost totalizing vision to establish the very agenda for 'values education' in the 21st century. This is more than merely setting the tone for future discussion and analysis: in a few years, it is very possible that the VHF will have succeeded in dominating entirely the realm of Holocaust (and tolerance) education. What will the landscape of Holocaust memory look like if thousands of videotestimonies are available at the touch of a button, far overshadowing the current availability of written memoirs? The VHF will have the ability to determine for many years to come the medium by which most members of the next generation learn about the Shoah. Berenbaum suggests that the full impact of the videotestimonial medium may not be known for another hundred years, or even a thousand, but that the opportunity to preserve these stories in this manner must nevertheless be seized. This transforms victims into witnesses, not only to their own past but also to a future that has yet to be determined. The VHF is thus, in Berenbaum's language, more involved in marketing the Holocaust than in promoting it. This is not meant to commodify the Shoah, but rather to recognize that the former strategy aims to create a 'product', then get people to 'buy it', while the latter is more concerned with first defining the need for a certain product and then responding. For Berenbaum, the VHF and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum are both examples of marketing rather than promotional strategies, and both take the Holocaust beyond its 'instrumentality for the re-parochialization of Holocaust memory as Jewish memory'. Again, this clearly sets a new agenda for Holocaust education and memory.

Because of these issues of size, scope, and agenda, there is, therefore, a crucial difference between the VHF and the Yale archive, and that difference is instructive with respect to the future of Holocaust memory as mediated through the genre of videotestimony. According to Matthew Chuck, the Fortunoff Archive at Yale, since it is not designed to be fully computerized and searchable, is already sufficiently large (currently about 4100 testimonies) for its own agenda. This satisfies a primarily academic audience ready and willing to view whole tapes and thus, I would argue, 'digest' complete accounts. Yale's own rules regarding access treat their archive, according to Berenbaum, like a 'rare book room', a restricted place, in my view, to which the researcher must come and at which she must spend significant time, thus requiring a seriousness of commitment in the engagement with the material. But, as Berenbaum argues, the VHF is much more like the 'other side of a museum', in that a museum (and by analogy the Yale archive) brings people to a place, while the VHF 'brings experience to a people'. For Berenbaum, the ultimate goal of the VHF is to be spaceless, an archive whose spatial limitations are only those of the available technology for dissemination. In this way the VHF positions itself as more of a 'public' institution than Yale. The 'public' the VHF serves also comes with a different agenda and different expectations, driven by a sound bite based, technologically saturated world in which all knowledge is available on demand. The VHF will therefore offer Shoah-on-demand to a new age of cyber-surfing data-samplers, a full technological generation beyond the intended audience of the Yale archive.

And, for this new generation, size is always a priority. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the VHF is so vast in scope: the original target of 50,000 testimonies recorded has recently been revised as simply tens of thousands. Clearly the archive wishes to capture and preserve as many testimonies as time and money will allow. Is this excessive? Yes, but perhaps that is the point: to meet the excesses of the Shoah, an event that already exceeds its own bounds and its own representation, with excess, to meet the spectre of total annihilation with another kind of totality, to answer any charge of impropriety with an onslaught of data in all its multiplicity.

The VHF thus carries the inherent excessiveness of testimony to an institutional extreme. As such, it also stretches the notion of what constitutes an archive, which is by nature, a legal institution: archives literally 'lay down the law' in their role as repositories for the various records of human memory. Traditionally, archives existed as dry, stale places to which only those sufficiently energetic and qualified could gain access. But now, especially with the work of the Shoah Foundation, the archive of the memory of the Holocaust will be more widely and easily accessible than any archive before it. In this manner, the project of the VHF exposes the dual character of the archive, which is according to Jacques Derrida 'at once *institutive* and *conservative*. Revolutionary and traditional.'[37] The archive thus moves in two simultaneous directions: towards the past and towards the future, even as it sits in the temporal juncture between these two poles. And when we come to that space, burning with the feverish desire for knowledge, for the authority and the authorization that the archive grants, we express our own need for the archive:

> We are *en mal d'archive*: in need of archives. Listening to the French idiom, and in it the attribute *en mal de*, to be *en mal d'archive* can mean something else than to suffer from a sickness, from a trouble or from what the noun *mal* might name. It is to burn with a passion. It is never to rest, interminably, from searching for the archive right where it slips away. It is to run after the archive, even if there's too much of it, right where something in it anarchives itself. It is to have a compulsive, repetitive, and nostalgic desire for the archive, an irrepressible desire to return to the origin, a homesickness, a nostalgia for the return to the most archaic place of absolute commencement. No desire, no passion, no drive, no compulsion, indeed no repetition compulsion, no '*mal de*' can arise for a person who is not already, in one way or another, *en mal d'archive*.[38]

Holocaust videotestimonies, in all their frames, well depict this passion, this sickness, this need to return to the origin in memory, a return that is represented in the progression of the videotape, towards an origin that in many ways is unknown prior to its telling. And they also contain within them the desire of the voyeur, searching for this place of commencement. Not only are she and the witness bound together in the testimonial enterprise, but also their joining points to the archive's other gesture towards the future:

> [T]he question of the archive is not . . . a question of the past. It is not the question of a concept dealing with the past that might *already* be at our disposal or not at our disposal, *an archivable concept of the archive*. It is a question of the future, the question of the future itself, the question of a response, of a promise and of a responsibility for tomorrow. The archive: if we want to know what that will have meant, we will only know in times to come. Perhaps. Not tomorrow but in times to come, later on or perhaps never. A spectral messianicity is at work in the concept of the archive and ties it, like religion, like history, like science itself, to a very singular experience of the promise.[39]

That is to say that an archive is always about some future purpose and goal which is promised but not yet realised, a messianic dream endlessly deferred. The archive is thus a redemptive institution which by nature exceeds the bounds of the past conserved within it. An archive of Holocaust videotestimonies only makes this messianic promise acute.

Between the past and the future, the longing for origins and the promise of redemption, the archive of Holocaust videotestimonies brings survivor and witness together in an eternal present. Where technology once limited the eternal present of catastrophe to the confines of liturgy and commemoration, these new technological advances have enriched and enhanced the weave of the fabric of communal memory. In addition, they offer a medium for the construction of a sense of the past and its meaning on into the future.

Holocaust videotestimonies are thus situated at an important juncture in the time and space of the memory of the Shoah. This position is exposed by attention to the various frames of reference through which such testimonies are contextualized and from which they burst forth. What I want to suggest, ultimately, is that attention to these various frames of reference reveals the highly mediated nature of Holocaust memory as it is constructed in and through the use of videotaped survivor testimonies. These audio-visual memorials stand directly between the past and the future and serve as the media through which such memory is negotiated between witness and audience. Because they show us 'live' images of the survivors in the 'present', they restore to presence, life, and wholeness the 'canonical' images of skeletal survivors in striped uniforms barely alive, rehumanizing the static, lifeless images from the past that continue to haunt us.[40] But more than simply altering the 'canon' of Holocaust representation, these testimonies, and the institutions which frame them and preserve them for posterity, establish a new agenda for Holocaust memorialization.

In this way, on several simultaneous levels, the survivor, as framed by the videotape, becomes a conduit for the ebb and flow and, at times, flood of memory. The media of the video screen and the video-narrative literally mediate our engagement, as the audience, with the survivor's story, itself so '*im*mediate', so much a complete and complex memorial package, that without such mediation entry into the memorial process would not be possible. And this, in turn, provides the context for the ultimate goal and purpose of video-archives like Yale's and the VHF's: the transmission of Holocaust memory from survivor to viewer along the mediated conduit of videotestimony. Therefore, rather than suspect the video medium for leading us away from memory and tradition (Huyssen's question), we must realise that testimonies like these actually lead us back to a more solid and grounded sense of the presence of the past, to a clearer sense of the importance and relevance of Holocaust memory.

Ultimately, we see how the television screen, the border line separating inside from outside, one general frame of reference from another, is really an artificial dividing line. What must happen, what in fact does happen, is that, from both sides, that frame is broken, violated, disrupted. The survivor speaks across it, directly to us, and asks us to remember her story. And, equally important, we, in watching her testimony, enter her frame of reference and, in some small way, attempt to understand the horrors she witnessed. The mediating process of Holocaust video testimonies thus continues: the making of memory is an ongoing collective, communal, and cultural process that, like the memory of the survivors, never really comes to closure. In this continuing process, we ultimately create our own frames of reference and remembrance for viewing, understanding, and empathizing with the witnesses framed by the testimonial process, even as that process takes them, and us, beyond the bounds of time and space into a genuine, and potentially redemptive, engagement. Perhaps this is what Geoffrey Hartman means when he calls such testimonies a 'homeopathic form of representation'.[41] Each one, by offering up a minuscule sample of the excesses of the Shoah, begins to provide in the process a cure for the human ailment of which the Holocaust may be the most virulent strain.

NOTES

1 The author acknowledges the generous assistance of the following individuals: at the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale University, Geoffrey Hartman and Joanne Rudoff; at the Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation, Michael Berenbaum, Matthew Chuck, and Michael Nutkiewicz.

2 Interview with Kim Feinberg, South African coordinator for the VHF, June 1997, Johannesburg.

3 From a full-page advertisement for the foundation seeking donors that appeared in the November 13, 1997 issue of the *Jerusalem Report*.

4 Andreas Huyssen, 'Monument and Memory in a Postmodern Age', in *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, ed. James E. Young (New York: The Jewish Museum, 1994), p.11.

5 I owe a great deal to Iwona Irwin-Zarecka's book, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory* (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers, 1994), for inspiring me to think critically about the processes of 'framing' here.

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

7 This paper is based in part on a month-long visit to the Yale archive in August 1993. I thank the archive for its support and for granting me permission to publish excerpts from the testimonies housed there.

8 Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust*, p.158.

9 It could be suggested that this itself represents a not-too-subtle appropriation, or even colonization, of Holocaust memory by the English, particularly American English, speaking world: the money for such projects is here, primarily, and hence this is increasingly becoming the dominant language of memory.

10 Tape T-3, Sally H., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

11 Tape A-39, excerpt from the testimony of Edith P., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

12 Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust*, p.160.

13 Tape T-107, Edith P., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

14 Tape T-641, Martin S., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

15 Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust*, p.161.

16 Lawrence L. Langer, 'Memory's Time: Chronology and Duration in Holocaust Testimonies', in *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 6, no. 2 (fall 1993): 268–9.

17 Dori Laub, 'Bearing Witness, or the Vicissitudes of Listening', in Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (NY and London: Routledge, 1992), p.65.

18 Tape T-943, Dr. Fred O., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

19 Shoshana Felman, 'Education and Crisis, or the Vicissitudes of Teaching', in Felman and Laub, p.24, italics in original.

20 Felman, 'Education and Crisis', p.5.

21 Laub, 'Bearing Witness', p.58.

22 Lawrence L. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), p.174.

23 Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies*, pp.174–5.

24 Tape T-3, Sally H., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

25 Dori Laub, 'An Event Without a Witness: Truth, Testimony, and Survival', in Felman and Laub, p.75.

26 Laub, 'An Event Without a Witness', p.85.

27 Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, 'Foreword', in Felman and Laub, p.xx, italics in original.

28 Laub, 'An Event Without a Witness', p.85.

29 Laub, 'Bearing Witness', p.62.

30 Laub, 'Bearing Witness', p.57.

31 Laub, 'Bearing Witness', pp.70–71.

32 This idea is embedded in language: we speak of someone '*giving* testimony;' we therefore must consider to whom such testimony is being given. What is the nature of this legacy, this inheritance?

33 Tape T-641, Martin S., Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.

34 See Felman, 'Education and Crisis.'

35 Interview with Matthew Chuck at the VHF, 11 December 1997. All quotations are taken from this interview.

36 Interview with Michael Berenbaum at the VHF, 11 December 1997. All quotations are taken from this interview.

37 Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p.7.

38 Derrida, p.91.

39 Derrida, p.36.

40 See Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust*, p.163.

41 Geoffrey H. Hartman, 'The Cinema Animal', in Yosefa Loshitsky, ed., *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on* Schindler's List (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), p.70.

MEMORIES OF MIKHAILOWKA:

LABOUR CAMP TESTIMONIES IN THE ARNOLD DAGHANI ARCHIVE

Edward Timms

THE ARTIST Arnold Daghani (1909–1985) came from a German-speaking Jewish family in Suczawa, a small town in the Bukowina on the eastern frontier of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (now Suceava in Romania). Although he visited Vienna, Munich and Paris as a young man, he seems to have received scarcely any formal artistic training. Indeed, his career began under the most adverse circumstances – in the Mikhailowka labour camp in the Ukraine. He and his wife Nanino, whom he married in 1940, were Romanian citizens living in Czernowitz at the time of the German invasion. In June 1942 they were deported across the river Bug to Mikhailowka, together with four hundred other Jews who were forced to work as slave labourers. Among the few personal possessions which Daghani took with him when they were deported was a set of water-colours and a sketchbook (a Romanian guard had persuaded him to keep them in his knapsack). He was thus able to complete a remarkable series of paintings and drawings recording the appalling conditions in the camp. He and his wife had to endure twelve months of forced labour under extremely arduous conditions, working for the August Dohrmann company on the construction of a strategic military road, known by the abbreviation DG IV (Durchgangsstrasse IV).

During this period Daghani and his wife witnessed the arbitrary execution of many of their fellow prisoners by German officers or Lithuanian armed guards. There was also an outbreak of typhoid at the end of 1942 which resulted in many deaths. In the summer of 1943, however, Daghani's artistic gifts earned them the opportunity to spend some nights outside the barbed wire in the neighbouring town of Gaissin, when he was commissioned to design a mosaic of a German eagle for the villa of an official of the Dohrmann company. They were treated with some sympathy by members of the Dohrmann staff, including the engineer Werner Bergmann, the foreman Josef Elsässer and a secretary named Martha Fischer. It was this that made it possible for Daghani and his wife to escape in July 1943, aided by a Jewish cobbler who was a member of the resistance. They were able to smuggle out of the camp about fifty of his artistic works, concealed in a metal tube. They spent several months hiding in the ghetto of the small town of Bershad, and in September they learnt that the prisoners from Mikhailowka had been transferred to Tarassiwka, after the camp was attacked by partisans. In January 1944, as they were preparing to return to Bucharest, they received the terrible news that camp in Tarassiwka had been liquidated and all the remaining prisoners exterminated.[1]

These events left an indelible impression on Daghani's personality, and in March 1944, after he and his wife had reached the relative safety of Bucharest, he began to compile a narrative of events at Mikhailowka in the form of a diary. This was published after the war in several languages, and it forms the core of a remarkable series of