Chapter 3

Structuring the past:

Sculpture and 'Storytelling' in Survivor Testimony

It is not a story. It has to be made a story. In order to convey it.[238]

The term 'storytelling' may initially bring to mind associations of fictitiousness, of 'made-up' scenarios and, ultimately, of 'untruth'. To be sure, the idea of 'telling stories' may at first seem in opposition to the very nature of Holocaust testimonies, and to be inappropriate if applied in any way to survivor memory. But in spite of this seemingly commonsensical reaction, the supposition that storytelling necessarily carries with it connotations of fictionality - and that it is therefore by its very nature diametrically opposed to testimony – is erroneous. Research in fact shows us that storytelling is an important means of communication that we all naturally use to structure our thoughts, feelings and experiences into everyday language.[239] In reality, people use stories in order to 'share real life experiences, values and attitudes'[240] with others, and importantly, it is through this exchange that we are able to 'transform our thinking about ourselves in the world'.[241] Researchers posit, however, that when someone has lived through a traumatic

---

[238] 'Leon'. Quoted in Henry Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors:* p. xvii

[239] See Rhiannon Crawford, Brian Brown, Paul Crawford. *Storytelling in Therapy* (Nelsen Thornes Ltd, 2004) Imparting stories has been shown to be an extremely effective communicative tool, and as Teresa Grainger argues in *Traditional Storytelling*, it is a rhetorical device that we all use: 'storytelling is an ancient art form,' she posits, 'an *integral part of human existence*, and the most enduring form of education. Teresa Grainger. *Traditional Storytelling: In the Primary Classroom* (Leamington Spa: Scholastic Ltd, 1997), p.13. My emphasis

[240] Ibid p.1. In fact, Jones and Buttrey locate storytelling as one of our earliest forms of communication, emerging not from textual forms and the printed word 'but [from] speech, not [belonging] to our skill in reading, but to our natural urge to listen and talk.' Anthony Jones and J. Buttrey, *Children and Stories* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), p.1.

[241] Jones A and Buttrey, *Children and Stories* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971, p.1.

experience they are often unable to structure their recollections of that time into a coherent narrative framework, their memories instead 'fragment[ing]', and becoming 'image[s] without context';[242] but by piecing their memories into a coherent 'story' - or series of stories – survivors of traumatic events are able to speak about their recollections in a manner that is both comprehensible to their listening audience, and beneficial for their own mental recovery.[243] Indeed, Judith Herman has found that the act of telling their stories 'in the safety of a protected relationship can actually produce a change in the abnormal processing of...[a person's] traumatic memory' and that this practice[244] can 'relie[ve]...many of the major symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder.'[245] Despite this claim, Elie Wiesel still asserts that there remains a rift - or as he terms it 'an unbridgeable gulf' - of trauma 'between the survivor's memory and its reflection in words',[246] his own included. In this chapter, I will examine the configuration of storytelling practices employed by Holocaust survivors as they relay their pasts, and explore the idea that storytelling can counter the trauma of witnessing, 'the *physioneurosis* induced by terror [being]... reversed through the use of words.'[247] I will also question what effect reconstructing traumatic memories into a cohesive life-story may have on survivors' remembered experiences, and probe what type of memory is relayed through a medium designed to 'transform our thinking about ourselves' in

---

[242] Herman, *Trauma and Recovery,* p.176. See also Katherine Borland "That's Not What I Said": Interpretative Conflict in Oral Narrative Research', in *The Oral History Reader: Second Edition,* ed. by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 2006), pp..310-321.

[243] See also Crawford, Brown and Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy,* and Margot Sunderland, *Using Story Telling as an Therapeutic Tool with Children* (Winslow Press Ltd, 2000)

[244] The process which Herman terms the 'transformation of memory', which is discussed later in this chapter.

[245] Herman, p.183

246 Elie Wiesel 'A Plea for the Survivors', in *A Jew Today.* trans. by Marion Wiesel (New York: Random House, 1978), p.198.

[247] Herman, *Trauma and Recovery* p.183. Herman's emphasis.

relation to the past. Finally, in order to bring together and evaluate research that has been conducted on storytelling practices in fields as diverse as psychology and Oral History, psychotherapy and sociology, this chapter will necessarily be much more theory-orientated than my previous ones. To counterweight this bulk of secondary research, however, I will rigorously compare and contrast these theoretical sources with my own findings.

Structure in Testimony

As I have outlined in Chapters 1 and 2, there are identifiably recurrent motifs in the content of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies, as well as discernable patterns in the way that these survivors enunciate of these recountings in various testimonial forms. But the chronologically progressive method of recounting which Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman frequently appear to favour when speaking about the Holocaust, is as much an example of repeated consistency in the way that these survivors *structure* their rememberings, as the *subject matter* of the recollections under consideration. The framework by which Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman configure their memories is therefore crucial to our overall understanding of the patterns that arise in survivor testimony; and it is imperative to examine the structure in which these survivors organise their memories *a capite ad calcem*, if we are to fully recognise what the traits previously identified in the subject matter and composition of their accounts ultimately denote. In order to achieve an intelligible analysis of the configuration of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies, this chapter will be centred on a systematic exploration of the formation of their memories as they appear in each of their

testimonies. I will also look at how each of these survivors narrates their memories in their oral and written accounts. On the basis of this information, I will posit what consistent patterns in the construction of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's recollections signify, and suggest how these motifs link with those explored in my previous chapters.

'Set' Modes of Remembrance: 'Fixing' Memory?

When casting a broadly comparative eye at the testimonies Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given since the end of the war, one will notice that there are many commonalities in the ways in which all three survivors have structured their recountings of the past. All three survivors, for instance, exhibit an almost formulaic method of speaking about their Holocaust experiences – seemingly reflecting on certain memories at the same designated point in each testimony they have given. The parallels between Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial arrangements are so marked, in fact, that I was drawn to question whether such consistencies are signs that Holocaust survivors have established a 'set' mode of narration when reflecting on their past lives. This proposition is not as radical as it may at first seem. Alistair Thomson in fact poses a similar question in *Anzac Memories: Putting Popular Memory Theory into Practice in Australia*, in which he explores the idea that surviving World War I soldiers talk about certain memories in 'relatively fixed'[248] ways. Thomson suggests this after noticing that some veterans appeared to have spoken about their pasts in what he sees as a rather

[248] Thomson, p. 247.

prescriptive manner, telling 'the same stories in the same ways to...various audiences'.[249] But Thomson goes on to assert that his interviewees' memories had not always been so 'fixed'; that their recollections appeared to have become more standardised over time, since they were not so uniform in the earliest interviews the soldiers gave.

The idea that people's memories become entrenched or 'set' over a period of time – normally after a person has spoken about their experiences on a number of occasions over a number of years - is well documented in oral history research.[250] But during the course of my study, I found that this did not seem to be the case when comparing the testimonies of Holocaust survivors. Indeed, and as I have noted in my previous chapters, what I found perhaps most striking is the very regularity with which Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greeman have *always* evoked and enunciated certain memories of the Holocaust in *every* testimony they have given since the end of the war - regardless of when that testimony was recorded. If we look at the earliest recorded depositions that these survivors have given as examples – as explored in Chapter 2 – we can see that though there are memories in both Anita Lasker-Wallfisch and Leon Greenman's 1945 liberation testimonies, and Trude Levi's 1958 account, which do not feature in their later

[249] Ibid. p. 247 Henry Greenspan also writes about a Holocaust survivor who 'retold the story of a prisoner's execution in each of his three different interviews'. Greenspan notes this, as 'it was apparent in each retelling that he did not remember having told me the story before' yet 'this was the only episode that he repeated in this way'. Greenspan finds this systematic recounting of the same memory over and again as unusual, and comments that this particular recounting is the only one which 'appeared to have a mind and a memory of its own' Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors* p. xvi .

[250] For instance, the well-renowned Oral Historian Luisa Passerini has written about how people come to 'remember...and recount...over the years'. Passerini asserts that as time passes, 'events in...life [are] superimposed one on the other, providing a firm point of reference for...memory.' In this way, Passerini argues, over the years people tend to 'project' their memories of the past 'onto an unchanging present' or, as she terms it 'static plane' of remembrance. Luisa Passerini, *Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class*. trans. by Robert Lumley and Jude Bloomfield (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melborne, Sydney, [1984] 1987), pp..22, 21.

interviews, for the most part all three survivors still refer to the same memories in their post-war testimonies that they speak about in detail in their earliest accounts. What is more, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's immediate post-war testimonies are as much focused on *these* memories, as are their later depositions. As an illustration, the reader can see that the memories which feature in Lasker-Wallfisch's 1945 appeals, and that arise recurrently thereafter in her later testimonies, include: being a political prisoner as a result of helping French prisoners of war to escape captivity; being imprisoned for one and a half years prior to being sent to Auschwitz; being a member of the Auschwitz women's orchestra; and her and her sister, Renate, falling ill, after which both girls were sent to Belsen. Likewise, the recollections which are present in Leon Greenman's 1945 testimony, and which reappear as central components in every testimonial he has subsequently given, include: his deportation; his selection upon arrival at Auschwitz, where he was separated from his wife and child; the Nazis' denial of his British nationality; his first conversation with another camp inmate; his experiences of forced labour; his undergoing medical experimentation; and his memories of the death march between Auschwitz and Buchenwald.

To add to this, although Trude Levi's earliest taped interview was recorded 13 years after Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman's first accounts,[251] she likewise recounts many of the same experiences in this testimony that she has gone on to speak (and write) about at length in her later accounts. For example, in her 1958 interview Levi talks about being attacked as a child for being Jewish; the circumstances surrounding her family's deportation to Auschwitz; her experiences working in a munitions factory as a slave

[251] The first taped testimony that I have found dating from 1958.

labourer; her subsequent transport to Hessisch-Lichtenau; and the death march during which she collapsed from exhaustion. These experiences are all essential parts of Levi's later testimonies. Yet as previously discussed - and unlike Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman - Levi incorporates many more 'factual' details to do with her camp experience into her earliest testimony that have been omitted from her later accounts.[252] This is not to say that the memories themselves - as they are enunciated in this testimony - differ significantly from the way Levi reflects upon these same experiences in her later testimonials. Rather, it seems that these purely factual omissions have occurred primarily because Levi has changed the structural emphasis of her recounting in her later testimonies – moving from speaking about her past in terms of the background circumstances to the Holocaust, to reflecting upon those elements which have made these incidents unique to her own personal situation.[253] This discrepancy is further counterweighted by the fact that Levi recalls *so many* of the same events in her 1958 interview that she then refers to in all of her later testimonies. On top of this, Levi configures these memories in the same sequentially ordered format in which she speaks about them in every one of her successive accounts. This means that when one reads the testimony as a whole, the same pattern of recounting that is present in Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman's testimonials can be traced from Levi's 1958 account to her most recent deposition.

[252] For instance, Levi includes a great many more precise facts – such as the exact amount of time she began and finished the day's 'Zaehl-Appell', and the amount of prisoners who were made to participate in this particular roll call, 5,000 – in this account. Levi also includes a lot more explanatory background material into this testimony, describing her experiences of the camp hierarchy, and what and who 'kapos' were. Indeed, the differences between Levi's first testimonial and Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman's first depositions are likely to be due to the fact that Levi's earliest account was recorded at a later date than the other two survivors testimonies.

[253] See Chapter 2.

These findings would seem to contradict the supposition that survivors' memories become more 'fixed' or static *purely* with the processes of time and repetition of description - that survivors only tell 'the same stories in the same ways to...various audiences' after 'settling into' giving voice to their recollections in a certain way over a number of years. Instead it seems that, though Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman may be able to speak about their memories in a more collected and organised manner after a period of time, that the *intrinsic components* of their recountings had already been formulated very soon after the events themselves were experienced, and indeed, put into practice from the time these memories were first voiced. What I am suggesting here then, and borrowing a concept from the Russian formalists, is that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman often instinctively adopt a causal and sequential formulaic 'plot' whilst reflecting on their pasts in order to structure their memories into arranged and coherent – that is to say 'storied' – forms.

What this means is that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman all seem to reflect upon their past lives in a manner dictated by the specific order and memory associations they unconsciously give to the events conveyed in their testimonies,[254] rather than knowingly

[254] The origin of the Russian Formalists' distinction between 'story' and 'plot' can be found in Boris Tomashevsky's essay 'Thematics' in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, ed. and trans. by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Bison Books, 1965) pp. 66-78. Tomashevsky sums up the divide between 'story' and 'plot' as follows: 'In brief, the story is "the action itself", the plot, "how the reader learns of the action"' p. 67. In short, Tomashevsky defines a 'story' as a straight-forward historically chronological account of the past, whilst a story is given a 'plot' when the narrative is dictated by the order the narrator gives the events conveyed. In oral history, Alessandro Portelli has refined this definition: 'we might say that oral sources, especially from nonhegemonic groups, are a very useful integration of other sources as far as the fabula – the logical, causal sequence of the story – goes; but they become unique and necessary because of their plot – the way in which the story materials are arranged by narrators in order to tell the story. The organization of the narrative reveals a great deal of the speakers' relationships to their history.' Alessandro Portelli, 'What Makes Oral History Different' in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson eds. *The Oral History Reader: Second Edition* (Routledge: London and New York, 2006) p.36.

assembling their recollections into a contrived and emplotted[255] framework. But what effect does this have on the configuration of eyewitness recountings, and more fundamentally, how is this hypothesis fit into to my analysis of survivor testimony? The fact that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial rememberings became established so early after living through the Holocaust, combined with the fact that their recountings vary so little in their later accounts, is precisely why these findings are so germane to my study. This is because it shows that all three survivors must have elected to talk about selective moments from their past lives almost immediately after actually experiencing the events that they describe in their first testimonies; that rather than *developing* a strategy of talking about the Holocaust some time after the war (which would have gradually allowed Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman to speak without evoking their most painful memories of suffering) that these survivors had already structured their recountings into a 'life-story' that enabled them to speak articulately about the genocide *at the time*. That this was the case with all three survivors, further suggests that the formation of their experiences into a life-story was less the result of planned and intentional composition, and more the product of reaction – an unconscious and spontaneous formulation of their rememberings into a workable whole. To add to this, the fact that a few memories included in their earliest testimonies were further 'edited out' of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's later accounts provides us with ancillary evidence that all three survivors have employed methods of speaking about the

[255] In terms of Hayden White's theory about the deliberate process of 'emplotment', whereby 'a sequence of events [is] fashioned into a story' and that story 'is gradually revealed to be a story of a particular kind.' See Hayden White *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe* (Balitmore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973) p.7.

past that simultaneously permitted them to contend with – and indeed contain - the trauma of what they have witnessed and experienced.

That people who have been subject to traumatic events may construct their recountings in such a way as to allow for their mental self-preservation whilst reflecting on that time is something Alistair Thomson also touches upon in his article – though he continues to insist that people's memories only become solidified in this manner with the process of time. Thomson also sees this 'petrification' of memory as proof that people recall the past in a manner that allows for the preservation of what he terms their 'subjective identit[ies]'[256] whilst describing highly disturbing memories from the war, and questions what is contained when survivors of such events relate memories which were once seemingly fluid and amorphous in more defined and clearly delineated ways. Thomson concludes that:

> Another related and difficult focus of the new interviews was upon the ways memories are affected by strategies of containment, by ways of handling frustration, failure, loss or pain. This required a sensitive balance between potentially painful probing and reading between the lines of memory. What is possible or impossible to remember, or even to say aloud? What are the hidden meanings of silences and sudden subject changes? What is being contained by a 'fixed' story? Deeply repressed experiences or feelings may be discharged in less conscious forms of expression, in past and present dreams, errors and Freudian slips, body language and even humour, which is often used to overcome or conceal embarrassment and pain. Discussion of the symbolic content and feelings expressed by war-related dreams suggested new understandings of the personal impact of the war, and of what could not be publicly expressed.[257]

[256] Thomson, p.246.
[257] Ibid.

Though Thomson acknowledges that there are sections of his interviewee's dialogue that lie beyond the remit of conventional oral history research, and even identifies some of these vacillations as 'strategies of containment', he does not interpret these barometers of disturbance further - although, ironically, he wholeheartedly advocates 'reading between the lines of memory' whilst in the act of interviewing.[258] To add to this, I suggest that Thomson fails to take note of an essential distinction here. Rather than describing memories narrated in a certain order as 'fixed' recollections, he should instead be searching for a more subtle and multi-layered definition of this configuration of traumatic memory. I propose that rather than having 'fixed' memories of the past, people who have experienced extremely traumatic events may have unconsciously *sculpted* their memories into a narrative format in order to contend with the 'frustration, failure, loss...[and] pain' certain recollections evoke. In fact, as my research has shown throughout the course of this study, despite the condensation of such memories into an organised story form, this instinctual containment mechanism is not impermeable. Survivor speech is still subject to 'silences and sudden subject changes...errors and Freudian slips' whilst relating past events, even in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's most recent testimonies. In fact, as I have shown, it seems that it is precisely at the moments when the restraint or containment of certain recollections fluctuates and begins to break down, that symptoms of unresolved trauma and post traumatic stress can be glimpsed through the survivors' veneer of composure – an idea we will return to later in this chapter.

[258] Defining them instead under the all-encompassing yet ultimately unhelpful moniker of 'hidden meanings'.

Sculpted Memory: Storytelling in Practice

What I term the 'sculpting' of survivor memory is apparent in multifarious forms, as the Holocaust eyewitnesses examined in this study use a number of processes to shape their recollections into effective - and articulate - testimonies. To illustrate this, I will simultaneously analyse the ways Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have spoken about their memories in their various testimonies, by laying extracts from each survivors' oral and written depositions next to each other. By doing this, I can demonstrate that each survivor has employed recurrent storytelling techniques through which they have constructed their experiences of the Holocaust into a coherent whole. If I begin by looking at Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's testimonies, one can seen that - aside from the narrative markers previously mentioned, such as when she organise her recountings around 'extraordinary' or significant incidents from the past - Lasker-Wallfisch also utilises other noteworthy 'storied' elements into her formation of her Holocaust memories. To show how Lasker-Wallfisch makes use of storytelling in her testimonies, I will cite an anecdote which features in Lasker-Wallfisch's *Desert Island Discs*, British Library, and Imperial War Museum interviews, as well as her memoir. In each of these testimonies, Lasker-Wallfisch talks about the moment that her father, Alfons, attempts to dissuade his daughters from accompanying his wife and him on their deportation transport. As Lasker-Wallfisch reaches this point in her life-story in her various recountings, she relays this incident in an extremely similar manner in all of her depositions, highlighting the same points in each account using markedly similar vocabulary in both oral and written contexts. Lasker-Wallfisch also arranges this

experience into a self-contained subplot that is attached to, yet distinct from, the previous and following narrative line of her life-story.

> **L-W**: ...I tell you what one thought I think one kidded oneself that one was being re-settled in the East...but rumours had already uh, gone about you know, rumours had already gone about gas chambers but you know...you don't want to believe it so of course a re-settling in the East and they were so cunning you see the Germans you were allowed to take a suitcase with you you see and, I remember my parents for instance they had 24 hour notice – there were different systems by which they deported people some were just taken from the street straight in out, my parents were given 24 hour notice to report at a certain place so in these 24 hours...you packed suitcases you see with warm things and this and that and the other and of course you got there the suitcases were taken off you but, one still lived...you see we...my sister and I wanted to go with them and my father who was a very wise man said no, he said I will go to the Gestapo and ask for permission he said whether he ever went or not I can't tell you, but he came back and said no. He didn't want us to come, and also I remember his words he said 'where we are going you get soon enough' – so I dare say my father knew quite well what was happening...he didn't want us to go and he he was very wise.[259]

> **L-W**: Well I think you know looking back I think my father knew quite well because - obviously we wanted to stay together and we wanted to go with them, and my father said well I will go to the Gestapo and ask whether you can come, it sounds a little bit ridiculous now in retrospect and t-he left the house and he came back a few minutes later and said I'm sorry you can't come, because where we are going you get there soon enough, and if I look back o-on that situation now, I'm pretty sure my father knew *exactly* where they were going...it's unthinkable really what you feel as a parent [260]

[259] Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.
[260] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs*, testimony.

L-W: [interrupting] No it didn't dry up at all because he, now I must go back now to my parents' deportation, this Künigl was a very wonderful man I mean he, he was very dependant on my father as well because he he did his court case, when my parents were deported which was in 1942 on the 9th of April...it was only my mother my father who had - like the convocation to appear in within 24 hours, you know it was always, the systems was weren't always the same in their case it was in 24 hours to report to a certain place, but not my sister and I, so um...we wanted to go with them. One still didn't know in those days where this all ending you know we just want to stay together, now my father was a very very clever man and I think he must have known because he said right, I will go to the Gestapo and ask for permission for you to come with us, the reason why we weren't on the list is because by that time my sister and I were working in a, paper factory and we were considered still useful people if you see what I mean whereas my parents were no longer - useful, I doubt that my father ever went so far as the Gestapo he just left the house he came back half an hour later, and he said 'sorry you are not allowed to come with us', I'm sh pretty sure that my father never went ent ent to the Gestapo to ask for permission, you know he could have just gone, and they wouldn't have stopped us, but I think he must have known by then - in fact he said 'look it is better for you to stay... [...] 'this is how it is *leave* it' maybe this is better [...][261]

L-W: I would like to tell you a little about the 'departure' of our parents. We knew the day before that it was going to catch up with them. [...] had we tried with all our might to go with them, we would probably have succeeded. Our names were not on the list but if we had simply presented ourselves, it is unlikely that we would have been send back. However, Vati – our clever Vati – wouldn't hear of it. 'It is better for you to stay. Where we are going, you get there soon enough.' We didn't exchange many words. There was a lot to do – packing – packing...[262]

If I begin my analysis of these excerpts with an overview of the apparent discrepancies between Lasker-Wallfisch's various versions of her parents' deportation, one can see that the most obvious distinction in the above extracts is that this 'story' is relayed as an

[261] Lasker-Wallfisch, British Library testimony. Lasker-Wallfisch's emphasis.
[262] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth* p.79.

independent anecdote in her media interview and memoir, yet is subsumed within other forms of contextualization in Lasker-Wallfisch's non-media testimonies. Yet conversely, despite appearances these differences are not really differences at all. This is because firstly, in each testimony Lasker-Wallfisch speaks about these memories at a consistently similar point, though they do not always emerge at *exactly* the same instant in all of her recollections.[263] This means that when looking at Lasker-Wallfisch's testimonies in their entirety, one can see that as she reflects upon this particular memory it is always closely followed (or preceded) by the *same* commentary that Lasker-Wallfisch absorbs into her above non-media extracts. Secondly, this distinction may also appear to indicate that Lasker-Wallfisch changes the context and emphasis of her recollecting in her various versions of this anecdote. This is not the case – though Lasker-Wallfisch's anticipation of her intended audience will necessarily have some impact on her recountings. Instead, on a closer inspection of the above descriptions one can see that in spite of the seemingly different standpoints from which Lasker-Wallfisch narrates this memory – whether it be from the perspective of a parent caring for his children; a child looking up to her 'Vati'; a professional deprived of his career; or from the position of all those persuaded to believe that they were 'being re-settled in the East' Lasker-Wallfisch is in fact contending with the trauma of what she has experienced *in the same way* and *with the same purpose*. What I mean by this is that in each of the above extracts Lasker-Wallfisch is reflecting on her memory from the same viewpoint: that of a Holocaust survivor attempting to speak about

[263] Therefore apparently 'omitted' memories that are absent from the above extracts are not omitted from the entire testimony. All of these apparently 'missing' memories in fact feature at a very slightly earlier/later point of Lasker-Wallfisch's recounting in her various testimonies. This is most often due to the fact that giving testimony in an interview necessitates a two-way exchange between interviewer and interviewee. The interviewee obviously responds to questions posed by his/her interviewer, and this leads to a slight altering of the chronological structure of their recountings – though, as my research shows, survivors are extremely defensive of their memories and keen to ensure that their interviews do not deviate too far from the self-defined boundaries of their life-stories.

her experiences in a way that allows for their successful narration and comprehension. To put it another way, Lasker-Wallfisch is, I posit, giving voice to different facets of the *same* experience – on the one hand, sculpting her memories into a story format that has enabled her to reflect upon her parents' deportation; indeed to make sense of it, and thereby to give a sense of purpose to the otherwise futile loss of her father and mother. On the other hand, Lasker-Wallfisch is doing this in such a way as to allow for her mental self-preservation whilst reflecting on these traumatic experiences – by communicating her past life in a manner that allows her to 'universalise' the event, to make it understandable for 'outsiders'[264] whatever their background.

Besides this, another marked discrepancy occurs towards the end of the penultimate extract - which is taken from Lasker-Wallfisch's latest testimony: her 2000 British Library interview. Unlike Lasker-Wallfisch's other recountings of her parents' deportation, in this testimony she misses out her father's 'famous' phrase 'where we are going you get soon enough'. Instead, this idiom is replaced by a rather different précis of Alfons' instructions to his daughters: 'look it is better for you to stay [...] 'this is how it is *leave* it'.[265] One of the most interesting aspects of this change is how the tone of this instruction is at variance with the more philosophical and acquiescent way Lasker-Wallfisch describes her father's acceptance of his fate in her other testimonies. This change in mood also gives the listener a different insight into Alfons' emotional state, as Lasker-Wallfisch's hitherto consistent portrayal of her father's calm rationalisation of his deportation gives way to an intimation of the fear and apprehension the whole family

[264] Greenman, British Video Archive testimony.
[265] Lasker-Wallfisch, British Library testimony. Lasker-Wallfisch's emphasis.

must have felt at the time her parents were transported. The fact that this memory is missing from Lasker-Wallfisch's other testimonies, is therefore further suggestive that her most distressing memories have been excluded from the majority of her testimonial rememberings, or at the very least moderated. Indeed, there is further linguistic evidence to support the idea that Lasker-Wallfisch finds recalling this incident exceptionally disturbing, as signified by the uncharacteristic hiatuses, prolonged pauses and stammered repetitions present in her dialogue as she relates the circumstances of her parents' deportation in each of her oral accounts. But on top of this, the fact that this conversational exchange appears in Lasker-Wallfisch's most recent testimony in 2000 is particularly peculiar, especially if we accept Thomson's theory that memories become 'fixed' in place with the process of time and repetition of description.

Yet in spite of the disparities between Lasker-Wallfisch's various accounts of this incident, the number of similarities connecting the above extracts it is still remarkable. For in both Lasker-Wallfisch's media and non-media interviews, she employs remarkably analogous vocabulary and methods of description. For instance, Lasker-Wallfisch refers to how she and her sister 'wanted to go with them [her parents]' in all of her oral accounts; how 'my father knew quite well' what was going to happen to him, in her 1991 non-media and 1996 media testimonies; and how Alfons apologised to both his daughters for not being able to accompany him on his deportation transport, in Lasker-Wallfisch's *Desert Island Discs* and British Library interviews. Lasker-Wallfisch also employs parallel chronology whilst recounting these events in each of her testimonies, so that no matter how concise her relation of this occurrence, the basic framework of this incident

remains by and large the same in her written and oral accounts. Indeed, if we break Lasker-Wallfisch's recountings down into their component structural parts, one can see that she organises each of her media and non-media testimonies around the same redeeming salient points or themes – such as her father's wisdom, his profound words, and his selflessness whilst confronting the reality of his own destruction. And though Lasker-Wallfisch does not talk about her father's feigned visit to the Gestapo in her memoir, this detail does not affect the overall impression of the anecdote - which still centres on Alfons' 'cleverness', his bravery and his acumen.

Lasker-Wallfisch also employs other narrative techniques whilst relating her memories – both when giving voice to this recollection and her other recountings: pacing the action of her storytelling so that each anecdote builds to either a crescendo or a cadence; going over certain points - such as the 24 hour period her parents had before they were deported, in the above excerpts from her British Library and Imperial War Museum interviews - in order to underscore the circumstances and elucidate the limitations of her situation; narrating her memories from the point-of-view of a historically informed narrator and as such incorporating asides, didactic sentiments, and selective commentary with the benefit of hindsight into her descriptions of the events in her past. Again, and as discussed in my previous chapters, Lasker-Wallfisch also embeds her experiences within their overall historical context - including general facts and figures into her life-story, whilst taking the time to explain how these incidents had an impact on her own individual circumstance. Lastly, Lasker-Wallfisch inserts intentional and unintentional emphases into her dialogue - such as verbal stresses - as she speaks, purposefully varying her vocal

tone and pitch to draw attention to important moments in her life-story in every recorded oral testimony she has given.[266]

Trude Levi employs similar storytelling techniques in her various testimonial recountings. For instance, Levi has reflected upon the day she travelled back from Budapest to her home town of Szombathely - and her experiences throughout that day – at the same point in every testimony she has given in both written and oral forms.[267] So like Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi highlights the same happenings whilst recounting this anecdote in her Wiener Library, Imperial War Museum and British Library interviews, as well as in her memoir *A Cat Called Adolf*. One again, I have taken extracts from each of these testimonies and laid them side by side to allow for comparison, and so as to demonstrate the extent of these parallels. From the examples below, the reader can thus see that Levi relates the circumstances surrounding her train journey to Szombathely - including the exact restrictions imposed on her during the course of this trip - in a strikingly analogous manner in all of her accounts. Besides this, Levi uses markedly similar vocabulary and imagery during each recounting, for instance, recurrently referring to her mother as 'old' and 'grey' after the arrest of her husband,[268] and repeatedly

[266] Though this is a common feature in survivor's narrative accounts, these inflexions – when taken in conjunction with the factors I have previously outlined, can be seen as a further feature of the storytelling techniques Lasker-Wallfisch employs when speaking about her past-life.

[267] The only exceptions are in her second book '*Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss*?' which is not really a piece of testimony, and has an entirely different emphais, being a question and answer text, responding to the letters of school and university pupils that have contacted Mrs Levi over the years; and Lasker-Wallfisch's media interview for the *Jewish Chronicle*, which again, is focused on an entirely different area of her life-story – her time working in a munitions factory as a forced labourer.

[268] In all but her Imperial War Museum testimonial, though this may be because Levi is emphasising a slightly different point here - concentrating on the fate of her father rather than the fate of her mother at this stage in her recounting, whilst her mother is the joint focus of this anecdote in her other testimonies.

detailing the difficulties she incurred when trying to 'get out of her' mother what had happened during her absence:

> L: On the 24th I was allowed to travel in a train - to sit only if there was a bench free not to sit next to anyone, I had a yellow armband I had a Yellow Star I had a yellow paper, was not allowed to use the loo, I was not allowed to go to the restaurant car I was not allowed to speak to anyone, and uh it was the journey was scheduled in a way that I should get home, before 6 o'clock in the evening because after 6 o'clock, people were not allowed to be uh Jews were not allowed to be in the street; um unfortunately there was an air raid while we were in the train and the train stopped, and we had to get out of the train and lie down on the embankment, and we lost an hour, so by the time I arrived home it was past a few minutes past 6 o'clock and I was on the station and I had to get home; I wasn't as a Jew I wasn't allowed to use a tram, um I had my cello I had one or two suitcases I think I had one suitcase, one very heavy suitcase, and I had to walk- uh the tram journey would have taken five minutes the walking took 2O minutes, uh *twenty-four people stopped me*...Six of them spat on me...And asked me "You dirty Jew what are you doing out here?" And uh um and uh-m that was my reception in my home town. [...] and when I arrived on 24th April, my mother, was - in the flat, and looked completely disturbed, with very very big eyes and couldn't speak, and the flat was in a complete upheaval all the books on the floor all the papers on the floor all the pictures on the floor, there was a complete mess and I didn't know what a as if something hit hit it, and um finally I managed to get and my mother was completely confused, and an old woman she was then 5O but either 48 or 5O, but she was a completely old woman gone completely grey, and um and uh half senile really and she with big difficulties I got out of her, that after my phone conversation from with my father on the Saturday on the 22nd April, some Germans came and the Hungarian police, and they took my father away and they searched the flat, and they threw down everything in the flat onto the floor, and my father was taken away and she doesn't know where he is.[269]

[269] Levi, British Library testimony. Another interesting - though unrelated – point worthy of note in this extract, is Levi's self-correction when she goes from saying that 'people were not allowed to [...] be in the street' to substituting 'people' with the more specific designation of 'Jews'. This amendment is even more interesting, given what Levi goes on to say about the treatment of Jews on the trains in Hungary at the time, and in Szombathely town itself.

L: When on the 24th of April I travelled with the Yellow Star, a yellow armlet and a yellow railway ticket, I was not allowed to speak to anybody, or to enter a restaurant or convenience...Bombardments were interrupting the journey, which lasted 24 hours instead of the normal 10-12 hours. I arrived in my home town [*sic*] at 6.30 p.m.; after 6 p.m. no Jews were allowed to be in the streets; also no Jews were permitted on the tramway. I had quite a long walk from the station to my home and was stopped and questioned and I had to show my permit a number of times to anybody who cared to ask for it. When arriving at my home, I found the flat in a complete upheaval due to a search, made by the Gestapo, amongst all our books and papers. I only found my mother (who had suddenly turned grey), as my father had been arrested 48 hours before. His arrest was amongst the first 19 in Szombathely, him being an active member of the Socialist party.[270]

L: [...]on the 24th of April I travelled by train [...] I had to wear a yellow armband and to uh carry yellow papers, and I wasn't allowed to use the loo or to speak to anyone; during the journey there was an air raid which delayed the train for a long while and when I arrived in my home town in Szombathely it was five minutes past six, after six Jews were not permitted to be on the street uh-uh Jews were not permitted to board a tram, and I had a rucksack and heavy rucksack, I had a heavy suitcase and I had a cello in my other arm, and I had to walk through town and during my walk through town well it by tram it would have taken me 5 to 6 minutes to get home but with this load walking, home, took me about 20 to 25 minutes and especially as I was stopped, by many people asking how dare I be in the street, and was called dirty Jew was called c- di-uh Jewish pig was spat at was kicked, that was my homecoming it made it sure that I was never home-sick again; [angry tones] um then when I got home there was more to *come*, um I entered my home, and my mother whom I have seen I had been at home about six weeks earlier, and my mother was 49-50 years old very energetic still, um suddenly there was an broken confused old woman in front of me, the flat in a complete disarray, everything on the floor books on the floor, in my father's surgery, medical instrument medicines medical books *everything* in a heap on the floor, it turned out that when my father put down the phone on the 22nd two SS men and two Hungarian policemen came, and searched the u-that was the day when they took away not the *Jews* but the political prisoners, and my father was taken as a political - prisoner, and they look were looking for subversive literature and that's why the, flat was in this complete disarray; um my mother was very very confused and really broken, and never quite recovered after that, with great difficulties I got out the story from her and also that she first tried to find out where they took him but she couldn't find out and has no idea whether he's still alive or whether is not alive or what happened to him.[271]

---

[270] Levi, Wiener Library testimony. pp..3-4.
[271] Levi, Imperial War Museum testimony.

L: The permission to travel came [...] but with strict conditions. I had to wear, in addition to my yellow star which was sewn on all our clothing, a yellow armband. My permit was on yellow paper. In the train I was allowed to sit only if there was no one sitting next to me. I was forbidden to speak to anyone and not permitted to use toilets or eat in the dining car [...] The journey lasted some twelve hours. We experienced an air raid during which all passengers had to get out of the train and lie in a ditch alongside the track. I arrived in Szombathely a few minutes after six in the evening, carrying a suitcase and a violoncello – all my possessions. No Jew was permitted in the streets after six and no Jew was permitted to use the trams. By tram I would have had a five-minute journey. Without it, carrying the heavy suitcase and the cello, it took me some twenty minutes to reach home. During my walk, I counted 24 people who stopped me, asking how, as a Jewess, I dared to be in the street, spitting at me, calling me names. It was a journey which made it absolutely certain that I would never again be homesick for Hungary. When I got to our home I entered through the kitchen. My mother was there, hardly acknowledging my coming. She seemed to have become an old woman – she was only 50 then – utterly dejected, and I could hardly get out of her the grim information that as soon as I had completed my telephone conversation with my father on the previous Saturday, German SS men and the Hungarian police had come and arrested him. They searched the entire flat. When I arrived, all its contents were strewn on the floor and the flat was in complete disorder. My mother was totally confused. She did not know where they had taken my father.[272]

Yet again, as with Lasker-Wallfisch's accounts - and in common with Levi's narration of her other war-time experiences - Levi organises her memories around significant 'themes' whilst relating this anecdote, though these narrative focuses lack the redemptive nuances of Lasker-Wallfisch's parental 'subplot' in this case. Indeed, in Levi's most recent accounts this event takes on an even more negative and menacing dimension – the most prominent incidents Levi talks about in these testimonies including her memories of being called a 'dirty Jew', being spat on, and even, in her Imperial War Museum

[272] Levi, *A Called Adolf* pp.30-31. The reason that this version of Levi's anecdote seems much more fluent and measured than her previous versions is because this quotation is taken from Levi's written memoir, *A Cat Called Adolf*. Due to the nature of writing, being as it is a slow and methodical composition rather than a spontaneous rendition of the past, this is always the case when comparing oral and written testimonial accounts.

interview, being assaulted. Levi's recounting is also densely information-packed, as she includes a lot of exact information into all of her testimonies (such as dates and times) whilst similarly taking care to situate her experiences within their historical and political context. Yet intriguingly, some of these precise factual details alter from Levi's earliest account to her most recent testimonies, and vice versa.[273] In her 1958 interview, for instance, Levi talks about the specific amount of time the train journey took, and the exact time of her arrival – details which are either omitted from her following accounts, or much more vaguely defined. But in her later post-war testimonies, Levi is a good deal more specific about some details – such as the number of people who stopped her on her way home after curfew (24 in all) – which are absent from her 1958 testimony. Interestingly, Levi is also much more definite about the amount of time her journey took (which she stipulates as 5-6 minutes on a tram, and 20-25 minutes on foot) in her most recent testimony in 1997, than she was in her earliest deposition. I am at pains to stress that this does not affect the overall sculpting of Levi's memories, which my research shows remains quite consistent throughout her testimonies. Rather, it is the inclusion or omission of particular details which alters in the above extracts. Once more, I believe this to be as a result of the shifting *emphasis* of Levi's testimonies through time – that certain memories have been given a higher priority, as Levi's views about what constitute important aspects of her life-story have changed. As if to reinforce this reading, and once again like Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi also sometimes repeats certain points for narrative

[273] The pivotal word is 'precise' here, as the overall 'sculpting' of Levi's memory does not fundamentally change between accounts. Rather, some precise details are included in some of Levi's accounts and not in others – and this does not necessarily occur in a logically chronological order i.e. that more detailed information is included in Levi's first accounts and 'forgotten' in her later testimonies. In fact, as my research shows, sometimes this inclusion of exacting details is most prominent in Levi's later accounts – again illustrating that her storytelling techniques have been refined over time.

effect whilst speaking about her past - and this is especially the case in her later testimonies. Yet the hesitant repetitions, uncharacteristic pauses and notable silences present in the above oral extracts when Levi is speaking about her experiences of being verbally and physically attacked, differ significantly from the deliberate and weighed reiterations she uses elsewhere. Indeed such stammering and immediate repetitions are almost certainly the result of the trauma of this experience, rather than a deliberate narrative device. This interpretation is reinforced when one takes into account Levi's occasional yet sudden shifts in tense whilst relating these anecdotes, such as when she is talking about her mother: 'and my father was taken away and she *doesn't* know where he is'.[274] At such moments, it is as if Levi is mentally returning to the past and is 'transported'[275] back by her recollection of her mother's distress; or similarly, is so engrossed by this memory that she is remembering and then relating her mother's exact words as she remembers them.

Finally, Leon Greenman also speaks about certain anecdotes in all of his testimonies that, like Lasker-Wallfisch and Levi, form independent subplots that are departures from the previous and subsequent narrative line of his life-story. But these anecdotes are not isolated digressions. Indeed, each subplot almost always directly contributes to an overall point Greenman is making – be it to create the requisite atmosphere for his recountings, or as part of a successive memory he will refer back to at a later stage of his recollection. One such subsection is Greenman's memory of his first encounter with a camp inmate at

[274] My emphasis.
[275] To use Leon Greenman's term. Greenman, *An Englishman in Auschwitz*, p.2.

Auschwitz, which he mentions at the same point in every testimony examined from 1945 to the present day:

> **G**: They took every stitch of clothing we had, all they left us was our shoes. [...] Most of us, were still worrying about our wives and kids, and when we asked another prisoner, who knew the camp he said, that certainly by now they were in Heaven. He knew the methods of the SS and about their ovens and their gas chambers.[276]

> **G**: [...] Then we went into another department f from the barrack a wooden barrack, and we had a hot shower and we stood there until the water was switched off, and then we had to lay down on the wooden floor to dry and wait. [...] Then in comes a Kapo which we know now as a Kapo passed by us, and some of us asked what happens with our wife and children 'Where are they now?' and he happened to be a Belgian Kapo as some of us said - I didn't hear it myself, but he did point up there like that. So we said he's mad, he must have been a long time here. He wasn't mad – he meant through the chimney, smoke, finished. And we didn't understand it [...] you were as if you were dreaming all the time.[277]

> **G**: We entered the barracks [...] we went into a shower room. We got under the hot and cold water when we were ordered, and tried to wash off some of the paraffin and a little of the downhearted feeling which had overtaken us. There was no soap and no towel – we had to lie down on the wooden floor to dry ourselves. [...] it was quite warm in the bath house and some of us began to talk about our wives and children. One or two of the bigger Dutchmen took courage and asked the bath attendant questions about our families. The attendant – a Belgian prisoner – told us that he did not know, but we kept on trying to get information about work and our weekend meetings with the women and children. He looked at us, pointed his hand upwards: 'Heaven.' We could not make out what he meant: we thought he was fooling and trying to frighten us.[278]

---

[276] Greenman, European Service testimony.
[277] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony.
[278] Greenman, *An Englishman in Auschwitz* pp..33-34.

G: We were then led into another barrack we had to strip, off came our clothes we had our best clothes on, a special winter coat I had made, and clothes (after all Poland was a cold country) a beautiful pullover my wife had knitted for me cable stitched I remember it beautiful grey one, I had to leave that. That was taken away from me. [...] we marched into another, barrack and we got a hot bath a hot shower, couple of minutes; no soap, no towel forget it I never saw a bar of soap, during my 3 years in - Nazi concentration camps, towels forget about it you dried yourself on your jacket, [...] then a man walked in wearing a beret and Wellingtons. This was a Kapo but we didn't know at that time who he was because a Kapo is a manager and probably the Kapo the manager of the shower room. One of our men called out to him 'Tell us, where are our wives and children now'; he stopped, put up his arm, and pointed with his finger high up without saying a word. We didn't understand what he meant by putting his arm up and his finger up high. The man turned away and we said to one another 'there's something wrong with the man's voice he he can't answer you he didn't answer you, he doesn't know' a few minutes later the same man came back and another one of us ask him 'Where are our wives and children now' and again this man, lift up his arm, pointed his finger right up high, kept it there for some seconds, brought it down and walked away; what he meant was 'door de pijp' that's Dutch 'through the chimney' in English but we didn't understand that. Later on we understood when you arrive there you're gassed you're killed. Your bodies cremated. And the ash and the smoke goes through the chimney, and you well up in Heaven [...] [279]

Like Lasker-Wallfisch and Levi, Greenman uses very similar methods of description when recalling this section of his life-story in all of his testimonial recountings – though the vocabulary he employs when speaking about the above memory does not contain as much parallel language as the other two survivors. It is interesting that in his earliest testimony Greenman uses a number of English slang terms – 'kids', 'Hun', 'robbed', 'chucked', 'smack in the face' – which are missing from his later testimonies; though the fact that this account was being recorded for a radio broadcast in which Greenman was keen to highlight his 'Englishness' (in spite of his noticeably Dutch accent) is likely to be

[279] Greenman, David J testimony.

the cause of this distinction. Greenman also uses affective imagery to depict the function of 'the chimney' throughout his testimonies – though interestingly, in the above extracts his descriptions are often less explicit in his later testimonies, as he only directly references the crematoria ovens and gas chambers by name in one other testimony after his 1945 deposition. Greenman's testimonies also seem to become gradually more detailed over time, as he includes much more information – such as the colour and knit of his pullover, and what the Kapo was wearing when he entered the shower room – in his 1995 interview with David J. However, in common with Lasker-Wallfisch and Levi's recountings, no matter how concise his rendition of this anecdote Greenman nonetheless regularly paces the action of his storytelling in each of his testimonies – all of the above recountings ending on the same confused and disconcerted nadir. Greenman also builds tension and suspense at various points in his rememberings through the use of vocal stresses in his oral accounts and changes of tone in his written memoir. Besides this, Greenman replicates the ignorance of his war-time self as he recounts in the present tense, and conveys his experiences to his audience in the meticulously chronological order in which they happened, one after another, without 'getting ahead' of himself.[280] Greenman further enhances this narrative point of view by recalling his memories from the perspective of his past self (from the position the young Greenman, in order to convey to his audience how these things were experienced *at the time*) rather than reflecting on the Holocaust from a continually retrospective standpoint. This explicitly narrative technique is unique to Greenman's testimonies, as though Levi and Lasker-Wallfisch do intermittently reflect upon their pasts from a war-time viewpoint, only Greenman is explicit in his use of this practice as a storytelling device. Yet in spite of the problems this

[280] Greenman, British Video Archive testimony

style of counterpointing could incur, Greenman's delicately communicates his mindset in such a way as to remind his listeners/readers that they are being relayed by a historically informed narrator, who speaks from the vantage point of knowing 'the methods of the SS'.

Greenman also intersperses his memories with intermittent commentary and reflective asides whilst relating this event and others in his testimonies. Once again, Greenman mostly uses such organisational tactics for the sake of clarity and emphasis. For example, in Greenman's Imperial War Museum interview he is talking about who he could trust once Nazi troops had occupied Rotterdam. During his telling of this 'story' he speaks about the events which took place, but also about how he felt about these occurrences, and the eventual repercussions these incidents had on his family and himself. Such an instance occurs when Greenman is talking about a woman who lived in his block of flats, illustrating his point that she was 'a funny kind of woman' by referring to an anecdote about the Union Jack (which he hung out of his window every year on 'the King's birthday'). Once Rotterdam was occupied, Greenman felt he could no longer hang his flag from his window as he 'was getting scared' and 'didn't know which way to turn.' When his neighbour noticed he had not unfurled the flag, she asked why this was so. Greenman relays how from that moment on he knew 'Oh, you're against us all right. I said "Oh, the flag was dirty and it's in the washing" I got out of it that way'. After this, Greenman points out that he 'never trusted her again' as he feared for his family and 'had to be very careful with whom I went around.'

Moreover, in the above extracts Greenman makes use of reiteration - both to draw attention to the circumstances of his experiences, and to highlight the injustices of his past - in each of his testimonies. His accounts are further historically contextualised as Greenman is careful to inlay his personal circumstances within the historical facts of the Holocaust – as well as to situate his own experiences within the communal experience of the other camp inmates through his continued use of the plural personal pronouns 'we' and 'our'. The only exception to this comes at moments during Greenman's interview with David J, when he occasionally stops referring to his group of '50 Dutchmen' as a collective whole, and instead talks about his experiences in terms of a singular identity: '*I* had to leave that', That was taken away from *me*.'[281] But aside of these factors, the similarities Greenman's narrative structures have to Lasker-Wallfisch and Levi's testimonials, and indeed, in spite of any distinctions between Greenman's depictions of this encounter, atypical breaks, uncertain repetitions and fragmentary language also appear recurrently when he is reflecting on the fate of his wife and son in his testimonies. For instance, Greenman reverts to speaking in a befuddled present tense at this point in his testimonies, asking 'what *happens* with our wife and children'[282], as if these things are occuring in the here and now: 'when you *arrive* there *you're* gassed *you're* killed, your bodies cremated. And the ash and the smoke *goes* through the chimney'[283] Greenman's descriptions also begin to fragment and condense at this point in his recountings - 'through the chimney, smoke, finished', 'He looked at us, pointed his hand upwards: 'Heaven' - conveying how he felt at the time – confused, in a state of shock: 'you were as if you were dreaming all the time.'

[281] My emphasis.
[282] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony. My emphasis
[283] Greenman, David J testimony.

All of the narrative strategies I have identified in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's recountings provide definitive evidence that all three survivors do shape their memories into 'storied' forms, and further, that these survivors employ such storytelling techniques in order to comprehensibly give voice to their memories of suffering. Indeed, suggesting that people naturally formulate their memories into life-stories in order to speak about their lived experiences - and that this structuring is even more marked when used by people who are attempting to relate traumatic past encounters - is an idea supported by the findings of practitioners in the field of the 'talking therapies'. To be sure, psychotherapists have found that people[284] who have suffered from some form of mental disturbance often use storytelling techniques in therapy, that they benefit from formulating their memories into coherent 'stories', and that such patients often convey their recollections most productively when utilizing storytelling practices such as those that I have identified in the testimonies of Holocaust survivors. In *Storytelling in Therapy*, for instance, Rhiannon Crawford, Paul Crawford and Brian Brown discuss the idea that employing storytelling *modus operandi* in therapy allow people to articulate - and indeed make sense of - their experiences in a way that effectively allows them to keep on going in spite of their turbulent pasts:[285]

[284] Both therapists and patients. See Crawford, Brown, Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy*, p. 53.
[285] Crawford, Brown, Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy*, p. 53.

> During the story, the storyteller will use various intensifiers, such as gestures, motions, expressive sounds, asides and repetitions to increase the impact of various elements. The storyteller may clarify details and amplify facts or descriptions... us[e] metaphors, stories or anecdotes...[often] offering a moral or principle for how we might act in the future...storytelling in therapy is all about 'equipping people for the going'.[286]

To develop this theory in light of my own research, if I work from Crawford, Crawford and Brown's notion that storytelling provides people with a means of coping with their memories, the utilisation of storied forms in Holocaust testimony can be seen as an aegistic tool, employed as much for the benefit of the *speaker* as the *listener*. This is because the act of relating their memories through narrative would allow traumatised Holocaust survivors to recount their experiences from within the protective boundaries of a mutually constructive and symbiotically beneficial relationship: in order to communicate their disturbing recollections, the survivor would mould his or her memories into a 'story' that enables him/her to keep 'going' whilst sharing their 'values, attitudes and beliefs'[287] with others. This would also be done in a way that would allow for the greatest degree of comprehension and empathy on the part of their listeners, the speaker working from the premise that the more 'our audience shares with us as

[286] Crawford, Brown, Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy,* p.7, 2, 7. Psychology and psychotherapy also designate a difference between 'storied' and 'narrative' forms, as Martin J. Packer argues to great effect in his article 'Interpreting Stories, Interpreting Lives: Narrative and Action in Moral Development Research': 'Structuralist analyses distinguish between two planes of *story* (content, or what is narrated) and *discourse* (expression, or the narrating). Story is typically analysed in terms of elements such as *actants* and *events*...or *roles* and *moves*. Discourse, in turn, can be further differentiated into *substance* (medium) and *form* (the connected set of narrative statements). Discursive form is then considered in terms of such features as the chronological order of presentation of events, point of view, pacing of action, and nature of any commentary by the narrator.' Martin J. Packer 'Interpreting Stories, Interpreting Lives: Narrative and Action in Moral Development Research' in *Narrative and Storytelling: Implications for Understanding Moral Development,* ed. by Mark B. Tappan and Martin J. Packer (Jossey-Bass Inc Publishers: San Francisco, 1991) p. 65. Though I am aware of that narrative is seen as 'the cultural "master frame" or structure that prefigures stories and makes storytelling possible' (David. Maines, 'Narrative's Moment and Sociology's Phenomena: Toward Narrative Sociology' in *Sociological Quarterly* (Vol. 34, 1993 p.p.17-38))

[287] Crawford, Brown, Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy,* p.8.

storytellers, the more they will understand and the less chance there is of [our story] having a negative impact.'[288] If we return to Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's storytelling practices as manifest in their testimonies, we can see that all three survivors have developed a reliance on their interviewers, appealing to them for understanding and empathy - for example, conferring with them, and directing questions at them (as if to gain their approval) – before continuing on with their life-stories:[289]

> **L**: I mean how can you say that? and why do you take away our hope? And, and how do you know?[290]
>
> **L**: Um what else can I tell from Hessisch-Lichtenau?[291]
>
> **L-W**: So what do you want me to tell you now? What it was like to arrive etc?[292]
>
> **G**: Now what was I before?[293]

All three survivors' defensive reactions when they sense an interviewer has misunderstood what they are saying, or is in any way judging their past actions,[294] further supports the notion that Holocaust survivors strive to convey their experiences in a form that will have the least amount of 'negative impact' on their audiences. At the same time, if we look at Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies as a whole, in configuring their experiences into a cohesive 'life-story' my research shows that these survivors are facilitating themselves with a means not only of structuring a version of the

---

[288] Crawford, Brown, Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy*, p.8.
[289] This point is discussed expansively in Chapter 4.
[290] Levi, British Library testimony.
[291] Levi British Library testimony.
[292] Lasker-Wallfisch Imperial War Museum testimony.
[293] Greenman, British Video Archive testimony.
[294] Once again, this point is discussed in Chapter 4.

past they can successfully relate to others, but *through that same act* (of shaping their memories into a narratable 'story') are able to live with themselves.

However, the suggestion that survivors may be able to take control of their pasts through the act of telling their stories is in total contrast to Lawrence Langer's assertions in *Holocaust Testimony: The Ruins of Memory*. For in this volume, Langer argues that survivors are *always* at the mercy of their pasts, permanently 'crippled'[295] - as he puts it - by their experiences, and as such will forever remain the 'victims of [the Holocaust's] power'. [296] The idea that survivors of the Holocaust are permanent 'victims' by classification, and that they are always - and only - defined by their Holocaust experiences is, I believe, reductionist and patronising. Trude Levi's memoir *A Cat Called Adolf*, for instance, stands in direct opposition to Langer's theory, as she intentionally focuses her writing on her post-war experiences - and how her life has progressed in the aftermath of the Holocaust - with hardly any direct reference to her time spent in the camps whatever. Furthermore, through this chosen viewpoint Levi shows her readers that, though the Holocaust has had an undeniably huge impact on her life, she has also had many other experiences besides this which have shaped her. Indeed, through this attentiveness to her post-camp existences Levi makes it clear that she will not allow the Nazi regime *alone* to define her as a person.

[295] Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies* p.xv.
[296] Ibid.

Truthtelling and Storytelling: Theorizing the Structure of Trauma in Psychological Research

So what does survivor empowerment through storytelling mean in practice? To begin with, by contending that survivors employ storytelling techniques whilst giving testimony, I am not suggesting that the 'stories' Holocaust eyewitnesses tell about the past lives are in effect 'untrue'. Indeed, this potential for misunderstanding is a contentious area – and one that survivors themselves are all too painfully aware of. During an interview with Henry Greenspan, for example, one of his interviewees was at pains to emphasise that his experience is '*not* a story' although, it had 'to be made a story. In order to convey it.'[297] This survivor's assertion alerts us to the inevitable paradox of storytelling in Holocaust testimony – that it inexorably makes a story of an experience which is not a 'story'.[298] It therefore follows that in order to fully understand the functions of storytelling in Holocaust memory, we must first explore what manner of truth storytelling communicates, and from this premise, interpret what the life-stories Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman narrate in their testimonies are conveying.

In *An Event Without a Witness: Truth, Testimony and Survival*, psychiatrist and child survivor Dori Laub discusses the psychology of survivor memory, and the effects that trauma has on remembered experience. Laub asserts that, in order to perform their role as

[297] 'Leon'. Quoted in Henry Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors: Recounting and Life History* (Praeger: Westport, Connecticut, London, 1998) p. xvii Greenspan's emphasis.

[298] In the fictional sense, the connotations of which the term 'story' is so inexorably bound. For a more comprehensive assessment of how testimony has 'to be made a story' whilst it is 'not a story', see Henry Greenspan, 'Lives as Texts: Symptoms as Modes of Recounting in the Life Histories of Holocaust Survivors' in. *Storied Lives: The Cultural Politics of Self-Understanding* ed. by George C Rosenwald, Richard L Ochberg. (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1992).

witnesses effectively, Holocaust survivors must recount their memories 'unimpeded by ghosts from the past *against which one has to protect oneself.*'[299] If I apply this theory to Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies, one can see that the 'ghosts' of memory Laub refers to here are the disturbing events these survivors experienced during the Holocaust,[300] and the associated feelings of fear and vulnerability that their remembering of such incidents necessarily evokes. In order to communicate their memories comprehensibly, it thus follows that these survivors must have created a life-story that has enabled them to block out their trauma so as to recount their experiences coherently and meaningfully Like Freud, who reminds us that an overload of external stimulus must be 'bound' and 'disposed of'[301] to allow for the mental survival of a person afflicted by trauma, Laub is proposing that repressive techniques must be employed by survivors so that they can protect themselves from the menacing 'ghosts' of memories from the past. Through the course of this study, I have come to the conclusion that simply managing to deliver a testimonial account is evidence that such repressive techniques are to a large extent successful for the majority of survivors who have spoken out about their experiences. Yet giving testimony inescapably means reopening the scars of the Holocaust, stirring up feelings which in some cases may have lain dormant for many years. As a result, relating a testimony must inevitably mean that survivors come face to face with their negative feelings - of pain, loss, frustration and anger – which are bound up with those past events, and must thus to some degree also *re*-experience those same

[299] Dori Laub, 'An Event Without a Witness: Truth, Testimony and Survival' in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History.* ed. by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (Routledge: New York and London, 1992) p.78. My emphasis.
[300] Such as the loss of family and friends, and the experience of mental and physical torture.
[301] Sigmund Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, pp. 29-30.

feelings for a second time in that narration.[302] Therefore, seemingly paradoxically, I suggest that survivors must create a psychosomatic armour in order to defend themselves from their *own* memories of suffering, in order to convey *those same memories* of trauma to any given audience.

Working from the assumption that the delivery of a coherent testimony necessarily signifies that each individual has had to contend with their anguish and distress whilst at the same time giving voice these very same memories, the life-stories Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman convey - as related in their testimonial accounts - must be performing a dual function. On the one hand, all three survivors will be employing methods of storytelling in order to give voice to their recollections effectively, but in a manner that also satisfies demands from both within (to repress/suppress their most painful memories) and without (to describe those memories as accurately as possible so as to involve their listening audience in their recountings). This must ultimately mean that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies are at once candidly honest whilst at the same time as being a 'sanitized' version of their past experiences; glossed at various points so as to allow for Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's mental self-protection whilst speaking about such incidents. A combination of these two demands means that the kind of truth conveyed in the survivor life-stories examined in this study is principally an individual and psychological one.[303] This is not to say that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies do not also contain a large amount of important and interesting and verifiable

[302] This is an extension of Laub's idea that the act of witnessing 'entails yet another repetition of the experience of separation and loss' endured during the actual event. Laub, p.91.
[303] According to each individuals' perception of the moral and social imperatives levelled on them as a witnesses, combined with their need to contain certain traumatic memories from the past.

factual information to boot. A brief look at any historical textbook on the period would attest to this. But even if one were to ignore any notions of external 'factual truth', survivor testimonies can always be seen to give a highly accurate representation of past events from the point-of-view of the narrator. The key to understanding this psychological truth is thus to bear in mind that the memories conveyed in such accounts are always in effect a *clarified version* of the Holocaust, doctored in order to counter trauma in the individual, and constrained by that individual's perception of what 'outsiders' need to hear.

Truthtelling and Storytelling: A Means of Countering Trauma

Oral historians have been questioning what kind of truth is conveyed through the articulation of a 'life-story' along similar lines. Alessandro Portelli, for instance, has examined the testimonies of working class individuals, paying particular attention to the recollections of those who have suffered traumatic experiences. As discussed in the introduction, Portelli's case work on 'uchronic dreams'[304] has established that, when dealing with traumatic recollections, one derives meaning from the 'internal' reality of the eyewitness, from their experiences of the past as memory, and from their multiple narrative accounts of the event, rather than from some illusion of an objective historical 'truth'.[305] But Portelli has also pioneered the notion that people use storytelling techniques in order to artificially construct a 'complete' version of their life experiences,

[304] As previously discussed, Portelli defines 'uchronic dreaming' as a situation in which 'the author imagines what would have happened if a certain historical event had not taken place' or as the representation of 'an alternative present, a sort of parallel universe in which the different unfolding of a historical event had radically altered the universe as we know it.' Alessandro Portelli, *The Death of Luigi Trastulli*, p.99-100.
[305] See ibid.

as, he asserts, 'a full, coherent oral narrative does not exist in nature'.[306] This means that even if survivors' memories are incoherent and disturbed, by formulating their experiences into a testimonial life-story this would enable people who have undergone some form of trauma to speak about the past in a rational and lucid manner. What is more, this utilization of storytelling techniques ranges, in Portelli's estimation, from 'a direct tapping of existing, outcropping memory'[307] to an actual reconstruction of a survivors' memories into a rational and consistent whole.[308]

The idea that storytelling may allow survivors not only to *describe* their Holocaust experiences, but also to actively *re-construct* these events through testimony is an intriguing one. This is because it implies that the configuration of survivors' memories into an inclusive 'life-story' allows for the hitherto impracticable renegotiation of the original events as they were experienced, and as such, for a re-viewing of those events after they occurred. This brings us back to the idea that expressing the past through storytelling would not only allow 'outsiders'[309] to begin to comprehend the reality of the genocide, but also enable the survivors who give testimony to derive durable meaning from the chaos of their experiences. This is because through the act of translating memory into story, the eyewitness would be able to establish a sense of continuity between their pre and post Holocaust, or past (concentration camp) and present (everyday) selves – identities which were, by definition, entirely separate before this

[306] Portelli, *The Death of Luigi Trastulli,* p.99-100.
[307] Alessandro Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Guilia,* p.25.
[308] In fact, Portelli sees this as a property of 'history-telling' an extension of storytelling where 'the narrative range is wider: prompted by the interviewer, the history-teller weaves personal recollections into a broader historical background, and is encouraged to expand the tale toward a full-sized oral autobiography, in which the self-contained narrative units of anecdotes or tales are included in a more complex framework.' See Alesandro Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Guilia,* p.p.24-25
[309] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony.

process of conciliation.[310] By conveying their life-histories through the process of 'telling a story', then, this furnishes survivors with the ability to traverse the rift between Charlotte Delbo's impermeable 'skin of memory' which 'isolates...Auschwitz...from my present self'.[311] This indeed explains why Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman all show a great reluctance to deviate from their temporal, sequentially ordered way of speaking about the Holocaust in their testimonials as this would mean - in a literal sense - renouncing the command they have over the 'ghosts' of memory which otherwise threaten to consume them. On the basis of these findings, this again reinforces the notion that it is the ability to formulate their pasts into a workable 'story' structure that has enabled all three survivors to speak about their Holocaust pasts.

Re-Empowerment Through Story

That the victims of traumatic events are psychologically disempowered by the period of disturbance is a view endorsed by psychiatrist Judith Lewis Herman, who defines trauma as 'an affliction of the powerless' since 'at the moment of [the] trauma, the victim is rendered helpless by overwhelming force'.[312] But as a result of the 'overwhelming force' of their experiences, Herman contends that immediately following the violent event the traumatic memories the victim is left with will 'lack verbal narrative and context', being

[310] This alludes to Charlotte Delbo's definition of 'common' and 'deep' memory. Robert Eaglestone also discusses the dichotomy that exists between the 'past' and 'present' self in *The Holocaust and the Postmodern* (Oxford University Press, 2004)

[311] Charlotte Delbo, *Days and Memory*, p.2.

[312] Herman, p.183. Herman's full definition of psychological trauma is 'an affliction of the powerless. At the moment of trauma, the victim is rendered helpless by overwhelming force...traumatic events...overwhelm the ordinary human adaptations to life...traumatic events generally involve threats to life or bodily integrity, or a close personal encounter with violence and death.' Ibid.

instead fragmentary and incoherent.[313] I dispute this claim, as my research shows that whilst the accounts Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman give nearest to actually experiencing the events they describe in their testimonies are often a little irregular and abrupt, they in no way 'lack verbal narrative and context'. Indeed, Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman both speak articulately about their experiences during the Holocaust, formulating their memories into coherent narratives which they then contextualised for their listeners as early as 1945 – Greenman speaking a few weeks after his liberation, and Lasker-Wallfisch on the actual day of her liberation from Belsen concentration camp. If we take Lasker-Wallfisch's first testimonies as a case in point, we can see that even in these appeals she has organised her memories into a nascent 'story', arranging her memories into a roughly chronological sequence of events, including burgeoning anecdotes and authorial asides. Lasker-Wallfisch's testimony is also measured, her rememberings often building to rapid climaxes, whilst she is careful to situate her experiences within the framework of the atrocity as a whole:

> This is Anita Lasker-Wallfisch speaking, a German Jewess. I have been imprisoned for three years together with my sister. [...] At first I was thrown into prison. My sister was sentenced to 3 ½ years hard labour and I got 1 ½ years imprisonment. After nearly 1 ½ years we were both sent to the most terrible concentration camp of Auschwitz. First I would like to say a few words about Auschwitz. [...][314]

The above extract is thus more than a simple chronology. This is because Lasker-Wallfisch has linked her memories to create a cohesive and comprehensive account of her

[313] Herman, p.183

[314] Lasker-Wallfisch, first European Service testimony. Though I have already cited some of this quotation in a previous example, I use this extract here to attest to the storytelling practices that Lasker-Wallfisch was employing from the time she was incarcerated in concentration camps.

experiences, as she progresses in a reasoned and steady manner through her pre-camp life, and later, through her experiences in concentration camps to her present day situation – a far cry from the disconnected and chaotic utterances Herman claims to have observed in other victims of trauma. As early as April 1945 then, one can see that Lasker-Wallfisch's memories had already been sculpted into a workable format, and what is more, this is the *same* layout and method of narration that she uses in *all* of her later testimonies. Like Lasker-Wallfisch, Leon Greenman's memories also had a comparable narrative and contextual consistency in his earliest oral testimony. For example, in his 1945 account Greenman speaks about his experiences in the same chronologically sequential manner in which he recalls these very events in all his later testimonies. Greenman also portrays his memories as a series of anecdotes in this account, succinct yet contributing to the overall flow of his testimonial. Greenman further regulates the depiction of each subplot so that they culminate in either a controlled cadence or an abrupt climax, and in the same fashion as Lasker-Wallfisch, his memories are presented as highly lucid and comprehensive descriptions of the things he has witnessed:

> My name is Leon Greenman. And I used to live in [inaudible] I got married in 1935 to a Dutch girl, and we decided to go to Holland, where we settled down. It was there in Rotterdam, that the Hun picked us up [...] With hundreds of other people, mostly Jews like us we were sent across Holland through Germany into upper Silesia until we arrived at Birkenau about 5 miles from Auschwitz. Before we knew what was happening we were chased out of the train, and an SS officer with a club in his hands started to separate the man from the women and children; shouting and bullying us, and hitting the ones, who didn't move quickly enough [...] The Russian Army was advancing rapidly and we had to evacuate our camp. We marched 40 miles with only a 10 minutes pause. The roads were covered with snow and many of us had to drop out. Those who did, had their boots taken off so that they would freeze to death more quickly. Then we were out into a goods train, which consisted of open wagons. We had about 140 prisoners to a wagon, which was 50 or 60 too many. The journey took 5 days and 4 nights, during which we had nothing to eat or drink except snow. And of the 3,200 men who started, 900 died of starvation, and exposure to cold [.] [315]

This meticulous cataloguing of events seen and experienced, listed one after another, is also a feature of Lasker-Wallfisch's first testimonies. This is because Lasker-Wallfisch's 1945 appeals contain a great deal of proper naming, as she lists the details of those involved in the Auschwitz hierarchy: 'Maria Mandel, Margot Drechsel, and Kommandant Kramer':[316] and taxonomically rolls off a series of pertinent times: the precise amount of time she was sentenced to hard labour (three and a half years), the duration she served in prison (one and a half years), and the amount of time she spent in Breslau jail before being sent to Auschwitz (again, one and a half years). Lasker-Wallfisch also lists the amount of time during which she went without food in Belsen (two weeks), as well as the date of her eventual liberation. To add to this Lasker-Wallfisch registers the facts of her situation precisely, particulars ranging from what today's audience may consider the

[315] Greenman , European Service testimony.
[316] Lasker-Wallfisch, first European Service testimony.

'everyday': 'My barrack was about 25 yards away from the Crematoria',[317] to the truly gruesome: 'A certain Dr. Mengele was engaged in research work [...] experiments were carried out on twins i.e. their tongues were almost torn out, their noses were opened [...]'[318]

These narrative devices are easily identifiable as methods of storytelling, techniques which grant Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman the means of narrating their disturbing memories, and thereby of stifling their trauma, even in their earliest testimonials. I use the term 'stifling' because I assert that the ability to assemble their disparate and harrowing memories into a narrative storyline enables survivors to impose a causal and sequential order on events which were neither ordered nor reasonable when they were experienced; in effect to *override* their trauma, and through this practice to assume a control over even their most horrific memories: in short, to render them bearable. Conversely, some Holocaust survivors actively explore the trauma of their memories in testimony in an attempt to achieve some form of cathartic release through communication. Elie Wiesel, for example, has analysed the storytelling techniques he himself employs whilst giving testimony, and sees the embodiment of his trauma through writing as fundamental to the configuration of his memories:

[317] Lasker-Wallfisch, first European Service testimony.
[318] Ibid.

> To tell stories in a linear way would be deceitful. The trauma doesn't end, it comes back in memory, returns and returns, often with a different take on the original event; horror, outrage, disbelief. War and trauma don't end in a literal sense, they reverberate across time, and my repetitions are a way to get [across] this psychological truth.[319]

Like Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman, Wiesel is attempting to remain as true to the essence of his Holocaust experiences as is possible. But unlike the three survivors examined in this study - who have repressed their most harrowing memories, and fashioned life-stories which protect them from the realism of their experiences - Wiesel assumes control of his past through an exploration of his trauma. For Wiesel, to understand the nature of Holocaust testimony it is vital to appreciate the reciprocal relationship that exists between the articulation of memory and trauma. The mental damage caused by the event, followed by the description of that trauma in testimony, are fundamental to his conception of the concentration camp experience. And this raises an interesting point; that instead of viewing slips and pauses, digressions and repetitions as weaknesses in testimony, they can instead be seen as a strength of this medium – as authentically conveying the 'psychological truth' of survivors memories of genocide.

Reversing Trauma Through Structuring

Whether the structuring of their memories into a storied form has enabled Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman to recover, or even reverse the trauma of their initial

[319] Elie Wiesel. Quoted in Zoe Trodd 'Mosaics and Mirrors: Wiesel, American Autobiographies, and the Shaping of a Storied Subject' in Mark B. Tappan and Martin J. Packer eds., *Narrative and Storytelling: Implications for Understanding Moral Development* (Jossey-Bass Inc Publishers: San Francisco, 1991) p.25.

experiences is another matter all together entirely, however. Judith Herman believes that the configuration of memory into an inclusive 'story' can:

> produce a change in the abnormal processing of the traumatic memory. With this transformation of memory comes relief of many of the major symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder. The *physioneurosis* induced by terror can...be reversed through the use of words.[320]

Though I disagree that Holocaust survivors only use storytelling techniques in their later testimonies, and dispute Herman's assumption that storytelling can be a useful tool solely when utilised in an interviewing relationship,[321] the idea that trauma can be counteracted - indeed even reversed - through storytelling is an extremely appealing concept. Certainly, upon first glance my research seems to support the thesis that post-traumatic stress is effectively reduced through storytelling. It would, for instance, explain why Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have been able to articulate their memories with such clarity of expression in testimonies given many years after the war. It would also explain why the oral testimonies given by all three survivors contain very few overt symptoms of trauma, or audible bouts of emotion which would definitively point to some kind of psychological disturbance (though, as I have illustrated, the irregularities present in all three survivors' oral testimonies do convey the presence of traumatic memory). However, as I have demonstrated, a closer analysis of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies shows us that in spite of the apparent absence of perceptible trauma in their accounts, there are still points in each testimony examined in which one

[320] Herman, p.183.
[321] See ibid.

can determine an undertone of mental distress – even in those testimonies given many years after the war. Post-traumatic stress, I therefore posit, cannot be completely *eradicated* through the use of storytelling. In fact, in a compromise with Herman, I suggest that whilst structuring memory into a storied framework may open the channels for survivor dialogue with 'the outside world'[322] - which may in turn lead to a 'change in the abnormal processing of...traumatic memory',[323] - storytelling can not, by its very nature, reverse the mental damage caused by the initial trauma. Instead, my study of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies shows that by narrating their memories in 'storied' forms these survivors have been able to conceal, marginalise or 'section off' recollections which they are no longer psychologically strong enough to explore. What storytelling ultimately does then, is enable survivors to shape their accounts in such a way that they do not have to openly confront their most painful and traumatic memories. This concept works in practice, until a 'story-listener'[324] begins to ask probing questions which necessarily invoke these 'lost' or repressed recollections. When this occurs in the testimonials examined in this thesis, the lucid and coherent life-stories survivors portray are ruptured, and symptoms of post-traumatic stress can be detected in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's speech.

In suggesting this, I am not attempting to underrate the ameliorating influence storytelling and story-listening have for survivors, nor to undermine the importance of this facility as a means to help people come to terms with the traumas of their past lives. Indeed, the

---

[322] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony.
[323] Herman, p.183.
[324] To borrow John. H. Harvey's term. John H. Harvey, *Embracing Their Memory: Loss and the Social Psychology of Storytelling* (Allyn & Bacon, 1996), p.10.

healing power of storytelling has been widely researched,[325] and is recognised as a useful means through which survivors can start to deal with their loss and begin the grieving process, in the fields of psychology, sociology and history alike.[326] Henry Greenspan, for instance, has candidly stated that the power of stories as a means of catharsis cannot be underestimated, since 'in a fully mundane sense, we re-enter the "world of the living" through our participation in life's retelling.'[327] But to really understand the function of storytelling in the testimonies of Holocaust survivors, it is perhaps more important to determine which memories have been 'sectioned off', and to identify what these memories of trauma tell us in their absence. This task is, however, made all the more difficult when dealing with the testimonies of Holocaust survivors, who as I have demonstrated, construct their narrations of the past as a defence against the destructive intensity of the remembered experience itself.[328] Indeed, some interviewers actively encourage this defensive behaviour. For instance, interviewers who come from the disciplines of psychotherapy and psychology may elect to interview their traumatised subjects in a 'narrative therapy'[329] format, where people who have suffered from some sort of mental disturbance are encouraged to 'deconstruct' their life-stories into component parts which are then revised or re-envisioned into a more constructive, cohesive account of the past.[330] These 'applied stories'[331] have been described as a means

---

[325] Again, for a comprehensive discussion of this issue see See Harvey, *Embracing Their Memory.*

[326] See Mark B. Tappan and Martin J. Packer eds. *Narrative and Storytelling: Implications for Understanding Moral Development*; *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry* ed. by Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney; Luisa Passerini, 'Facism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class'.

[327] Greenspan. *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors,* p.146.

[328] For an interesting discussion of how this manifests itself in survivor memory, and how such practices can be replicated by 'outsiders', see Andrea Reiter, *Memory and authenticity.*

[329] Crawford, Brown, Crawford *Storytelling in Therapy.* p.8.

[330] See ibid.

of assigning 'positive meaning to what appear to be negative solutions'[332] which thereby allows survivors to come to terms with their past turmoil. However, by deconstructing their memories in this way survivors may in effect be telling a *different* story; what I mean by this is a story which may, in reality, bear little resemblance to the narrative they would naturally impart.[333] For instance, in *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling* Peter Brooks asserts that the primary job of the 'talking therapies' is to edit traumatic memory:

> The narrative account given by the [traumatised person]...is riddled with with [sic] gaps, with memory lapses, with inexplicable contradictions in chronology, with screen memories concealing repressed material. Its narrative syntax is faulty...It follows that the work of the analyst must in large measure be a recomposition of the narrative discourse to give a better representation of the patient's story, to reorder its events, to foreground its dominant themes, to understand the force of desire that speaks in and through it.[334]

In contrast to an oral historian, who would see his or her role as primarily to retain and explore eyewitness memories as they are narrated,[335] for Brooks the testimonial in question is 'faulty': it contains gaps and pauses, hesitations and temporal contradictions that obscure the overarching 'story' he believes the person has to tell. Brooks therefore considers that the primary concern of the interviewer should lie in the *recomposition* of his/her interviewees' memories – to 'reorder' events in-line with his perception of how

---

[331] J. Holmes, 'Supportive Psychotherapy: The Search for Positive Meanings' *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 167 (1995) p.439.
[332] Ibid. p.p.439-45
[333] If left to their own devises. We can see this happening, as in As a consciously and deliberately reconfigured life-story may well emphasise different memories than a survivor might naturally do
[334] Peter Brooks, *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling* (Blackwell: Oxford, Cambridge 1994) p.47.
[335] For instance, Luisa Passerini writes about how she 'quickly learnt to avoid phrases like 'from the beginning', 'from your birth' which imposed a chronological order, thereby interfering with the sequence of association in recalling the past which they arrived at themselves' and how it is necessary 'to respect memory [which] also means letting it organise the story according to the subject's order of priorities.' See Luisa Passerini, *Facism in Popular Memory*, p.8.

this person's life-story should be structured. Indeed, Brooks states that the role of the interviewer should be to 'help the analysand construct a more coherent, connected, and forceful narrative discourse, one whose syntax and rhetoric are more convincing, more adequate to give an interpretive account of the story of the past than those that are originally presented, in symptomatic form, by the analysand.'[336] This *representation* of the interviewee's[337] remembered experience Brooks sees as somehow more valid than that person's own story; only through a re-organisation of this interviewee's memories of trauma, can the interviewer unveil the 'repressed material' the interviewee has 'concealed' from him, and ultimately 'cure'[338] him/her of their symptoms. This I see as a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of traumatic memory – of what the testimonies of traumatised people such as Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman *are* and what they are trying to *convey*. There are two significant flaws to Brooks' argument. Firstly, he does not consider that this person might be speaking about his/her memories in the only way he/she is able to voice his/her memories of trauma - that the repressed recollections he accuses the interviewee of 'concealing' from the interviewer may be obscured for good reason. Secondly, in seeing these variations in the interviewee's account as flaws that Brooks actually describes as 'the weakness of their narratives discourses'[339] (that in due course he sees as undermining the validity of the life-stories portrayed) Brooks is overlooking an essential fact. The narrative inconsistencies present in a traumatised subject's account are not hindrances to their life-story. They in fact make

[336] Brooks, p.53.
[337] This debate is extremely relevant to the interviewing of Holocaust survivors, since Brooks' interviewee-patient has also gone through a severe trauma, and is learning to communicate these experiences in an interviewing scenario.
[338] Crawford, Brown, Crawford, *Storytelling in Therapy,* p.69.
[339] Brooks *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling*, p.47.

up the very *heart* of traumatised individuals testimonies, telling us more about the nature of trauma than any 'outsiders'[340] assumption or misguided representation of events could. What is more, I believe this individual's coping mechanisms should not necessarily be unearthed and discarded for the sake of clarity, or the perceived flow of 'narrative syntax'. By taking such a directive stance when dealing with traumatic memory, Brooks would effectively disempower the very people he is trying to strengthen. This is because in assuming the role of life-story 'coordinator' and planning the flow of his interviewees' narratives *for them*, Brooks is actually removing the interviewee from a position of control over his/her own narrative discourse.[341] This would mean re-situating the traumatised person at the very site of powerlessness they occupied when the initial trauma occurred. What Brooks is proposing here then is a *revision* of this person's past, rather than a realignment of traumatic memory. And what he perceives as incoherent discourse - as traumatised individuals' memories are not necessarily expressed according to the conventions of a 'coherent, ordered chronological story'[342] - does not mean that the events conveyed in such accounts are not 'connected', though they may not be presented in a straightforward, linear manner. Or that such accounts are not 'forceful' or 'convincing' in their original state. What Brooks' thesis does show us, however, is that the conscious and intentional reconstruction of fragments of memory into an artificially structured cohesive whole – whether this process is undertaken by the survivor themselves or an outside party – raises important concerns for the scholar of Holocaust memory. That this practice is encouraged in the fields of psychology and psychotherapy

[340] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony.
[341] This is especially the case as Brooks is writing about psychic (that is individual) not historical trauma (which could be discussed as a collective phenomenon).
[342] Brooks, p.55.

as a means of coping with the events of the past raises further research problematics. In spite of this, it is certain is that unconscious revisions of memory have been occurring as far back as in the camps themselves[343] as a defence against the destructive potential of trauma, and as a survival mechanism that allowed for self-preservation even in the harshest of environments. But what effect does the instinctive re-construction of memory have on the remembered experience of Holocaust survivors? This is hard to quantify since we can never know at what point in time the revision of memory began, nor the extent to which this re-structuring has pervaded each survivor's testimonial accounts. Nonetheless, that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have fashioned a version of the past they are able to live with and successfully narrate to others is testament to their endurance in the face of destruction. I reassert that it is in order to cope with the past, that survivors have sculpted their life-stories – and this sculpting includes the omission of memories which are too painful and too extreme for the survivor to actively recall. What this means is that in effect the only thing scholars can be sure of, is that in shaping their pasts into a communicable story survivors have necessarily been forced into a compromise, and as Greenspan has argued 'in the context of the rest of what survivors have lived[ed] and remember[ed], it is always a failed compromise.'[344]

[343] See Reiter, *Memory and authenticity*, p.134.
[344] Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors*, p. xviii.

Conclusion

What remains of a story after it is finished?
Another story.[345]

There are many factors that may have had an influence on the form that Holocaust survivors' storytelling takes. The Jewish tradition of Hasidic storytelling defines one of its most important facets as the ability to 'tell one another stories' so as to propagate 'the living word [so that it] continues to be active.' Indeed, in Hasidism the story format is seen as 'more than a mere reflection' of reality; rather, it is perceived as the transmission of a truth that once 'testifie[d] to lives on.'[346] Though it is likely that such traditions may have permeated the consciousness of Jewish men and women brought up in orthodox households, it is, unfortunately, impossible to quantify the influence of such stimulus in the testimonies examined in this thesis. I can, however, be sure that the life-stories narrated in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies centre around the dual linchpins of survival and endurance. This is because their life-stories – in common with all other survivor testimonies - are accounts of extreme hardship, of living through that hardship, and of emerging through the other side (mostly) intact and able talk about their experiences. William Westerman describes testimony as being 'about people rising from a condition of being victims, objects of history, and taking charge of their history, becoming subject[s], actors in it' so that 'history no longer makes them; they make it,

[345] Elie Wiesel, quoted in Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney, 'The Narrative Turn in Social Inquiry' in *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry* ed. by Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney (Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, London, 2005), p.1.
[346] Martin Buber, *Tales of the Hasidim: The Early Masters*, trans. by Olga Marx (Thames and Hudson: London, 1956), p.v.

write it, speak it.'[347] Yet as we know, Holocaust testimonials are not simply testaments of victory in the face of adversity. Indeed, the memories conveyed in such accounts are steeped in ambiguity and contradiction: they are descriptions of traumatic experiences which are narrated, yet concurrently cocooned from listener and speaker alike due to their 'unsafe' nature; they are truthful descriptions of the past, yet in many instances provide us with more of an insight into the internal truth of the individual, than into objective historical 'truths' about the genocide at large. The configuration of their past lives in storied formations allows for mental healing on the part of the survivor, and opens the way for the 'transformation of memory'.[348] This in turn alters the way eyewitnesses think about themselves and their past Holocaust experiences, and it is this reshaping of memory that can lead to a reprieve from some of the most major symptoms of post-traumatic stress. But storytelling has its limitations. My research has shown that whilst organising their memories into a coherent testimony may pave the way for Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's mental restoration, it does not necessarily allow for their full mental recovery. Nevertheless the configuration of their memories into a life-story structure has enabled these survivors to remodel their recollections in order to make the past more bearable and, more positively, to allow for a partial 'reconstruction of the self'.[349] Exploring the patterns that arise in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's life-stories is therefore key to understanding the trauma that dogs all Holocaust victims. As such, identifying the storytelling structures by which survivors recall their memories is perhaps

---

[347] William Westerman, 'Central American Refugee Testimonies and Performed Life Histories in the Sanctuary Movement', in *The Oral History Reader: Second Edition*, ed. by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 2006), p.501.
[348] Herman, p.183.
[349] Herbert Hirsch, *Genocide and the Politics of Memory: Studying Death to Preserve Life* (The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill & London, 1995) p.60.

one of the best forms of insight we 'outsiders'[350] will ever get their 'journey through and beyond suffering'.[351]

[350] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony.
[351] Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney, 'The Narrative Turn in Social Inquiry' in *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry,* ed. by Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney (Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, London, 2005), p.8.

Chapter 4

Resource Limitations and Influencing Factors:

Interviewing, Intervention and its Effects

Who says what in which channel to whom and with what effect?[352]

As with any piece of research, there are a variety of factors which have had a bearing on the material used in this study. Whilst the limitations of my analysis of the testimonies explored during the course of this thesis will be discussed in detail in the concluding section to this examination, this chapter is instead concerned with those components which have had an influence on the creation and production of the testimonies given by Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman since the end of the war. Starting with an analysis of survivors' oral testimonies and moving on to their written accounts, the topics evaluated in this chapter range from the positioning of recording equipment to assessing levels of editorial intervention, and throughout I will appraise what effects these modes of intercession have had on the eyewitness testimonies looked at during the course of this study. The main focus of this chapter is consequently on quantification: providing an assessment of the extent to which such forms of intervention have had an impact on the testimonies given by each survivor over time. By asking what has influenced how survivors have spoken about their memories, and by negotiating what has shaped their recountings of the past, I hope to show that consistent patterns necessarily appear in witnesses' narratives, no matter what their mode of expression. Rather than any form of outside intervention, I posit, it is the experience of trauma - as indicated by the consistent

[352] Jean-Marie Schaeffer, quoted in Alessandro Portelli, *Battle of Valle Guilia*, p.5.

presence of the dialogic irregularities I have identified - that has ultimately dictated *what* and *how* Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have spoken about the past since 1945.

Intervention and Spoken Testimony

The Role of the Interviewer

To begin with, perhaps the most obvious – and overtly quantifiable – form of intervention to have affected the shape and content of survivors' oral testimonies is the involvement of a second person, an interviewer, whilst survivors recount their memories of the Holocaust. This is because, with the exception of the monologue format,[353] when Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have spoken about their experiences they have almost invariably done so in conversation with representatives from the official bodies or archives that commissioned the recording of their testimonies. In the past, the significance of this interviewing relationship was marginalised in a great deal of oral history research.[354] Most studies conducted on testimony instead focused on the speech and performance of the interviewee, either overlooking the impact of the interviewer on the testimony given, or viewing the interviewer as simply a companion to the process of remembering - an escort who steered his or her interviewee through the difficult process

[353] Though monologues are themselves subject to interventionist techniques which will be examined later in this study. The differences between various kinds of oral records, for instance media and non-media interviews, is also discussed later in this chapter.
[354] See footnote 354.

of history telling.[355] In recent years, however, oral historians have become increasingly aware that testimonies are in fact a dialogic exchange, produced through a combination of what is said by both interviewer *and* interviewee.[356] This exchange can be affected by the interviewer's presence and style of address; his/her presentation of themselves, and his/her knowledge of the material dealt with in the interview.[357] Indeed, as Martin J. Packer reminds us, interviews 'are not simple question-and-answer sequences whereby factual information is obtained from a research "subject" but instead are human interactions in social settings.'[358]

As an illustration, if we look for examples of the impact interviewers have had on the testimonies produced by Holocaust eyewitnesses in this study, one is first struck by the fact that in the vast majority of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's recountings the first person to speak is the interviewer, not the interviewee. The first question that the interviewer poses must therefore have a marked bearing on the subsequent flow of that testimony, as it is the starting point for all future exchanges between these parties. I have found that the interviewer's choice and phrasing of this query also sets the tone, and determines the course of the ensuing dialogue – certainly in the early stages of the

[355] For instance in *The Voice of the Past,* Paul Thompson discusses the methodology of interviewing, and the different approaches interviewers can take to the interviewing process in comprehensive detail. However, Thompson always works from the premise that the interviewer is a guide to the process of remembering, and does not look at the role the interviewer plays in terms of the mutually constructive role he/she has in the creation of meaning in an interview scenario. See 'The Interview' chapter of Paul Thompson's *The Voice of the Past,* pp. 222 – 245.

[356] See, for instance, Alessandro Portelli's *The Battle of Valle Guilia.*.

[357] Alessandro Portelli identifies some of these areas, for instance, the impact an historians presentation of material may have during an interview in 'Chapter 1: Oral History as Genre' to *The Battle of Valle Guilia.*pp..3-23.

[358] Martin J. Packer, *Interpreting Stories, Interpreting Lives* p..65.

conversation - to a significant extent.[359] If we look at two different instances of opening questions interviewers have asked Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, for instance, we can see this happening in practice. Firstly, in Lasker-Wallfisch's interview for the Imperial War Museum, Conrad Wood begins the conversation by asking his interviewee about general personal – and later historical and socio-cultural - 'background' information to her life-story, *à propos* growing up with her family in Germany under the Third Reich. Wood begins his interview thus:

> Can you tell me first of all where you were born and something about your family background please?[360]

This understated, open-ended style of questioning establishes a basic framework for Lasker-Wallfisch's remembering, providing a context for her recollections which at the same time gives her the freedom to recall intimate personal memories from the period at her own pace. By starting his interview by asking such a general question, Wood thus allows Lasker-Wallfisch the opportunity to structure her thoughts as she wishes to. This style of questioning also sets the tone for the rest of Wood's interview, as his queries continue to be presented in a manner that is not overly limiting or directive. The ensuing testimony is expansive and detailed, as Lasker-Wallfisch is responsive to Wood's queries and remains receptive to his various lines of enquiry throughout the interview.

---

[359] This is a refinement of Portelli's theory that in 'opening the conversation, the interviewer defines the roles and establishes the basis for narrative authority', as I have found the intonation, specific phrasing of the opening question, and the interviewer's style of address, all have a significant impact on the ensuring dialogic exchange. *The Battle of Valle Guilia* p.9.

[360] Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.

In total contrast, when Lasker-Wallfisch is interviewed by Sue Lawley for *Desert Island Discs*, Lawley's first question evokes Lasker-Wallfisch's experiences in concentration camps, [361] her direct questioning demanding a very specific response from her interviewee:

> [...] it's a simple truth isn't it Anita that if you hadn't played the cello you wouldn't be here today?[362]

Lawley's specific, leading and often melodramatic questions - typical of a media interviewer –gives her queries a polemical quality, and she certainly she seeks to obtain a swift and particular response from her interviewee. Lasker-Wallfisch's reply is prompt and condensed, and this style of question-and-answer come to characterise the rest of this interview. Yet in spite of their differences, what unites these two interviewers is their initiation of the dialogic exchange: by beginning their interviews with a question, Lawley and Wood have both automatically placed themselves in positions of (real or assumed) authority. This is because in opening the conversation each interviewer is designating him/herself in the role of self styled 'narrator' to Lasker-Wallfisch's recountings. Even though their interviewing styles are at variance (as Wood's narrative or free report form of questioning stands in polar opposition to Lawley's controlled narrative questions)[363] by introducing the interviewee at the start of the interview, and beginning the discourse by

---

[361] By asking Lasker-Wallfisch about how playing the cello saved her life i.e. how playing the cello in the Auschwitz orchestra saved her from selections, and later, from being selected for the gas chamber whilst she was sick in the *Revier* or camp hospital.

[362] Sue Lawley's emphasis. Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

[363] To use Elizabeth Loftus' terms. Loftus stipulates that 'open questions' such as 'tell us what you remember?' are forms of 'narrative or free report form[s]' of interviewing, whilst questions that are more specific, such as 'what are you memories of this day?' and 'what was your assailant wearing?', are 'controlled narrative question[s].' See *Eyewitness Testimony*, p.90.

asking her questions, both interviewers are defining themselves - and by extension their interviewees - in specific authorial, and importantly interviewer-assigned, positions.

In psychological research, it has been proven that the authority (or perceived 'authority') of an interviewer can have a significant impact on the testimonies witnesses produce, interviewees recalling memories with a much higher level of 'accuracy and completeness' in a conversation where the interviewer has established him/herself as a 'status figure.'[364] In spite of their differences, Wood and Lawley have both distinguished themselves as 'status figures' in similar ways - via their official positions as representatives from recognised bodies, [365] and through casting themselves in a commanding role by commencing the dialogic exchange with their interviewee.[366] However, Wood and Lawley's diverse styles of address, presentation of themselves and of their knowledge of the Holocaust, and personal presence, lead to two distinct *forms* of narrative authority which can be seen to impinge - to greater and lesser extents - on the testimonies created.[367]

Interviewer Agenda: Interviewing Techniques and Power Dialectics in an Interviewing Relationship

These different forms of narrative authority can be seen to stem from the divergent aims of each interviewer, or to put it another way, their differing *agendas* for participating in

[364] Elizabeth Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony* p.p.98-99.
[365] In this case, the Imperial War Museum and BBC respectively.
[366] And continuing to steer the interview throughout the exchange.
[367] Though both forms of interviewing necessarily impinge on the testimony produced as they are both necessarily modes of mediation. These different forms of narrative authority will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

the interviewing process. Conrad Wood is a representative from a museum sound archive; his interview has no specific 'audience' or target market because it is a non-media recording intended as part of a specialised Holocaust collection. As a result, Wood's agenda for this interview is subtle – to let Lasker-Wallfisch speak as openly as possible about her experiences during the war, so that the ensuing testimony is of maximum use to any historian or scholar who may come to the Imperial War Museum's archives. To achieve this aim, Wood's methodology is in the style of an oral historian, as he seeks a 'nondirective approach to interviewing...encouraging spontaneity of report...[in order to uncover]...what is on the interviewee's mind rather than his opinion of what is on the interviewee's mind.'[368] To attain this 'nondirective' mode of interviewing, Wood takes care that he maintains a 'low profile' throughout this interview, asking questions which are minimally intrusive, and ensuring his personal presence remains fairly inconspicuous. We see this in practice as Wood does not ask Lasker-Wallfisch a number of questions at once, press her for answers, or ask the same question over and over repeatedly until he gets a certain response (as do other interviewers).[369] Instead, if Lasker-Wallfisch goes on to answer the questions he asks in purely general terms without reference to her own

[368] Robert K Merton, Marjorie Fiske, Patricia L Kendall, *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures. Second Edition.* (The Free Press: Collier Macmillan Publishers: London, [1956] 1990), p.13.

[369] For example, during Lasker-Wallfisch's preparatory interview for 'The Archive Hour' if her interviewers failed to obtain a certain response from their interviewee they simply rephrased the question and posed it again at a later stage of the interview. For example, during this exchange Jo Glanville and Smita Patel asked Lasker-Wallfisch whether there was a 'Belsen orchestra'. When Lasker-Wallfisch asserts that there was no such orchestra, Glanville asks her a slightly different question to the same ends: 'So who could have been playing that? Because it's recorded at Belsen [...]'. Again, Lasker-Wallfisch states that there was no Belsen orchestra, but ventures that this might have been to do with the post-liberation theatre. Glanville attempts to reconfirm this by asking 'But there was no actual orchestra like there was at Auschwitz. [?]' Again, Lasker-Wallfisch denies the existence of such an orchestra. After asking a few questions about different matters, Glanville returns to the subject of a Belsen orchestra, asking: 'And do you have memories of the classical concerts that you performed in Belsen?' Lasker-Wallfisch is again unequivocal in her assertion that 'We didn't perform in Belsen.' Lasker-Wallfisch's interviewers, however, continue to ask her about orchestral performances at Belsen intermittently throughout the rest of this interview.

personal experiences, Wood gently prompts her with questions that are designed to elicit a more individual response. For example, Wood asks Lasker-Wallfisch: 'What do you remember about the Nazis taking over in '33 if anything?', a question which she answers purely in terms of background information to the Nazi rise to power. Wood then modifies his question, asking Lasker-Wallfisch about her memories a second time but addressing his query to Lasker-Wallfisch's own circumstance: 'Did it make your own personal life miserable?'[370] When he does ask more direct questions such as this, however, Wood does not express himself in an exacting or overtly forceful manner, but instead slips queries into the conversation relatively unobtrusively when there is a pause - or gently encourages Lasker-Wallfisch if there is an obvious lull - in her conversation. Wood does not interrupt Lasker-Wallfisch when she is talking or interject when she is in the midst of a flow of utterance. Instead, as far as is possible, Wood allows Lasker-Wallfisch to maintain a freedom of association as she remembers and speaks.

Wood's manner of address is also minimally intrusive. This is because he does not give the impression of having an emotional involvement in Lasker-Wallfisch's recountings; Wood's vocal intonation instead remains neutral, and he maintains a composed and dispassionate comportment throughout the interview. By not betraying any hint of the personal feelings or opinions he may harbour concerning her past, and as such not sounding shocked, disgusted, surprised, or saddened at any point during the sitting, Wood sustains an air of impartiality. This overall impression of neutrality means that Wood avoids seeming judgmental or condemnatory when discussing Lasker-Wallfisch's past actions with her. There is one exception to this rule, however. Around the middle section

[370] Conrad Wood, quotation taken from Lasker-Wallfisch's Imperial War Museum testimony.

of this interview, Wood does sound mildly surprised when he learns that Lasker-Wallfisch had her own bed as one of the privileges of being in the women's orchestra at Auschwitz. Immediately following her interviewer's response, Lasker-Wallfisch becomes audibly defensive and discernibly curbs her flow of testimony:

> **Int**: And you had separate beds [surprised tone]
>
> **L-W**: Well we had a bed to sleep in [defensive tone –changes immediately after this] yeh…which was a real luxury, total luxury…
>
> **Int**: And any heat in your block?
>
> **L-W**: Yes I think there was heat. There was a stove definitely…
>
> [End of reel][371]

Lasker-Wallfisch's vocal tone does change half way through her sentence, however, as she seems to audibly check herself, her manner returning to normal when Wood asks her another question in his usual tone of voice. After the tape is resumed, Lasker-Wallfisch appears to have relaxed completely and continues to talk again as normal. It is interesting that it is the mention of an apparent privilege or contradiction – something that challenges what Wood already knows about the history of Auschwitz – that inspires an emotional response from him. Perhaps this is a good example of why an interviewer who knows too much background information before interviewing a subject – or too little - can be a hindrance to the interviewing process rather than a help. In spite of this, however, Wood's generally even tone of voice also has the effect that his questions often sound

[371] Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.

more like statements than queries, and this, combined with the fact that he is well informed about the history of the period, instills his queries with a knowledgeable and authoritative resonance. The upshot of this is that Lasker-Wallfisch's nervous defensiveness, evident at the beginning of the interview in her shorter, more condensed answers and cautious tone of voice, is allayed early on. She then begins to relax - the timbre of Lasker-Wallfisch's voice changes, and her concise answers are replaced by more openly descriptive and intimately personal recollections.

Interestingly, it seems that that Wood's authoritativeness - as affirmed by his interviewer status - united with his non-invasive interviewing style, makes Lasker-Wallfisch *more* receptive to his suggestions rather than less. This occurs to such an extent that at times she even appears unsure of herself and of her memories. For instance, Lasker-Wallfisch appeals to Wood for confirmation of dates, places and words if she is uncertain[372] and even turns to him for guidance, asking him what recollections he would like her to provide: 'So what do you want me to tell you now? What it was like to arrive etc?'[373] Wood's understanding of her past situation seems very important to Lasker-Wallfisch, and she frequently asks if he knows of the existence of an organisation or camp, for instance, before continuing with her narrative. However, Wood's careful phraseology and sensitive questioning means that it is Lasker-Wallfisch rather than her interviewer who remains in control of this interview. Thus, overcoming her awkwardness early on, Lasker-Wallfisch takes up a position of dominance on many occasions throughout this

[372] Lasker-Wallfisch often asks Wood about English words, such as when she is unsure of the German translation of 'Governor', and appeals to her interviewer for confirmation of dates and places, for instance, when she is talking about the outbreak of war: 'And then of course our war was a bit earlier than yours because, yeh well three days wasn't there in it [?]'

[373] Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.

interview, such as when she interrupts Wood – though not in a confrontational way - before he has finished asking her questions:

> **Int**: Had you personally come into contact with people who had had first-hand experience [**L-W** [interrupting] 'Yes. Yes.'] of the camps?' And again later, when Wood asks Lasker-Wallfisch: 'So yours [**L-W**: [interrupting] 'which was lucky'] was quite a different experience from most people [**L-W**: [interrupting] 'Yes'] coming into Auschwitz'?[374]

Sue Lawley takes a very different approach to the interviewing process in her media interview with Lasker-Wallfisch for *Desert Island Discs*. Unlike Wood, Lawley's agenda for this interview is patently apparent: as a broadcaster, hosting a programme concerned with 'intelligent speech'[375] about 'factual'[376] issues, Lawley's job requires her to conduct this interview in a way that confronts the disturbing and emotive subject of the Holocaust in a frank and evocative way. Primarily, as the presenter of 'one of Radio 4's most popular and enduring programmes',[377] Lawley's concern has to be commercial: to draw attention to - and arouse the public's interest in - Lasker-Wallfisch's testimony, whilst also 'entertaining' her listening audience.[378] One can see this, as although Lawley is a polite interviewer, her explanations, clarifications and general mode of address are geared towards involving an audience and making Lasker-Wallfisch's memories comprehensible

---

[374] Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.
[375] Description of Radio 4 taken from the BBC Radio website, <www.bbc.co.uk/radio/4> [accessed 15/03/05]
[376] Description of *Desert Island Discs* taken from the BBC Radio website, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/factual/desertislanddiscs/shtml> [accessed 15/03/05]
[377] Ibid.
[378] As the point of such interviews is to increase and hold listener ratings, it is important that Lawley interview Lasker-Wallfisch in a way that will interest and hold the attention of her listening audience.

for third party listeners, rather than responding to her interviewee's natural flow of remembrance. As a result, the focus of Lawley's interview is on building her listener's intrigue, at times at the expense of showing sensitivity and consideration to her interviewee. For instance, Lawley begins her interview by speaking *about* Lasker-Wallfisch in a flattering and practised manner - talking relatively slowly and employing the very measured pauses typical of a professional commentator in order to build tension. She also uses carefully placed stresses to involve her listeners, focusing the attention of her audience on Lasker-Wallfisch's turbulent life-story through her use of dramatic vocabulary and suspense-invoking syntax:

> My castaway this week is a cellist her musical talent has made her one of the most *distinguished* members of the English Chamber Orchestra with whom she's toured all over the world, until the early '80s however there was one country which she always refused to visit, that country was Germany where at the age of 18 she found herself a Jewish prisoner in *Auschwitz*, because she could play the *cello* she survived, she was moved to Belsen where she almost *didn't*, hers is a remarkable story which remained untold *until* she decided to reveal it herself nearly *50* years after the war had ended, through music she's written 'we are able to raise ourselves high *above* the inferno of Auschwitz, into spheres where we could not be touched, by the degradation of concentration camp existence' she is Anita Lasker-Wallfisch [...][379]

In this passage, which typifies Lawley's style of interviewing, she is very much setting the atmosphere and context of Lasker-Wallfisch's remembering. Lawley's presence is extremely imposing throughout the exchange: she speaks swiftly, with very few pauses for breath or reflection (as shown in the above extract) so that Lasker-Wallfisch is not able to interject or clarify her assertions as she speaks, as she does in other interviews. [1]For instance, in spite of Lawley's apparently extensive knowledge of Lasker-Wallfisch's

[379] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

life-story, she makes an interesting error in this introductory speech. Uncorrected by Lasker-Wallfisch, Lawley asserts that at the age of 18 Lasker-Wallfisch found herself a prisoner of *Auschwitz*, which she locates as a concentration camp in *Germany* rather than Poland. Lasker-Wallfisch would normally correct such errors- as she does in her non-media interviews. Such inaccuracies also remind the listener that such programmes are simply broadcast passages of radio journalism, rather than definitive guides to a particular subject. Also, in comparison to Lasker-Wallfisch's other interviewers, Lawley spends a much greater proportion of this interview talking rather than allowing her interviewee to speak. Furthermore, Lawley heavily summarises large sections of Lasker-Wallfisch's life-story (in the same style as the above excerpt) intermittently throughout this interview. In a twist on Wood's quiet erudition, Lawley continually asks Lasker-Wallfisch questions that are purposely phrased and spoken *purely* as statements rather than queries - an approach which in many instances negates the need for Lasker-Wallfisch's 'answers' in the traditional sense.[380] For example, as we see in the above excerpt, at many points during this interview Lawley actually tells Lasker-Wallfisch's life-story for her. Rather than asking undefined, unrestrictive questions and allowing Lasker-Wallfisch the freedom to speak about her past as she would like, Lawley assumes the mantle of Lasker-Wallfisch's narrative and - referring to her interviewee by her first name -[381] talks about her and her past as if she has an intimate knowledge of them. Lawley does periodically

[380] For instance, a question that epitomises Lawley's leading style of interviewing occurs when she is asking her interviewee about Alma Rosé, the leader of the Auschwitz women's orchestra: 'But do you think she understood perhaps that this *was* salvation of all of you?' Sue Lawley, quoted in Lasker-Wallfisch's *Desert Island Discs* testimony. Lawley's emphasis.

[381] Which is a social mannerism that Lasker-Wallfisch finds overly familiar and uncomfortable when she is being addressed by strangers. Anita Lasker-Wallfisch stated this during her interview with me in 2004.

seek Lasker-Wallfisch's confirmation and/or endorsement of the odd detail – but on many occasions, it is as if her answers are a little superfluous:

> **Int**: But when you arrived in that camp and you told somebody I think on your first day -
>
> **Int**: But it was the same for you in a sense wasn't it that that that playing the cello gave you an identity which [**L-W**: Yeh; absolutely] all of those thousands of other people didn't have [**L-W**: Absolutely]
>
> **Int**: And you had to file in and m very soon afterwards your head was shaved and you were [**L-W**: Yes] tattooed with a number [**L-W**: That's right] on your arm it's still there I presume [**L-W**: Oh yes], m it was a vast camp but, I take it everybody knew what was going on [**L-W**: Oh yes] that people were being - systematically [**L-W**: Absolutely] gassed uh you actually *lived* didn't you in a hut opposite the gas chamber? [**L-W**: Ya] so you saw them [**L-W**: Absolutely][382]

By *telling* Lasker-Wallfisch what she did rather than *asking* her about it, and by putting her interviewee in a position where she is often simply confirming what Lawley is saying rather than talking about her memories herself, an interesting situation begins to emerge. For in speaking about Lasker-Wallfisch's past with such unhesitating confidence and authority, Lawley is impinging on the normal narrative flow of Lasker-Wallfisch's memories,[383] giving the listener the impression that she has some kind of first-hand knowledge of the events she is describing – that is, Lasker-Wallfisch's lived experiences. This view is enhanced by Lawley's casual use of 'camp-referential'[384] language, such as

---

[382] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

[383] As they are given voice in Lasker-Wallfisch's other interviews.

[384] To borrow James E. Young's term, from *Writing and Re-writing the Holocaust: Narrative Consequences of Interpretation* (Indiana University Press, 1988), p 104.

to 'organise'[385] something, in her general conversation.

The interviewee-interviewer power dynamics of Wood's non-media interview are thus entirely reversed in this exchange, and this happens to such an extent that Lawley in effect assumes a narrative authority over Lasker-Wallfisch's entire life-story. Lawley's interviewing techniques consequently result in building her listeners' confidence to such an extent that our attention becomes fixed on the *interviewer* rather than the *interviewee*, so that - as is usual in Lawley's *Desert Island Discs* interviews - she fashions herself as our 'guide' to a subject that, it is implied, the listener may otherwise find inaccessible and alienating. If we take as an example the way that Lawley asks Lasker-Wallfisch questions which are not about the history and context of her oppression (which Lawley generally fills in herself) but rather about Lasker-Wallfisch's emotional responses to these traumatic occurrences, we see that Lawley seems to be attempting to provide her audience with a personalised exploration of the feelings and attitudes of someone who has lived through the Holocaust. But significantly, this mode of interviewing also serves to undermine Lasker-Wallfisch's position in the incidents that are being examined, as by assuming Lasker-Wallfisch's role as narrator Lawley is separating - and in so doing distancing - Lasker-Wallfisch from her own life-story. More worrying still, in doing this Lawley goes so far as to intimate what Lasker-Wallfisch's thoughts and feelings must have been at such pivotal moments, such as when she asks Lasker-Wallfisch:

[385] Full quotation: Int: 'Your father was a lawyer I-I I mean obviously the whole family would have been aware for the reason you *just* said not least uh of of this growth of anti-Semitism why on earth didn't he organise you all out of there?' Though this quotation is not in a camp context, it is clearly used with camp connotations in mind given the context of this interview, and Lawley's subsequent style of dialogue. Lasker-Wallfisch's *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

Int: How did you feel when you played for such people [as Dr Mengele] I mean did you *have* any feelings or did you just go cold...'

Int: So you lived because you knew um those of you who m went on surviving you you lived therefore with a with constant fear [.][386]

By asking Lasker-Wallfisch questions which are heavily pregnant with suggestion, and making leading inquiries, Lawley is putting words into Lasker-Wallfisch's mouth and effectively speaking *for* her during various points in their conversation. In this interview, then, Lawley is unknowingly committing a interviewing crime - painting a picture of Lasker-Wallfisch's past that might be entirely unrepresentative of Lasker-Wallfisch's memories as she would enunciate them and, indeed, perhaps even fictitious (though Lasker-Wallfisch evidently does not feel able to disagree with her interviewer, even when she is wrong).[387]

Many of Lawley's interviewing techniques are equally restrictive, and can be seen to have inhibited the form Lasker-Wallfisch's testimony may otherwise have taken. These include Lawley's frequent interruptions whilst Lasker-Wallfisch is in the midst of recollecting a memory; her constant interjections when Lasker-Wallfisch momentarily pauses in order to change the direction of the discussion, or to introduce a musical interlude; and Lawley's idiosyncratic habit of beginning her enquiries with conjunctions such as 'and', 'but', 'because' and 'so', as if her queries are a continuation of Lasker-

[386] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.
[387] For instance, during this interview Lawley states with confidence that Lasker-Wallfisch was at Belsen Concentration Camp for 9 months, when she was actually there for 12 months. However, Lasker-Wallfisch does not correct her interviewer – as she almost invariably does in her non-media testimonies - and the mistake remains unrectified.

Wallfisch's own sentences (and thereby memories), all have a direct impact on her interviewee's responses.[388] This is most evident when comparing the long, detailed descriptions Lasker-Wallfisch gives in her interview with Conrad Wood to her responses to Sue Lawley's questions during her *Desert Island Discs* interview:[389]

> **Int**: Had you personally come into contact with people who had had first-hand experience [**L-W**: [interrupting] Yes.Yes.] of the camps?
>
> **L-W**: I mean it was y uh a prison is a place of *rumours* although you sit in your cell and you're locked up you get to know about everything don't ask me how, although you're not allowed to talk to the other prisoners, somehow you know what's going on. There are ways and means of messages and, I can't tell you now who told me what but one just knew that Auschwitz gas chambers that is actually a fact...[break in tape] So uh yes from this a medical I was sent back to me cell...a and given my civilian clothes. Actually I'll tell you a funny story about civilian clothes [...][390]

In this Imperial War Museum extract, Lasker-Wallfisch voluntarily launches into 'funny stories' and actively attempts to recreate the appropriate ambiance for her recountings: 'a prison is a place of rumours' in order to engage with her interviewer. In contast, Lasker-Wallfisch's replies are often audibly curtailed in response to Sue Lawley's constant intrusions:

---

[388] Though, as I have said, this style of interviewing is typical of Lawley's other *Desert Island Discs* interviews, the point I am making here is that this is also typical of the interviewing techniques used in media interviews in general– and highlights the dichotomy between the type and phrasing of questions generally asked in media and non-media interviews.

[389] As I have shown in previous examples - though a full extract of Lasker-Wallfisch's response to an equivalent question from Conrad Wood would take up far too much space in the present study given existing word restrictions.

[390] Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.

Int: It's a sense of duty [**L-W**: Absolutely it's a sense of duty] y-you went back I know to Belsen have you been back - to the site of Auschwitz?

L-W: Yes [perceptibly measured response] I've been twice to Auschwitz.[391]

Lasker-Wallfisch is also much more defensive throughout this interview, pointedly asserting herself at a number of junctures during her conversation with Lawley. A patent example of this occurs a few minutes into the interview, when a struggle for dominance ensues between interviewer and interviewee. This begins when Lawley asks Lasker-Wallfisch about how she felt having to play music for Nazi officers:

L-W: [interrupting] You know I don't think we gave ourselves time to feel anything -

Int: 'cause you knew what they were doing didn't you

L-W: [interrupting] Of course we knew what they were doing,

Int: [interrupting] h-how could you entertain them really is I suppose what one's asking?

L-W: Yeh but h what was the alternative [ironic chuckle as she speaks]

Int: No you don't have a choice?

L-W: No.[392]

In this extract, Lasker-Wallfisch rapidly goes from being quite relaxed - if a little reserved - to being very resolute and guarded as soon as she feels Lawley is implying that she had any measure of choice over what she did, or culpability for the tasks that the

[391] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.
[392] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

Nazis made her perform. This is discernable in the above transcription from the point that Lawley asks Lasker-Wallfisch if she knew what the Nazis were doing, when Lasker-Wallfisch's sentences begin to constrict, and in the recording she starts to speak more loudly and with a greater depth of conviction. Lasker-Wallfisch interrupts and overrides her interviewer at this point in an attempt to ensure that there is no confusion over the facts of her situation as it was at the time, and so that Lawley (and her listeners) do not judge Lasker-Wallfisch according to the realities of today. Lasker-Wallfisch's tone of voice also audibly changes as her intonation hardens and she becomes more forceful, disparaging, and by the end of the extract, outwardly affronted and defensive – culminating in the ironic chuckle at her interviewer's ignorance. Finally, the tenor of Lasker-Wallfisch's address shifts after her interviewer's interjection, taking on a sardonic edge culminating in the dismissive and reproving denial on which the above section of dialogue ends. In her assertive and emotionally-charged response to Lawley's questions, Lasker-Wallfisch is trying to re-establish her position of authority over her life story. Lasker-Wallfisch continues to reavow possession of her narrative at sporadic intervals through the rest of this discourse, interrupting her interviewer when she wants to make an important point or to correct Lawley when she says something that Lasker-Wallfisch does not agree with – such as when Lawley begins to talk about Lasker-Wallfisch living 'in very straitened circumstances' and she is interrupted and overridden by her interviewee, who wishes to clarify and refine Lawley's statement : 'Eventually yes eventually we had to leave uh our flat and we moved in with an aunt and, uh we lived on top of one another till 1942'.[393]

[193] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

A final interesting example of the continued power struggle between Lawley and Lasker-Wallfisch during their interview-dialogue occurs when the interviewer asks her interviewee how she survived in an environment of 'constant fear', living with the unremitting threat of Nazi annihilation hanging overhead:

> **Int**: So you lived because you knew um those of you who m went on surviving you you lived therefore with a with constant fear
>
> **L-W**: Somehow you come to terms with eventually they're going to get you...but whilst they haven't got you – you just carry on. I think one of the ingredients were of survival was to be with other people. I think anybody on their *own* - really didn't have a chance. But, the fact that we were an orchestra and I mean I'm still see [sic] the people that have uh-uh still alive now we still, keep in touch you know and we really looked after each other and bullied each other and, [**Int:** Did you? – So you bullied each other if f f] [**L-W**: [talking over her] we bullied each other anybo [**Int**: [talks over Lasker-Wallfisch] some people felt like giving up] Yes you could see if people started perhaps not to wash every day or – well you can see when people start giving up[394]

As one can see, after Lawley asks her initial question a verbal battle ensues between these two women. As their dialogue progresses, both continually attempt to talk over the other, with Lawley trying to extract a very specific response from her interviewee. Lawley also seems intent on getting Lasker-Wallfisch to put a more dramatic slant on her past memories – something which Lasker-Wallfisch vehemently resists. Once more, Lawley is also attempting to intimate Lasker-Wallfisch's thoughts and feelings - even as her interviewee is attempting to give voice to them. And in spite of Lasker-Wallfisch's exhibition of symptoms of trauma when responding to her interviewer's question – as shown by the uncharacteristic gaps, hiatuses, lapses into the present tense ('*they're going*

[394] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

to get you')[395] and elongated sentences without pauses for breath – Lawley still pursues with this line of questioning.

Less Quantifiable Areas of Interviewer Impact

Though the intended audience, format and style of address each interviewer brings to his or her interview can be quantified to a high degree of accuracy, there are other interviewer-related influences - the effects of which may vary more subjectively from interviewee to interviewee. The impact each of these factors has on the interviews produced in each instance is therefore less straightforwardly verifiable. The age of an interviewer, for example, may have an influence on the way the interviewee reacts to his or her questions: a very young (or young-looking) interviewer may evoke a appraisal of inexperience or unacquaintedness on the part of the interviewee, which may affect the way the survivor responds to his/her questions during the interview. Conversely, if an interviewer is the same age (or older than) his/her interviewee, this may have an equally negative effect on the interviewing relationship. Trude Levi, for example, has stated that she could not speak to a German person above a certain age for fear of their involvement in the events of the Holocaust.[396]

The gender of the interviewer may also have a bearing on the testimonies given by Holocaust survivors. It might be, for instance, that Leon Greenman responded to the questions asked by David J more openly because his interviewer was male, and Greenman felt he could relate certain experiences, such as his sense of paternal

[395] My emphasis.
[396] Levi, *Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss?* p. 80.

responsibility towards his son whilst being deported, more readily to a male interviewer than a female interviewer. One might also suggest that Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's answers were so expansive - and at junctures uncertain - in her interview with Conrad Wood in part because she was more accepting of his taking an authoritative role, due to her assumption of the traditionally gendered position of compliant female to his more dominant male. However, since Wood is the only male interviewer to have questioned Lasker-Wallfisch, any conclusions drawn from such assumptions would be tenuous. Psychological research has shown, however, that the gender of both interviewer and interviewee may have an effect on the kind of questions asked and answers given in any given interview scenario. In *Eyewitness Testimony*, Elizabeth Lotfus examines whether gender can have an effect on the reliability of a witness statement. Loftus finds that:

> All things equal, who makes a better witness, a man or a woman?...recent works...suggest a possible answer, namely, that both women and men pay more attention to items that catch their interest and consequently store more or better information in memory about those items. If a...test asked about female-orientated items, women would outperform men. The converse would be true if testing concerned male-orientated details.[397]

If this is the case, the gender of the witness - and by extension perhaps even the interviewer - may have a direct impact on the questions asked (and the answers given) by male and female survivors and their interviewers, in accordance with how both sexes observe and mentally 'store' information. Indeed, by contending that men tend to focus on 'male-orientated items', Loftus is implying that their female counterparts – be they interviewees or interviewers - may fail to respond to these stimuli. In the sphere of the

[397] Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony*, p. 157.

interviewing relationship, it therefore follows that a female interviewer, focusing on 'female-orientated items' (perhaps by asking about specifically female experiences in the camps) would 'outperform' a male interviewer when interviewing a female subject. It can be reasonably assumed that such impulses would be countered to a great extent in interviewers through training courses in interviewing techniques. [398] Indeed the testimonial evidence to hand would seem to endorse this supposition, as the questions asked by both male and female interviewers in this study have marked similarities throughout all the testimonies examined.[399] However, the responses of the interviewees are probably not counterbalanced in this way, as it is unlikely that they would have participated in such courses. It would, however, take much wider clinical trials to bear such a hypothesis out, and for the purpose of this study, it is virtually impossible – as well as unnecessary - to quantify the extent to which such factors could have an effect on Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial responses.

The Interviewee and Testimonial Recountings

Interviewee Agenda

In spite of these uncertainties, a great deal of what drives survivors to speak about their experiences, as well as how they choose to articulate their pasts, *can* be examined in

[398] The British Library Sound Archive, for instance, run interviewing workshops which train people in interviewing techniques. These are open to interviewers from any background and are available to all members of staff who take part in interviewing initiatives. See <www.oralhistory.org.uk/training> [accessed 10/02/05]

[399] Other than the disparities already examined in the different approaches media and non-media interviewers take to the interviewing process. These differences are due to the factors I have outlined in this chapter.

detail. Indeed, one must not forget that interviewers are not the only individuals to bring an agenda to their interviews. Like many Holocaust survivors, the eyewitnesses studied in this thesis have spoken out about their past lives in order to transmit the reality of the genocide to the world of today, as a warning against prejudice, and with a mind to preserving their memories for posterity. As I have established, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have all composed a version of their pasts that is both *tellable* and *hearable*, and these narratively structured 'life-stories' form the basis of all their various testimonial recountings. But survivors will also change the emphasis of their accounts depending on their intended audience – be they a party of school teachers or delegates from an academic conference.[400] To be sure, sociologists such as Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein argue that people always assemble their life-stories in order 'to meet situated interpretive demands', that is, anticipated societal or individual expectations.[401] Holocaust survivors are no exception to this rule. Like anyone else, survivors will gauge their audience and attempt to 'pitch' their testimonies at the right level so that we as 'outsiders' can begin to understand them.[402] For example, Trude Levi has stated that she intentionally leaves out any reference to menstruation and the difficulties this entailed whilst living in concentration camps from her talks with school children, as she believes that this age group does not have the emotional maturity to deal with such a topic.[403] Likewise, Anita Lasker-Wallfisch gauges her listening audience in a similar manner. In

[400] As Trude Levi told me, during our interview. Levi, testimonial interview with Jennifer Maiden, August-October, 2007.
[401] Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein. 'Narrative Practice and the Coherence of Personal Stories' ,*Sociological Quarterly*, 39 (1998), p.166.
[402] Once again, as Trude Levi told me during our interview. Levi's testimonial interviews with Jennifer Maiden, August-October, 2007.
[403] As Trude Levi told me, during our interview. Levi's testimonial interviews with Jennifer Maiden, August-October, 2007.

her British Library interview, for instance, Lasker-Wallfisch speaks about the past with the assumption that her interviewer has some prior knowledge of the subject matter, and

as such she skips over information she sees as superfluous in this interview.[404] As an example, when Lasker-Wallfisch first speaks about Kristallnacht she does not reference the incident by name, but instead simply mentions the date, offering no further explanation about the incident:

> **L-W**: [...] So eventually when we realised that it is you know 9th of November '38 really, that it hits you home that this [Germany] is not a place...[405]

It is only later in this interview, after Jennifer Wingate asks Lasker-Wallfisch directly about her experiences during Kristallnacht, that she speaks about the event in detail. In contrast, in Lasker-Wallfisch's preparatory interview for 'The Archive Hour' radio programme, she talks about her memories in detail, offering frank explanations about phrases and historical circumstances she presupposes her interviewers (and perhaps post-interview public audience) may not know about.[406] In both interviews, however, Lasker-Wallfisch states that she has intentionally framed her memories within a context that her audience can understand – in terms of her own experiences. Lasker-Wallfisch thus allows

[404] For instance, from a very early point in this testimony Lasker-Wallfisch leaves a great many more German and Yiddish words untranslated and without explanation whilst she recounts. She appears to begin doing this once she realises her interviewer is Jewish, and has some background knowledge of German history and culture. Lasker-Wallfisch also occasionally skips over information in a similar manner, once she realises her interviewer has some background knowledge of World War II during her Imperial War Museum testimony. For example, Lasker-Wallfisch is in the middle of explaining the options her family had to emigrate before the outbreak of war, when she says: '[you] see a place like Shanghai one could have gone to, – didn't appeal to my father at all – "but what will I do in Shanghai" well you know about that'. Since she assumes her interviewer already 'know[s] about' the implications that emigration to Shanghai entails, Lasker-Wallfisch breaks off her dialogue here and moves onto the next subject without explaining her situation further. Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.

[405] Lasker-Wallfisch, British Library testimony.

[406] Such as when she describes exactly what 'looting' means and what it entailed. See Chapter 1.

her listeners to identify with an otherwise faceless collective of Holocaust victims by examining the catastrophe within the context of her personal experiences, as she seeks to 'make it [the genocide...] *understandable*'[407] by 'personalise[ing] stories [...in order] for people to really uh identify with [...] six million dead people'.[408]

The Interviewee and Listener Expectation

To add to this, survivors will also shape their memories according to their perception of the varying expectations of their listeners. This is not to say that the content of survivors' testimonies will vary radically from one account to the next. Instead, these differences are subtle. A comparative analysis of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's life-stories, for instance, shows that these survivors do not drastically alter their recountings in terms of substance. Nonetheless, each survivor will modify the emphasis of his or her recountings depending on whether they sense their listeners are validating, (agreeing with) challenging, (disagreeing with or appearing sceptical) or consolidating (empathizing or attempting to assimilate) their personal experiences of the Holocaust into his or her understanding of the genocide.[409]

These changes are discernable in all three survivors' oral testimonial accounts, as when their interviewers attempt to challenge their recollections, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman all begin to become defensive, their recountings constrict, and they start to

[407] Lasker-Wallfisch's emphasis.
[408] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.
[409] Indeed, as Henry Greenspan highlights: 'Survivors do not recount in a vacuum but always to an actual or imagined audience of listeners. What survivors say, how they say it, whether they say it at all, will depend, in part, on their perceptions of those listeners.' Greenspan, *Listening to Holocaust Survivors*, p.30.

steer away from less often discussed personal memories and/or any potentially contentious areas surrounding the Holocaust. For instance, in Trude Levi's British Library interview she begins to talk about the liquidation of the Szombathely ghetto, and of the time she spent in the deportation camp that was used as a holding point for the Jewish population. Whilst recounting this memory Levi begins to become quite angry, her voice taking on an accusatory tone as she remembers that none of their non-Jewish friends came to give her family any provisions during this period of internment. When her interviewer, Gaby Glassman, implies that there may be a reason for this, however - by questioning whether it happened because non-Jews were not allowed into the camp - Levi's defensive demeanour becomes instead focused on her interviewer, as she curtly rejects Glassman's theory out of hand, and her previously long and expansive answers are replaced by an uncharacteristically short, brisk response:

> **L**: [...] because I remember we couldn't get out and and some people some some people still had friends who came and brought them some bread and brought them some eggs and brought them some stuff, and we didn't have any we di we were, I was terribly upset that none of our non-Jewish friends who for years used to come to us for dinner, and used to be close friends ever came and did anything for us, and none of my father's patients who he treated, for free, did anything for us. [accusatory tone]
>
> **Int:** Were they allowed to [**L:** [Talking over her interviewer] They weren't allowed to] uh come?
>
> **L**: [continuing] but I mean people did come nevertheless [**Int**: Um it was possible.] and it was still possible to do it and but we didn't have *anyone* who did anything for us.[410]

[410] Levi, British Library testimony.

Even when Glassman attempts to change the subject, asking Levi about what kind of people were gathered at the deportation camp, Levi continues to interrupt and override her interviewer for a further few minutes, her answers remaining noticeably truncated and guarded until the end of the reel. Often in instances such as this, survivors also begin to focus on more general personal or background historical information to their life-stories as if to justify – or simply contexualise - their past actions. Conversely, in interviews where their interviewers appear to be attempting to empathise with their plight, all three survivors respond by speaking more openly about their experiences, often - in non-media interviews - revealing memories which they had rarely spoken about in their public talks. For example, in his Imperial War Museum interview, Leon Greenman begins to speak about Kurt Schlesinger, a man who could have intervened and possibly prevented the deportation of the Greenman family from Westerbork to Auschwitz, where Greenman's wife and son were gassed. Although Greenman begins by speaking frankly about his opinions of Schlesinger, after his interviewer endorses this viewpoint by broadcasting her personal opinions about the man: 'It sounds as though he didn't care because he was saving his own skin in collaboration with the SS?' Greenman opens up even more, speaking with greater depth of conviction and in more details about 'what kind of man he [Schlesinger] is.'[411] Henry Greenspan has observed similar behaviour in the Holocaust survivors he has interviewed. By way of explanation, Greenspan avers that the expectations of a survivor's audience of listeners – be it actual or imagined by the interviewee - is imperative to take into consideration when one is analysing the testimonies produced by a survivor through time. Greenspan concludes that:

[411] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony. Note the use of the present tense here, when Greenman talks about the kind of man Schlesinger *is* rather than the kind of man Schlesinger *was*.

> What survivors say, how they say it, whether they say it at all, will depend, in part, on their perceptions of those listeners, as well as on the ways the listeners have made their own hopes, fears, and expectations known. A consideration of listeners – like a consideration of meaning and form – thus becomes essential to the interpretation of survivors' recounting.[412]

However, though survivors may shape their memories in order to meet with their perception of what their various listeners expect to hear, this does not affect the *fundamental form* of the memories conveyed. As I have established, every account of the past Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given contains essentially the same experiences, narrated in an equivalent chronological order. Moreover, in 'anticipating our anticipationism'[413] and constructing their recollections accordingly, survivors do not compromise the veracity of the memories conveyed. Indeed, research has shown that no matter what atmosphere the interviewer creates – be it confrontational or empathetic, supportive or unaccommodating – this does not affect the accuracy or completeness of the testimony produced.[414]

Circumstances of Creation and Production

In contrast, one may assume that the conditions in which an interview is conducted will have a more straightforwardly verifiable impact on the content of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies. For instance, the setting of the interview - whether the interview was conducted at the interviewee's home, in a studio, or in an interview room –

---

[412] Greenspan, *Listening to Holocaust Survivors*. p.30
[413] Greenspan, *Listening to Holocaust Survivors*. p.xvi.
[414] Clinical trials have proven that, in contrast to research expectations, the atmosphere in which an interview is conducted does not affect the accuracy or completeness of a witnesses report. See Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony*. p.99.

is likely to have a significant influence on the memories recounted, and on the style of interviewer-interviewee exchange, in all of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonials. But these factors are not so easily quantifiable as they may at first appear. For instance, it may seem commonsensical to suppose that discussions conducted in an interviewee's home would produce the most effective form of interview, as interviewees would be more relaxed with regard to speaking about the Holocaust in the safety and comfort of a familiar environment. Indeed, in those interviews that were conducted in survivors' homes – such as Leon Greenman and Trude Levi's Imperial War Museum testimonies, and Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's interview with the British Library - they do seem to be more at ease whilst recounting their memories of the Holocaust. During Lasker-Wallfisch's British Library interview, for instance, she speaks in a generally relaxed and open manner, and is able to drink and smoke at her leisure.[415] The listener can also hear familiar background noises throughout Lasker-Wallfisch's interview which seem to enhance the private domesticity of the setting – the background hum of a television, and the occasional ring of a telephone.[416] But these interviews are also non-media accounts, and as such Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman may well have been more at ease because they did not have to actively 'entertain' their 'captive' audiences.[417] Any assertions that these survivors would *always* be better able to discuss their private recollections in a home environment would therefore be difficult to substantiate. Indeed, as I have already established, the content and chronology of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and

[415] As can be heard throughout this interview.
[416] The television – or radio - can be heard in the background during Lasker-Wallfisch's Imperial War Museum testimony.
[417] Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Giulia*, p.19.

Greenman's testimonies vary very little between each testimonial account – be they media or non-media recordings.

Whether it is better to allow the interviewee to stay in his or her home environment whilst being interviewed is a conundrum that does not only affect my thesis. To be sure, opinions are divided amongst interviewers as to what is the best ambience in which to encourage survivors to embark on a free-flowing dialogue invoking their traumatic experiences. Some testimonial archives, most notably the Yale Fortunoff Archive, insist that survivors recount their memories in a blank camera set, free from props or visual aids such as letters from the time of their persecution. This is done as the archive conducts its interviews on the basis of psycho-analytical research which they claim shows that by putting people in a therapeutic setting, untouched by everyday surroundings and their lives today, they are better able to talk about their memories of the past.[418] In contrast Steven Spielberg's Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation takes the opposite approach, interviewing survivors in their home environments, and encouraging witnesses to reflect on documentary and photographic evidence throughout their interviews.[419]

---

[418] Interestingly, such variations mark a fundamental difference between the ethea of these two archives. The Shoah Foundation, for instance, encourages people to bring photographs into their interviews, whereas the Yale Fortunoff Archive does not encourage people to bring items which may remind them of their current lives to their interviews. Information gained from email correspondence with Joan Ringelheim, Director of Oral History at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

[419] Information gained from email correspondence with Erica Cabag, Coordinator of Educational Access for the *Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation*. This format is also observable throughout all of the UK Shoah videotestimonies I have seen. It is worth noting that the Shoah Foundation includes a special slot at the end of all their recordings to video the documents that their interviewees have referred to throughout their interviews. During this section of the recording, the cameraman also videos extra material such as pre and post war photographs of family and friends. This material is only shown on-screen after the end of the interview – unlike Leon Greenman's videotestimony for the British Video Archive, during which all the documentation he refers to is pictured on-screen as he is still speaking, and is often zoomed into and viewed in close up.

Immeasurable Conditions of Production

The circumstances of interview production may also have had a significant impact on the testimonies Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given since the end of the war. Factors such as the position of the interviewer - whether he or she sat opposite or next to their interviewee when conducting the interview - may have had an influence on how comfortable the interviewee felt, and thus, how readily they spoke about their experiences in a particular interview scenario.[420] The intrusiveness of interviewing equiptment – such as the brightness of the lighting equipment during a videoed interview – may also have an impact on any given testimony a survivor has produced. In *The Battle of Valle Guilia*, Alessandro Portelli discusses a number of technical factors which he feels have a significant impact on the testimonies witnesses produce in a particular interview situation. Portelli uses the positioning of recording apparatus, and the associations these recording devices carry with them, as a case in point:

> ...[Their] voices go through some kind of machine: a tape recorder, a camera, or at the least a notebook...this acts as a moderating influence on the narrator's perception of the interviewer: the presence of the machine indicates that these words will be repeated elsewhere, to an absent indetermined audience.[421]

If an interviewee were to become preoccupied with the 'undetermined audience' indicated by the presence of the tape recorder, this could very well have a huge effect on how and what they choose to speak about in their interviews. Moreover, in highlighting this Portelli is evoking a second important point: that all forms of recording, be they tape

[420] Though this can only be gauged by an analysis of videotestimonies, which are beyond the remit of this study.
[421] Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Guilia*, p.13.

machine or video camera, are effectively forms of *mediation*, interceding between the interviewee and his or her intended audience. As a result, by simply recording an interview the interviewer is necessarily having a moderating influence on the testimony given by his/her interviewee at that time. The extent to which such forms of mediation may have inhibited the testimonies produced by Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman in each of the interviews they have given is almost impossible to measure. This is because it is impractical to gauge variables which may differ so significantly from one survivor to the next. However, Portelli suggests that one can estimate the level at which the presence of recording equipment has affected survivors' recountings, as the more intrusive the intervention the more survivors will be inclined towards speaking in terms of a 'monologue public statement', rather than in 'the genre of personal dialogue exchange'.[422] Working from this hypothesis, I can surmise that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman are less affected by interview intervention in their non-media testimonials, as in these accounts all three survivors appear to converse in the style of a 'personal dialogic exchange', responding more lengthily to their interviewers' questions and asking questions in return. Conversely, in their media interviews Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman each appear to revert to more 'public' versions of their life-stories, leaving out the digressions and explanations of personal issues present in the non-media accounts and summarizing huge portions of their pasts. For example, Trude Levi talks at length about her camp experiences in all of her non-media testimonies. In her media interview for the *Jewish Chronicle*, however, Levi summarises most of her camp experiences in a very concise monologue at the beginning of the interview, which she herself terms as 'quick':

[422] Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Guilia*, p.13.

> L: Well, a very qui I shall very quickly go over um; I come from Hungary, I was deported in 1944 in June, to first to Auschwitz, and after in in uh-uh no no in July I was deported to Auschwitz and uh and then from Auschwitz, I was transferred into a Buchenwald outcamp as a slave labourer.[423]

Though Levi does go on to speak at length about her work as a slave labourer, as I have previously noted, she talks about this time mostly in terms of factual details – such as the number of women in her work unit; her exact role working in a munitions factory, and the roles of others; the duties performed by her and other 'sabotage volunteers'[424] who incapacitated the grenades they had to make – rather than in terms of individual personal experiences. From these findings I can reasonably conclude that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's non-media interviews are, on the whole, likely to be experienced as less intrusive than their media counterparts – though there are of course always going to be exceptions to this rule.

Likewise, the duration of each interview,[425] and whether the conversation was taped in one sitting or over a number of days weeks or months, must have some bearing on the testimonies each survivor has produced. One might reasonably assume, for instance, that an interview conducted without a pressing time scale (such as an Oral History interview) is likely to be more expansive and detailed than an interview conducted in a perceptibly time-dependant environment. However, the extent to which interviews carried out over a number of dates may have affected survivors' testimonies is again harder to measure with any degree of certainty. This is because all of the non-media interviews Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have participated in have been conducted over a number of sittings,

---

[423] Levi, *The Jewish Chronicle* testimony.
[424] As Trude Levi told me during our interview. Levi testimonial interviews with Jennifer Maiden.
[425] That is the period of time over which the interview is conducted.

sometimes stretching over several months. There is also often no clear delineation between where one sitting ends and another begins. In some of Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's non-media interviews, for example, the tape is occasionally paused and one may surmise that the interview has been resumed at a later date when the interviewee is prompted by her interviewer, who reminds her where they have previously left off. This happens during Lasker-Wallfisch's Imperial War Museum interview, when the tape is paused, after which Conrad Wood runs through what Lasker-Wallfisch has been speaking about:

> **Int**: You were giving the reasons why your [**L-W**: [*Beginning to speak as he finishes asking his question*] Ya, why I think i in in retrospect you know...so] How did they treat you once they had arrested you?[426]

But in Lasker-Wallfisch's British Library interview, there is no clear indication where one sitting ends and another begins at all. There is no taped interviewer prompting in this interview. Instead, Lasker-Wallfisch continues to talk after there is a pause in the tape seemingly without any temporal gap whatever. Yet records show that this interview was conducted over four sittings, spanning from 5th May 2000 until 13th October of the same year. What kind of conversations - or memory prompts - the interviewee has exchanged with her interviewer prior to the tape recorder being switched on is therefore completely indeterminate. Only Lasker-Wallfisch's media interviews have been recorded in one session, and as previously discussed, these interviews are necessarily more constricted: firstly as they tend to focus on specific moments of Lasker-Wallfisch's life-story, and secondly as they have invariably been conducted within a tightly prescribed time period.

[426] Lasker-Wallfisch, Imperial War Museum testimony.

It is therefore hard to draw any conclusions about whether it is 'better' that interviews are carried out in one sitting, or over a number of sessions, with the evidence to hand.[427]

Intervention and Written Testimony

Assessable Disparities Between Different Forms of Testimony

It therefore follows that, unlike oral interviews, in written testimonies survivors have a great deal more control over the content, direction and narrative flow that their recollections take. Indeed, unlike the reciprocal and symbiotic interviewing relationship, survivors themselves – and they alone – have made the decision about what and how to write about their experiences. This absence of collaborative effort is apparent in the form Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's written testimonies take, as their memories are narrated unimpeded by the interruptions, intercessions and impositions of an outside party. As a result, the written form has allowed each survivor to compose his or her experiences with a greater depth of reflexivity than afforded them in spoken interviews (though a central point of this thesis is my finding that the memories included in these testimonies do not differ radically from those recollections spoken about in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's oral accounts). Trude Levi, for instance, reflects upon her experiences in *A Cat Called Adolf*, stating that the main aim of her memoir is to convey the difficulties survivors face in living with the legacy of the Holocaust: 'for

[427] Though I personally think that it is better to record an interview in one sitting where possible. This is because often, when survivors are in the midst of their dialogue and the tape is paused and resumed at a later date, the enthusiasm and involvement with which Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman were speaking about their experiences before the recording is stopped is lost. Also, though Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman continue with their life-stories at a similar point after the break in the interview, they often may have started to speak about a memory that they do not pursue or finish when the interview is resumed. This, as much as any of these factors, has an impact on the natural flow of their narration.

many have spoken about the horrors of the camps, but few have discussed the effect they had on those who survived'.[428] Anita Lasker-Wallfisch similarly attempts to explain her behaviour and reactions in *Inherit the Truth*. For example, when asked by an interviewer in later life whether she was scared all of the time whilst in Auschwitz she responds by simply saying 'no'. Lasker-Wallfisch then ponders why she answered in this manner, concluding: '*I have often thought about it since*, and the only explanation I have is that fear is like an ache. If you live with it long enough, you do get used to it.'[429]

Equally, memories only touched upon in survivors' oral interviews are frequently expanded on in much greater detail in their written accounts. After discussions with Holocaust survivors, I believe this is due to the nature of the medium of writing itself, which necessitates the slow and methodical deliberation and recording of survivors' memories. I can test this theory, by comparing the levels of detail and description present in the anecdotes Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman discuss in their oral and written accounts. If we take a contrasting anecdote which has featured in Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's oral and written testimonies, for example, we can see that in her interview for *Desert Island Discs* Lasker-Wallfisch briefly mentions her overall impression of Bergen-Belsen in the following manner:

> **L-W**: We didn't know where we were going and when we d did find out I don't know how somebody said 'oh Belsen oh that's a very good place that is a convalescent camp,' [...] it was a camp where people perished. There wa were no gas chambers there [**Int**: um] no *need* for gas chambers you just died of disease of starvation – [430]

[428] Levi, *A Cat Called Adolf*, p.3.
[429] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*, p.75. My emphasis.
[430] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Desert Island Discs* testimony.

Even though this interview is focused on Lasker-Wallfisch's experiences in Belsen, this anecdote is still concise and to the point. In her book, however, Lasker-Wallfisch discusses these same memories much more expansively, explaining the events in much greater depth - though using similar adjectival descriptions to those used in her oral account. As before, Lasker-Wallfisch also comments on these experiences with sporadic evaluatory and reflective asides:

> We started our journey westwards. There were rumours flying about – there was never any shortage of them – that we were heading for a 'convalescent camp', an Erholungslager, and that it was called Bergen-Belsen...Belsen was not equipped to cope with anything – least of all with the sick and the dead. It did not possess the 'facilities' available in Auschwitz...Auschwitz was a place where people were *murdered*. In Belsen they *perished*.[431]

In her written testimony, Lasker-Wallfisch builds tension and involvement in her life-story by pacing her narrative, punctuating her account with snappy phrasing, euphemistic terms in quotation marks, and by making succinct parallels between camps. In her oral testimony, these same ideas are still present – though they are less smoothly drawn together, Lasker-Wallfisch's comparisons are less 'catchy', and her grammar consists mainly of a few pauses for breath as she narrates this memory. By writing about their experiences survivors are also able to communicate their remembrances in a continuous and unbroken surge as, undistracted by questions, their memoirs are not punctured with the sidetracked digressions often present in all three survivors' interview testimonies. Instead, all asides, anecdotes and commentary not relating to the main body of the survivors' experiences still feed into their main life-stories in a fluid and well-organised

[431] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*,. pp. 87-91. Lasker-Wallfisch's emphasis.

manner, contributing significantly to the central thrust of their testimony in some form or another.[432] As such, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's memoirs are all essentially more concise and succinct versions of their oral accounts.[433] But these memoirs also contain decidedly literary elements that are absent from their oral testimonies - and these techniques indicate that survivors written testimonials are not simply meticulously recounted yet *unaffected* versions of their oral accounts. To illustrate what I mean by this, I will use Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's memoir as a case in point. In her published, unpublished and monologue versions of *Inherit the Truth*, Lasker-Wallfisch employs a number of literary techniques in order to draw her readers into her recountings. For instance, Lasker-Wallfisch uses the shortened sentences present in her oral accounts in her written testimonies, whilst in her memoirs she outrightly states that she intentionally utilised a 'Telegram Style' of expression.[434] Lasker-Wallfisch thus uses very pronounced shortened, end-stopped sentences – audible in her monologue testimonial, and visible in her books - in order to build tension when she comes to an especially dramatic or disturbing moment in her life-story. An example of this occurs when Lasker-Wallfisch

[432] Rather than trailing off or being left unfinished.

[433] Though the oral accounts Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given may appear to be longer than their memoirs, this is not normally the case. This is because the amount of time these survivors devote to reflecting on their Holocaust experiences is usually roughly the same in both forms of medium. The length of both forms of testimony is, however, dependant upon what Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman include in each account. For example, these survivors' non-media oral testimonies are often longer than their memoirs, as these accounts typically begin with the survivor detailing his/her upbringing and the life-stories of their parents (and even grandparents). These recountings can also continue right up to the survivors circumstances in the present day. In their memoirs, however, Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman focus on their early pre-Holocaust lives, leading into their Holocaust experiences. They also tend to end soon after their leaving the camps, and include some brief reflection on their experiences in hindsight. Trude Levi's memoir *A Cat Called Adolf* is slightly different, as this book looks at the aftermath of the Holocaust on Levi's post-camp life – with little direct reflection on her camp experiences. This has been done deliberately, as Levi states that 'it is most important to speak out, to tell it all, not only what happened to me in the Nazi concentration and work camps, but my life before and after that grim experience.' p.3. But as Levi has chosen to primarily evaluate these parts of her life, rather than reflecting on her whole life-story, this is again a selective account.

[434] See Lasker-Wallfisch's 'Preface' to her unpublished manuscript. In this, Lasker-Wallfisch states that she employs this style of writing in an effort to 'avoid 'embroidery' [that is embellishment] at all costs.'

writes about the time she and her sister were captured by the Gestapo whilst trying to escape to Paris in the published version of *Inherit*:

> Naturally we were frightened. After all, we only had the vaguest idea what would happen to us once we arrived in Paris, among other things. I carried with me a notebook with the addresses of several contacts in France, should we ever get that far. That was all. We did not think too far ahead.[435]

Lasker-Wallfisch employs the same technique all the way through her published and unpublished memoirs, such as when she writes about the moment she thought she was about to be shot upon arrival at Bergen-Belsen: 'We continued marching in silence, past the rifle range. The noise never stopped. But nobody shot us.'[436] These foreshortened sentences not only shock the reader out of our 'comfort zone' in their abruptness (coming, as they do, after long sections of dialogue in which Lasker-Wallfisch uses more conventional syntactical language) but the suddenness of these jerky lines also *stylistically* emphasises the *actuality* of the scene – jolting, and out of place with normality. To add to this, Lasker-Wallfisch's idiosyncratic grammar forces her reader physically to slow down when reading these sections of her memoir, and in so doing, to physically *think* about the images the author is presenting us with, rather than passively skimming over her lines.

Lasker-Wallfisch's altering of standard language rules and its effects[437] may be designed to imitate the emphases of a speaking voice, so as to instill a further sense of authenticity

---

[435] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*, p. 51.
[436] Ibid, p.89.
[437] As has been previously noted, this technique is rather jolting, and forces the reader to pause and consider what Lasker-Wallfisch is saying between each assertion.

in the memories conveyed. But whatever its motivation, this technique is mirrored in the memoirs of other Holocaust survivors. Like Lasker-Wallfisch, Trude Levi also employs a succession of foreshortened sentences in her memoirs when emphasizing an important point in her life-story. When Levi is discussing her move to Israel after the war in *A Cat Called Adolf*, for example, she employs a more choppy form of syntax to reflect the peculiarity of her situation:

> One could say what one thought and, oddly enough, it was the first place where no one asked why I did not go to synagogue. I felt free. Every time I travelled from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv, I saw new roads and buildings and where there had been stony ground trees were now growing. I felt alive and part of something great.[438]

Levi also uses strategically placed foreshortened sentences in her question-and-answer memoir *Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss?* For instance, when asked if she would ever live in Germany again, for example, Levi's reply is polite, though her abrupt sentence structure - punctuated by full stops and semi colons that were not present in her writing before this point - conveys her true feelings:

> I never lived in Germany. [...] Nor would I like to live in Germany today. My second husband came from Berlin and had to flee to Palestine at the age of 16 to save his life. Both his parents were killed by the Nazis; his father was a slave-labourer [...] He was well over 60; it was too much for him and it killed him.[439]

[438] Levi, *A Cat Called Adolf*, p.117.
[439] Levi, *Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss?* p.80.

Similarly, Leon Greenman uses condensed sentences at junctures in his memoir *An Englishman in Auschwitz*. However, unlike Lasker-Wallfisch and Levi, Greenman employs these truncated sentences when attempting to communicate his memories from a camp-orientated perspective. To put it another way, Greenman uses unusual amounts of punctuation – from full stops to semi-colons, colons to question marks - to drive home the *essence* of his experiences; grammatically to emphasise, augment and authenticate the experiences articulated in his life-story for his reader. Greenman's grammar thus replicates his memories at such moments, representing stylistically the reality of his Holocaust experiences. For instance, Greenman tends to combine these various forms of punctuation over a very short sequence of writing when he is endeavouring to recount his past as it happened, at which time he includes the facts surrounding events, as well as replicating his thoughts and reasoning *as it was at the time* rather than as it is *now*:

> I remember one afternoon, a very old SS guard was near me. He must have been nearly 70. He looked down at me as I was digging [...] I stopped and looked at him, the old boy; was I pitying him? He told me that four sons had been killed in the war. What could I do about that? It serves them right. But perhaps it was a bit hard for the old man and his wife. He was holding a pipe in his mouth, but had no tobacco to smoke; he made a gesture, no tobacco. I thought for a minute. I had found a piece of cigarette, I felt for it and I threw it up to him. He thanked me.[440]

Greenman's short sentences, clipped staccato descriptions in which he misses out words: 'he made a gesture, no tobacco' and occasional use of the present tense: '*serves* them right' highlight the extraordinariness of the scene - both of the camp situation itself, and of this unlikely exchange between prisoner and prison guard. Greenman's idiosyncratic

[440] Greenman, *An Englishman in Auschwitz*, p.103.

syntax in this extract, unusual in comparison to the standard grammar he employs elsewhere in this book, also technically conveys the quick turn of events that made up his everyday concentration camp life.

Candid and agonisingly open, I posit that Greenman is attempting to convey his thoughts and feelings to his reader from a 'camp standpoint'. What I am suggesting here, is rather than omitting facts which make the young Greenman look less than saintly, Greenman includes details of how he felt and reasoned at the time of his persecution - so that in response to his guard's admission of the deaths of his sons, Greenman does not pretend her felt sorry for the man, or feign compassion. Rather, as is a reasonable human response in such dire circumstances, his first reaction is one of dismissive reprisal: 'What could I do about it? It serves them right.' By taking the brave leap of faith to include such information into his testimony, Greenman is, I assert, relaying his experiences and mindset as authentically as is possible to his reading audience. Yet though this account appears to be an artless and spontaneous description of Greenman's past, it is actually a carefully crafted anecdote designed to convey his memories to the reader in a realistic manner – through honed methods. In fact, I propose that the realism of this memoir is reinforced by Greenman's mix of unconventional literary techniques – techniques which highlight the starkness of his circumstances, and underscore the precariousness of his situation - living with the daily threat of 'extermination'.

Like Greenman, Lasker-Wallfisch employs idiosyncratic literary techniques to communicate the reality of her Holocaust situation to her readers more effectively. This is

evident in the very fabric of Lasker-Wallfisch's memoirs – in the ways in which she has approached the actual writing of her life-story. What I mean by this is that at points in *Inherit* Lasker-Wallfisch gives the impression that she has 'jotted down' her memories in a continuous and unmediated way.[441] One such instance occurs when Lasker-Wallfisch suddenly shifts between writing in the first-person past tense to the first-person present tense. This happens when Lasker-Wallfisch is trying to quantify what gave her the will to survive whilst living in the death camps, when she states: 'Somehow we kept going. It is strange that, *as I sit here trying to recall things* [...] The more I think about it, the more I realise that, for me at least, it is not possible to describe life in Auschwitz-Birkeneau adequately'.[442] Reminiscent of Charlotte Delbo's lamentation in *Auschwitz and After*: 'Presently I am writing this story in a café – it is turning into a story',[443] Lasker-Wallfisch is situating the recalling of her past in the here-and-now. In doing this, Lasker-Wallfisch is able to endow her life-story with a sense of currency and immediacy, and this enables her to make her memories more accessible – as well as relevant - to her present day reading audience. In addition to this, by stating that she is sitting 'here trying to recall', Lasker-Wallfisch is implying that this piece of writing is simply an extension of her thinking – almost as if she is recording her testimony as it comes to mind, akin to speaking her thoughts into a tape-recorder. This representation of *Inherit* as an uninterrupted vocalisation of her memories, is repeated at other points in Lasker-Wallfisch's memoir. For instance, on a number of occasions Lasker-Wallfisch writes in a style that incorporates pauses and breaks into her prose, as if the author is writing down

[441] Although the reality of the situation is that the demands of publication mean this is not the case – as has been confirmed by Lasker-Wallfisch's editor Giles de la Mare. Interviewed by Jennifer Maiden. 1st March 2005, transc. by Jennifer Maiden.
[442] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*, p.81. My emphasis.
[443] Delbo, *Auschwitz and After*, p.26.

everything that she is thinking, including the time it takes her to stop and ponder as she makes these notations:

> Certain words and images do come to me, though, and will convey some of the ingredients of this hell on earth ... the stench of burning corpses ... smoke ... hunger ... despair ... screaming ... 'Muselmänner' (emaciated people, in camp language) ...[444]

In her use of these disconnected words broken up by carefully placed ellipses, Lasker-Wallfisch is trying to figuratively convey the harsh confusion and cacophonic frenzy of activity in the camp. But at the same time, this non-standard writing style communicates the trauma of Lasker-Wallfisch's experience, as well as the disjointed way in which she remembers these events – as a frenzy of tumultuous images. Like Greenman's, Lasker-Wallfisch's language is halting, unadorned and to-the-point, realistic in its starkness of address. But as with her shifting use of the present tense, this technique also has a second purpose: it replicates the hiatuses and breaks that occur in natural speech when one is trying to recall something. This device thus adds to the impression that Lasker-Wallfisch's memories are being recorded in an uncontrived way, and are further being mediated as such, in one continuous narrative flow. The ambiguity of such literary techniques is of course counter-weighted by the fact that the reader is intermittently reminded that Lasker-Wallfisch's testimony is told in retrospect, from the viewpoint of a highly meditative and historically informed narrator. This narrator is omnipresent and omniscient, always on the periphery of the text informing us that 'Things were bad. Very

[444] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*, p.81. Lasker-Wallfisch's ellipses.

bad. *But not nearly so bad as they were to become*',[445] building the suspense which helps to make this memoir such a absorbing text.

All three survivors use literary techniques in order to make their memoirs more compelling for their reading audience. For instance, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman all employ forms of rhetorical questioning in their memoirs. These are either directed at the text's readers, asking us to respond to quandaries that survivors themselves were faced with: 'can you believe it?',[446] 'But how do you do that in the middle of a war?'[447] Alternatively, these queries are introspective, posed when Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman are questioning their past actions: 'Maybe we also had things available but was I too naïve to notice?'[448] or are openly appealing for answers: 'Why did the Swiss consul take so long to answer our letters?'[449] Such questions are highly emotive, calling us to actively think about the choices these survivors had to make when reading, and thereby to question what we ourselves would do in a similar situation. By appealing to our sense of empathy, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman are further ensuring that their readers cannot remain unresponsive and separated voyeurs on their lives, but are instead drawn into - and embroiled in – each eyewitness's struggle for survival, both during and after the camps.

---

[445] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*, p. 89. My emphasis.
[446] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth* p.70
[447] Ibid. p.99 Indeed, such appeals call for the readers working interaction with the life-stories being presented to us, so that instead of thinking of these memories as a collection of inert and potentially abstract incidents with no connection to real life events, we instead begin to identify with them and perceive them as universally relevant; as quandaries that could be easily transposed into the present day, and contain as much relevance and potency in the here-and-now as they did for the Jewish population during World War II.
[448] Levi, *A Cat Called Adolf*, p.11.
[449] Greenman, *An Englishman in Auschwitz*, p.16.

Levels of Mediation in Written Testimony

Though Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman employ these techniques in their written testimonies in order to have a lasting impact on their readers - and so as to imitate the way they speak about their pasts in their oral accounts - such literary devices do not appear to have substantially altered the shape or content of any of these survivors' memoirs.[450] Indeed, all three survivors' written accounts bear marked similarities to the memories narrated in their spoken testimonies, both in terms of the anecdotes referred to, as well as the wording and imagery Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman call upon to convey their experiences. In having published these memoirs, however, this leads to a more complex area of ambiguity. For though such moving prose would seem to be unmediated, flowing directly from the survivor's mind to the page, and from the page to the reader, this is not the case. Each of these accounts must in fact have been subject to many forms of outside arbitration in the shape of editors, proof readers and in some cases, invention by family and friends. The presence of this outside intervention is evident at the very start of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies. In *Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss?*, Trude Levi talks about the various editors and friends who have supervised the production of her book 'going through all the material, correcting my grammatical mistakes.'[451] This could be taken as Levi's recognition of her editors having corrected her written English, since English is not her first language.[452] However, not only has Levi lived in England since 1957, but her mother also spoke fluent English and taught the

[450] This can be established by comparing each survivor's written testimonies with their oral accounts.
[451] Levi, 'Acknowledgements' *to Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss*, p.x.
[452] Indeed, English is in fact Levi's fourth language as she also speaks Hungarian, German and French. Levi grew up natively bilingual, speaking Hungarian with her father and friends, and German with her mother and Austrian relatives. Her mother was also a trained linguist, teaching German and English to students – including her daughter – whilst speaking French at home.

language to her daughter from a very early age. On top of speaking English from childhood, Levi was also an archivist and librarian for most of her working life, handling and cataloguing a great deal of documentation written in English. She has also written a book and published several papers on biographical listing in English, as well as a number of other articles and short stories besides her memoir. Levi's background and the body of work she has produced would therefore suggest that she is quite adept at writing in English. But if these 'grammatical mistakes' are not to do with language issues, one must consider the possibility that Levi is referring to the impact that her editor has had on other more structural elements of her memoir. To add to this, Anita Lasker-Wallfisch similarly thanks her publisher and editor Giles de la Mare on the acknowledgements page to her memoir, stating that 'with admirable patience [de la Mare] made me see that there is a big divide between the spoken and the written word and also that the English language has a lot more grammar than I had given it credit for.'[453] Lasker-Wallfisch insisting that there is a 'big divide' between the spoken and written word is interesting, as my research shows that the 'divide' between her memoir and oral testimonies is actually very small. Yet Lasker-Wallfisch seems to be implying that in *Inherit* at least, her editor has corrected more than her language mistakes; indeed, that he has shown her how to write effectively in English and perhaps even introduced her to alternative vocabulary.[454] More radical still, Leon Greenman goes into the details of how his memoir was ghostwritten - his manuscript expanding from 137 pages to 250 after his co-author had worked on it - in his

[453] Lasker-Wallfusch, 'Acknowledgements' to *Inherit the Truth*, p.9.

[454] Indeed, when I interviewed Lasker-Wallfisch's publisher, Giles de la Mare, about the level of intervention he had in producing her finished memoir, his responses were both vague and contradictory. In the first instance, de la Mare insisted that he 'did not put new thoughts in her head, just some new words', yet he later asserted that the book had 'a lot of input from me as a publisher' and that the memoir had been 'very heavily edited.' However, as I highlight below, a brief comparison of the published and unpublished versions of Lasker-Wallfisch's memoir shows that there is actually very little variation between these two works. Giles de la Mare, interviewed by Jennifer Maiden.

preface to *An Englishman in Auschwitz.* As a result, though the literary devices Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman use do not appear to have *distorted* their memories *per se*, it is unclear whether these contrivances have been implemented by the survivor him or herself, or an outside party – and thus, in effect, how faithful these memoirs are to their authors' original intentions.[455]

In the case of Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, public access to her original unpublished manuscript version of *Inherit the Truth* resolves the opacity of this issue to a large extent.[456] This is because a comparison of her two memoirs shows that the integrity of Lasker-Wallfisch's original account (completed in 1988) remains largely intact in her published testimony (1996). For instance, the passage where Lasker-Wallfisch uses runs of ellipses, and expresses herself using fragmented, disconnected words is all her own.[457] Likewise, segments of Lasker-Wallfisch's published memoir which appear to be uncharacteristically 'literary', and thereby seem upon first reading to be definite editorial additions, can also be found in Lasker-Wallfisch's original manuscript. For instance, there is one section of Lasker-Wallfisch's memoir in which she uses an unusually literary style of phraseology to maximise the tension, suspense and drama surrounding her experiences during one evening in Auschwitz:

---

[455] For an interesting discussion of the faithful editing of an author's work, and why it is important to edit works in-line with the authors original intentions, see Lance Schachterle's 'Cooper and His Collaborators: Recovering Cooper's Final Intensions for His Fiction', in *Studies in Bibliography,* 56 (2003-2004), pp. 317-337. Though this article looks at James Fenimore Cooper (a nineteenth century American writer), the ways in which Schachterle outlines responsible editing practices could equally be applied to the testimonies of Holocaust survivors.

[456] As Lasker-Wallfisch's manuscript is housed in the Imperial War Museum Document Archive and is therefore accessible to the public.

[457] See Lasker-Wallfisch's unpublished manuscript, p.55.

> Fania [Fenélon] had a remarkable musical memory and transcribed the *Pathétique* sonata by Beethoven for string quartet, and we played it one evening. It may not sound very extraordinary; it was just a chamber music evening. But it was one with a difference. We were able to raise ourselves high above the inferno of Auschwitz into spheres where we could not be touched by the degradation of concentration camp existence. [458]

Such formally worded passages, striking due to their unusually literary imagery, allow the listener to envisage the exhilaration experienced by the camp internees as they played music, and equally, to experience the bathos of realising the actuality of their situation, living in the 'grim reality' of Auschwitz. But contrary to expectation, this memory also features in Lasker-Wallfisch's original memoir, in which it is depicted using essentially identical wording and methods of description:

> As I said before , Fania was a most accomplished musician, and I shall never forget the evening when we actually played 'Chambermusic' [sic] in Auschwitz. – Fania had a wonderful musical memory and wrote the Pathetique Sonata by Beethoven out for Quartet (so to say) – and we played this one evening. – This does not sound like anything very extraordinary I suppose. – Just a chamber music evening but with a difference. – In the truest sense of the word we lifted ourselves above the inferno of Auschwitz, into spheres where we could not be touched by the degradation of a Concentration Camp existence.[459]

Upon first comparing these quotations, the reader may notice that second extract appears to be less polished and more 'foreign' sounding than the first. Certainly De la Mare has eradicated the verbal resonance and colloquial methods of description that Lasker-Wallfisch employs in her original manuscript, '(so to say)', for example, as well as her odd use of capital letters, and habit of using dashes throughout her writing. But these

[458] Lasker-Wallfisch *Inherit the Truth*, p. 84. Lasker-Wallfisch's emphasis.
[459] Lasker-Wallfisch, unpublished manuscript, p.59.

changes not withstanding, it is clear that aside from replacing Lasker-Wallfisch's idiosyncratic grammar with more standard punctuation, de la Mare appears to have preserved much of her original voice in his edited version of *Inherit*. But de la Mare has had some perceptible impact on Lasker-Wallfisch's writing style. In the published version of *Inherit the Truth*, for instance, Lasker-Wallfisch's memories are often expressed more succinctly, sometimes with a greater clarity of expression than in her unpublished memoir. The repetitions which frequently appear in Lasker-Wallfisch's original version of *Inherit* have also been removed.[460] However, it is clear that both Levi and Greenman's memoirs must have gone through a similar editorial process, and have been checked and cross-checked by proof readers and editors – though in these cases, the lack of access to their original manuscripts means the degree of outside intervention is harder to quantify. To be sure, Leon Greenman's ghostwritten testimony raises the most problems. Whether his ghostwriter simply re-worked the memoir to include memories which Greenman had previously left out, or whether she has taken it upon herself to 'bulk out' the text Greenman had previously written, is uncertain.[461]

[460] For example, in Lasker-Wallfisch's original manuscript she frequently refers back to events she has previously mentioned and consciously repeats herself: 'I would just like to say here – and I may be repeating myself – that [...]'. However, all such repetitions are absent from Lasker-Wallfisch's published memoir. Lasker-Wallfisch, unpublished manuscript, p.15.

[461] Leon Greenman has stated in another interview that his manuscript was ghostwritten by the niece of his publicist: 'and she, enlarged the book with part of my life before I went to the camps, and part of my life after the camps, it's 250 pages now.' Greenman, British Video Archive testimony. This implies that the section of Greenman's life-story whilst he was in the camps is as it was when Greenman originally wrote it. However, a visual comparison of the documents would be the only way to bear this theory out.

Cultural Influences: Blurring the Boundaries of Later Learning and Absorption

What is clear, however, is that certain cultural factors have affected how Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have portrayed their experiences, and what they have chosen to recall. Alongside the cultural influences of folklore and mass media examined in Chapter 3, all three survivors have also had their memories shaped by 'add[ing] just a little from other works to make the Holocaust tragedy understood'.[462] Although Greenman plainly states this in *An Englishman in Auschwitz*, I have shown that he is not the only survivor to have subsumed historical information acquired from other sources into his writing. Problems arise, however, when what appear to be direct personal recollections turn out to be intermingled with other survivors' memories, which Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have not distinguished from their own rememberings. The same is the case when background information taken from textbooks or other sources at a later date, is referred to in combination with the personal memories Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman describe in their testimonies. If we again look at Lasker-Wallfisch's testimonies as a *locus classicus*, it is clear that she has absorbed information that she has read or heard about the Holocaust after the war, which she then includes in her war-time accounts. This is not a problem in itself. The issue comes, however, when Lasker-Wallfisch refers to information she has learnt about the genocide without distinguishing between what she actually remembers, and what she has acquired from other sources *after* her persecution. Indeed, at a number of points Lasker-Wallfisch completely subsumes these facts and figures into her testimonials without differentiating at all

[462] Greenman, 'Preface' to *An Englishman in Auschwitz*.

between her war-time experiences and knowledge and that of others. A case in point can be found in Lasker-Wallfisch's 'Breslau' monologue, when she is talking about her parents' deportation and eventual murder at the hands of the Nazis:

> He asked me to wait up for him, so I took a notebook and pencil and sat with my mother next door. She was so frightened. Finally at two in the morning my father called me. He had aged in that night by twenty years. He dictated everything I had to do: how to pay the rent, the gas, to whom I had to write – and he gave me power of attorney to sign his name. "I count on you Anita" he said. My father did not easily count on anybody. My father and mother were sent to a place called Izbica near Lublin. There people had to dig their own graves, they had to undress, then they were shot.[463]

Despite the fact that Lasker-Wallfisch states with assurance that her parents had been sent to Izbica here, with the implication that she knew of their intended destination at the time of their deportation, this is something that Lasker-Wallfisch did *not* know at the time that her parents were transported. In fact, as I have shown in Chapter 2 this information is something that Lasker-Wallfisch learnt a good while after the war had ended.[464] Yet in her monologue - and other testimonies - Lasker-Wallfisch's parents' death is presented as a simple fact, sandwiched between her own memories of their deportation. In doing this, Lasker-Wallfisch is thus not simply including her subsequent knowledge of the Holocaust into her testimony, but is actually incorporating it into her remembrances from that time. The listener therefore cannot determine what Lasker-Wallfisch remembers from the time of her parents' deportation and what she has learned at a later date. In truth, the listener is

---

[463] Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, 'Breslau' in *Inherit the Truth:* monologue series for BBC Radio 3, 1 of 5 (1993), transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: H2611/0. Housed at the British Library and BBC Sound Archives. My emphasis.

[464] As I have already highlighted, during Lasker-Wallfisch's British Library interview she admits that she only found out about Izbica after she moved to England, stating: 'I never knew what happened to the people in Izbica till I went to the Wiener Library, many years later, where curiously enough - they found some report about Izbica there -are no survivors at all.' Lasker-Wallfisch, British Library testimony.

unsure if Lasker-Wallfisch herself is sometimes aware of where her memories end and information obtained from research in the aftermath of events begins.

It certainly seems that for Lasker-Wallfisch these 'pseudo-memories' may have become so interwoven with her own recollections as to be virtually indistinguishable from her own memories of the Holocaust. This impression becomes all the more intense as the listener sifts through Lasker-Wallfisch's other testimonies, as this particular blurring between personal memory and later learning is by no means an isolated occurrence. In Lasker-Wallfisch's 'Belsen' monologue, for instance, she talks about her memories of the liberation of Belsen in 1945. But whilst discussing her memories, Lasker-Wallfisch's narrative moves fluidly between her own recollections of the liberation, memories which she admits are 'vague...[as I] was running a high temperature', and those of her sister, Renate. And although Lasker-Wallfisch outwardly states that 'I have drawn heavily on Renate's recollections', she mixes her own memories with those of her sister so thoroughly, that at points they become virtually interchangeable with one another:

> That morning Renate nursed me as I lay delirious in my bunk. She had managed to get hold of a rusty bucket and went to the camp entrance. There was an SS man standing guard but he didn't even try to stop her and she went to the one water tap which was still working. It was near the administration block which stood totally deserted. Renate filled her bucket and went back through the gate where she was set upon by a horde of prisoners trying to get some of the water. The bucket was snatched from her hands the water spilled and she returned to our block empty-handed. She helped me off my bunk and out in the open air.[465]

[465]AnitaLasker-Wallfisch, 'Belsen' in *Inherit the Truth:* monologue series for BBC Radio 3, 1 of 5 (1993), transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: H2151/04, housed at the British Library and BBC Sound Archive.

If we bear in mind that Lasker-Wallfisch was self-confessedly 'delirious' when the British Army entered Belsen and remembers very little about the liberation, this leads us to question what of this scene, if anything, Lasker-Wallfisch actually remembers - lying delirious on her bunk or being helped out into the open air? The fact that Lasker-Wallfisch is so adamant that she 'remember[s] very well about the liberation' in her interview with Conrad Wood, when she states here that she does not remember very much at all, gives us further pause for thought. One can only conclude from this that Lasker-Wallfisch must feel - or imagine - that she remembers the liberation, as she has learnt so much about it from talking to her sister, and reading Renate's accounts of their freedom from captivity.[466] A further extract from Lasker-Wallfisch's Imperial War Museum interview also indicates that many of her memories of the Holocaust may not actually be 'memories' at all, but rather a collage of things that she has re-read or learnt about at a later date, and which she then incorporates into her testimony as actual memories *in* and *of* themselves:

> So then we went home and, and knew, but you just sort of have to - well life has to go on somehow but, you know one didn't exactly...well one didn't know exactly what was happening but one didn't uh have too many hopes, so we went through some sort of pretence of normality *I remember* I went back to school school was still going, and I my sister started singing lessons *all these things I know from the letters which I have found.* And it strikes me as funny that in 1940...for instance one [distractedly] should have singing lessons you know.[467]

[466] Which Lasker-Wallfisch includes in her memoir. See *Inherit the Truth* pp. 94-95.

[467] It is worth noting here, that these letters are not something that Lasker-Wallfisch has always had with her and that may therefore have simply supported and enhanced her own recollections as time went by. In fact in Lasker-Wallfisch's preface to her unpublished memoir, she acknowledges that it was only after her sister Marianne's death in 1952 that she came into possession of these letters. Importantly, Lasker-Wallfisch also states that she did not actually *look* at this 'old tattered bundle of letters' until the mid-late '80s/early '90s at which point she felt totally 'detached' from them and from the times that they record: 'Marianne sadly died in 1952, and it was after her death that these letters came into my possession. – I had put them away unseen and promptly forgot about them. Reading them, 40 odd years later, truly transported me back into the past. – They are almost *Documents* now.' Lasker-Wallfisch's 'Preface' to her unpublished manuscript. Lasker-Wallfisch's emphasis. Main quotation: my emphasis.

Though one cannot ignore this interesting clouding between memory and later learning, what these blurrings illustrate most clearly is that survivors have necessarily been influenced by historical accounts of the Holocaust as well as other survivors' testimonies of the past. It is, however, impossible to gauge the extent of these blurrings as there is no indication that even survivors themselves are aware of the extent of their permeation. It seems that the need for narrative continuity and the necessity to compose a 'complete' version of their pasts is the overriding factor for each of these survivors. And certainly, such additions do not detract from – and may at times even enhance - the overall effectiveness and veracity of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's personal recollections.

Conclusion

Every version [of the past] is not only "selective" but precarious, often contested by memory at the same moment that memory is given voice.[468]

In this chapter, I have examined the different forms of intervention that are likely to have had some influence on the testimonies Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given since the end of the war. Factors such as interviewer and editorial intercession, the circumstances of interview production, and the agenda of both interviewer and interviewee, have all been shown to have had a significant impact on the way survivors have narrated their past experiences. There are also those factors whose influences have

[468] Greenspan, *Listening to Holocaust Survivors*, p. xvi.

been harder to measure with any degree of accuracy: the effect of the presence of recording equipment during each oral interview, and the circumstances in which each interview was conducted, to name but two. Finally, there are those variables that are impossible to determine: what conversations interviewees had with their interviewers prior to the tape recorder being switched on, and what the personal relationships between interviewee and interviewer were, both before and during the interviewing process. In terms of written testimonies, even the conditions in which a memoir was written, and the survivor's state of mind at the time of writing, are likely to have had some bearing on the testimonies that they produced. However, though these combined influences have been considerable, I suggest that they have not had a fundamental impact on the *nature* of memories conveyed, or on the overall *structuring* of those experiences. What I mean by this is, as I have established in Chapter 3, survivors will always refer to a version of their pasts that they are able to articulate in any given situation. Though they may be more open to speaking about intimate personal memories in a non-media interview, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman all stick to an identifiable rendering of their life-stories in every testimony analyzed in this study. Indeed, although I have shown that the testimonies survivors give have undoubtedly been affected by external factors, what is also clear is that this does not alter how survivors essentially recall and recount their pasts. Though research has shown that the perceived authority of an interviewer, for instance, *does* affect the precision and completeness of the oral testimonies interviewees give at a particular time, studies also show that this is not because interviewees do not remember an accurate and complete version of events.[469] In fact, Elizabeth Loftus has found that no matter what the environment in which a testimony is produced, this has 'no

[469] See Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony*, p.99.

effect on either the accuracy or completeness of the witness's report.'[470] It therefore follows that whatever may effect a *consistent* change in an eyewitness testimony, is not dependant on such forms of 'outside' intervention. Indeed, external intrusion in the form of interviewers and studios cannot on their own explain the recurrent patterns present in the survivor life-stories examined in this thesis. Instead, it seems, it is the survivors' own *internal* intervention, their need to remember an account of the Holocaust that they can both live with and narrate to others, that has determined how and what they speak about in their testimonies. The accounts they produce are therefore selective by necessity, the shifts and fluctuations present in such testimonies signifying rifts in the almost impermeable 'skin' of deep recollection that I have shown 'enfold[s] the memory of Auschwitz'.[471] It is this trauma, I posit, which has dictated how Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have talked about their memories since 1945, memories which threaten to consume them even as they give them voice.

[470] Ibid.
[471] Delbo, *Days and Memory*, p.2.

Conclusion

Thesis Limitations, and the Importance of Future Research

What is past is not dead; it is not even past.[472]

In summation, during the course of this study I have found a series of unusual fluctuations in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies. These variations are remarkable not because they highlight incidents of major inconsistency, or, by contrast, extreme narrative regularity – though, as I have shown, there are prominent consistencies and moments of patent omission in each of these survivors' accounts. Instead, many of the most interesting disparities perceptible in Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's recountings consist of subtle shifts in tense and easily overlooked additions. In fact, the variations I have discovered in my research are significant not as a result of their severity, but because they haven arisen so recurrently in each of these survivors spoken and written testimonies through time - forming a motif of remembrance that is otherwise, quite paradoxically, staggering in its unobtrusive continuity. By tracking these spoken and written oscillations, I have shown that there are patterns in survivor memory, and that these variations are not simply a result of the random deterioration of memory brought on by old age. Instead, these motifs are only truly prominent when Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman are attempting to communicate memories which are traumatic in nature – all three survivors' utterances become speckled with gaps, pauses, repetitions and hesitations when, for example, they are explaining the circumstances surrounding the deportation of their loved ones.

---

[472] Christa Wolf, quoted in Lynn Rapaport *Jews in Germany After the Holocaust: Memory, Identity, and Jewish-German Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 1997), p.1.

Some of the patterns I have discovered in these survivors' testimonies were entirely unexpected. For instance, whilst a great deal of research attests to the fact that 'all memory is subject to change',[473] Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial recountings do not appear to have slipped and altered over time as one might anticipate. Thus in terms of content - aside from the exclusion of a few memories, most conspicuously some of those present in their earliest accounts, - the events and chronology that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman call upon when speaking about their war-time experiences remains quite consistent from the very first testimonies they gave to their most recent depositions. Yet rather than disregarding these 'untold'[474] memories as inconsequential anomalies, I have questioned what such omissions may mean in their absence. Indeed, my studies illustrate that these exclusions cannot be discounted as instances of 'ordinary forgetfulness'.[475] Instead, certain memories which are continually absent from Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies - such as those only present in their earliest accounts - have shown themselves to be signifiers of repressed trauma; they are examples of each survivor's inability to deal with certain past events, which they have then 'forgotten' or excluded from their testimonies to allow for their mental self-preservation.[476]

Another unanticipated finding goes against Dori Laub's assertion that 'traumatic experience[s] ha[ve] normally long been submerged and ha[ve] become distorted

[473] Roseman *The Past in Hiding*, p.476.
[474] Mollica, p.311.
[475] Phil Mollon, *Remembering Trauma.* p.77.
[476] See footnote 15.

in...[their] submersion'.[477] This is because as Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial recountings have been so regular since their liberation from concentration camps, if their memories have indeed been 'distorted' this cannot be the result of 'submersion'. For if Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's recollections had been adapted so as contend with the trauma of their experiences, these modifications must have occurred at the time the disturbances were happening – whilst actually in the camps or immediately after – since the blueprint for their future recountings was already established by the end of the war.[478] As a result of my findings, I have posited that these changes cannot be labelled a 'distortion' or 'fixing'[479] of memory, but more a 'sculpting' of the past so as to limit and contain the intrusion of 'excitations from outside'.[480] But this sculpting of memory is not an impenetrable method of defence. As my examination of testimony shows, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman are still plagued by the psychological burden of their recollections in the present day, and it is elements of this mental anguish which are manifest in the speech disturbances perceptible in each of these survivors' utterances when they are reflecting on harrowing past events. Indeed, as Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis have established in *The Language of Psychoanalysis,* though trauma can be repressed, this 'repressed material...has a permanent tendency to re-emerge into consciousness.'[481]

---

[477] Laub, *An Event Without a Witness*, p.76.
[478] As Lasker-Wallfisch and Greenman's war-time testimonies show. Though I can only conclusively say that Trude Levi was narrating her past in a 'life-story' format from 1958 onwards, it is highly likely that she too had formulated a cohesive 'life-story' since the end of the war.
[479] Al Thomson, *Anzac Memories*, p.247.
[480] Sigmund Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, p. 29.
[481] Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis *The Language of Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1973), p.465.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman also exhibit more explicit indicators of trauma, which reinforce my assertions that their speech disturbances are signifiers of underlying post traumatic stress. For instance, all three survivors describe a feeling of dissociative detachment[482] or a sense of depersonalization and derealization when reflecting on certain past events. This is concisely summed up by Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, as she claims that whilst living through her ordeal 'I somehow managed to set myself "outside" what was actually happening' so much so that she felt 'hypnotized' and even 'untouchable'[483]. Trude Levi similarly comments that 'today I can talk about it [my past] as an outsider' and that whilst she is criticised for not 'show[ing] enough emotion' when giving testimony, she believes this has 'probably [been] my [form of] defence.'[484] All three survivors have also mentioned that some of the things they describe in their testimonies feel 'unreal' in the recounting, an impression that is echoed in Primo Levi's famous assertion that 'today at this very moment as I sit writing at a table, I am not convinced that these things really happened.' [485] To add to this, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman also exhibit highly individual manifestations of post traumatic stress. Trude Levi, for instance, talks about being unusually passive whilst in the camps, of having 'no instinct of survival',[486] and of suffering from amnesia after her liberation – some of her

[482] For a comprehensive discussion of the symptoms of dissociative detachment, see See Phil Mollon's *Remembering Trauma*, p.31.
[483] Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth*, p.70.
[484] Trude Levi, *Woman's Hour* testimony.
[485] Primo Levi, *If This Is A Man* (Abacus, 1987), p.109.
[486] Levi, British Library testimony.

memories continuing to elude her to the present day.[487] Similarly, Leon Greenman writes in his memoir about being plagued by extremely vivid nightmares of concentration camps, in which his perception of time is disorientated and he feels as if he is being 'transported...back in time, as if in a time machine.'[488] All of these traits can be understood as mechanisms of psychological defence, since, as Phil Mollon affirms, 'if trauma is repeated...[one] may...learn dissociative responses as a means of minimising distress.'[489] As a result of their trauma, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have had to live with a past that 'is not dead...is not even past'.[490] In order to cope with their memories, each survivor has adopted psychological defences that have enabled them to 'keep going'[491] whilst speaking about harrowing past events. But the presence of this trauma has also meant that elements of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's memories have been repressed - encrypted in a 'secret' method of narration that 'the rest'[492] of the world cannot access. I believe that identifying Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's psychological defences and tracking the emergence of their post traumatic symptoms allows the 'outsider'[493] to better understand the realities these survivors are

[487] Such as her memory of people's names. For instance, immediately after her liberation and move to France Levi 'forgot' that she had an uncle who lived in Paris. It was only after she was interrogated by the French police on suspicion of being a Nazi that Levi recalled she had a French uncle, and could remember his name. Levi also discusses the fact that she cannot remember the names of a number of people who befriended her during her time in concentration camps. She attributes this to the 'partial amnesia' she developed immediately proceeding her liberation and which persists in some areas until the present day. See Levi's British Library and Imperial War Museum testimonies.
[488] Greenman, *An Englishman in Auschwitz*, p.2.
[489] Mollon, *Remembering Trauma*, p.31.
[490] Christa Wolf, quoted in Lynn Rapaport *Jews in Germany After the Holocaust*, p.1.
[491] See Chapter 3.
[492] Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz*.. p.23.
[493] Greenman, Imperial War Museum testimony.

attempting to convey in their testimonies, and thereby, to better equip us as the future 'custodians of memory'.[494]

The Limitations of my Examination

There are, however, a number of factors which have limited the scope of my present study, and which I hope to redress in future projects. The first is the size of my study group. For the purposes of this PhD thesis, I have limited my study to an analysis of the testimonies produced by three Holocaust survivors. As I stated in my introduction, this has allowed me to analyse the testimonial material produced by these survivors more thoroughly and systematically than would have been possible with a larger study group. However, as my results have been so encouraging, I believe a broadening of this investigation would prove fruitful. Likewise, I have only been able to look at the testimonies of one male survivor in my present project. In my future research, I will look to analyse an equal number of male and female case studies. This would enable me to see whether gender plays a significant role in the way that survivors narrate their past experiences, and to draw more definitive conclusions about the potential differences - and similarities - between male and female expressions of mental disturbance. To add to this, though I have been able to examine the taped and written testimonies Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given since the end of the war in exhaustive detail, videotestimonies have fallen beyond the scope of this thesis. This being said, I do intend

[494] To use a well-known phrase. Indeed, this phrase is used to describe the primary responsibility of the Holocaust Centre of Toronto, whose mission statement is that they 'must preserve the memory of those who perished' and 'dedicate ourselves to preserving the past' as they are the 'custodians of memory'. See <www.holocaustcentre.com> [accessed 28/05/06]

to look at videoed material in future projects, and to contrast my present findings with this material elsewhere.

Due to the problems of translation, and my inability to translate the testimonies Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given in various different languages to the competency levels required for such a meticulous linguistic analysis, I have only examined the testimonies these survivors have given in English in the present study. I maintain that this was the correct decision so as to avoid the various issues of translation which may have undermined my findings, and would do so again in future projects. However, there are two exceptions to this rule. Anita Lasker-Wallfisch's 1945 appeals were originally given in German, and so as to avoid the problems of translation I have worked from Mrs Lasker-Wallfisch's own translated transcriptions of these testimonies. This has also enabled me to remain as faithful to Lasker-Wallfisch's intended meanings as possible – though it has prohibited me from drawing conclusive results from any speech disturbances present in these testimonies. The other translation is taken from Mrs Lasker-Wallfisch's 1957 Wiener Library testimony, which was originally written in German. My reason for doing is that this is such an early testimony, and the only recorded example of Lasker-Wallfisch's recountings from this period. The translation I have used was commissioned by me for the present thesis. I therefore worked from a translated version of this testimony in my thesis, but have been mindful that this translation is as close to Lasker-Wallfisch's original version as possible. I did this by informing the translator about my need to have an exact as is possible match of Lasker-Wallfisch's specific wording throughout this testimonial for the purposes of analysis.

Once I received this translation, I also went through the original document myself to ensure that the translation was completed to my specifications – which I am confident has been the case.

An Exploration of my Role as Testimonial Analyst

Another factor to take into consideration when discussing the potential constraints of any research project is the role of the analyst. Like any scholar, I have come to this project with my own set of ideologies, expectations and suppositions – influences which must be embedded in the framework of my investigation. These influences must be acknowledged. Indeed, Erna Paris reminds us that all historical analysis must inevitably produce what she terms a 'distorted' account of the past:

> ...because it is the product of an individual researcher's choices, emphasis and point of view. This is not to adopt the postmodern view that there can be no 'truth' in history – a stance that can reduce inquiry to subjectivity and meaninglessness – but to acknowledge that when historians comb through the detritus of the past for an approximation of reality, they must ultimately express their findings in a form far removed from the 'booming, buzzing confusion'...of once-contemporaneous life.[495]

Whilst I acknowledge that all research is necessarily refracted through each individual's life experiences, unconscious suppositions and emotional/cultural standpoints, I have tried to limit my personal involvement in the testimonies examined, and to question my responses to each of my findings. For instance, I found I was surprised that – contrary to

[495] Erna Paris, *Long Shadows: Truth. Lies and History* (Bloomsbury, 2000), p..322.

'conventional wisdom'[496] – the events Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman describe often did not change significantly or fade with the process of time between the first testimonies they gave and their more recent depositions. Also, in contrast to my expectations, Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies showed remarkably few of the inaccuracies other scholars have identified in survivor testimonies since the end of the war.[497] This is not because I carry with me resolute ideas about what one should expect to find in survivor testimony, or that I have approached this project with a particular agenda in mind. Rather, I have been surprised when my findings have gone against the general consensus of research on testimony, and produced controversial results I had not anticipated.

In *The Past in Hiding*, Mark Roseman makes value judgments based upon educated guess-work about the survivor he is researching, Marianne Strauss. When, for instance, Roseman is writing about traumatic moments in Strauss' life-story, he goes so far as to explain why she elaborates or appropriates certain events into her narrative - intimating what her thoughts and feelings must have been based on how he 'feel[s]'[498] she is reacting to certain memories - such as when he surmises that Strauss' 'memory was shaped by her sense of guilt and loss.'[499] I have consciously tried to avoid such value judgments or rather, interpretations in my study, and to base my conclusions purely on

[496] To use Efraim Sicher's terminology. In fact, Sicher also found that in contrasdiction to 'conventional wisdom that historical events [which] are usually remembered immediately after their occurrence...then fade into oblivion', this was not always the case. See Efraim Sicher, 'The Future of the Past: Countermemory and Postmemory in Contemporary American Post-Holocaust Narratives' in *History & Memory*, 12.2 (Indiana University Press, 2001) p.81.
[497] See Roseman, *Surviving Memory*, p. 3.
[498] Such as when he says that 'I was already beginning to feel that the traumas of separation were at once the most painful and the most elusive events in Marianne's enormous collection of sad memories.' Roseman, *The Past in Hiding*, p. 303.
[499] Ibid. p.396.

the evidence to hand. As I have stated throughout this thesis, I have also tried to remain as faithful to Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial material as possible, transcribing their wording, pauses and hesitations as precisely as was possible. Indeed, on many occasions my desire to reproduce as carefully as was feasible the actual sounds of these survivors' spoken words may have come at the cost of making their accounts easily accessible to a reading audience. I do not, however, believe that my transcriptions are so 'minutely faithful to sounds' that they 'turn...beautiful speech into an unreadable page.'[500] In all, I recognise that all approaches to the analysis of spoken testimony are inevitably problematic. However, as far as was possible, I have tried to prevent my own assumptions from encroaching on my research, and to focus on the testimonial evidence without drawing premature or unfounded conclusions.

The Issues of Using Discourse Analysis

In a literal sense, all analysis of utterance in textual and oral forms is a method of discourse analysis. Indeed, as Pascale Rachel Bos reminds us, any close examination of survivor dialogue necessitates an 'understanding and analyzing' of communication, since 'as scholars, we are...engaged in performing...an analysis of discourse' in everyday research.[501] Taking on board the linguistic connotations of this term, however, leads to a more profound discussion of the issues and limitations of discourse analysis as a method of investigation. In this thesis, I have taken a dual approach to the study of survivor utterance. This is because I have carefully transcribed the details of Lasker-Wallfisch,

[500] Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Giulia*, p.15.
[501] Pascale Rachel Bos. 'Women and the Holocaust: Analyzing Gender Difference' in *The Holocaust: Theoretical Readings*. ed. by Neil Levi and Michael Rothberg, (Edinburgh University Press, 2003), p.181.

Levi and Greenman's oral and written testimonies, paying attention to the structures of their dialogue whilst also looking at linguistic patterns in their verbalisations in order to interpret their underlying meanings. This has lead to the examination of survivor discourse in two distinct and often complementary ways – looking at the *structure* as well as the *function* of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's utterance. Deborah Schiffrin advocates such a combined approach to discourse analysis in *Approaches to Discourse* – though she cautions her reader that a amalgamation of these methods would be a 'hefty task'.[502] In this volume, Schiffrin breaks down the linguistic analysis of discourse into distinct component parts. She lists these elements as consisting of a mixture of speech act theory; interactional sociolinguistics; ethnography of communication; pragmatics; conversation analysis; and variation analysis. Schiffrin sees all these approaches as feeding into an analysis of language, and whilst my methodology is less geared towards a pragmatic analysis of survivor discourse, the range of approaches I have taken to the examination of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's utterances encompass all the other areas of discourse analysis Schiffrin outlines to greater and lesser degrees.

For instance, I use elements of speech act theory to examine the performance aspects of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies – in terms of the oral history definition of the narrativisation of experience.[503] As such, when looking at testimony as a performance of utterance I have attempted to 'replicate what is said in a way that reveals the use of a particular variety of speech' in each contextual circumstance.[504] Likewise, I have looked at the interactional sociolinguistics exhibited by Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and

[502] Schriffin, p.42.
[503] See footnote 2.
[504] Schiffrin, p.7.

Greenman when I have questioned how their 'language is situated in particular circumstances of social life, and...[how their language] adds different meaning...and structure...to those circumstances.' [505] Schiffrin identifies the ethnography of communication as 'an approach to discourse that is based on...holistic explanations of meaning and behaviour'[506] By this, Schiffrin means that this approach is most useful when examining the grammatical 'rules' of language, how those rules are breached, and to interpret what consistent linguistic breaches may mean. In my study, I have looked at consistent linguistic rifts - such as the traversing of tense - and interpreted what such shifts mean when they occur on a continual basis. I therefore use conversation analysis - not in terms of 'the methods by which members of a society produce a sense of social order',[507] but simply in terms of the analysis of survivor conversation and dialogue. 'A variationist approach to discourse...stems from studies of linguistic variation and change...fundamental assumptions of variationist studies are that linguistic variation (i.e. heterogeneity) is patterned both socially and linguistically, and that such patterns can be discovered only through systematic investigation of a speech community.'[508] In this thesis, I have only analysed the patterns of survivor speech that are not directly attributable to 'normal' speech patterns inherent to a particular community. Instead, I have looked at those patterns of discourse which are *only* present in individual survivors' testimonies and posed theories to explain why such variations may have occurred. However, whilst I have utilised elements of all these methods of analysis in my research, a pragmatic approach to discourse analysis instead focuses on the philosophy of

[505] Schiffrin, p.7.
[506] Ibid, p.8.
[507] Ibid, p.10.
[508] Ibid, p.11.

linguistics, and is 'most concerned with analyzing speaker meaning at the level of utterances and this often amounts to a sentence, rather than text, sized amount of language use.'[509] In this project, I am looking at each survivor testimonial as a whole, and do not strip individual sentences away from their situational context. And though I am scrutinising Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's discourse at the level of utterance, this study is not concerned with philosophizing speech in order to find meaning in survivor utterance.

In all, the main drawback of using my brand of discourse analysis is that this approach, drawing together as it does elements from different strands of the field, presents a new combination of theoretical devices in order to obtain results. This has meant that my study presents an unusual approach to discourse analysis, and one without forerunners. However, through the course of this study I have shown that this combined methodology can obtain interesting and compelling results – enabling me to establish causal relations between specific linguistic phenonmena, that would be been unattainable using only one form of analysis.

English as a Language of Mediation?

This leads me to a discussion of the last limitation to affect this project – the use of testimonies given in English. In *Sounds of Defiance*, Alan Rosen asserts that the primacy

[509] Schiffrin p.9.

of the English language in all areas of Holocaust studies is, as he terms it, a 'problem'.[510] The crux of Rosen's argument is that English is fundamentally incapable of communicating the events of the Holocaust to the post-war world, and he bases this contention on a number of assumptions. Firstly, Rosen views English as 'a latecomer to the ghettos', and as having 'little significance in concentration camp[s].'[511] As a result of its marginal status in the camps – being neither the primary language of persecutor nor victim - Rosen avers that English is incapable of portraying the essence of the camps, and as such is 'transgressive of the reality of the Holocaust'.[512] More elementarily still, Rosen argues that English is one of the 'languages of culture', and as a consequence is unable to overcome 'the gap between the discourses of death and of life.'[513] In making these statements, Rosen ignores the fact that English is not the only 'language of culture.' Indeed, languages which were directly involved in the events of the Holocaust – such as Greek and Italian, not to mention German – are traditionally considered quintessentially cultivated languages; indeed, as the starting point for all of modern Western civilization and 'culture'. Yet Rosen specifically names Italian as one the languages that is better able to communicate the Holocaust experience, as it was commonly used in concentration camps. To add to this, earlier in his text Rosen acknowledges that 'every language is going to be unfaithful to the camp experience, taking what existed solely in fragments and rendering it in a medium that is intact.'[514] If this is the case, and all languages necessarily betray survivors' experiences in the very act of communication, why should

[510] Alan Rosen, *Sounds of Defiance: The Holocaust, Multilingualism & the Problem of English* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, London, 2005), p.xi.
[511] Rosen, p.8
[512] Rosen, p.7. Languages which Rosen views as more able to convey the reality of Holocaust events include: Yiddish, Hebrew, German French and Italian.
[513] Rosen, p.7.
[514] Rosen, p. 6.

the writing of Holocaust discourse in English be subject to a different set of problematics than texts written in Yiddish or German?[515] Indeed, Rosen completely ignores the argument that English presents those who have been maligned with a language free from the tainting force of Holocaust involvement. In contrast to Rosen's contentions, in *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust* James E. Young discusses how survivors have often spoken in English when giving testimony, and questions why this might be the case. Young concludes that survivors have often consciously chosen to give testimony in English as they see it as a language that it 'neutral, uncorrupted and ironically amnesiac...Having experienced events in Yiddish, or Polish, or German, survivors often find that English serves as much as mediation between themselves experiences as it does as medium for their expression.'[516]

In my thesis I have carefully considered both of these arguments, and made a conscious decision only to refer to those testimonies that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman have given in English. I did this partly for practical, and partly for ideological reasons. As I have already discussed, from a practical point of view my transcription of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonial depositions is so detailed and specific, that without an absolute fluency in each of these survivors' numerous spoken languages it would have been impossible for me to compare their utterances on a like-for-like basis. Ideologically speaking, moreover, I am aware of the possibility that there may be irrevocable linguistic differences between narratives given in different vernaculars;

[515] Indeed, it could be argued that since German was the language of Nazism and genocide, it cannot possibly convey the meanings of survivor testimony since it is too deeply instilled with these prior meanings.
[516] Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust*, p.160.

indeed, that there is 'a certain loss of self implicit in the speaking of another's language.'[517] Yet whilst I acknowledge that communicating Holocaust experiences in a second language may blunt Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's capacity for expression – as, for instance, the 'new language'[518] may be incapable of conveying the semantic nuances implicit in their mother tongues – I believe these are necessary risks. This is because all three of these survivors have expressed difficulty in talking about their pasts in their native languages. Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, for instance, has discussed the problems she encountered when visiting Germany and speaking about her past in German – even though this is her native language. To be sure, Lasker-Wallfisch has not lived in Germany since the war, and as a result speaks German in a 1940s idiom. This can make it difficult for her audience to understand what she is saying, and equally, for Lasker-Wallfisch to express herself satisfactorily in her native tongue.[519] Likewise, though Leon Greenman spoke fluent Dutch and was brought up in Holland from an early age, he is adamant that he narrate his experiences in English since he saw this language as his mother tongue – even though he spoke with a thick accent and was occasionally unsure of his English vocabulary. Whether this means that English is the 'best' language in which Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman could speak about their Holocaust memories is uncertain. However, one must bear in mind that *all* languages are imbued with their own set of cultural precepts, ideological, political and emotional undertones. One must also

[517] Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, London, 1996), p.49

[518] Yaffa Eliach, 'Discussion: the Holocaust and Concentration Camps in Literature', in *The Nazi Concentration Camps: Proceedings of the Fourth Yad Vashem International Historical Conference, Jerusalem, January 1980*, ed. by Yisrael Gutman and Avital Saf (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1984),p.716.

[519] As informed by Giles de la Mare, interviewed by Jennifer Maiden on 1st March 2005. transc. by Jennifer Maiden.

ask what constitutes a survivor's 'own language'[520] – the language they were born speaking (which could be multiple, as Levi and Greenman both grew up bilingual) or the language of their adopted country? All three of the survivors I have studied in this project have lived in England for many more years than they lived in their native countries, are adopted or grew up as British citizens, and importantly, *chose* to give testimony in the English language. Perhaps, before we begin to question which languages 'are more valid, nearer to the inner truth, than...other languages',[521] we should instead ask ourselves whether it is ethically right for us as scholars to dictate which idiom is the 'right' one in which survivors should give testimony.

Looking to the Future

Every day it becomes clearer that facts that must be retrieved are pervaded by error, partiality, myth, and may sink under the weight of our attempts to correct for distortion.[522]

In *The Past in Hiding*, Mark Roseman notices that his interviewee, Marianne Strauss, tends to merge the various uniformed men that approached her during her time in hiding into the homogenised figure of the SS man. In fact, Roseman notes, in 'common [with]...the accounts of other Jewish witnesses, in Marianne's testimony uniform wearers of very different provenance were metamorphosed in memory to "SS men." *Wehrmacht* soliders, railway officials, ordinary police on the trains and other figures became fused with the archetypal threat figure: the SS man.'[523] Because the details of survivors'

[520] David Boder, quoted in Alan Rosen's *Sounds of Defiance*, p.21.
[521] Engelking *Holocaust and Memory*, p.15.
[522] Geoffrey H. Hartman, 'Introduction: Darkness Visible' in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory*, ed. by Geoffrey H. Hartman (Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge U.S.A, 1994), p.3.
[523] Roseman *The Past in Hiding*, p.6.

testimonies are often obscured in this manner, many scholars simply disregard testimony as a reliable historical resource – discounting memories which they feel 'the past has begun to blur, and which ha[ve] been...diminished, by the numerous images since liberation.'[524] At best, scholars tend to ascribe the value of testimony to its ability to 'evok[e] the Holocaust experience', and in its 'emotionally powerful elements' which lead to 'enhanced empathy' for survivors.[525] In doing this, historians are overlooking two important points. Firstly, all historical events are exposed to subjective perception and interpretative means of mediation, 'filtered through the prism of the narrator's psychological, cultural, linguistic and social constructions which may also change over time.'[526] In this way, survivor accounts are no different from other methods of historical recording – and certainly would have been as subject to these influences at the time the Holocaust occurred as they were after this time. Secondly, in focusing so avidly on the inaccuracies in survivor testimony, scholars may be blinding themselves to the truths that testimony contains. If I return to Roseman as a case in point, during his research into Strauss' testimonies Roseman found that whilst he had been 'conscious[ly looking for]...the changes and omissions in particular individuals' testimony' he had missed the fact that 'many discrepancies did, in fact, faithfully reflect different contemporary perceptions of [the] event.'[527]

---

[524] Abraham J. Peck, "Our Eyes Have Seen Eternity": Memory and Self-Identity Among the Sheerith Hapletah', *Modern Judaism*, 17.1 (The John Hopkins University Press, 1997) p57.
[525] Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (A Mariner Book: Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, New York, 2000), p.275.
[526] Efraim Sicher, 'The Future of the Past: Countermemory and Postmemory in Contemporary American Post-Holocaust Narratives' in *History & Memory*, 12.2 (Indiana University Press, 2001), p.81.
[527] Roseman *The Past in Hiding*, p.84.

Roseman's observation leads us to an interesting point. Perhaps scholars have been so preoccupied with 'retriev[ing]...facts' from the 'error[s]' of testimony, and in 'our attempts to correct...[testimonial] distortion'[528] that we have been missing a fundamental point. My research has revealed that though survivor testimony does contain misrememberings and inaccuracies, flucatuations and omissions, that these variations almost always occur when survivors are attempting to recall and relay moments of extreme trauma. Perhaps then, survivor testimony is structured as a defence against the very reality of certain events – against the destructive and painful evocation of facts buried in trauma. Like Roseman - who has observed that his interviewee's memories tend to be accurate unless she is recalling moments of menace and mortal peril - I have found that such discrepancies occur most recurrently at the very moments that Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman are giving voice to their most traumatic recollections. By tracking the presence of trauma in testimony, and observing where these inaccuracies occur, this has provided me with an alternative method of reading and listening to survivor testimony that I posit allows for access to 'a reality or truth that is not otherwise available.'[529] Through the course of this study, I have shown that this reading of testimony shows no disrespect to survivors, nor does it provoke what Primo Levi has termed a 'war on memory.'[530] On the contrary, rather than challenging the veracity of Lasker-Wallfisch, Levi and Greenman's testimonies, this method of reading their

[528] Geoffrey H. Hartman, *Introduction: Darkness Visible*, p3.
[529] Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience*, p.4.
[530] Primo Levi, Quoted in Geoffrey H. Hartman, 'Introduction: Darkness Visible' p.4. Indeed, from my conversations with Holocaust survivors it often seems to be critics and 'second generation' survivors who are more concerned about 'the floodgates of denial...open[ing] and threaten[ing] to render the voice of the survivor inconsequential or, worse yet, inauthentic...what happens when the texts of those survivor voices are analyzed by professional scholars, when testimonies given by survivors during the past two decades are studied for their 'scientific' value?' Abraham J. Peck "Our Eyes Have Seen Eternity": Memory and Self-Identity Among the Sheerith Hapletah', *Modern Judaism*, 17.1 (The John Hopkins University Press, 1997) ,p.57.

depositions in fact reinforces the authenticity of their accounts and, I believe, is the key to understanding what is encoded in Holocaust testimony – providing us with what may well be the best means we have to decipher the secret language of the survivor.

Bibliography

Primary Source Material:

de la Mare, Giles., Testimonial interview., interv. by Jennifer Maiden., transc. by Jennifer Maiden. (1st March 2005)

Greenman, Leon., Testimonial interview., 'The Barber of Buchenwald', *Evening Standard.* Interv. by Anne Matheson, (April, 1945)

Greenman, Leon., Testimonial interview., *BBC European Service.* Unknown interviewer., transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 1CDR0031784. (Between 25th April and 26th May 1945), Housed in the British Library Sound Archive.

Greenman, Leon., Testimonial interview., Imperial War Museum: *Europe Under the Nazis 1933-1945* collection. interv. by Margaret Brooks. transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 9274/23. (22nd April 1986), Housed in the Imperial War Museum Sound Archive.

Greenman, Leon., Testimonial interview., The British Video Archive: *Holocaust Survivors* collection. interv. by Alberta Strage. transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no. C533/120 (16th September 1992), Housed in the British Library Sound Archive and Audio Visual Department, University College London.

Greenman, Leon., Testimonial interview., interv. by David J. transc. by Jennifer Maiden. (1995), Transcription taken from Greenman's personal copy of this recording.

Greenman, Leon., *An Englishman in Auschwitz* (Vallentine Mitchell: London, Portland, 2001)

Greenman, Leon.,. Testimonial interview., interv. by Jennifer Maiden. transc. by Jennifer Maiden. (10th, 15th July 2007)

Greenman, Leon., Quoted in *The Times Obituary*, 10 March 2008, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/obituaries/article3524503.ece> [accessed 28/04/08]

Greenman, Leon., BBC News link to the testimonial he gave for Holocaust Memorial Day, 27th January 2008: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/spl/hi/pop_ups/03/uk_an_ englishman_in_Auschwitz/html/8.stm> [accessed 19/03/08]

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., (Given under her birth name, Lasker). First testimonial interview., BBC European Service: *Belsen Concentration Camp Interviews*. interv. by Patrick Gordon-Walker. transc. and trans. by Anita Lasker-Wallfisch Cprd no: 8679(1). (15th April 1945), Housed at the BBC Sound Archives.. Private transcript, loaned for use by Anita Lasker-Wallfisch. Punctuation amended to mirror original oral recording by Jennifer Maiden.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., (Given under her birth name Lasker). Second testimonial interview., Interviewed by Patrick Gordon-Walker. transc. and trans. by Anita Lasker-Wallfisch (15th April 1945),. Private transcription, loaned for use by Anita Lasker-Wallfisch.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., (Given under her birth name Lasker). Testimonial transcript from Official British Record of the Trial in Lüneberg., (September/November 1945), Ref no: WO 235/14. Housed at the National Archives. Quoted in Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, *Inherit the Truth 1939-1945: The Documented Experiences of a Survivor of Auschwitz and Belsen* (Giles de la Mare, 1996), pp.157-163.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., (Given under first marital name, Wallfisch) Testimonial: *Cellist in the Auschwitz Camp Orchestra.* trans. by Anna Brown, Cat no: P.III h (Auschwitz) No.707. (August 1957), Housed at the Wiener Library.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., *Inherit the Truth.* Testimonial manuscript., (1988) Housed at the Department of Documents, Imperial War Museum.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., Testimonial interview., Imperial War Museum Sound Archive. interv. by Conrad. Wood., transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 11914/4/1-2, 3-4. (March 1991) Housed at the Imperial War Museum.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., Testimonial monologues, BBC Radio 3: 'Breslau', 'The Graupe', 'Auschwitz', 'Belsen', 'England – Eventually'., Collectively entitled *Inherit the Truth* Cat nos: H2611/01, H2136/12, H2151/01, H2151/02, H2157/04. (1993) Housed at the British Library and BBC Sound Archives.

Lasker,-Wallfisch, Anita., 'BBC Online'., *The Works*, <www.bbc.co.uk/works/s2/lasker/index.shtml> [accessed 12/03/05]

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., *Inherit the Truth 1939-1945: The Documented Experiences of a Survivor of Auschwitz and Belsen* (Giles de la Mare, 1996)

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., Testimonial interview., BBC Radio 4: *Desert Island Discs.* interv. by Sue Lawley., transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 16832/2. (August 1996), Housed at the Imperial War Museum and BBC Sound Archives.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., Testimonial interview., BBC Radio 4: *My Century*. Unknown interviewer. transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 20567. (1999), Housed at the Imperial War Museum and BBC Sound Archives.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita.,. Prepared speech., British Library, *Taking Testimonies Forward: Oral Histories of the Holocaust* conference. Cat no: 1CDR0014606-1CDR0014607. (1999), Housed in the British Library Sound Archive.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita., Preparatory interview for *The Archive Hour: Images of Belsen.* interv. by Jo Glanville, and Smita Patel. transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 1957915. (1999), Housed at the Imperial War Museum and BBC Sound Archives.

Lasker-Wallfisch, Anita. Testimonial interview., British Library: *Living Memory of the Jewish Community* collection., interv. by Jennifer Wingate., transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: F8849 –F8854. (May-October 2000), Housed at the British Library Sound Archive.

Lasker-Wallfisch, A. Testimonial interview., interv. by Jennifer Maiden. transc. by Jennifer Maiden, (27th October 2004)

Levi, Trude., (Given under her first marital name, Deak) Testimonial: *A Woman Survives Auschwitz and the Death March*. Cat no: P.III h (Auschwitz) No.864. (March 1958), Housed at the Wiener Library.

Levi, Trude.,. Testimonial interview, BBC Radio: *Repressed Trauma Syndrome*. Unknown interviewer. transc. by Jennifer Maiden. (1985) Taken from Trude Levi's personal copy.

Levi, Trude., Testimonial interview, British Library: *Living Memory of the Jewish Community* collection. interv. by Gaby Glassman, transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: F268-F281 C1. (April 1989) Housed in the British Library Sound Archive.

Levi, Trude., Testimonial interview, BBC Radio 4: *Woman's Hour*. interv. by Sophie Chalk. transc. by Jennifer Maiden (1994)

Levi, Trude., *A Cat Called Adolf* (Vallentine Mitchell: London, 1995)

Levi, Trude., Testimonial interview, Imperial War Museum Sound Archive. interv. by Lyn Smith. transc. by Jennifer Maiden, Cat no: 17558/8. (October 1997), Housed at the Imperial War Museum Sound Archive.

Levi, Trude., Testimonial interview, *Jewish Chronicle*. interv. by Helen Jacobs. transc. by Jennifer Maiden. (February/March 1996), Transcription taken from Levi's personal copy of the tape-recording.

Levi, Trude. *Did you ever meet Hitler, Miss?* (Vallentine Mitchell: London, Portland, 2003)

Levi, Trude., Testimonial interviews, interv. by Jennifer Maiden. transc. by Jennifer Maiden (16th August, 1st October and 25th October 2007)

Secondary Source Material:

Apel, Dora., *Memory Effects: The Holocaust and the Art of Secondary Witnessing* (Rutgers University Press: New Brunswick, New Jersey and London, 2002)

Berger, Ronald J., Quinney, Richard. 'The Narrative Turn in Social Inquiry' in *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry* ed. by Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney (Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, London, 2005), pp.10-15.

Bergson, Henri., *Matter and Memory* (Zone Books: New York, 1988)

Bettelheim, Bruno. Quoted in Barbara Engelking, *Holocaust and Memory: The Experience of the Holocaust and Its Consequences: An Investigation Based on Personal Narratives,* ed. by Gunnar S. Paulsson, trans. by Emma Harris (Leicester University Press: London and New York, 2001), p.244.

Bettelheim, Bruno. *The Informed Heart: Autonomy in a Mass Age* (Harper Mass Market Paperbacks, 1985)

Beyrak, Nathan., Quoted in Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*. trans. by Jared Stark (Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London, 2006), pp.128, 136-137.

Beyrak, Nathan., 'To Rescue the Individual Out of the Mass Number: Intimacy as a Central Concept in Oral History', in *These Faces Talk to Us* ed. by Maurice Cling and Yannis Thanassekos (La Fondation Auschwitz, 1994) pp.100-151.

Bloxham, Donald., Kushner, Tony., *The Holocaust: Critical Historical Approaches* (Manchester University Press: Manchester, New York, 2005)

Boder, David., Quoted in Alan Rosen, *Sounds of Defiance: The Holocaust, Multilingualism & the Problem of English* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, London, 2005), p.21.

Borland, Katherine., "That's Not What I Said": Interpretative Conflict in Oral Narrative Research', in *The Oral History Reader: Second Edition* ed., by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 2006) pp. 310-321.

Bos, Pascale Rachel., 'Women and the Holocaust: Analyzing Gender Difference' in *The Holocaust: Theoretical Readings*. ed. by Neil Levi, Michael Rothberg (Edinburgh University Press, 2003), p.181

Brewer, William F. 'What is Autobiographical Memory?' in *Autobiographical Memory* ed. in David C Rubin (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1986), pp. 26-44.

British Library Sound Archive, *Oral History Training Course* <www.oralhistory.org.uk/training> [accessed 10/02/05]

Brooks, Peter., *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling* (Blackwell: Oxford, Cambridge 1994)

Buber, Martin., *Tales of the Hasidim: The Early Masters*. Trans. Olga Marx (Thames and Hudson: London, 1956)

Cabag, Erica. Personal email correspondence between March-October 2004.

Carlat, Daniel J., *The Psychiatric Interview: Practical Guides in Psychiatry* (Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1999)

Caruth, Cathy., *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, London, 1996)

Crawford, Rhiannon. Brown, Brian, Crawford, Paul., *Storytelling in Therapy* (Nelsen Thornes Ltd, 2004)

Delbo, Charlotte., *Auschwitz and After* (Yale University Press, 1997)

Delbo, Charlotte., *Days and Memory*, trans. by Rosette Lamont (Marlboro, Vermont: Marboro Press, [1985] 1990), pp.1-10.

Eaglestone, Robert., *The Holocaust and the Postmodern* (Oxford University Press, 2004)

Eliach, Yaffa., 'Discussion: the Holocaust and Concentration Camps in Literature', in *The Nazi Concentration Camps: Proceedings of the Fourth Yad Vashem International Historical Conference, Jerusalem, January 1980*, ed. by Yisrael Gutman and Avital Saf (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1984),p.716.

Elkan, Irmi., Quoted in Joseph Sandler and Anna Freud, *The Analysis of Defense: The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense Revisited* (International Universities Press: New York, 1985), p. 229-234.

Engelking, Barbara., *Holocaust and Memory: The Experience of the Holocaust and Its Consequences: An Investigation Based on Personal Narratives*, ed. by Gunnar S. Paulsson, trans. by Emma Harris (Leicester University Press: London and New York, 2001)

Favorini, Attilio., 'History, Collective Memory, and Aeschylus's *The Persians*' in *Theatre Journal*, 55.1 (The John Hopkins University Press, 2003) pp.99-111.

Felman, Shoshana., Laub, Dori., 'Foreword' to *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History* ed., by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub. (Routledge: New York and London, 1992), pp.xiii –xviii.

Felman, Shoshana., 'The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah'* in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, ed., by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (Routledge: New York and London, 1992) pp..204-283.

Freud, Anna., 'Child Observations and Prediction of Development: A Memorial Lecture in Honour of Ernst Kris' (1958 [1957])' in *The Writings of Anna Freud, Volume V: Research at the Hampstead Child-Therapy Clinic and Other Papers 1956 – 1965* (New York: International Universities Press, 1969), p. 133.

Freud, Sigmund., *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis: A Course of Twenty-Eight Lectures Delivered at the University of Vienna* trans. by Joan Riviere (George Allen & Unwin ltd: London, 1949 [1922])

Freud, Sigmund., 'Beyond the Pleasure Principle' in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works* ed., by James Strachey (Hogarth Press: London, 1953 – 1974), pp. 29-30.

Friedlander, Saul., 'Trauma, Memory, and Transference' in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory*, ed., by Geoffrey H. Hartman (Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge U.S.A, 1994), pp..252 –263.

Funkenstein, Amos., 'History, Counterhistory, and Narrative' in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"*, ed., by Saul Friedlander (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1992), pp.66-81.

Geyer, Michael., Hansen, Miriam., 'German-Jewish Memory and National Consciousness' in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory* ed., by Geoffrey H. Hartman (Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge U.S.A, 1994), pp.175-190.

Grainger, Teresa., *Traditional Storytelling: In the Primary Classroom* (Leamington Spa: Scholastic Ltd, 1997)

Greenspan, Henry., 'Lives as Texts: Symptoms as Modes of Recounting in the Life Histories of Holocaust Survivors' in *Storied Lives: The Cultural Politics of Self-*Understanding, ed. by George C Rosenwald and Richard L Ochberg (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1992), pp.145-160.

Greenspan, Henry., *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors: Recounting and Life History* (Praeger: Westport, Connecticut, London, 1998)

Gilbert, Martin., *Atlas of the Holocaust* (William Morrow, 1993)

Grenville, Anthony., Personal email correspondence with Jennifer Maiden, 23/07/07.

Gubrium, Jaber F., Holstein, James A., 'Narrative Practice and the Coherence of Personal Stories', in *Sociological Quarterly*, 39 (1998), pp.163-187.

Hartman, Geoffrey H., 'Introduction: Darkness Visible' in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory* ed. by Geoffrey H. Hartman (Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge U.S.A, 1994), pp.1-22.

Hartman, Geoffrey H., *The Longest Shadow: In the Aftermath of the Holocaust* (Indiana University Press: Bloomington & Indianapolis, 1996)

Hartman, Geoffrey H., 'Holocaust Videography, Oral History and Education' in *Tikkun: A Bimonthly Jewish & Interfaith Critique of Politics, Culture & Society* (May/June 2001) <*http://www.tikkun.org/magazine/index.cfm/action/tikkun/issue/tik0105/article/010521.html*> [accessed 02/02/05]

Harvey, John H., *Embracing Their Memory: Loss and the Social Psychology of Storytelling* (Allyn & Bacon, 1996), p.10.

Hedges, Lawrence E., *Remembering, Repeating and Working Through Childhood Trauma: The Psychodynamics of Recovered Memories, Multiple Personality, Ritual Abuse, Incest, Molest and Abduction* (Jason Aronson Inc: Northvale, New Jersey, London, 1994), pp.18-22.

Herman, Judith Lewis., *Trauma and Recovery: From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror* (Pandora, 1992)

Hilberg, Raul., *Sources of Holocaust Research: An Analysis* (Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, 2001)

Hirsch, Herbert., *Genocide and the Politics of Memory: Studying Death to Preserve Life* (The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill & London, 1995)

Hirsch, Marianne., Mourning and Postmemory' *The Holocaust: Theoretical Readings,* ed., by Neil Levi and Michael Rothberg (Edinburgh University Press, 2003), p.416.

Holmes, J. 'Supportive Psychotherapy: The Search for Positive Meanings', *British Journal of Psychiatry,* 167 (1995), pp. 439-445.

Holocaust Centre of Toronto, *Mission Statement*, <www.holocaustcentre.com> [accessed 28/05/06]

Howe, Irving., 'Writing and the Holocaust' in. *Writing and the Holocaust* ed. by Berel Lang (Holmes & Meier, 1988), pp.180-189.

Howes, Janice., L. Vallis., T. Michael., 'Cognitive Therapy with Nontraditional Populations: Application to Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Personality Disorders' in *Advances in Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy: Benff International Behavioural Science Series*, ed., by Keith S. Dobsom and Kenneth D Craig (Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 1996), pp.247-248.

Irwin-Zarecka, Iwona., *Neutralizing Memory: The Jew in Contemporary Poland* (Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick and Oxford, 1989)

Jones, Anthony., Buttrey, J., *Children and Stories* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971)

Kay, Jerald., Allan Tasman., *Essentials of Psychiatry.* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2006)

Kirmayer, Laurence J., 'Landscapes of Memory: Trauma, Narrative, and Dissociation' in *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*, ed., by Paul Antze. Michael Lambek (Routledge: New York, London, 1996), pp. 173-189.

Krystal, Henry., *Integration and Self-Healing: Affect, Trauma, Alexithymia* (The Analytic Press, 1988)

La Capra, Dominick., *History and Memory After Auschwitz* (Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London, 1998), pp.7-10.

Lang, Berel., 'The Representation of Limits', in. *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the 'Final Solution'* ed., by Saul Friedlander (Harvard University Press, 1993)

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

Langer, Lawrence., 'Interpreting Survivor Testimony' in *Writing and the Holocaust* ed., by Berel Lang (Holmes & Meier, 1988), p.26.

Langer, Lawrence L., 'Remembering Survival' in. *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory* ed., by Geoffrey H. Hartman (Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge U.S.A, 1994), pp.70-80.

Langer, Lawrence L., *Versions of Survival: Holocaust and the Human Spirit* (State University of New York Press, 1982)

Laub, Dori., 'An Event Without a Witness: Truth, Testimony and Survival' in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History* ed., by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (Routledge: New York and London, 1992), pp.75-92.

Laplanche, Jean., Pontalis, Jean-Bertrand., *The Language of Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1973), pp.455-470.

'Leon'., Quoted in Henry Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors: Recounting and Life History* (Praeger: Westport, Connecticut, London, 1998), pp. xvii,156.

'Leon Greenman', *The Times Obituary*, 10 March 2008, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/obituaries/article3524503.ece> [accessed 28/04/08]

Lester David., Stockton, Richard., *Suicide and the Holocaust* (Nova Science Publishers Inc, 2005).

Levi, Primo., *If This Is A Man*: *The Truce*, trans. Stuart Woolf (Abacus Books: New York, London, 1987), pp.109, 215, 237.

Levi, Primo., *The Drowned and The Saved* (Abacus Books: New York, London, 1988), pp. 19, 24.

Levi, Primo., *Survival in Auschwitz* trans. Stuart Woolf (Collier Books, 1986 [1959]) p.23.

Levi, Primo., Quoted in Geoffrey H. Hartman, 'Introduction: Darkness Visible' in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory* ed., by Geoffrey H. Hartman (Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge U.S.A, 1994), p.4.

Lifton, Robert., *Death in Life: Survivors of Hiroshima* (The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill and London, 1991[1968])

Loftus, .Elizabeth F., *Eyewitness Testimony* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge (Massachusetts) London: 1996 [1979])

Maines, David., 'Narrative's Moment and Sociology's Phenomena: Toward Narrative Sociology' in *Sociological Quarterly*, 34 (1993) pp.17-38.

Malcolm, Karen., 'Prose Dialogue and Discourse', in *Approaches to the Analysis of Literary Discourse* ed., by Ventola, Eija (Åbo Academy Press, 1991)

Marcus, Paul., *Autonomy in the Extreme Situation: Bruno Bettelheim, the Nazi Concentration Camps and the Mass Society* (Greenwood Publishing Group, 1999)

Martel, Yann., *Life of Pi* (Canongate Books Ltd, 2002), p.x.

Mendelsohn, Daniel., *The Lost: A Search for Six of Six Million* (HarperCollins, 2006)

Merton, Robert K., Fiske, Marjorie., Kendall, Patricia L., *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures.* 2nd edn. (The Free Press: Collier Macmillan Publishers: London, 1990 [1956]), p.13

Michaels, Anne., *Fugitive Pieces* (Bloomsbury, 1997), p.193.

Mollica, Richard F., 'The Trauma Story: The Psychiatric Care of Refugee Survivors of Violence and Torture', in *Post-Traumatic Therapy and Victims of Violence* ed., by Frank M.Ochberg (Brunner/Mazel Publishers: New York, 1988), p.311.

Mollon, Phil., *Remembering Trauma: A Psychotherapist's Guide to Memory and Illusion* (Whurr Publishers: London and Philadelphia, 1998)

Norrick, Neal R., *Conversational Narrative: Storytelling in Everyday Talk* (John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2000)

Novick, Peter., *The Holocaust in American Life* (A Mariner Book: Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, New York, 2000)

Oral History Society, 'Practical Advise: Getting Started', on the *Oral History Society* website <http://www.ohs.org.uk/advice/> [accessed 25/05/08]

Packer, Martin J., 'Interpreting Stories, Interpreting Lives: Narrative and Action in Moral Development Research' in *Narrative and Storytelling: Implications for Understanding Moral Development* ed., by Mark B. Tappan and Martin J. Packer (Jossey-Bass Inc Publishers: San Francisco, 1991), pp.64-65.

Paris, Erna., *Long Shadows: Truth. Lies and History* (Bloomsbury, 2000), pp.312-345.

Passerini, Luisa., *Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class* trans., by Robert Lumley and Jude Bloomfield (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1987[1984])

Pearsall, Judy. ed., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary: Tenth Edition* (Oxford University Press, 1999), pp.948, 1335.

Peck, Abraham J., '"Our Eyes Have Seen Eternity": Memory and Self-Identity Among the Sheerith Hapletah' *Modern Judaism,* 17.1 (The John Hopkins University Press, 1997), pp.57-74.

Perks, Robert., Thomson, Alistair., 'Introduction' and chapter Introductions to *The Oral History Reader* ed. by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 1998)

Portelli, Alessandro., *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History* ed. and trans. by Michael Frisch (State University of New York Press, 1991)

Portelli, Alessandro., *The Battle of Valle Guilia: Oral History and the Art of Dialogue* (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1997)

Portelli, Alessandro., 'What Makes Oral History Different' in *The Oral History Reader: Second Edition* ed., by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 2006), p.36.

Radio 4, BBC Website description, <www.bbc.co.uk/radio/ > [accessed 15/03/05]

Radio 4, BBC. Description of *Desert Island Discs* taken from the BBC website, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/factual/desertislanddiscs/shtml> [accessed 15/03/05]

Rapaport, Lynn., *Jews in Germany After the Holocaust: Memory, Identity, and Jewish-German Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Reiter, Andrea., 'Memory and authenticity: the case of Binjamin Wilkomirski' in *The Memory of Catastrophe* ed., by Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (Manchester University Press: Manchester, New York, 2004), p.134.

Rickard, John S., Schweizer, Harold., 'Introduction' to *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling* by Peter Brooks (Blackwell: Oxford, Cambridge 1994), pp.10-15.

Ricoeur, Paul., *Memory, History, Forgetting* trans. by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (The University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London, 2004), p.413.

Riley, Brian T., *Introduction to Psycho-Linguistics* (Cosmo Publications, 2000) pp.50-90.

Ringelheim, Joan. Personal email correspondence, October 2004.

Roseman, Mark., *The Past in Hiding* (Penguin Books, 2000).

Roseman, Mark., 'Surviving Memory: Truth and Inaccuracy in Holocaust Testimony' in *The Journal of Holocaust Education*, 8(1) (Summer, 1999) pp. 1-20.

Rosen, Alan., *Sounds of Defiance: The Holocaust, Multilingualism & the Problem of English* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, London, 2005)

Rosensaft, Menachem., Quoted in Erna Paris's *Long Shadows: Truth. Lies and History* (Bloomsbury, 2000), p.342.

Roskies, David G., ed., *Against the Apocalypse: Responses to Catastrophe in Modern Jewish Culture* (Harvard University Press, 1984)

Rubin, David C., 'Introduction'. *Autobiographical Memory* ed. by David C Rubin (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1986), pp. 4-7.

Sandler, Joseph., Freud, Anna., *The Analysis of Defense: The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense Revisited* (International Universities Press: New York, 1985)

Santner, Eric L., 'History beyond the Pleasure Principle: Some Thoughts on the Representation of Trauma' in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"* ed., by Saul Friedlander (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1992), pp. 143-154.

Schachterle, Lance., 'Cooper and His Collaborators: Recovering Cooper's Final Intensions for His Fiction', in *Studies in Bibliography*, 56 (2003-2004) pp. 317-337.

Schaeffer, Jean-Marie., Quoted in Portelli, Alessandro, *The Battle of Valle Guilia: Oral History and the Art of Dialogue* (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), p.5.

Schiffrin, Deborah., *Approaches to Discourse* (Blackwell Publishing, 1994)

Schwartz, Charlotte., 'Communication in psychoanalysis – developmental Antecedents'. *The Psychoanalytic Review*. ed. by Leila Lerner, 69 (No 2. Summer, 1982.), pp.32-33.

Semprun, Jorge., *What a Beautiful Sunday!* trans. by Alan Sheridan (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York: 1982), pp. 61, 105.

Semprun, Jorge., *Literature or Life* trans. Linda Coverdale (Penguin Books, 1997), pp.124, 262.

Sicher, Efraim., 'The Future of the Past: Countermemory and Postmemory in Contemporary American Post-Holocaust Narratives' in *History & Memory*, 12.2 (Indiana University Press, 2001), pp. 56-91.

Stallbaumer, L. M., 'Frederick Flick's Opportunism and Expediency', in *Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies*, <http://www.adl.org/braun/dim_13_2_flick.asp> [accessed 28/04/08]

Stargardt, Nicholas., *Witnesses of War: Children's Lives Under the Nazis* (Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 2006), pp.239-366.

Sunderland, Margot., *Using Story Telling as an Therapeutic Tool with Children* (Winslow Press Ltd, 2000)

Thompson, Paul., *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (Oxford University Press, 2000 [1978])

Thomson, Alistair., 'Anzac Memories: Putting Popular Memory Theory into Practice in Australia' in *The Oral History Reader* 2nd edn ed., by Rob Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 2006), pp. 245-247.

Tomashevsky, Boris., 'Thematics' in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, eds. and trans. by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Bison Books, 1965), pp. 66-78.

Trodd, Zoe., 'Mosaics and Mirrors: Wiesel, American Autobiographies, and the Shaping of a Storied Subject' in *Narrative and Storytelling: Implications for Understanding Moral Development* ed., by Mark B. Tappan and Martin J. Packer (Jossey-Bass Inc Publishers: San Francisco, 1991), pp..25-62.

Unnold, Yvonne S., 'Narratives of Trauma from the Southern Cone' in *Latin American Narratives and Cultural Identity: Selected Readings* ed., by Irene Maria F. Blayer & Mark Cronlund Anderson (Peter Lang: New York, Washington D.C/Baltimore, Bern, Frankfurt, Berlin, Brussels, Vienna, Oxford, 2004), pp.75-86.

Valent, Paul., 'Child Survivors: A Review,' in *Children Surviving Persecution: An International Study of Trauma and Healing*, ed., by Judith S. Kestenberg and Charlotte Kahn (Praeger: Westport, CT and London, 1998), p.112.

Warburg, Miriam., 'Personal Experiences of Camp Inmates at D..P. Center of Foehrenwald, Bavaria', Jewish Central Information Office, London, February 1946', *American Jewish Committee Archives,* <http://www.ajcarchives.org /AJC_DATA/Files/DP13.PDF> [accessed 25/05/08] p.1.

Weiss, Gilbert., Wodak, Ruth., 'Introduction' to *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, ed. by Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak (Palgrave Macmillan ltd, 2003), p.1-2.

Westerman, William., 'Central American Refugee Testimonies and Performed Life Histories in the Sanctuary Movement' in *The Oral History Reader* 2nd edn ed., by Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (Routledge: London and New York, 2006), p.501.

Wertheimer, Michael., 'The Annals of the House that Ebbinghaus Built' in *Human Memory and Cognitive Capabilities: Mechanisms and Performances. Volume 1* ed. by F. Klix and H. Hagendorf (North-Holland/Elsevier Science Publishers B.V: Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, Tokyo, 1986)

White, Hayden., *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe* (Balitmore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973), p.7.

White, Hayden., 'Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth' in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution"* ed. by Saul Friedlander (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1992), pp..37-53.

Wiesel, Elie., 'The Holocaust as Literary Imagination' in *Dimensions of the Holocaust: Lectures at Northwestern University*, ed. by L. Baldwin Smith (Evanston, Il.: Northwestern University, 1977), p.7.

Wiesel, Elie., 'A Plea for the Survivors' in *A Jew Today.* trans. by Marion Wiesel (New York: Random House, 1978), p.198.

Wiesel, Elie., *Twilight* trans., by Marion Wiesel (Summit Books, 1988)

Wiesel, Elie., *From the Kingdom of Memory: Reminiscences* (Schocken Books, 1990)

Wiesel, Elie., Quoted in Zoe Trodd 'Mosaics and Mirrors: Wiesel, American Autobiographies, and the Shaping of a Storied Subject' in *Narrative and Storytelling: Implications for Understanding Moral Development*, ed., by Mark B. Tappan and Martin J. Packer (Jossey-Bass Inc Publishers: San Francisco, 1991), p.25.

Wiesel, Elie. Quoted in 'The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah'* by Shoshana Felman in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, ed., by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (Routledge: New York and London, 1992), p.204.

Wiesel, Elie., Quoted in Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney, 'The Narrative Turn in Social Inquiry' in *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry*, ed. by Ronald J Berger and Richard Quinney (Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, London, 2005), p.1.

Wievioka, Annette., *The Era of the Witness.* trans., by Jared Stark (Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London, 2006), p.128.

Wolf, Christa., Quoted in Lynn Rapaport, *Jews in Germany After the Holocaust: Memory, Identity, and Jewish-German Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 1997), p.1.

Young, Allan., 'Bodily Memory and Traumatic Memory' in *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*, ed., by Paul Antze and Michael Lambek (Routledge: New York, London, 1996), p. 97

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

Young, James E., *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1993)