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Capturing the Intangible: Holocaust Survivor Testimonies held in the Jewish Holocaust Museum and Research Centre, Melbourne*

Michele Langfield

This paper provides an analysis of aspects of a significant videotestimony project that raises and discusses challenging issues about the factors influencing the telling of Holocaust testimonies and about the messages conveyed through those testimonies. It sets research questions which specifically look at the nature and role of video testimonies, including comparisons to non-video forms of oral history, and argues for what is 'new, different and significant about video testimonies' of Holocaust survivors. The analysis focuses on the nature, structure, messages and experiences shared (and those silenced) through the testimonies. In particular, it argues for the significance of video testimonies as a new means of capturing intangible cultural heritage.

This paper arises from an Australian Research Council Linkage Project, entitled 'Analysing Holocaust Survivor Testimonies' with the Jewish Holocaust Museum and Research Centre in Melbourne as the industry partner. The focus of the research is the vast collection of Holocaust survivor videotestimonies held in the Centre, the largest of its kind in Australia. This collection now includes almost 1,500 videotestimonies and is still growing. The testimonies vary from one hour to several hours long. Not only are they highly personalised individual narratives intended for direct descendants, but they are also a communal legacy and rich oral and visual history archive to be passed down to future generations, both Jewish and non-Jewish.¹

The primary aim of the Jewish Holocaust Centre as industry partner in this project was to make these lengthy, untranscribed interviews on video more accessible to the public. Thus our original application was twofold. Firstly, from a methodological perspective, it involved the purchase of equipment and software to enable us to code a sample of videotestimonies using a computer qualitative data program, Atlas.ti. Secondly, from an historical perspective, we wanted to use the data, once coded, to explore the different ways in which Jewish Holocaust survivors, who later settled in Melbourne, experienced and confronted Nazi persecution. We also wanted to investigate the influence of socio-cultural factors in shaping not only survivor experiences, but also the telling of those experiences, and how they are remembered and interpreted more than fifty years on.

Members of the project team have taken a number of different research directions, at times working together, at times separately.² The testimonies provide an endless supply of themes and issues to pursue. With such extraordinarily rich primary data, we have been able to make use of a variety of disciplinary and theoretical frameworks, including the study of memory, Jewish studies, Holocaust and immigration history, class and identity debates, gender analysis, oral and video history, and the theory of testimony.

**Capturing the Intangible**

This paper is entitled 'Capturing the Intangible', utilising a term now common in heritage studies, which denotes those aspects of the past and present that are non-material, but nonetheless deserving of examination and preservation for the future. These aspects include people's memories, beliefs, ideals, rituals, practices and traditions that are, more often than not, passed down orally and through demonstration and performance. With increasing globalisation, the protection of cultural heritage, especially intangible heritage, is crucial in maintaining cultural diversity and in the construction and maintenance of identities. Our identities evolve from our culture, and culture can be understood as 'the shared way of living of a group of people, including their accumulated knowledge and understandings, skills and values'.³ A UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage adopted in 2003, states:

> The philosophy, values, moral code and ways of thinking transmitted by oral traditions, languages and the various forms taken by its culture constitute the foundation of a community's life. The essentially ephemeral nature of this intangible heritage makes it highly vulnerable.⁴

The fact that intangible heritage is ephemeral, always changing or evolving, makes its protection and preservation extremely complex. The process of 'capture' fixes it in time and is contrary to its nature. It is well known that interviews conducted with the same people on the same topic after lapses of time can lead to quite different responses because understandings of past events and actions change according to the current context.⁵ Memories are layered and socially constructed. Nonetheless,
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'capturing' intangible heritage usually means recording it in some way—on paper, on computer, by taping or filming—to create a tangible record of the memory. The practice of capturing memories through oral histories has been a burgeoning field since the 1970s, increasingly recognised not only as a legitimate historical source but frequently an indispensable one in the preservation of history and heritage. Videotestimonies, especially Holocaust videotestimonies, have also been increasingly collected since the early 1980s, for example, by the Shoah Visual History Foundation at the University of Southern California and the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale University in New Haven, CT.6

What is the nature of videotestimonies as a relatively new historical source? What can they offer us, especially in terms of capturing intangible heritage and the impact of the Holocaust on individual survivors? What can we learn from Holocaust survivors that is not possible from more traditional sources? What can we discover in terms of what survivors hold most dear, what they want to pass on in their testimonies, and their own speculations about their past and how they survived?

Phillip Maisel, Co-ordinator of the Videotestimonies Project at the Jewish Holocaust Museum and Research Centre, reflects on the value of this form of testimony: it allows for individual descriptions of events. Sometimes there are alternative versions of the same event amongst siblings, a niece or an uncle, but it is valuable to have different versions. It gives an insight into the gamut of human emotions and responses, reflecting the broad scale of humanity, both noble and selfish—in other words we see every emotion which humans can have. It's better than a book, which needs to be edited, restructured and changed. With a video, you get the whole story first-hand and, with facial expressions, gestures, tone of voice, pauses, tears, turning away from the camera—in other words, a genuine account, with no distortion or intermediary. As well as recording, we give survivors the opportunity to have photos taken of their whole family, for future generations. A lot of new material is revealed then.7

**Selected videotestimonies**

Here I draw on a sample of five videotestimonies by Henry, Berthe, Martin, Henrietta and William, in order to examine the questions posed above. Each narrative is strongly influenced by the national, cultural and religious identities of the interviewees. In addition, these testimonies are linked in that, in each case, the importance of family relationships, especially with a sibling, in sustaining the interviewees throughout the darkest moments of their wartime experiences, is highlighted. I will be concentrating here particularly on the process of telling their life stories through the medium of videotestimony.8

**THE TELLING**

**Firstly, breaking the silence**

For many survivors, to relate their Holocaust experiences is to break a silence that has lasted for decades. Berthe, for example, has not yet spoken to her children of her experiences during the war. She confides:

I find it difficult to talk.9

Similarly, Martin says his children know little of his story10 and Henry admits at the end of his testimony:

I have not told my kids as I have told you.11

While survivors as they grow older feel more and more compelled to tell their stories, they are often reluctant to do so since the process can involve reliving the trauma. What they have not been able to share with their families directly, they have somehow been able to put on record for them in their videotestimonies. Some have placed embargoes on their testimonies until after their deaths. Although telling their stories is of the utmost importance to them, for many, through this opportunity, it is the first time they have felt able to do so. Perhaps this is because of the particular method of collecting the videotestimonies and the setting for doing so. For the most part, interviewees are allowed to speak freely without interruption or undue direction in the intimate environment of the filming studio at the Jewish Holocaust Museum and Research Centre. The aim is not to challenge but to document and record. The videotestimonies thus constitute a conversation with someone who, ideally, will understand their experiences and conduct their questioning with sensitivity. Nothing is edited or cut. As with other traumatic memories, the process of telling in this way can be therapeutic.12

**The need to tell versus the fear of not being believed or understood**

Holocaust survivors, as well as other victims of trauma, often experience a tension between the compulsion to tell, and the fear of not being believed or understood.13 Roberta Culbertson in a 1995 article on recounting trauma, explains that they are trapped between the need to tell and the intense pressure of silence. She draws on Lawrence Langer's notions of memory and telling, quoting a statement from a member of the Polish underground:

If you were not there it is difficult to describe or say how it was.14

She points out that to be a survivor is precisely...to live with the paradox of silence, and the present but unreachable force of memory, and a concomitant need to tell what seems untellable. The paradox is based in more than simply the difficulty of reporting events that listeners would rather not hear or believe, or which are too different to be grasped. It is a paradox of a known and felt truth that unfortunately obeys the logic of dreams rather than of speech, and so seems as unreachable, as other, as these, and as difficult to communicate and interpret, even to oneself.15

As Culbertson notes, some survivors resolve this tension by not telling, with the aim of forgetting or suppressing their traumatic memories. Many others, however, given the opportunity, will tell their stories, no matter how painful.16

**Cultural Silencers**

Culbertson also notes that the demands of narrative operate as cultural silencers to traumatic memory. For example, when describing his experiences in the Mauthausen concentration camp, Henry becomes
consciously the impropriety of revealing the sadistic torture he witnessed and experienced during the war. He says:

I was standing naked in snow for three or four hours. Shaved heads and everywhere else. Very sadistic. First time I met sadistic inmates... I don't know if I can say this... 18

Despite his hesitation, he continues, uneasily, with detailed descriptions of what he and others were subjected to. On my first viewing of his testimony, I had difficulty watching this section, sharing his unease as he struggled with these memories. I also feared the effect it might have on me as a viewer through trauma referral. I foresaw my own nightmares; I felt that he had already gone too far, been too explicit. Yet, afterwards, I came to believe that unless such events are told, how are we ever to know the extent of the horror which he and many other Holocaust victims went through.

Henrietta and her sister spent approximately four years in the Lodz Ghetto before being deported to Auschwitz along with 70,000 others in August 1944. 19 Henrietta is very conscious of her 'performance', checking her appearance in the mirror before beginning. Her testimony is notable for its repetition of particular phrases, the messages she wants to get through. One of these is:

It is unbelievable [always with emphasis] what people can do to other people. 20

She describes the dehumanising conditions and personal cruelty in Auschwitz but, unlike Henry, is careful not to give too many details. Once, after being made to stand for hours and hours in freezing conditions, she picked up some rotten potatoes to eat and a woman in authority beat her and beat her, resulting in permanent damage to her hearing. Throughout her interview we see her straining to hear the questions asked with her head slightly turned to one side and she speaks slowly and carefully in order to be better understood. It is only by seeing these compensatory actions, through the medium of videotestimony, that this hearing impediment, this particular physical effect of her Holocaust experiences, can be fully appreciated.

There are also questions of morality and ethics which some interviewers, interviewees and viewers find difficult to reconcile with 'normal', expected, or 'civilised' responses—such as the taking of bread from others, or the inaction or inability to help others, for fear of harm or one's own death. Martin recalls that when they were fleeing from the Russians:

Whoever fell down, couldn't walk, got the bullet. I knew what would happen to me once I couldn't walk. I saw a couple of people trying to help those who had fallen down but the Germans just dragged them away. The reality is there is nothing you can do. You had to put your feelings away. 21

When his brother David died, Martin was devastated but he confesses:

I didn't tell anybody. Maybe I wanted his portion of bread. Maybe I couldn't stand the strap on his legs for someone to cart him out. I stayed with him for three days and three nights and slept with him in the same bed. Nobody realised. 22

He goes on to relate:

The most important thing I forgot to mention was that before I worked in the [typhus] block with my brother, I worked in the crematorium. For quite a while. Extra food. Putting dead people into the ovens. Piles and Piles. Five and six would go in one go. A few hundred in each day. The one thing—I can still see it in my eyes—a huge pile. A woman on top. Germans pulling the gold teeth out. I didn't volunteer to do this. The Germans asked me to do this. 23

In the videotestimonies, the viewer sees the intense strain and torment of testifying, as survivors wrestle with these unsettling memories. 24 The traumatic effects of recounting Holocaust experiences are also clear from the breaks in the filming. These breaks are taken whenever it is necessary to allow narrators time to recover.

Emotional impact

The videotestimonies as a source provide us with a powerful indication of the lingering emotional impact of the Holocaust, which the viewer cannot help but feel, engage with, be affected by and, in some small way, understand. It is therefore a crucial medium for transmitting the painful and horrifying legacy of the Holocaust, especially to those who are outside the Jewish community and have no direct experience of such a phenomenon as extreme anti-Semitism.

Berthe and her sister, aged eight and ten respectively, were hidden during the war on a farm in France, with little communication with their mother. It was here that Berthe's relationship with her sister became much closer. She explains:

They were the formative years in a child's life and it's so important. We didn't have the warmth of a household. We had none of that love. 25

After the war, her mother returned and Berthe says:

It was very traumatic. We felt so much. 26

Throughout her testimony, Berthe is very uncomfortable, close to tears, but here she becomes totally overcome by her feelings, crying visibly while explaining that they could still no longer live with their mother for about eighteen months owing to lack of room in the apartment where she was working. These points of emotional breakdown in her narrative signify the deep impact of the separation from her parents at a young and vulnerable age. She is clearly still traumatised by her experiences so many years ago and it is impossible for the viewer not to share her pain. Berthe was by then twelve years of age and the overall effect on her was a sense of homelessness:

We never felt we belonged anywhere, never stable, we never put roots anywhere. We spent a couple of years here and a couple of years there. 27

When asked how she feels the Holocaust affected her as a person, Berthe replies:

First of all I lost my family there—I feel so unsettled because of the Holocaust, no roots, never been in Australia before. It's such a remote country. What are we doing here? I felt my life was not my life. It is somebody else's life because of the Holocaust, because of my mother, all that suffering she went through. All my family suffered so much. 28
Martin’s testimony is also broken up by points of obvious distress. His family was one of only three Jewish families in a shtetl in Slovakia, near the Ukrainian border. In 1939, the police came and told his parents to leave. They went west towards the border. He says:

Slovakia didn’t want us. Hungary didn’t want us. We were stateless so we finished up in the forest. Thanks to the Joint, they returned home after a few weeks. By 1942, the two other Jewish families in the village had been taken away with only twelve hours’ notice. Slovakian Jews were making arrangements with Hungarian Jews to give protection for their children in Budapest. Thus in early 1943, Martin’s parents paid someone to take their two boys to the Hungarian border secretly during the night. Martin says:

[I’ll] never forget the time when I left my mother. In recalling this painful experience, he looks to the side and then down, away from the camera. The interviewer asks: ‘She didn’t want to come?’

No. It was five in the morning, fourteen kilometres down to train. I said goodbye to my mother. I couldn’t comprehend till later what was my mother’s feeling. She was sending two kids away. One was twelve, the other one thirteen and never knew whether she was ever going to see them again. She was not allowed to talk about it in the village. There was no Jewish people anywhere to comfort her or do anything. After the war, I realised what that woman went through. My father came with us to the border and then we met up with the fellow who was going to take us across the border during the night ... and that’s the first time I saw my father ... you know what I mean ... put his hands down and cry.

Here Martin himself shakes his head, his face distorted. He bends down and puts his head in his arm, clearly distressed. As in Berthe’s case, it is the separation from their families, which caused such suffering for those who were child survivors.

William becomes very emotional when speaking early in his testimony about his family’s inability to provide him with a formal education.

Life consisted of reading and educating myself. That I believe I have achieved to a very large degree. I had no formal education whatsoever. I had no means of going to school ... Worked twelve, fourteen hours a day. I had no opportunity to study. This is something that I awfully miss.

Education, often denied to Jews in this period, was something William valued in life above all else. His parents were too poor to send him to school for more than a few years. In his youth he was greatly assisted in his learning by his older sisters and brother but in later years he was forced to teach himself under enormous difficulties, which left him traumatised. This is conveyed throughout his testimony by his tears, wavering lips and unsteady narration and would not have been so evident from an audio-only interview or written transcript. In other sections of the video where he is emotional, William is able to continue speaking, but at times he is so overcome that he cannot proceed. At the end, he takes a deep breath and says:

That’s my story. I hope you don’t mind that I’m crying. Obviously, for many Holocaust survivors, giving testimony is immensely painful. Almost all are emotionally exhausted at the end of the process, which can take hours, often necessitating short breaks to regain the strength and composure to continue. One has to ask why survivors put themselves through such an ordeal. The message which interviewees are asked to give to successive generations at the end of their testimonies is an integral part of the narrative and often provides the clue. Most are like Berthe:

For my children and grandchildren. Never to happen again. To make sure there is no anti-Semitism.

Why they survived
Martin believes he survived because of his village upbringing (where you had to do everything yourself to survive), his common sense and will power, but mainly his brother’s leadership. He says:

I knew from instinct what right and left meant. Mengele asked my brother how old he was and my brother said he was seventeen. So I said the same. So we went to the right. My brother saved my life. He was a great leader. I just followed him.

And later in his testimony:

I was sitting with my brother. [My] brother was very, very sick [with typhus]. We were both crying. So I told my brother he had to be strong. He said, ‘I can’t survive, you’ll have to survive.’

Martin’s parents survived the war, although his beloved brother David did not. Martin also attributes his own survival to his faith:

The day I left my mother, my last words to her were: ‘God should help us that we should see each other again.’ In hindsight my brother didn’t say that. My belief in God is so strong.

Henrietta recounts:

There was an electric fence at Auschwitz. People committed suicide, yes. I was not inclined to commit suicide because I was caring for my sister and as long as she was alive, I was [alive].

When Auschwitz was too full, the sisters were moved to Bergen-Belsen. Henrietta repeats that had she and her sister not been together they would both have given up. She repeats throughout the testimony:

My sister was out of this world, there is none like her.

The rest of her family did not survive. She attributes her survival entirely to her sister:

... only that I was with my sister. It wasn’t luck, it was because I was with my sister.

Lawrence Langer acknowledges the nurturing value of family unity, especially amongst sisters who went through these experiences together.

William believes his altruism and moral attitudes helped him to survive, as well as simply a physical reaction, a strong desire to stay alive.

Survivor Guilt
Henry suffers from intense survivor guilt. At the end of his testimony, the interviewer asks him why he thought he survived out of all his family. Rather than answer this, Henry replies:
This is my nightmare, the guilt. Very bad nightmares … see my little sister climbing in the gas chamber on the inside wall, screaming to me to help her. Don’t see my parents, just my sister. Particularly since you rang me.42

Here he is visibly tormented. He testifies to having recurring painful memories and, given his last comment, these were intensified by the prospect of giving testimony.

Henrietta carries the guilt of her mother’s death since her mother would eat nothing unless Henrietta shared it with her. Her parents died about a year apart from starvation in the Lodz ghetto.53

Fractured/Disrupted narratives

The testimonies are rarely as ordered as written sources, such as memoirs and autobiographies. Instead, they are fractured, interrupted and sometimes incoherent.44 While there is often a free flow of memory, there are also places where survivors are unable or unwilling to continue. They may have reached dangerous ground, emotionally or in terms of perceived propriety. Henry, for example, begins to talk of his experiences in the Warsaw Ghetto:

Sometimes we saw some very strange things you know … and then stops, saying:

I would prefer not to record that.

The interviewer, off camera, asks:

Do you want me to stop?

Henry replies:

Yes.45

Berthe is very uncomfortable and close to tears during the whole of her interview, although she somehow manages to retain her composure until she comes to the part where her father was ‘taken away’ to work in Germany on 20 August 1941, never to return.

The Germans came to our apartment. We were at school and mother was not there. We had a very good concierge. The Germans put seals on the door. The concierge picked us up from school and took us to our mother. We lost all our possessions. So mother was penniless, without a husband. I was very insecure. I was like a displaced person.46

Although they could send parcels and write to her father, they never saw him again. She says:

I remember very vividly … But here she breaks down, takes off her glasses and wipes her eyes. She asks for the tape to be turned off.

When the camera is turned back on, she is somewhat more collected.

He wrote to mother he wanted to see us. We made arrangements. I stood behind the wire. I hope he did see us there. He saw us but we didn’t see him. That was the last time he saw us.47

At this point Berthe shows the photograph taken for her father on that day. We are able to see the sisters as children and sense their vulnerability. It is a poignant moment in her testimony. I stopped the tape and looked at the photograph for a long time, contemplating the context in which it was taken. This is another advantage of videotestimonies. We are able to view not only the interviewee but also their personal memorabilia, their photos, letters and documents.

These are the tangible aspects of Berthe’s Jewish heritage. The stories that go with them and why they are so important to her are the intangible aspects. Her father was deported to Auschwitz on 26 June 1942. A month later, on 29 July her aunt was also taken to Auschwitz. Neither survived the war.

‘Recounting is not the memory’ (Culbertson)
The Sometimes what is left out is the most telling—the pauses, the gaps and the silences. Culbertson again explains:

This recounting is not the memory. The blank period is, and whatever elements of recall crossed his mind and body in those few still moments. The account is a pale telegraphed version of what is actually recalled.48

These blanks and the ‘weight’ of the silences are far more evident to the viewer of videotestimonies and to the listener of oral testimonies than to the reader of oral history transcripts or of other historical texts. Oral testimonies increasingly rely on transcripts as the last word, thus shifting the focus away from the spoken testimony and its greater ability to convey meaning.

Conclusion

To return then to my research questions: What is new, different and significant about videotestimonies as an historical source, especially in the preservation of intangible heritage? What is their primary value? Firstly and most obviously, it is the visual effect, the ‘performance’ element that is unique.49 Some survivors are more conscious of this than others. Some indeed forget that they are ‘on camera’. For viewers, however, videotestimonies are both visual and in motion. Like film, they are more than simply a verbal record of the legacy of the past. They are active rather than passive, dynamic rather than static in comparison to the written word and even the oral interview. They convey an immediacy which is lacking in other sources.50

Secondly, they are a powerful medium for conveying emotions. They surpass other sources in their intimate recording of the impact of past events and policies on particular individuals.51 As mentioned earlier, they are highly personalised responses to events that many Jews in Nazi-controlled Europe experienced. We see in the process of telling, the different ways in which the Holocaust impacted and continues to impact upon the lives of these survivors, especially emotionally and in sustaining or challenging values, beliefs and ideals. Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub view the trauma of the Second World War:

… not as an event encapsulated in the past, but as a history which is essentially not over, a history whose repercussions are not simply omnipresent (whether consciously or not) in all our cultural activities but whose traumatic consequences are still actively evolving …52

This is clearly evident in these videotestimonies which illustrate the long-term effects of persecution.

Thirdly, the insight into aspects of intangible heritage is much enhanced—language, expressions, gestures, and values are all recorded. These life narratives are shaped by the cultural identities of the interviewees, interweav-
ing issues of gender, religion and community. In their message to future generations, the importance of their identities and the retention of Jewish culture is often emphasised. In many cases, this is their primary reason for giving testimony. For example, William concludes his testimony by saying:

I would like to continue the Jewish heritage, to continue the upholding of the values that the Jews have upheld for the past millennia and contribute whatever they can to lift the lives up of the Jews here, to extend their sense of compassion. That's what I think my children will do. I brought up my children to respect Jewish values.53

Through seeing William say these words, one is convinced of his sincerity and how much his Jewishness means to him.

Finally, the testimonies constitute a form of embodied cultural heritage. The interviewee is "living", visible to the viewer so that the actual time of the interview remains a continual semblance of the present. If the medium survives or if the material can be "migrated" successfully onto another medium, the interviewees and their stories will live on. By watching the videotestimonies we, the viewers, become witnesses, not to the events themselves but to the reliving of them through the life histories of the survivors.
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