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ABSTRACT

Since unification the memorial landscape of Berlin and its surrounding territories has shifted and expanded exponentially. The majority of this change has occurred within the past ten years, as commemoration of the Holocaust and educational programmes on the National Socialist period have become not only prevalent, but a necessary and expected contribution to the shaping of German identity and memorial culture. In the past decade memorial museums and sites of remembrance, such as the House of the Wannsee Conference, the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, and the former Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück concentration camps, have contributed to and been impacted by the formation of a globalised memory of the Holocaust.

As major and internationally renowned institutions, these sites offer unique insight into the nature of current memorial culture and recent approaches to memorialising and commemorating the past. Through an analysis of their exhibition spaces (online, permanent, temporary) and educational programmes (guided tours, seminars, and workshops), this dissertation will attempt to identify how these sites contribute to the formation of a globalised memory.

Though each of these four sites possesses a different connection to the history of the Holocaust, and their own alternative approach to presenting and commemorating this history; this variation will provide insight into the divergent landscape of memorialisation within Germany, while also highlighting the common approaches, and practical issues that are of concern to these institutions. Overall the main aim of this thesis will be to demonstrate how memorialisation of the Holocaust, at sites within Berlin and Brandenburg, is no longer defined and shaped solely by the nation state, but rather is influenced by and contributes to international trends of remembrance and a globalised memory of the Holocaust.
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INTRODUCTION

Since unification the memorial landscape of Germany has shifted and expanded exponentially. In recent years, the states of Berlin and Brandenburg alone have seen the establishment of numerous memorials and institutions of remembrance. These have included sites dedicated to the murdered Sinti and Roma (2012),\(^1\) the victims of the T-4 ‘Euthanasia’ Operation (2014),\(^2\) those killed during the death march through the Belower forest (2010),\(^3\) the Jews deported from Grunewald station (2006),\(^4\) and the rescue efforts of Otto Weidt (2006),\(^5\) to name but a few. Additionally, older memorial sites have undergone extensive renovations and updates, and existing projects have dramatically expanded in scope, as in the case of the Topography of Terror \(^6\) and the Stolpersteine (Stumbling Stones) Project, respectively.\(^7\)

Commemoration of the Holocaust and educational programmes on the National Socialist period, have not only become prevalent, but also a fundamental part of German memory and identity.

---

In the past decade, these memorial sites have increasingly contributed to the creation of a globalised memory of the Holocaust—or a form of memory that is no longer defined solely by the nation state, but by emerging supra-national structures and international trends in remembrance and commemoration. National and local forms of memory in Germany have not ceased to exist, but rather contribute to, and are in turn influenced by these globalising forces.

This thesis will explore four sites of remembrance in Berlin and Brandenburg, including the House of the Wannsee Conference Memorial and Educational Centre, the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum, the Ravensbrück Memorial, and the ‘Information Centre’ of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. As internationally renowned institutions these sites offer unique insight into the nature of current memorial culture and contemporary approaches to memorialising and commemorating the past. Through an analysis of the permanent exhibitions and educational programmes of these sites, this dissertation will examine the ways in which these four memorials reflect, are impacted by, and contribute to a globalised memory of the Holocaust; and in doing so will attempt to identify current trends and characteristics within memorial culture in Germany in the post-unification period.

Each of these four sites possesses a different connection to the history of the Holocaust, and provides an alternative approach to presenting and commemorating this history. This selection will serve as a means of representing the varied landscape of memorialisation in Berlin and the surrounding region, while also highlighting shared approaches, and common issues and areas of concern. The primary aim of this thesis will be to demonstrate how memorialisation of the Holocaust, at sites within Berlin and Brandenburg, is no longer shaped solely by the nation state, but by a

---

8 Though the title, ‘Information Centre’ is often written in scare-quotes, the remainder of this thesis will not include this designation for the sake of convenience.
plurality of forces and perspectives. In doing so it will argue that German memorial culture is influenced by and contributes to international trends of remembrance and a wider globalised memory of the Holocaust.

**Literature Review**

The past twenty years has seen a dramatic rise in scholarship related to the memory and representation of the Holocaust. In particular there exists a notable subset of literature that focuses upon memorialisation, sites of memory, and the formation of memorial museums. This research began to emerge in the late 1980s in response to the counter-memorial movement in Germany, which sought to challenge traditional forms of commemoration. Early explorations into the field of Holocaust memorialisation include the work of Jochem Spielmann and Sybil Milton. Both have documented the evolution of memorial sites in Germany from the postwar period to the present, as well as the shifting forms of commemoration and design at former concentration camps. Spielmann’s (and Ostendorff’s) work examines the development of West German memorial sites fifty years after the November Pogrom, and the varying artistic and aesthetic concepts that informed the composition of these memorials.

---

Milton alternatively analyses the, “complex interrelationship between authentic historic sites” and “disparate and ephemeral representations of history.” She, puts forth the argument that memorials reflect changing public constituencies and distinctive political, social, and cultural contexts,” and goes on to describe memorials as “secular-sacred shrines.” More recently, Stefanie Endlich has similarly compiled an extensive and comprehensive encyclopaedic study, of memorials within Berlin and Brandenburg. Her efforts seek to draw attention to and document the rise of Holocaust memorial culture within the region since unification, while also documenting and tracing the origins of these sites.

Drawing from these previous studies, the work of James Young has extensively explored the ways in which memorials, and varying forms of memorialisation, are constructed products of public memory. To Young memorials reflect the society and time in which they were created, thus providing insight into the social, political, and aesthetically driving forces of the communities that commission, design, and establish them. Holocaust memorialisation, and the counter memorial movement, is thus indicative of a rupture in traditional forms of artistic-historical representation, as well as a general anxiety over the process of

remembering itself. The development of counter-memorials is thus based upon an inversion and rejection of the traditional aesthetic, which seeks to honour or celebrate the past, through classical symbolism and the reinforcement of Christian and militaristic rhetoric. Young’s work thus explores memorials that challenge notions of permanency, cohesion, and inviolacy, in order to “truly” or accurately represent the nature of the Holocaust. As he observes, it was often the goal of counter-memorial designers to not merely represent the Holocaust, but through the shape and form of the monument engender reflection, thought, and an emotional connection to its viewers.

With respect to memorial museums, such works as Jonathan Huener’s study on the establishment and redesign of the exhibition spaces at Auschwitz, Harold Marcuse’s *Legacies of Dachau*, and Edward Linenthal’s *Preserving Memory*, have extensively explored the histories of these memorial sites, and the, at times, convoluted path to their creation and development. Marcuse’s work, in keeping with Young’s assertions, connects the establishment of the Dachau memorial museum to the larger political tensions and frustrations of the local community. Tracing the evolution of these tensions between the local authorities and survivor groups, Marcuse reveals how shifting socio-political contexts influenced the creation and content of the memorial, and eventually enabled the establishment of the memorial.


site. Similarly, Edward Linenthal’s work on the development of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) and Huener’s work on the creation of the Auschwitz memorial museum—painstakingly trace the numerous political and strategic decisions, which ultimately influenced the design and construction of these institutions. These works thoroughly cover the politics of remembrance, including the negotiations, debates, challenges, and competing narratives that emerged; however, they ultimately represent a historically grounded approach to these sites.

Within the related field of Museum Studies, though much has been written on memorials and memory as well as varying forms of commemoration, there is very little that has focused exclusively on the specific subset of Holocaust memorial museums. While Susan Sontag\textsuperscript{18} and Andreas Huyssen\textsuperscript{19} have briefly addressed these kinds of sites, Paul Williams has undertaken the most extensive study of different memorial museums throughout the globe.\textsuperscript{20} His work however, does not directly address sites of Holocaust remembrance, yet still remains heavily influenced by them. Examining the memorial museum as a medium through which to communicate an understanding of the past, Williams draws heavily from memory studies, and works related to monuments and memorialisation.\textsuperscript{21} In keeping with the assertions of Huyssen, Williams does not see the distinctions between monuments, memorials, and

\textsuperscript{18} Sontag briefly address the current incarnation of the memorial museum as it applies to the USHMM, Yad Vashem, and Berlin’s Jewish Museum. See: \textit{Regarding the Pain of Others} (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003).

\textsuperscript{19} Similarly, Andreas Huyssen has written a great deal on not only the fading of generational memory, but also the speed of technological modernisation, and its impact on modes of representation and remembrance. See: \textit{Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia} (New York and London: Routledge, 1995).

\textsuperscript{20} There are works that have attempted to bridge this gap between history and museum studies, most notably, Oren Baruch Stier’s \textit{Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust} (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003).

museums as “indurate,” but rather as fluid and interchangeable. To Williams the memorial museum, as an institution “commemorating mass suffering of some kind,” remains fundamentally different from traditional museums, given the extreme nature of the subject matter, the tendency to become mired in much publicized political controversy, and the severe scrutiny that they face.\textsuperscript{22}

Overall his work attempts to address issues related to authenticity in surviving objects, the impact of photography and the use of photographs, the use of space, the politics of museum creation, and the ways in which these sites shape identity and serve to undermine general trends of forgetting. Though these themes are not unique to memorial museums, Williams stresses how such issues as authenticity can carry significantly more weight as these institutions are intended to provide, “tangible proof in the face of…denial of what transpired.”\textsuperscript{23} In this sense he alludes to a fundamental difference, and inherent contradiction within memorial museums. They function both as authoritative state-sanctioned representations and memorials of the events they commemorate, while simultaneously having to defend their legitimacy.

With respect to scholarship related to the development and evolution of the sites under investigation in this study, Bill Niven and Thomas Fox have substantially examined the history of the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück Memorial Museums both under the East German regime and following unification. Overall Niven’s work explores the lingering remnants of East German anti-fascist rhetoric at these sites, which had excluded the suffering of the Jews, homosexuals and other key victims of

\textsuperscript{22} Williams, Memorial Museums, 8.
\textsuperscript{23} Williams, Memorial Museums, 25.
persecution. In addition he explores struggles to control and shape these spaces following the collapse of the Soviet Union, through, for example, his review of the supermarket controversy at Ravensbrück. An earlier study by Fox, *Stated Memory*, focuses upon the layers of East Germany history that continued to appear throughout these sites of remembrance. In addition his work also provides a thorough and detailed rendering of the East German narratives of this site in the pre-unification period during the Cold War.

Overall researchers based at these memorials have put forth the majority of work that specifically addresses the exhibition spaces and educational programmes of these sites. Most recently, Alyn Beßmann and Insa Eschebach’s review of the new exhibition spaces of Ravensbrück, and Günter Morsch’s publications on exhibition spaces at Sachsenhausen, serve as both exhibition catalogues, whilst also offering further research and scholarship into the history of these exhibition spaces. Similarly, for the programmes at the House of the Wannsee Conference, Michael Haupt has published the only comprehensive history of the Wannsee villa, and

---

Annegret Ehmann, Elke Gryglewski, Wolf Kaiser, and Lore Kleiber have published papers specifically detailing the educational initiatives of the site, and pedagogical approaches to teaching the Holocaust. Though there is an extensive body of literature detailing the Holocaust Memorial debate, there is considerably less scholarship on the Information Centre. The most notable exception to this is Irit Dekel’s recent sociological study on the impact of the memorial’s educational programmes.

Addressing the Gaps

Though Holocaust memory and memorialisation remains an ever-growing field of study, gaps within the literature remain. Historical approaches largely ignore the influences of museum studies and theories related to memorialisation though they remained informed by them. Similarly, publications put forth by these institutions are limited in their analyses of these exhibition spaces, choosing instead to present the outcome of their work (the content of exhibitions spaces, specific educational

---

33 Background and information on the development of the Information Centre can be found in Materials on the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Berlin: Nicolai in association with the Foundation for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, 2005).
34 Irit Dekel, Meditation at the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
workshops, and so forth), and to focus upon the rationale behind their designs and implementation, with minimal critical analysis beyond these immediate outcomes. Overall scholarship that systematically applies theories of globalisation to current educational programmes at these sites of memory in Germany is absent from this literature, and the specific sites I wish to explore have been largely under-represented in the field (especially in English-language publications as is evident from the previous sections). Though scholarship related to collective memory and the role of the nation state in shaping the content of these sites have been firmly established in the field of Holocaust Studies, supra-national influences and the incorporation of concepts of global-memory theory of the Holocaust remains underdeveloped.

Dominated largely by historical approaches, as well as the literature produced by the memorial foundations themselves, this thesis will offer a new approach to reviewing these sites by analysing them within the framework of globalised Holocaust memory, and by presenting an interdisciplinary approach to this material that will draw upon the varying fields of Holocaust Studies (Museum Studies, Holocaust education, Memory Studies, and the literature related to survivor testimonies). Utilising the framework outlined below, this project will address the gaps identified above, in order to produce a close analysis of the educational programmes and exhibition spaces of these four sites of remembrance.

**Theoretical Framework**

In large part this chapter will be based upon the work of Levy and Sznaider, who assess the shifting nature of ‘collective memory’ in an increasingly transnational and global age.\(^\text{35}\) In part Levy and Sznaider build upon the previous theorists within the

field, most notably Maurice Halbwachs.\textsuperscript{36} Halbwachs’ work is predicated on the notion that individual and personal memory will always be situated within a larger framework of socially prescribed memories. Individuals use these collectives to structure and shape an understanding of the past that is intelligible, and in accordance with the dominant views and preconceptions of the present or existing society to which they belong. According to Halbwachs, collective memory endures and draws strength from a group—whether that be a family, association, corporation, socio-economic segment of society, or national community—possessing a distinct identity, and delineated by specific spatial and temporal boundaries.

Levy and Sznaider directly critique scholarship that seeks to utilise Halbwachs’ theoretical framework in support of national forms of remembrance and memory. In examining memory in the post-Cold War period, their work fundamentally questions how one defines the boundaries of legitimate memory communities. Additionally, they challenge the clear elevation, and perceived legitimacy of, lived experience (or ‘authentic’ experience) and social memory over historical (or ‘superficial’) memory and ‘constructed’ representations of the past, as is delineated by the nation state.\textsuperscript{37} Memories, or representations of events, that lack a clear connection to lived experience are, through this perspective, deemed ‘alien.’ In particular they cite Pierre Nora’s well-known work, \textit{Lieux de Mémoire}, as a primary proponent of this viewpoint, in which there exists a clear separation between ‘authentic’ memory, and ‘substitutes for living tradition.’\textsuperscript{38} Levy and Sznaider criticize this view as heavily dependent upon a nationalist understanding of memory,

which ignores the degree to which the nation state and notions of national heritage and cultural tradition were themselves constructed forms of identity, which clashed with previous locally based notions of community. Instead they seek to apply the notion of a collective form of memory to a broader global context.

It comes as little surprise therefore, that Levy and Sznaider look more favourably upon the work of Benedict Anderson, as well as the theories of Jan and Aleida Assmann—the latter of which distinguishes between communicative and cultural memory. To the Assmanns, memory undergoes a process, by which it is transformed from lived memory (e.g. the memory of witnesses) to a prolific form of institutional memory (e.g. museums, memorial sites, monuments, archives). Levy and Sznaider incorporate this shift from communicative to cultural memory into their theoretical framework, viewing it as indicative of the larger transition from a national to a global form of remembrance. In an increasingly media driven and globalised context, the nation state is no longer the sole shaper of memory, but rather technology and media (as well as interconnected cultural interests) influence the formation of cultural memory. Ultimately, their theory criticises the distinction between “authentic” forms of memory derived from lived experience, and the perceived emptiness of historical or cultural memory, characterised by “constructed” representations of the past. Challenging this hierarchal classification of memory, they instead argue that one form of memory is not inherently more legitimate or authentic than the other.

41 Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 30–31.
Consequently, in the view of Levy and Sznaider, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is increasingly clear that trends connected to globalisation have contributed to the formation of memory and the nature of memorialisation in Germany and abroad. Globalisation thus reconfigures our spatial and temporal collective identities, by making it clear that society is no longer necessarily tied to a fixed territorial space. This is in part due to the impact of media and the easy exchange of cultural materials and ideas. Temporal boundaries collapse, as one can gain knowledge of global events virtually or instantaneously. Furthermore, the growth of the Internet has allowed previously buried events to resurface and once again become the focal point of international discussion. In addition, the Internet ideally presents information in a non-hierarchical way as the voices of academics, amateurs and charlatans co-mingle, and socio-cultural memory is less and less formed by, and dependent upon, a single central narrative of the past. Ultimately, Levy and Sznaider interpret these media-driven shifts in a positive light, noting how reactions to globalising forces further define the identity of individual communities, thus helping to establish a more, “self-aware, reflexive outlook that recognises the world as an arena of experiences…and global conditions.”

Still the notion that the Internet and new media merely facilitates the free exchange of ideas, as a neutral medium requires further qualification. As the Internet both facilitates global connections, it also, particularly with the growth of visual media, fosters “diasporic connections,” the development of ethnic and national divides, and the endurance of racial prejudice. For example, though the Internet was initially viewed as a means of facilitating colour-blindness and even a form of

---

racial tourism\textsuperscript{44}, Daniels explores the ways in which it continues to solidify racial group identities and entrenched social hierarchies. As she notes, increased interconnectedness does not necessarily mean more culturally diverse interaction, but at times provides a means for individuals of the same cultural, ethnic, and religious background to connect. At times this results in the growth of far-right groups espousing antisemitism, Neo-Nazism, Holocaust-denial, and, through the establishment of community websites, bigotry and prejudice.\textsuperscript{45}

Meddaugh, in her review of ‘cyber denial,’ notes in particular how the Internet provides a “unique linguistic space in which to subvert discourses of legitimate historiography.”\textsuperscript{46} Information sources are no longer transparent as web addresses can mask organisational and sponsorship ties, thus disguising political and racial agendas.\textsuperscript{47} Furthermore the Internet enables anyone with computer and Internet access to publish and establish websites on whatever subject they choose.\textsuperscript{48} This ‘democratisation’ of the publication process has resulted in a plethora of independent blogging and news channels, but also the diminishment and dilution of ethical

\textsuperscript{44} Racial tourism refers to when one intentionally misrepresents one’s ethnic identity online. Daniels offers a particularly interesting discussion on the ways in which identity is masked on the Internet through both intentional misdirection (misleading URLs and domain names), and the lack of clarity regarding funding, sponsorship, and commercial and political objectives.


\textsuperscript{47} Daniels, “Race and racism,” 705.

\textsuperscript{48} Note for example the rise of such websites as Wordpress, Tumblr, Blogger, YouTube, and numerous others.
publication practices and journalistic standards. As Meddaugh posits, such sites as the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) are able to promote Holocaust denial through the “guise of free expression and the pursuit of knowledge.” In order to bolster its legitimacy, Meddaugh notes how the site purposefully fosters the “illusion…of multiple voices engaged in dialogic interaction” through, “technical exploitation and textual repetition.”

With respect to Holocaust education and the Internet, Lazar and Hirsch remain wary of the issues addressed above. Lazar and Hirsch draw upon the work of Glanz, Lindquist, and Marnfра and Stoddard, who acknowledge the possible benefits of working with Internet resources, but also the potential dangers of accruing misinformation from Holocaust denial websites and sites that lack historical rigour. They argue that educators should remain aware of the ways in which their students may utilise Internet resources to gather answers and information about the Holocaust (such as Yahoo! Answers). Furthermore they should also address the biased and

---


51 Meddaugh, “Holocaust Denial, Cyberspace,” 141.

52 Meddaugh, “Holocaust Denial, Cyberspace,” 142.

often subjective nature of the information available, and be prepared to discuss these issues with their students.54

Apart from the blatant misuse and manipulation of the Internet to mask political and ideological agendas, there persists the more general problem of the ‘digital divide,’ or the “gap between those who do and do not have access to computers and the Internet.”55 Warschauer, in his exploration of technology and social inclusion, remains critical of earlier interpretations of the digital divide, which argue that “social problems can be addressed through [simply] providing computers and Internet accounts.”56 Instead he argues for a ‘socially inclusive’ approach, which pays sufficient “attention to the human and social systems that must also change for technology to make a difference.”57 In other words, according to Warschauer, in order for the digital divide to be breached one must take into account factors beyond accessibility, but also “content and language, literacy and education, and community and institutional structures,” as well as access to professional technological support and guidance.58 Similarly, Daniels notes how the availability of the Internet, computer technology, and mediums of communication are at times insufficient to facilitate engagement from minority groups in particular, as there is often a lack of a “perceived social benefit” in utilising these resources.59

Additionally, Pick and Sarkar in their quantitative study of the global digital divide note, for example not only geographical variations, but also a perceive gender gap in information and communication technology (ICT). In part this is a result of a

---

54 Lazar and Hirsch, “An online partner,” 123.
56 Warschauer, Technology and Social Inclusion, 1.
57 Warschauer, Technology and Social Inclusion, 6.
58 Warschauer, Technology and Social Inclusion, 6.
59 Daniels, “Race and racism,” 703.
lower average income for women, and an overall lack of access to education and resources.\textsuperscript{60} In addition sexual discrimination and online harassment within certain online communities (as typified in the recent Gamer-gate controversy of August 2014) discourage professional and more in-depth female interaction with ICT, thus contributing to this gender gap. Moreover, the types of connectivity (mobile networks versus DSL), and communication available (blogging, twitter, Facebook, community forums), can impact usage and the ways in which different groups and regions accesses ICT. Additionally, seemingly ‘free sources’ of information such as Open Educational Resources (OER)—including online courses available from such major universities as MIT, Stanford, and Columbia—are, as posited by Knox, also problematic. Still connected to brick and mortar institutions, assessment criteria are not typically adjusted to reflect the online structure and independent learning methodology of the course. The emphasis on self-driven education also minimises the role of pedagogy and the importance of mentoring and other forms of interactive guidance.\textsuperscript{61}

Overall in response to the concept of globalisation as a whole, Jean-Marc Dreyfus and Marcel Stoetzel criticise Levy and Sznaider’s thesis by questioning whether or not international commemoration necessarily denotes a ‘globalised’ form of memory that is cohesive enough to provide a “social framework of Holocaust memory.”\textsuperscript{62} Rather they uphold Nora’s distinction between ‘true’ or ‘natural’ forms of memory, and his thesis that hollow gestures and traditions increasingly serve as

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{61} Jeremy Knox, “Five critiques of the open educational resources movement,” Teaching in Higher Education 18 no. 8 (2013): 821.
\end{flushright}
‘substitutes’ for ‘authentic’ memory. In their view, Levy and Sznaider have not adequately demonstrated how a globalised self-aware community is able to provide a social or collective framework in which to acquire and interpret these memories. Cosmopolitan memory in their view is thus too thin and undefined a concept, does not clearly define the participants of this global community, and fails to fully account for the extent to which shared historical tropes of the Holocaust are in fact interpreted and appropriated in different ways by different nation states. Thus, in their view, for example Holocaust Remembrance Day (27 January) will be commemorated through the lens of a predominately British experience in the United Kingdom, and will be distinct from ceremonies in Poland, Germany, and elsewhere.

Similarly Plessow, in his investigation of the European Commission’s efforts to create a pan-European path to commemorate the Holocaust and the mass crimes of the last century, ultimately concludes that the creation of this memory is “not situated in a free market of opinions that are offered solely on their own merits.”63 Rather, through his examination of networking conferences, he finds that those institutions that are already well established and highly interconnected are better able to dominate meetings, and obtain and secure available funding. Moreover, though there are debates between individuals and institutional actors, the Commission often “resorted to pre-formed networks with discrete positions on the historical place of Nazism and Communism,” in order to establish their agenda.64 Thus Plessow argues

64 Plessow, “Interplay of the European Commission”, 388.
against “a convergence of positions that would result in a new and stable overarching meta-network,” and the creation of a “common European vision of the past.”

Once more, Aleida Assmann also explores the notion of varied yet collective national memories in her overview of globalised memory theories. Assmann posits that each nation experienced and thus remembers the Second World War and the Holocaust differently. There exists a shared history of the Holocaust, which grounds a network of collective national memories, each of which is distinct. Cautioning against “painting [national memories] with too broad a brush” she posits that global memory is in fact a constellation of different self-critical national memories, which form an intricate interlocking web of understandings that in themselves do not necessarily amount to a globalised memory.

Furthermore, Irit Dekel, in adopting the outlook of Peter Carrier, is also sceptical of the notion that national memorial sites are able to coherently unify memory “around a shared meaning.” Yet instead of focusing upon global shifts, she observes a parallel trend, in which personal and subjective interpretations of memorial sites, help to create a plurality of meanings, which preclude the formation of a ‘single figurative meaning’—national, global or otherwise. Dekel thus attempts to comprehend the formation of this memory through a sociological lens, which examines not only the wider political and cultural context upon which these interpretations are based, but also, the actual responses and reactions of visitors, spectators, and students, who visit the memorial space. Her work thus seeks to bridge the gap between theory and practice; and between the original intentions and
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conceptions of the memorial designers, and the actual way in which visitors interpret and interact with these sites.

Yet the continuation of national forms of remembrance does not hinder a globalised understanding of Holocaust memory. Despite the views of Dreyfus and Stoetzler, this thesis will argue that globalised memory is not a superficial and undefined concept, “predominately in the form of quasi-rituals and de-historicised narratives.” Furthermore the notion that memory is in fact a constellation of different national forms fails to address the reflexivity of globalisation, and the permeability of ideas across national boundaries. Though still a nascent concept, evidence pointing to the formation of a supra-national or globalised form of collective remembrance with respect to the Holocaust is evident through the internationally minded educational programmes offered at these sites; their own self-reflective awareness of national narratives as well as international interpretations of Holocaust memory; and the inter-connectedness of Holocaust education and memorialisation, which seeks to coordinate the development of these programmes and resources. In attempting to demonstrate how these sites both reflect and contribute to trends of globalisation, it will be necessary to identify the characteristics of globalised memory. The following section will thus sketch the fundamental aspects and trends that accompany the globalisation of Holocaust memory in recent years.

**Defining Globalised Memory**

How do we define globalised memory of the Holocaust, and what are its common characteristics? Why does Holocaust education and history lend itself so readily to
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68 Dreyfus and Stoetzler, “Holocaust Memory,” 75.
discussions on (collective, cultural, communicative, and now globalised) memory? How has the Holocaust been established as a universally recognised, paradigm of genocide?

Before progressing forward the terminology utilised in this section requires further clarification. As is clear from the previous section the terms ‘globalisation’ and ‘cosmopolitanism’ are conceptually interlinked yet remain distinct from one another. Cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan memory as it is utilised by Levy and Sznaider refers specifically to the process of “internal globalisation,” or the ways in which global concerns and forces provide the “political and moral frame of references for local experiences.” Cosmopolitanism is not merely a synonym for the development of global trends, but specifically refers to the interplay of globalising and localising forces. Furthermore, as they assert, their understanding of cosmopolitanism is largely unburdened from the Kantian concept of cosmopolitan democracy, which is based upon a form of universalism, and collectively accepted and adopted notions of political, civic, and human rights.

Taking a sociological approach, cosmopolitanism is thus largely focused upon the ways in which local memories are influenced and ‘patterned’ by larger global processes and concerns. To Levy and Sznaider, this specific understanding of cosmopolitanism as it applies to the Holocaust, is tied directly to the growth of technology and new media, which facilitates the wider interchange of ideas at both the global and local level.

Though informed heavily by the work of Levy and Sznaider this study will
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69 Levy and Sznaider utilise this term initially posited by Ulrich Beck. Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 2.
70 Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 3.
72 Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 3.
employ the term ‘globalisation’ and ‘globalising’ or ‘globalised’ memory in order to characterise the process of remembrance and memorialisation in Berlin and Brandenburg in the post-unification period. Globalisation serves as an inclusive term, referencing not only the sociological analysis of Levy and Szaider’s cosmopolitanism, but also the fundamental economic and political anxieties that are attached to the interchanges between international forces and local communities. As will be evident later in this section it will be not only the impact of mass media, that will inform this study, but also a multiplicity of forces. Globalising memory as it relates to tourism, commercialism, and the ethics of consumption will be explored in greater detail in subsequent chapters. This exploration will be in addition to a review of the impact and engagement of globalising forces on education, and shifting conceptual understandings of local and national communities. Though it is beyond the scope of this study to fully explore the economic dimensions of globalisation and how it impacts memory of the Holocaust, the utilisation of this term affords the opportunity for future development and exploration of this concept.

This section will subsequently attempt to define and identify characteristics of a globalised memory of the Holocaust. Aleida Assmann, through
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74 Bauman’s review of the spatial freedom of tourism and the economic irony that exists between tourism and vagrancy is particularly intriguing. Through his work he outlines a dichotomy between involuntary vagrancy as a result of globalising forces, and the luxury of international tourism. This trend reflects similar tensions between the rise of Holocaust tourism and memorials dedicated to persecuted ethnic minority groups, and the simultaneous neglect and persecution of these same communities. These contradictions will be discussed in greater detail later in this study.
her work on current trends in cultural memory theory, highlights key aspects and trends that have contributed to the perceived establishment (or construction) of a globalised memory of the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{75} Firstly, she identifies the “historical memory” of the event. The Holocaust was inherently global in nature, with respect to its impact, and its decidedly transnational scope. The sheer number of different national and ethnic groups affected by it, the mass expulsion and displacement of groups, and the territorial scope of the conflict—all attest to the global impact of the Holocaust. As Assmann notes there thus exists an “experiential link between memory and the event,” which underpins a collective connection to the Holocaust. Or in other words, the vast scope of the event and the number of groups affected by it has fostered a collective experiential memory and history of the event.

Yet as stated previously, this alone is not sufficient to account for the growing trend in globalised memory that has rapidly developed since the early 2000s. Furthermore the experiential link between historical events and memory cannot account for the massive interest in the Holocaust within such nations as the United States for example.\textsuperscript{76} Though the US was affected by the genocide, one cannot argue that it was on scale equal to that of continental Europe. Global fascination with the event has grown since the end of the Cold War. As Assmann notes, memory of the Holocaust was purposefully ‘forgotten’ for decades, and thus the drive towards globalisation, must necessarily be based upon more than just a shared history.

In addition, this highlights the inherently European or Western significance of the Holocaust. Arguably, to say that the it is a global event due to its history and historical impact exposes how supposedly ‘global’ forms of commemoration and

\textsuperscript{75} Assmann, “Global Memory?” 97–117.
\textsuperscript{76} The primary proponent of this sceptical view is the American historian Peter Novick. See, \textit{The Holocaust and Collective Memory: The American Experience} (London: Bloomsbury, 1999), 1–18.
memorialisation are largely absent in other parts of the world including Latin America, South East Asia, and the Middle East. Regions of the world that do not share this common history—or in which the history of the Second World War and the Holocaust are not as prominent—go quietly unmentioned in discussions on the global memory of the Holocaust. Thus it is necessary to qualify our conceptualisation of ‘globalised’ memory to a decidedly European or Western outlook.

Levy and Sznaider go on to connect globalised memory to the process of deterritorialisation and re-territorialisation, as ‘cultural particularities’ are displaced from their local and national contexts. In their estimation culture and memory are removed from closed national spaces with the growth of technological media, which enables information to transcend national and physical borders. This contributes to the ‘globalising’ of culture, and the movement and adoption of cultural trends.

Secondly, the establishment of supranational memory structures, such as the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research (ITF, now IHRA), contributes to an international collective of Holocaust remembrance. Founded in 1998 on the initiative of the Swedish Prime Minister Göran Persson, the initial member states included the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Israel. At present, the IHRA has thirty-one member countries, eight observer countries and seven Permanent International Partners. All members must ascribe to the Stockholm Declaration, and be committed to a cooperative delegation, which seeks to strengthen Holocaust education and awareness. The Declaration
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consists of eight points, with its primary goals being to acknowledge the magnitude of the Holocaust, defend against Holocaust denial, commemorate and honour its victims, “promote education, remembrance and research,” and “encourage the study of the Holocaust in all its dimensions.”

In order to ensure that the Holocaust would become a ‘common’ or shared memory amongst its member states, the IHRA designated 27 January, or the date of the liberation of Auschwitz, as Holocaust Remembrance Day. Furthermore, the criteria to assume full membership status in the IHRA require prospective governments to prove that they are democratic in nature, undergo at least two teacher-training courses organised by the IHRA on the Holocaust, adopt the above-mentioned day of remembrance, and send delegates to working groups on Holocaust education, memorials and museums, and communication.

As noted by Assmann, the creation of supranational organisations in order to coordinate Holocaust educational programmes and commemorative practices does not erase national ceremonies and forms of commemoration. For example, the United States and Israel observe Yom HaShoah on the 27th day of Nissan in addition to the internationally recognised day of remembrance. Furthermore distinct national narratives of the Holocaust can be downplayed in order to create a ‘unified’ form of transnational memory. Membership in the IHRA can be problematic in this respect, as it can both raise the prestige of a member nation, whilst simultaneously allowing them to evade awkward aspects of their own tainted past, or alternatively, to avoid

---

facing current uncomfortable truths or realities.\footnote{Assmann, “Global Memory?” 105.} This notion of memory competitions will be explored further in Chapter 2.

The IHRA however, is arguably part of a larger trend of international cooperation on Holocaust commemoration and education. Regardless of their stance on globalised memory, Dreyfus and Stoetzler do concede that 2005 marked an auspicious year for Holocaust remembrance with the sixtieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. The United Nations General Assembly, for example, held an official ceremony to commemorate the Holocaust for the first time, and voted to collectively condemn Holocaust denial. Similarly, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe, and the European Parliament, all held events and ceremonies in commemoration of the Holocaust.\footnote{Dreyfus and Stoetzler, “Holocaust Memory,” 70.}

Yet what is at issue, is not whether or not supranational commemorative ceremonies have supplanted or superseded national acts of commemoration, but rather, how perceptions have changed since the formal implementation of these internationally based structures of remembrance. Macgilchrist and Christophe for example see the development of global interdependencies, which have arisen as a result of improvements in communication, transportation, and technology, as facilitating a “\textit{cognitive shift} in the way the world is seen by observers.”\footnote{Felicitas Macgilchrist and Barbara Christophe, “Translating globalization theories into educational research: thoughts on recent shifts in Holocaust education,” \textit{Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education} 32 no. 1 (2011): 146. Italics in original quote.} It is not merely the creation of these supranational structures that is significant, but rather their impact on the observer. Individuals and nations are now ever more aware of “the ways in which distant events can affect local fortunes (and vice versa).”\footnote{Macgilchrist and Christophe, “Translating globalization,” 146.}
their view, technological improvements in communication have made local or national communities cognisant of how global events can impact them, and in turn how they can affect societies outside of their own borders. National educational programmes, according to Macgilchrist and Christophe, explicitly address this trend through the social sciences, by emphasising global connections and interdependencies that extend beyond the nation state. Students are thus shaped to be citizens of a global community, and are made aware of their own role in shaping and being shaped by this globalised community.

Supranational structures, as described above, both perpetuate and have come about as a result of this shift in our perceptions. As is evident from the founding principles of the IHRA, the decision to create the organisation was based upon the perception that each member state shared a common set of values, interests, and initiatives, which could best be realised through an international mediating body. Arguably, the relevant point is not whether or not national forms of commemoration are being lost, but rather, why is there a common desire to create international organisations in order to mediate this history, if not for a shift in perceptions and understandings that acknowledge the development of a globalised understanding of the Holocaust. A sense of at least European interconnectedness preceded the formation of these organisations. Rather than merely imposing a view from above, which “overwrites” national narratives, such organisations are reflective of a desire to coordinate the commemoration and memorialisation of this shared history.84 Member nations enter into these organisations willingly, understanding that in doing so they are sacrificing a certain degree of independence, in order to acknowledge and achieve their collective goals. Anxieties over such organisations as the IHRA are
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surprising contradictions—as they both point out how such organisations are incapable of completely supplanting national memory, while at the same time decry how they create an undifferentiated generic history of the Holocaust.

Macgilchrist and Christophe’s work points to an additional aspects of globalised memory. A theme reiterated throughout this section is the importance of technological communications in fostering global interchanges and the development of a perceived global community. With the growth of the Internet, and the general ease with which information travels, improvements in communication facilitate the creation of what they term “global selection horizons.” In their view, given the amount of information that is now readily and easily accessible to everyone, the “horizon to which we look for possible options when making a decision is increasingly a global one.” Though they acknowledge that not everyone will attempt to harness this information in the same way, there is a mutual desire to be “understood by others” and to refine how we communicate in light of these global forums in order to avoid running “the risk of remaining unnoticed or becoming irrelevant.”

In addition significant demographic changes throughout Europe, have further contributed to the conceptual development of a globalised society. Increased immigration from outside of Europe (e.g. Turkey, Syria, East Asia, and the Indian subcontinent), and the free movement of labourers within the EU—has ultimately contributed to a more ethnically and culturally diverse population. Consequently, anxiety over how to reconcile these demographic changes with existing national legacies and traditional conceptions of ‘Frenchness’ or ‘Germanness’ for example, has grown. These anxieties have, to an extent, manifested themselves in increasingly

85 Macgilchrist and Christophe, “Translating globalization,” 149.
hostile reactionary groups. Since 2001, and since the onset of the economic crisis of 2007, a growth in anti-immigration sentiment has fuelled the rise of such far-right groups as the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), the anti-Islamic Patriotic Europeans against the Islamisation of the West (PEGIDA) in Germany, and the radically conservative Golden Dawn party in Greece.86

This crisis of identity however is not one-sided. Second-generation children of immigrant families at times struggle to mediate the values, traditions and practices of their parents’ culture with the norms and expectations of the societies in which they are raised. With respect to education, de-facto segregation, language barriers, and latent marginalisation can hinder student development and cultural integration. As noted by Macgilchrist and Christophe, efforts to integrate and recognise the needs of students from migrant backgrounds at times sends a muddled message, as outward celebrations of multiculturalism are presented alongside, “the unspoken—but embodied—discourses of Whiteness, Orientalism and anti-Islamic post-9/11 threat.”87 At the same time Holocaust educators often cite the difficulties of teaching to fourth generation students, as well as students from non-European backgrounds, who do not always understand how or why they should inherit the burden of the Holocaust—with its narratives of collective guilt, atonement, and remembrance. Holocaust education at the House of the Wannsee Conference attempts to find a middle ground through seminars, which directly address how the Holocaust was

86 In the fall of 2014 PEGIDA held ongoing mass demonstrations against the perceived ‘Islamisization of Europe.’ These protests have drawn thousands of participants, though the group has since seen the breakdown of its leadership. Robert Roßmann, “Merkel verurteilt ‘Kälte und Hass’ bei Pegida,” Süddeutsche Zeitung, 31 December 2014, accessed 13 March 2015, http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/neujahrsansprache-der-kanzlerin-merkel-verurteilt-kaelte-und-hass-bei-pegida-1.2287216. The recent Syrian refugee crisis has similarly exposed tensions and resentments within the European Union over policies of immigration and asylum.

87 Macgilchrist and Christophe, “Translating globalization,” 150.
linked to non-European communities. This particular programme will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 1.

Furthermore, Assmann points to the ways in which the Holocaust has been transformed into a **universal norm or global icon**. She notes in particular the theory put forth by Dan Diner, that the Holocaust is simultaneously a **particular and universal** event. Particular, in that it reflects a specific “experience undergone by Jews,” and a “singular circumstance of extermination”; yet universal in that it is a transgression that “marks a rupture in civilisation (Zivilisationsbruch) that is carried out upon all humankind.”

The former view represents, according to Diner a historical perspective, which acknowledges the unique historical circumstances of the event. Alternatively, the latter view presents an anthropological perspective, which seeks to answer such broad ethical questions as ‘Why?’ and ‘How?’ Diner argues that in seeking answers to such questions there is the need to generalise the Holocaust, and to remove it from its specific historical context. Alexander for example, points to the ways in which the Holocaust, in representing a ‘paradigmatic collective trauma’ is thus utilised as a generic “reference point” by which to measure morality and evil.

He argues that the Holocaust has become a “universal symbol whose very existence has created historically unprecedented opportunities for ethnic, racial, and religious justice.”

Addressing these concerns, Levy and Snaider argue that globalised memory of the Holocaust seeks to blur the boundaries between the universal and the particular.
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The two are no longer opposing forces, but rather, “act together to determine a horizon of experiences that is fraught with discontinuities and uncertainties.” In other words, the notion of the universal and particular is closely tied to the national and the global, respectively. When applied to the Holocaust, the blurring of boundaries between the particular event and its universal meaning reveals the delicate balance between understanding the event as an antisemitic genocide, and at the same time being able to recognise the Holocaust’s implications regarding ethics, the boundaries of representation, and the limits of modernity and civilisation.

Assmann notes however, that when the ‘historical memory’ of the Holocaust is transformed into a global icon it is reduced, condensed, fragmented, and reshaped. This restructuring eases its ‘remediation’ into new contexts, though often in problematic ways. De-contextualisation, symbolic reconstruction, emphasis on empathy and emotional identification with the events, the application of rhetorical tropes, and analogies that seek to apply the lessons of the Holocaust to other genocides (at times indiscriminately)—have all contributed to the ‘universalising’ of the event. As a global icon the Holocaust is no longer bound to a particular location in space and time, but rather travels “freely across national and cultural borders,” transcends historical experiences, and acquires the status of a “secular norm.” The Holocaust thus comes to embody tropes and general moral lessons against the marginalisation and discrimination of ethnic groups, the blind and unquestioning obedience to authority, societal indifference, and the violation of human rights.
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These generalised tropes can be globally applied, thus extending the ‘memory community’ of the Holocaust irrespective of its particular historical context.\(^{94}\)

This trend has been most heavily criticised with respect to the ‘Americanisation’ of the Holocaust, which has in the estimation of Levy and Sznaider become a generalised critique of the perceived ‘McDonaldisation’ or ‘Disneyfication’ of European culture (e.g. its “cultural homogenisation” and commodification).\(^{95}\) ‘Americanisation,’ in the view of Levy and Sznaider, is directly connected to the vilification of mass culture, and the notion that the Holocaust has been “instrumentalised” for dubious purposes such as Hollywood entertainment, the economic or financial exploitation of tragedy, or generic liberal causes that have little connection to the historically grounded events of the Holocaust.\(^{96}\) As a result, this history is subsequently distorted to fit an overly optimistic or generalised narrative that emphasises survival over destruction, and triumph and success over adversity. This concept will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 2.

To summarise, factors contributing to the formation of a globalised memory of the Holocaust, and characteristics of globalisation, include the following:

1. Historical Memory—The Inherently Global History of The Event
2. Supranational Memory Structures
3. Cognitive Shifts—Conceptualising a Global Society
4. Technological Improvements in Communication
5. Demographic Changes
6. Its Dual Nature as a Particular and Universal Event
7. Its Transformation into a Global Icon
8. ‘Americanisation’ and Commercialisation

\(^{94}\) Assmann, “Global Memory?” 113.
\(^{95}\) Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 9.
\(^{96}\) Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 134–135.
All of the points above will be applied to the four memorial sites of this study, and explored in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

**Methodology**

This study will examine four sites of remembrance in Berlin and the surrounding state of Brandenburg. Given that Berlin is the capital of the unified German Republic, and has seen a tremendous growth in the number of memorials, museums, and monuments dedicated not only to the Holocaust, but also to the East German and National Socialist period—I will seek to explore this culture of remembrance. The central location of these sites, their relative accessibility, placement within the capital city of Germany, and the support they receive from the federal and state governments—attest to their significance and prominence both in Germany and abroad. 97 Though these sites are not necessarily representative of the whole of German memorial culture, their international reputations are indicative of their leading role in the wider formation of institutional Holocaust memory and remembrance. Though the Topography of Terror and Jewish Museum of Berlin would have been logical options for inclusion in this project, limitations of time and scope prevented this. Furthermore, their focus is arguably not solely on the victims of National Socialist persecution, but more heavily upon the administrative apparatus of the National Socialist system, and the history of Jewish-German culture as a whole, respectively.

In focusing on sites whose primary concern is the Holocaust and the crimes perpetrated under National Socialism, these four sites present a representative cross-section of memorials with divergent histories and various links to the East and West

---

97 The exception to this is of course the Ravensbrück Memorial, which is situated outside of Berlin in Fürstenberg-Havel.
German past. The Wannsee memorial, while established after unification, is directly connected to and representative of the evolution of West German memorial culture. Furthermore the primary aim of the site is weighted in favour of its educational seminars and workshops rather than its exhibition space. Alternatively, the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück memorial museums were established well before unification by the former East German government. Their histories extend beyond the National Socialist period and well into the post-war Soviet military occupation. The layered historical topographies of these sites, and ties to the now defunct GDR, present an added dimension of complexity and insight into the nature of German identity and memorialisation since the end of the Cold War. Finally, the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe is an essential site of memory given the memorial’s role as the national memorial to the Holocaust in Germany. Though the memorial underwent a long and circuitous path before the approval of the final design and its overall completion, its history is not significantly tied to the pre-unification period. Rather it has come to firmly represent unified Germany’s relationship to the Holocaust. Even spatially the memorial remains purposefully situated in a central, yet historically neutral space.

From this sample of memorial sites, this study will primarily draw upon the content of the exhibition spaces and educational programmes as its primary sources of evidence. Throughout my research, I was fortunate enough to travel to each of these sites numerous times over the course of four years, which has afforded me the opportunity to view these exhibitions in detail, observe visitors, and interview permanent staff. From my field research I have gathered statistical information,
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98 Though the initiative to create the memorial did begin in the late 1980s, the final design was not approved until 1999, and construction was not completed until 2005. Arguably, the memorial is more reflective of post-unification memorial culture than of the Cold War era.
photographs, and published and unpublished educational resources, which I have utilised in this study. Though exhibition spaces are a fundamental resource of this project, this term generically refers to the grounds of the memorial in their entirety, (both developed and underdeveloped spaces), physical, digital, and temporary exhibitions; as well as any monuments, statues, and memorials located within the grounds of the site. Exhibition catalogues, brochures, and subsequent publications and articles on these spaces also serve as significant sources of information. Educational materials refer to worksheets and activity sheets, online materials and lesson plans, videos and documentaries, published collections of primary sources, and other published materials (online or in print) related to these programmes. As part of this research I interviewed several members of staff in the educational departments at each of these sites, in order to better understand the implementation of their programmes, common issues and concerns they face, and the structure of their institution.

I conducted these interviews with members of the memorial and educational staff between the summer of 2012 and the summer of 2014. Furthermore, in August of 2013 I was fortunate enough to shadow a guided tour at the House of the Wannsee Conference, and was also invited to participate in educational activities with a work group at Ravensbrück that same month. All of these activities proved helpful in broadening my understanding of how the educational programmes at these sites are implemented and received by participants. The insight and guidance provided by staff members has been crucial to understanding the operation of the educational centre, as well as the primary themes and topics of the seminar programmes. Though these sources cannot be representative of these institutions as
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a whole, they do help to identify particular thematic trends and common problems associated with pedagogical practices at this site.

Each interview ran typically from one hour to two hours in length. It should be noted however that throughout my trips in the summer it was not unusual to meet more than once with museum staff. Instead of utilising previously established questions, I conducted loosely framed interviews around general topics and points of discussion. All names and titles of the interviewees have been masked in order to protect their identities. Additionally, interviews were not voice-recorded, but rather notes of what was discussed were taken during the interview in accordance with the request of the interviewees. Consequently, quotations from these interviews have not been included in this text, but rather information from these discussions has proven fundamental to understanding the general operation of the educational programmes of these sites, new projects and pedagogical developments, and common issues and areas of concern that could impact the delivery of these programmes. Overall topics of discussion included connections to local schools and international educational groups, common seminar topics and how they are implemented, the redevelopment of digital and physical spaces at these sites, the evolution of the educational programmes, and their own role at the institution.

The drawbacks of this method include reluctance on the part of staff members to fully share their work and teaching materials. Additionally, staff members were either new or even left the organisation shortly after our interview and therefore could not be contacted to provide further follow up information. Their experiential knowledge was either limited or lost. Furthermore, building relationships that would allow direct voice recording for example takes time, as
well as proof that these materials will be used responsibly. Publication is the best way to demonstrate a responsible application of this information, yet this can paradoxically only come after the completion of this project. With time and the development of stronger academic credentials this situation may change, but at present this proved the greatest drawback to this method.

Furthermore, merely shadowing a handful of groups does not provide a complete understanding of how these programmes are implemented. Should this project be developed to include student reactions to and reception of this material, I would need to observe a greater number of participating groups. Though my understanding of student reactions is limited as a result of this minimal sample, shadowing these groups still proved helpful in developing an understanding of the educational programmes at this site.

Overall this study, in choosing to focus on four sites of remembrance remains limited in its scope. This leaves room for further investigation of globalising trends through a wider-German, or multi-national review of memorial sites. Furthermore, this study does not address visitor reactions to these memorial spaces. Though this is beyond the scope of this project, it would prove a valuable avenue of investigation for future research.

**Research Aims and Objectives**

Throughout the course of this project I will explore the points above in relation to the history, exhibition spaces, and educational programmes of the House of the Wannsee Conference, Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück Memorial Museums, and the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. The primary aim of this project will be to explore the ways in which these sites reflect and
incorporate the above trends, and contribute to a globalised memory of the Holocaust. In addition, it will explore how national and local forms of memory continue to endure and influence the content of educational programmes at these sites, largely in reaction to these globalising trends. Given the existing gaps in the scholarship related to Holocaust memorial museums, and the impact of globalised memory in the post-unification period, this study will provide further insight into recent German memorial culture and common issues and concerns that arise as a result of these shifts.

Chapter 1 will explore the ways in which the new exhibition spaces and educational programmes at the House of the Wannsee Conference Memorial and Educational Centre have, since the early 2000s, contributed to the formation of a globalised memory of the Holocaust. Secondly, with respect to Dreyfus and Stoetzler’s assertion of entrenched nationalistic interpretations of the Holocaust (which I do not believe directly contradicts Levy and Sznaider’s argument), Chapter 1 will further explore the ways in which the Wannsee memorial continues to support national forms of cultural remembrance, which have developed alongside and in response to these wider trends of globalisation. As Levy and Sznaider make clear, these two trends need not be mutually exclusive, but can lead to a clearer understanding of entrenched narratives within distinct communities. Examining the potential tensions between globalised and national forms of collective memory, and specifically how these two seemingly divergent trends can co-exist within the same memorial space, will be the third and final objective of the first chapter.

Given the displacement of the nation state as the primary shaper of memory in the post-unification period, Chapter 2 will analyse the impact of globalising forces at the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum and Ravensbrück Memorial. In doing so it
will examine their museal spaces (exhibitions and grounds) and educational programmes, in order to identify key issues and concerns related to these sites. It will thus explore the historically shifting topographies of these spaces, and the ways in which they challenge traditional definitions of authenticity. In addition it will examine the fragmentation of memory and the incorporation of previously marginalised or taboo histories; questions related to who in fact owns the memories of these places, and who has the right to control what is remembered; the emergence of independent educational initiatives and strategies, and the creation of visitor dialogues and exchanges. Furthermore, it will situate Rothberg’s theory of multidirectional memory and memory contests (the assumption that remembrance is not in fact a zero-sum game), against practical considerations related to operational costs, the scarcity of funding and resources, and the realities of dark tourism and increased commercialisation. This in turn will tie into an exploration of how these sites create internal hierarchies of remembrance and preservation. Overall the aim of the chapter will be to explore the impact of globalisation, and the concerns that arise at these sites, as a result of the displacement of national forms of remembrance.

Finally, Chapter 3 will examine the transition from communicative to institutional memory at the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. Overall it will examine the ways in which the site utilises photographs and other visual media to generate a historical narrative of the Holocaust. At the same time it will explore how this same media simultaneously supports the creation of personalised or individual histories. In reviewing these trends this chapter will show how the site reflects the intersection of personal and institutional memory, and lived experience and historical representations of the past. It will thus examine how a site with little to no historical connection to the Holocaust
can generate an aura of originality, authenticity, secular-sacredness, and legitimacy within the memorial landscape of the post-unification period. Furthermore, the chapter will again examine the transition from communicative to institutional memory through the establishment of the survivor testimony database, and the ways in which testimonies are incorporated into the educational programmes at the site. In doing so it will reveal how the educational programmes of the site support the fragmentation of historical narratives of the Holocaust, and fundamentally seek to analyse and make transparent the process of memorialisation and the formation of institutional memory.

Through these three chapters this project will demonstrate how these four memorial sites contribute to the formation of a globalised memory of the Holocaust in the post-unification period. Moreover, the case studies of this project will attempt to sketch, how these sites incorporate characteristics and trends of globalisation, the impact of these trends, and the fundamental issues and concerns that arise as a result of them. Consequently, this project will try to discern the current nature and formation of memorialisation and commemoration in Berlin and Brandenburg, in order to better understand shifts in memorialisation since the end of the Cold War.
CHAPTER 1: THE HOUSE OF THE WANNSEE CONFERENCE
MEMORIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CENTRE:

Working Towards a Globalised Understanding of the Holocaust

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will explore the educational programmes and exhibition spaces at the House of the Wannsee Conference in order to measure the extent to which globalisation and national forms of memory have impacted the design and content. Moreover it will seek to analyse the way in which the site reflects current historiographical and educational trends of post-unification memorialisation in Germany. Thus this chapter will explore how the significance of the site has changed since 1992, and how it has adapted to fit the shifting memorial landscape of Germany, and the increasingly internationally grounded context of Holocaust education and memorialisation.

Given these aims this chapter will be divided into five sections. Drawing from the previous theoretical framework on globalised memory outlined in the previous chapter (Introduction), the remainder of this section will lay out the structure and methodology of this chapter. Section two will provide an overview of the historical background of the House, in order to highlight the key phases of its history from its early origins as part of the ‘Villa Colony’ of Wannsee to its eventual establishment as a memorial museum following unification. Given that the history of the creation of the Memorial has not been written before in the English-language, this preliminary information will help to clarify the site’s connection to the Holocaust, while at the same time depicting its lengthy and arduous path to official, and nationally and internationally grounded forms of recognition and sponsorship.
The third and fourth sections of this chapter will explore the themes of globalised and national forms of memory as they apply to the permanent exhibition. Section three will explore how the re-development of the exhibition, and the growth of online resources of the Wannsee Memorial reflect and foster many of the characteristics of globalised memory, which were outlined in the Introduction. In addition it will briefly examine the recent emphasis on the historical significance of the memorial itself, and how this reflects the endurance of locally focused forms of remembrance and commemoration. This section will thus argue that the exhibition spaces reflect globalisation, whilst simultaneously attempting to further define and emphasise the significance of local forms of institutional memory. Section four will argue along similar lines, though examine the growth of globalising forces within the educational programmes, and particularly through international and multi-national institutional affiliations and partnerships. At the same time it will explore the endurance of German-specific workshops and seminars, and the ways in which the memorial’s pedagogical focus continues to be shaped by the concerns of the nation-state.

Finally, section five, the conclusion, will review how the Wannsee Memorial has refashioned its identity in the historical and memorial context of Germany in response to these divergent trends. Thus it will attempt to identify its current role as a place of education and remembrance in both an international and national context, and discern the shifting significance of nationally grounded sites of remembrance in an increasingly globalised context.
Methodology

This chapter will incorporate a thorough analysis of the educational programmes, exhibition spaces, and larger exhibition grounds of the site. In doing so it will utilise published resources, including visitor statistics, academic articles produced by research staff, exhibition catalogues, official web pages and online exhibitions, interviews with staff, annual reports, newsletters, primary source collections for educational purposes, and published seminar programmes and workshop lesson plans.

Throughout my research I have found that it was unfeasible to include unpublished materials (with some very rare exceptions) for several reasons. Firstly, a comprehensive compilation of all seminar materials (published or unpublished) is not possible given that, since 2000, there have been hundreds of work days, study days, guided tours (with and without discussion), and other special programmes presented by both permanent as well as contract staff. As a result each seminar topic has a plethora of different versions and styles, which change depending on the facilitator, and the nature of the group taking part. For example, a group of PhD students will inevitably be presented with a seminar that is different in both scope and approach, from a seminar designed for secondary school students, even though the topic of study is identical. Every lesson plan, when put into action is modified to fit the specific needs of each group. If visitors have had a significant amount of prior instruction on National Socialism, the educational programme can be adjusted to ensure that the same subjects are not repeated, and the seminar day does not become redundant. Furthermore given that these institutions lack the physical and human resources to store and catalogue materials from every educational programme—and that a large portion of seminars are the work of temporary contract staff whose
materials go with them after they leave—it is not possible to collect a comprehensive body of pedagogical work from this site.

Furthermore, the decision to use published materials is in part in accordance with the wishes of museum staff, who have requested that their work not be widely disseminated and discussed outside of the context of the memorial space. As a result the source material for this chapter will be based on the permanent exhibition, and a selection of current seminars conducted at this site, which have either been offered for multiple years or have been published in online forums, or as articles, collected works and other educational materials.

1.2 Historical Background

The Villa Colony of Berlin Wannsee, and Villa Marlier/Minoux, 1914–1940

In April 1914 Ernst Marlier, a factory owner and pharmaceutical manufacturer, obtained two parcels of land amounting to 30,578 square meters from the Royal Prussian Water Bureau. In keeping with the popular tastes of the Villa Colony, Marlier commissioned Paul O. A. Baumgarten—the established architect who had previously designed the Liebermann villa in 1909, as well as the summer home of AEG-Director and Reichstag Deputy, Johann Hamspohn in 1906—to design the classically styled house and gardens. Construction on the house began in 1914 and was completed the following year. Due to Marlier’s legal troubles however, it was sold in 1921 to the North German Property Corporation (Norddeutsche Grundstücks-Aktiengesellschaft), which was under the leadership of Friedrich Minoux, for 2.3 million marks.

\[100\] Haupt, Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 13.
By 1940 the situation for Minoux had drastically changed. He along with two other board members of the Berlin Gas Works AG, were arrested on charges of embezzling 8.8 million Reichsmark (RM) from 1927 to 1938. At the time, it was one of the largest swindles in German history. Minoux was sentenced to five years in prison in 1941, and forced to pay a fine of 600,00 RM. He died in October 1945 shortly after his release. In 1940, whilst in prison, he sold his property for 1.95 million RM to the Nordhav Foundation (Stiftung Nordhav), a thinly veiled cover for an organisation operated by the SD (Sicherheitsdienst).

The SD in Wannsee (1940–1945) and the Wannsee Conference (1942)

Reinhard Heydrich, Head of the Security Police and the SD, established the Nordhav Foundation in 1939 to oversee real estate purchases for the organisation. By 1941 the Foundation established the villa as a guesthouse for the SS and the SD, as well as other high-ranking officers and commanders of the Einsatzkommandos. On January 20th, 1942, the conference convened at noon, at 56–58 Am großen Wannsee. In attendance were fifteen participants, including Reinhard Heydrich, the host and Head of the RSHA (Reichssicherheitshauptamt), Security Police, and the SD; Adolf Eichmann, Director of Section IVB4 of the RSHA; and Heinrich Müller, Head of Depart IV Gestapo of the RSHA. Also in attendance were the secretaries of the Interior, the Four Year Plan, the General Government of Poland, and the Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories; the under-secretary of the Foreign Office; and top representatives of the Party Chancellery, the Reich Chancellery, and the Race and Resettlement Main Office. As noted by Norbert Kampe, the participants were “among the elite of the National Socialist regime,” and, “from ‘good middleclass’
homes.” All had been privy to a strong academic education. Eight held doctorates, and all had achieved considerable success in their careers up to that point.

The meeting though brief—lasting no more than ninety minutes—did much to expose the power struggles and machinations behind the genocide’s implementation. According to the “Wannsee Protocol,” Heydrich, as head of ‘Jewish Affairs’ within the Gestapo, requested a draft plan for the “organisational, practical and economic aspects of the final solution of the European Jewish question…with a view to maintain parallel policy lines.” It went on to assert that, “responsibility for the handling of the” killing operations, “would lie centrally with the Reichsführer SS and…the Chief of the Security Police and the SD.” Though from the document it is clear that the meeting was in part meant to affirm Heydrich’s control over the implementation of the ‘Final Solution,’ it was simultaneously intended to implicate the other state departments in the wider genocide of the Jews.

Heydrich opened the meeting with a brief historical survey (from 1939 to 1942) of the previous measures taken by the Gestapo and SD to segregate the Jews from “the living space (Lebensraum) of the German people.” It is noted that before 1938 this tactic took the form of pressure to emigrate, but for various reasons this approach was considered insufficient, though accepted, “in the absence of other possible solutions.” In its place a policy of “evacuation of the Jews to the East” (Evakuierung der Juden nach dem Osten) was implemented. Heydrich made sure to

103 Eichmann, “Besprechungsprotokoll,” 2.
stress that this decision had been handed down directly from Hitler. These “evacuated” Jews would be assigned to heavy forced labour, though it was expected that “a large proportion [would] no doubt drop out through natural reduction.”

Following this country-by-country description of the evacuation policies in the east, the meeting continued with a lengthy debate on the status of Jews in “mixed-marriages” and those classified under the Nuremberg Laws as “Mischlinge” (those with both Jewish and non-Jewish ancestry). Unable to reach a consensus on these issues, the remainder of the time was subsequently taken up by these debates, and whether or not the above groups would ultimately be deported or forcefully sterilised.

The Postwar Period: Soviet Occupation, August Bebel Institute, School Hostel Neukölln, and Joseph Wulf (1945–1992)

Immediately following the war the site was first occupied by Soviet and then American forces, before standing vacant for nearly two years. During this time the majority of the furnishings were plundered. In 1947, two newspaper editors in Berlin established the August Bebel Institute at Wannsee. Named after the founder of Germany’s Social Democratic labour movement, the Institute—that is still operating in Berlin—moved their offices after a brief period. For the majority of the West German regime, from 1952 to 1988, the site operated as the Neuköllner School Hostel (Schullandheim), before the government adopted plans for the renovation and redevelopment of the site into the current memorial and educational centre.

The establishment of the memorial was neither straight-forward however nor timely, but rather came about after decades of failed negotiations with the West

---

108 The villa operated as a youth hostel for working-class inner-city school children. It offered them the opportunity to visit the countryside and indulge in outdoor activities for several days at a minimal cost to their families.
German government, and stalled efforts to formally and nationally recognise the historical significance of the villa. Early efforts to found the memorial were largely the work of Joseph Wulf, a Jewish resistance fighter and Holocaust survivor, who had been captured and deported to Auschwitz during the war. From 1955 until 1970 he published numerous historical texts on the destruction of the European Jews, life in the Lodz and Warsaw ghettos, and cultural life in the Third Reich. Much like his work on the Wannsee conference however, Wulf’s ambitions to be recognised as a serious scholar and historian in the academic community, were never realised in his lifetime.

As early as 1965, he began to vie for the creation of the International Documentation Centre Devoted to Research on National Socialism and its After-Effects (Internationalen Dokumentationszentrum zur Erforschung des Nationalsozialismus und seiner Folgeerscheinungen, e. V.). Originally Wulf envisioned a research centre, which would hold microfilmed archival documents, including public prosecution records, and information on the Nazi bureaucracy, from collections in Israel, Poland, and the United States. Copies of these materials would thus be readily available to German researchers, and would spare them the expense and complication of overseas travel, thus encouraging further research and investigation on the National Socialist period and the Holocaust. In addition Wulf envisioned the creation of a Yearbook of Contemporary History (Jahrbuch für Zeitgeschichte) or an edited volume that would publish scholarly works in the field, as well as newly uncovered documents.

---

In a 1967 interview, Wulf maintained that he intended to finance the endeavour with private funds and donations, and without aid from state institutions or the federal government, in order to ensure the centre’s independence.\textsuperscript{110} Overseen by a prestigious board of trustees, it was headed by a number of well-known academics and intellectuals from the period, including the philosopher Karl Jaspers, Golo Mann, Bishop D. Kurt Scharf, as well as academics from France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Israel, Poland, Switzerland, and Latin America.

Though funding and prestige was not an impediment to the opening of the centre, the process gradually became mired in controversy in spite of the Board’s plans to open in 1966 and 1967. One of the most glaring problems was the fact that the Neuköllner Polizeivermögen (police authority) already owned the property, and operated the aforementioned school hostel for children from low-income households. The decision to displace a centre that benefitted needy youths, in order to memorialise and facilitate research into the darker aspects of Germany’s past proved an unattractive prospect. As early as fall 1966 the creation of the documentation centre was a contentious issue, especially when the \textit{Jerusalem Post} reported that the Bundestagspräsident Gerstenmaier, whilst on a trip to Israel, allegedly stated that the house should ‘disappear’ or ‘vanish’ (\textit{verschwindet}).\textsuperscript{111} Questions regarding whether or not the house should remain standing or should be demolished as a form of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{110}“Das ‘Haus der Endlösung’ wird Dokumentationszentrum,” \textit{Der Aufbau}, 18 November 1966. This is perhaps reflective of the impact of both Cold War tensions during this period, as well as the reluctance of the government to finance Holocaust remembrance projects. Rudolf Steinbeck, “Um das ‘Haus der Endlösung’: Ein Gespräch mit Joseph Wulf,” \textit{Der Tagesspiegel}, 9 November 1967. This article went on to state that “Das e.V. am Ende des Namens, sagt Wulf, ist sozusagen Signum der Unabhängigkeit dieser Institution, da sie durch einen Fördererkreis finanziert und getragen wird.”

\textsuperscript{111}“Abrißpläne, weil dort die Nazis tagten, aber: Schullandheim bleibt,” \textit{Nachtdespeche}, 20 September 1966. His exact words remain unclear, as a different source alludes to his statement being something closer to “that it must be levelled to the ground.”
\end{flushleft}
coming to terms with the past (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*)—albeit a misguided one—were ultimately dismissed by the Berlin Senate soon after Gerstenmaier’s statement was made public.\(^{112}\)

Yet over a year later, the attitudes of high-profile officials remained cautious and hesitant. In 1967 the Regierende Bürgermeister of Berlin, Klaus Schütz of the SPD spoke in favour of the documentation centre, but warned against the creation of a “macabre cult icon” (*makabre Kultstätte*) or mausoleum.\(^{113}\) His statement indicated both a misunderstanding of Wulf’s original intentions and objectives, as well as a general anxiety and discomfort in creating a site focused on the genocide of the Jews. In addition, progress was further slowed when the less than enthusiastic Schütz ousted Willy Brandt from office. This proved unfortunate for Wulf as the latter had previously shown great interest in the project.

After over a year of negotiations with the Berlin Senate, Schütz, in December of 1967 wrote to the Board with a proposed compromise. Though the Senate “welcomed” their proposal and unreservedly (*ohne Vorbehalt*) approved the creation of a documentation centre, the letter went on to say that “The Senate is not of the opinion that the research centre should be established in the House on Greater

---

\(^{112}\) “Mit Abriß ist nichts gewonnen: Senat weist Gerstenmaiers Vorschlag für Haus Am Großen Wannsee 56 zurück,” *Der Tagesspiegel*, 16 September 1966. This article however, alludes to the fact that a partial reason for the ‘preservation’ of the house, was because of its estimated value of one million marks.

\(^{113}\) “Streit um das Haus der ‘Endlösung,’” *Der Aufbau*, 15 December 1967. As the article goes onto say, Schütz was responding to a letter from the actor Rolf Hochhuth, who wrote “Wenn der Senat von Berlin sich immer erneut trotz hinhaltender Zusagen der Bitte wieder entzieht, dieses Haus seinem einzig legitimen Sinn und Zweck zuzuführen, so handelt er nicht anders als jene deutschen Behörden, die 1939 auf unseren Kriegerdenkmalen die Namen der zwölftausend Juden tilgten, die 1914 bis 1918 für Deutschland auf den Schlachtfeldern gefallen sind.”
Wannsee 56–58." Instead they proposed that one of the two other buildings serve as the location either 15 Thielallee or 27 Limonenstraße, both in the vicinity of the Freie Universität. With this response the Senate clearly demonstrated a fundamental failure to recognise the unique significance of the Wannsee villa, and Wulf’s reasons for wanting to establish the documentation centre at that location. Alternatively, given the reactions and discussions outlined above, it is also likely that the Senate’s proposed compromise was not the result of a misinterpretation of the objectives of Wulf, but rather a deliberate attempt to distort or hinder the Board’s goals. In this respect it represented an effort to minimise the impact of the centre, and to reduce its status to that of a generic archive or library, rather than a memorial that was physically tied to the history of the Holocaust and symbolically and intellectually designed to preserve its memory in West Germany.

After a period of deliberation, only three members of the committee, which oversaw the creation of the centre, voted in favour of these alternative housing arrangements, while 57 voted against. Wulf in one statement to the press stressed that only in the Wannsee villa could the plan be satisfactorily implemented in Germany, and instead proposed that an alternative centre be established in Switzerland. By 1968, this series of delayed starts, and the failure of the Board to secure the cooperation and commitment of the Berlin Senate on the project ultimately saw the breakdown of plans to establish the Centre. Regardless, Wulf continued to strive for its establishment until his suicide in 1974.

---

114 Klaus Schütz, “Letter to Direktorium des Internationalen Dokumentationszentrums zur Erforschung des Nationalsozialismus und seiner Folgeerscheinungen, e. V.” 20 December 1967. This translation is my own.
116 Wulf’s suicide was thought to have been out of grief for his wife, who had died shortly before.
For a time the project remained buried, and the climate began to change only gradually in the 1980s. In keeping with this growing popular interest in the Holocaust, in the mid-1980s (as generated by the 1979 American TV-Series *Holocaust*), the West German Israeli producer Manfred Korytowski, released *The Wannsee Conference*, which sought to recreate the 85-minute conference, in order to establish a “photographic record” of the event. Based on six years of intensive research, the film was released in West Germany in 1984, before its translation and release in the United States in 1987. Korytowski, determined to enhance the film’s verisimilitude, researched the clothing and speaking styles of the men involved, as well as minute details such as the make of the attendees’ pocket watches and pens.\(^{117}\) If Korytowski’s intention was to draw attention to this underrepresented period of history, his film was in many respects a success. Its United States release coincided with a conference in West Berlin, which sought to establish the villa as a memorial and educational centre. Reviews of the film in the *New York Times*, *LA Times*, and *Washington Post* praised its historical accuracy and meticulous attention to detail, and drew attention to the history of the conference itself.\(^{118}\) Furthermore, the film, as noted by Wolfgram, was unique in that it clearly conveyed the bureaucratic nature of the genocide, as well as the centrality of the Holocaust to the National Socialist programme.\(^{119}\)

In addition, 1982 marked the fortieth anniversary of the Wannsee Conference, the then mayor of Berlin, Richard von Weizsäcker dedicated two plaques to the site.

---

\(^{117}\) Serge Schemann, “85 Minutes That Scarred History: The meeting that launched the Nazi ‘final solution’ is re-created,” *New York Times*, 22 November 1987, p H23. 
The plaques, though vandalised and later stolen, were eventually replaced and are still visible outside of the main gates today. They read: “This house was the site of the infamous Wannsee Conference of January 1942. In remembrance of the Jewish people killed by the National Socialist tyranny.” Still plans to create the educational centre, as it stands today, did not begin in earnest until 1986, when Regierende Bürgermeister Eberhard Diepgen, pushed for the establishment of a memorial site and permanent exhibition for German youths at Wannsee. The SPD faction of the Berlin Senate remained supportive and the CDU unanimously voted in favour of its creation, while a representative of the FDP stressed the importance of the centre in helping to come to terms with the past; going even so far as to call the plan “outstanding” (hervorragend).

In 1992, the inauguration of the memorial site emphasized its role as an active educational and learning facility for German youths, which aimed to not only foster remembrance of the past, but also support attitudes of tolerance and understanding for the future. The pedagogical focus of the House in the early 1990s was unique at the time, and set the facility apart from other memorial sites and monuments. The speech of Heinz Galinski—the representative of the Central Council of Jews in Germany (Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland) and the Jewish Community of Berlin (Jüdische Gemeinde zu Berlin)—emphasized the practical and pedagogic function of the new centre. In his closing statement he stressed: “It is not
about creating another memorial. There are enough memorials and memorial days, even if there are not enough sincere forms of commemoration. What is important here is to establish a space for active prevention."

On the following day, Rita Süssmuth, Präsidentin des Deutschen Bundestages, alluded to recent crimes against immigrants and asylum seekers in Germany in the previous months. By connecting such incidents of violence and xenophobia to the history of the memorial, she underlined the latter's potential as a place for youths to formulate an understanding of basic human rights. What it also reflected was a conscious awareness of the continuing relevance of the facility to teach not only about the Holocaust but other marginalized or victimized groups. The mission of the centre was thus to connect later generations of Germans to the experiences and horrors of the Holocaust, in order to ensure a more humane and “democratic” (demokratische) future.

The House of the Wannsee Conference Memorial and Educational Centre (1992–2015)

The memorial as it stands today is located in a far west suburb of Berlin on the border of Potsdam. It is easily accessible through the BVG (Berlin public


transportation network), and is open daily to the public. The entire site consists of both the original villa and the extended grounds including the green house (which now functions as a visitor cafeteria), and the statue garden.\textsuperscript{125} Visitors enter the main house through the front foyer at the reception and registration desk. The permanent exhibition is housed on the ground floor in fifteen separate rooms, with the original conference room as its highlight. Educational instruction rooms as well as the Joseph Wulf library and media centre are housed on the first floor, and administrative offices are located on the second.

The library and media centre contain roughly 37,000 monographs and 18,000 periodical volumes, as well as an extensive audio visual collection of interviews and documentary films, along with government documents on microfilm and microfiche.\textsuperscript{126} Though suffering from limitations of space, the collection is ever expanding with new acquisitions and recent publications of books and journal articles updated every month. The space is an essential resource of the institution for visiting scholars, staff members researchers, and also for students.

Throughout the year the memorial hosts educational study days, workshops, self-guided tours, and tour groups for youth groups and school classes, adults (civil servants, medical professionals, apprentices, and professionals) and university students, and teachers and teaching staff. On average the house hosts approximately


1,300 groups annually and employs over thirty freelance guides. Guided and self-guided tours primarily focus on the content of the permanent exhibition, which covers the persecution and murder of the European Jews, as well as the historical significance of the Wannsee Conference. For seminars and workshops topics of study include, at present, Jewish life in Berlin prior to 1933, historical hostility toward Jews since late antiquity, Jewish life under the National Socialist regime, dictatorship and daily life under National Socialism, the planning and organisation of the Holocaust, the aftermath of the Nazi regime in politics and society since 1945, twentieth century mass crimes promoted by states, and historical Methodological Workshops. Overall these topics are not merely historical, but also cover literature, religion, philosophy, art history, and the history of medicine. In addition the memorial also provides support to teachers to prepare for tours of Berlin, meetings with international groups, and post-visit projects with their students.

1.3 Exhibition Spaces and Visitor Demographics

From 2005 to 2006 the permanent exhibition of the memorial underwent extensive revisions. The redevelopment of the memorial at this time is arguably reflective of the wider growth of the Holocaust in the international popular consciousness of the West. Its original content, which had been developed between 1988 and 1991, had remained unaltered since the inauguration of the site in 1992 (roughly 14 years).

The total cost of the project was approximately 605,000 Euros with the expense split

---

127 “Educational work in the House of the Wannsee Conference Memorial and Educational Site” (Brochure, Berlin: House of the Wannsee Conference).
128 Included are the generic topics of study. For a full list of specific topics for seminars and study days please see the memorial’s main website, “Allgemeine Informationen zum Bildungsangebot,” accessed 26 September 2015, http://www.ghwk.de/bildungs-angebote/allgemeine-informationen.html.
between the state and the federal government.\textsuperscript{130} On 1 October 2005 the exhibition closed, in order to facilitate these changes, and by 18 January 2006 the work was complete.\textsuperscript{131} The reopening of the site garnered attention from the national and international media. In March 2006 several notable dignitaries toured the exhibition including the German Vice President, Gerda Hasselfeldt, the Israeli Defence Minister Shaul Mofaz, and the Israeli Ambassador, Shimon Stein.\textsuperscript{132} The following year visitor numbers to the memorial rose dramatically from roughly 78,000 in 2004, to well over 100,000 in 2006.\textsuperscript{133} Even at the end of 2012 this figure of roughly 100,000 visitors per year remained steady.\textsuperscript{134}

The significance of this is immediately apparent when one considers the integral role of the exhibition spaces in the educational programmes of the memorial. Drawing upon the exhibition as a source with which to communicate fundamental information of this period quickly and succinctly to participants in seminar programmes, it provides both students and other visitors with a foundational

\textsuperscript{130} The cost of the new wall hangings totalled approximately 100,000 Euros. Wolf Kaiser, “Neue Ausstellung im Berliner Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz,” \textit{Schwäbische Zeitung}, 17 January, 2006, accessed 13 November, 2012, \url{http://www.schwaebische.de/home_artikel.-Neue-Ausstellung-im-Berliner-Haus-der-Wannsee-Konferenz.-arid,1584724.html}. This funding however did not cover an alternative project, which sought to translate the exhibition catalogues into both English and German. Kampe hoped to secure private funds in order to complete this project. Given that the material is currently available on the website, one must assume that they were able to eventually find this funding. Sven Felix Kellerhoff, “Neue Dauerausstellung im Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz,” \textit{Die Welt}, 18 January 2006, accessed 16 November 2012, \url{http://www.welt.de/191533}.

\textsuperscript{131} Kampe, “Bericht des Leiters” (2006), 13.


understanding of the genocide. Its alteration thus inevitably impacts upon the work of the educational centre in addition to general visitors to the site.

The new space not only incorporated dramatic revisions to the historical content of the exhibition, as well as general technological improvements, but also attempted to address changes in visitor demographics, international shifts in scholarship following the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the memorial’s altered significance in light of the rise of Holocaust memory (in Berlin and abroad) since unification. In recent years these developments have continued with respect to the growth of the memorial’s online presence, which was bolstered by the site’s redesign in 2012. Ultimately these cumulative changes sought to establish (and maintain) the international reputation of the memorial, and demonstrate its significance as more than merely a national or local site of remembrance, but one of international importance.

From the outset the new space was designed to cater to a wider more varied and diverse audience. In doing so the permanent exhibition, and various exhibition spaces at the House of the Wannsee Conference have helped to foster a globalised memory and understanding of the Holocaust through the incorporation of translated material, a more open interpretation of the history of the genocide, a re-emphasis on the global impact and nature of the conflict, the inclusion of individual survivor histories, and technological improvements in communication and outreach. Reflecting key trends in the globalisation of Holocaust memory, these educational spaces have not only been made accessible to a wider range of visitors and students, but have in turn contributed to the international standing and interconnectedness of the site.
Updates to the content of the exhibition, as well as practical changes and technological improvements, the inclusion of translated materials, and the transformation of the historiographical stance of the memorial, all reflect a move towards a globalised memory of the Holocaust. Practical changes included efforts to transform the exhibition into a modern space in order to reflect its official standing as a state sponsored memorial site. The old exhibition boards, which had had photographs and texts pasted to them, were replaced with panels that utilised computer graphic technology to first configure the design of the memorial, and then imposed the images onto glass plates. Practically, it was both more aesthetically pleasing, less likely to be damaged or fade, and easier to maintain.\footnote{Kampe, “Bericht des Leiters” (2006), 6.} Suspended wall hangings also ensured that the mounted glass panels would no longer damage the integrity of the buildings walls, thus helping to preserve the structure of the building.

In addition, the original lighting of the exhibition—though intended to simulate the lighting during the winter months (or how it would have appeared during the conference)—proved impractical for viewing or reading material for extended periods of time. Visitors were often quickly fatigued, and thus new modern lightening facilities were installed. The augmentation of photographs and documents similarly allowed visitors to more easily view these materials, and mislabelled photographs were replaced.\footnote{Kampe, “Bericht des Leiters” (2006), 7.}

Given the memorial’s founding after the immediate end of the Cold War, these changes though subtle proved significant for visitors as they distinguished the site as one that was firmly (e.g. ideologically and historically) situated in the post-unification era. The redesign of the exhibition reflected the significant historiographical and socio-political changes that had occurred since the collapse of
the Berlin Wall. Thus no longer limited by the politics of the Cold War, the content of the space incorporated new trends and scholarship that utilised the newly opened Soviet archives.

Moreover, as noted by the *Berliner Zeitung* the redesign of the permanent exhibition was in part a reaction to similar developments at other sites of remembrance within Berlin. These included the opening of the Information Centre at the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe for example, as well as the general and widely publicised plans to redevelop the Topography of Terror. In addition, as noted by Wolf Kaiser, the new content of the exhibition was dramatically altered in order to more readily appeal to a wider audience, and to be more accessible to young people and school children. The expansion of memory culture, and the increasingly interconnected network of institutional memory within Germany and abroad, thus prompted a response from the memorial in order to ensure its continuing relevance and impact within the landscape of Holocaust memory and sites of remembrance.

Furthermore, the inclusion of translated materials serves an important practical as well as symbolic gesture to acknowledge the global interest in the subject, as well as the international interconnectedness of the memorial. Leaflets, which include basic information on the memorial and educational centre, are available in over a dozen (mostly European) languages at the front entrance. Yet as noted by Elke Gryglewski, in recent years these materials have also been translated into Turkish and Arabic, particularly for visiting secondary school groups. This is, as she indicates,

---


138 From the interview with Wolf Kaiser, *Schwäbische Zeitung*.
“not because young people who visit the House might need them due to language challenges, since most of them speak and read German,” but rather “are provided as a gesture of appreciation and acknowledgement of their culture and the history of immigration.”\textsuperscript{139}

That the site would attempt to at least superficially acknowledge this cultural divide by providing materials that go beyond the classically European context, reflects a willingness to not only extend the memory of the Holocaust beyond the west, but to also subtly recognise contemporary issues of discrimination, xenophobia, and exclusion. The danger of this however is the reemphasising of cultural and ethnic divides and feelings of otherness in students who no longer identify with the cultures of their parents or grandparents. Such resources may cater more to international visitors. Yet, they serve to both emphasise the international dimension of the Holocaust, and the international relevance of Holocaust memory, regardless of nationality or cultural background.

In recent years there has been a steady and persistent rise in the number of foreign visitors to the site. Statistical data on visiting groups to the museum indicated that the number of foreign visitors overtook the number of domestic visitors in 2005, and this upward trend has continued to the present. As of 2011 non-German visitors accounted for nearly 61 percent of the total. It should be noted however, that for seminar days and workshops, the majority of participants are still students or professionals from within Berlin, a qualitative point, which will be discussed in greater detail in the educational section of this chapter. Consequently, great efforts were made to ensure that the entirety of the renewed exhibition space would be provided in both German and English, and that a full version of the exhibition

\textsuperscript{139} Gryglewski, “Teaching about the Holocaust,” S44.
catalogue would be available. In part these efforts were practical, and responded to visitor statistics, which noted that nearly fifty percent of visitors were non-German speakers. The decision to ensure the complete translation of the permanent exhibition was in large part a response to these trends, as well as a means of encouraging further international interest and involvement in the site.

After the reopening of the memorial, there was a steep increase in the number of visitors. While previously from 1992 to 2005, the memorial saw a rough average of 62,000 visitors per year (with 78,000 visitors in 2004), 2006 saw a dramatic increase to 108,437 visitors. Arguably, the international press coverage, and inclusion of English translations made the site more accessible and engaging to visitors, and thus encouraged this steady growth in visitor numbers. By recognising and accommodating demographic changes of their visitors, the memorial bolstered its international reputation and relevance, and thus responded to and perpetuated globalised trends in Holocaust remembrance.

Simple changes to the overall layout of the exhibition however, provided a more powerful and effective way of communicating the impact of the Holocaust to visitors. For example the former room entitled the “Hall of Countries” (Room 8) had been a formulaic and tedious listing of statistical data relating to the population of Jews prior to the Holocaust and/or German invasion. It included figures on eighteen countries in Europe and the Soviet Union and listed figures for those who were deported, forced to emigrate, murdered, or survived the war. Alternatively, this rather cumbersome way of relaying statistics was replaced with an enlarged map of the Eurasian continent showing the population of Jews prior to the war, as well as the
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percentage that survived or were murdered for each country. The new visual aid offers a more succinct way to communicate this basic statistical information, and immediately impresses upon visitors the international scale and impact of the mass killings. Thus from the onset visitors learn that this was not solely a German problem or merely a European problem, but rather a campaign that affected significant numbers of the Middle East and Northern Africa, and the whole of western and eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{142}

Yet beyond the aesthetic, revisions to the permanent exhibition incorporated significant alterations to its historical and theoretical approaches. This was partly due to criticisms by historians within the field, a desire to incorporate feedback from visitor groups, and the opening of the Soviet Archives in Eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{143}

Previously the exhibition took a chronological approach, and was divided into fourteen rooms that began with the “NS-Dictatorship in Germany” in 1933 (Room 1), and ended with “Liberation” in 1945 (Room 14). It focused on the persecution of the European Jews, as well as the processes of deprivation, exclusion, deportation, ghettoization, and genocide. According to the former director of the memorial Norbert Kampe, the exhibit drew heavily from an \textit{Intentionalist} theory of the Holocaust, as well as what had been the current scholarship of the time up to the

\textsuperscript{142} Room 1 was designed by Norbert Kampe. Map produced in \textit{The Wannsee Conference and the Genocide of the European Jews: Catalogue of the Permanent Exhibition} (Berlin: House of the Wannsee Conference Memorial and Educational Site, 2009), 18–19.

\textsuperscript{143} The drive to balance the \textit{Intentionalist} and \textit{Functionalist} approaches derived from demands by the German historian Peter Klein, who sought to present both sides of the argument in order to keep both in check. Martin Jander, “Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz: Neue Ausstellung—Überwältigungsverbot,” \textit{haGalil}, 20 January 2006, accessed 13 November, 2012, \url{http://www.hagalil.com/archiv/2006/01/wannsee.htm}. The influence of statistical data is also mentioned in Norbert Kampe, “Eine neue Ausstellung in der Gedenk- und Bildungsstätte Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz” \textit{Aktuell} 79 (2007), accessed 27 November 2012, \url{http://www.berlin.de/aktuell/07_01/ereignisse/aktuell_77386.html}. 
1980s.\textsuperscript{144} This school of thought widely supported the notion that there was a direct path from Hitler’s antisemitism to the Holocaust, and that this seemingly unstoppable process, which was driven by a deliberate plan to perpetrate crimes against humanity and the genocide of the Jews of Europe, was formulated and set into motion well before the start of the war and the National Socialist rise to power.\textsuperscript{145}

Researchers of the new exhibition heavily revised this stance, and also sought to incorporate scholarship into the project that had been published in the years since the memorial was first opened. Primarily this included Christopher Browning’s influential work \textit{Ordinary Men},\textsuperscript{146} which analysed the actions of Police Battalion 101; Daniel Goldhagen’s controversial counter-argument to Browning, which posited the existence of a latent antisemitism in German culture\textsuperscript{147}; academic responses to and critiques of the ground breaking Hamburg exhibition Crimes of the Wehrmacht\textsuperscript{148}, as well as the work of Robert Gellately and Eric A. Johnson\textsuperscript{149} on the Gestapo, which undermined the apologetic arguments long held by the older generation within Germany.\textsuperscript{150} One of the main challenges and primary goals of the new exhibition was to incorporate new scholarship without becoming dated or fixed within a particular historiographical period. Consequently, this resulted in a less dogmatic presentation

\textsuperscript{144} Kampe, “Bericht des Leiters” (2006), 7. Kampe’s tone is almost one of frustration. In reflecting on the dogmatic tone of the exhibition he writes, “Die Ausstellungstexte selbst werfen keine Fragen auf!”

\textsuperscript{145} Marrus, “History of the Holocaust,” 120.


\textsuperscript{148} The full title was \textit{Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941 bis 1944} (War of Annihilation. Crimes of the Wehrmacht 1941 to 1944)


\textsuperscript{150} Kampe, “Bericht des Leiters” (2006), 7.
of the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust, and a subsequently more open and balanced presentation of primary source material.

Oversimplifications and sweeping generalisations found within the original exhibition were thus removed. The introduction to Room 5 entitled “Mass Shootings” brought together different victim groups under this generic general heading. It thus read: “They were then rounded up and either marched or transported on trucks to the outskirts of town. Communists and partisans, Gypsies and the mentally ill shared the same fate.” That prisoners of war should be seemingly equated with targeted ethnic groups is highly problematic. Unwittingly, the introduction suggests that their “common fate” was the result of blanket and undifferentiated policy of mass murder. The specific motivations behind these policies, as well as the overarching ideology behind the killings was thus presented in an unclear and overly simplistic way, that could have been strongly misleading for visitors.

Overall the new exhibition sought to correct the more substantial problems of the old exhibition’s content. For nearly every country listed, there was information on the active resistance or partisan movements. Its previous presentation of these movements, and the responses of individual nations to the Holocaust, was wholly problematic. The old exhibitions seemingly asked visitors to compare active partisan resistance to passive Jewish responses to National Socialism. Furthermore, in the case of Romania, the original text read: “The Romanian authorities organized bloody massacres and extensive deportations in the conquered territories but, despite German pressure, refused to hand over their own citizens”—thus making it seem as though this refusal of the Romanians was an absolution for their prior crimes. In the new exhibition this account of the history of Romania is removed. Similarly, the

---

152 Schoenberner, *Permanent Exhibit*, 54.
previous text read that the French government had been urged by the Gestapo in 1942 to deport all Jews, and that France had attempted to “save its own citizens” by handing over foreign Jews—thus implying that this twisted gesture was in fact a legitimate solution to their situation. In contrast the new exhibit does not minimise the interim government’s culpability, but instead states clearly that, “In summer of 1942 the German deportation plans were strongly supported by the Vichy government.” Passive voice notwithstanding, the text is refreshingly direct and free from the previous evasive excuses. Instead the facts are presented not as a justification for complicity, but rather as evidence of part of a larger killing process.

Equally, the old exhibition was criticised for its dogmatic approach, as documents were often presented in such a way as to strongly stress certain conclusions and assumptions in line with an Intentionalist interpretation of this history. For example an excerpt from Mein Kampf (1925) alluding generally to the colonial domination of Europe (and particularly Russia), was displayed alongside a military deployment order of 1941, stating that, “the war against Russia is a significant stage in the German people’s struggles.” That these two sources are placed out of context and side-by-side is highly suggestive though they were written sixteen years apart, and do not necessarily prove a direct course of action or connection. This technique is used throughout the exhibition, as a 1942 speech from Hitler serves almost as a forewarning against those who would have doubted his genocidal intentions. Displayed in room nine entitled “Death Camps,” the text reads: “They always laughed at my prophecies. Of those who used to laugh, many are no

153 Schoenberner, Permanent Exhibit, 51. As though it was somehow better to send foreigners to their deaths rather than French citizens.
155 Schoenberner, Permanent Exhibit, 26.
longer laughing.” The intended meaning here is unmistakable, and intentionally imposing upon readers particular ominous conclusions.

In large part this dogmatic approach is absent from the new exhibition, and there is a clear effort to integrate documents into a more open and contextually precise narrative. For example, section 2.5 of the new exhibition “Political Antisemitism in Germany,” provides a brief description of the “crisis of political liberalism” in 1873 in Germany, and illustrates this by providing excerpts of Heinrich von Treitschke’s work alongside that of Theodor Mommsen. Though written around the same time, these two men offer completely opposing views of Judaism that directly clash with one another. While Treitschke poses a largely assimilationist and negative view of Judaism, Mommsen offers a more tolerant and accepting stance. This display above all is meant to show to visitors that there was not one direct path towards the racial ideology of National Socialism, and that its rise to power was not inevitable. Furthermore it also subtly conveys to visitors their own social responsibility to ensure that similar events to the Holocaust do not occur again.

That the late nineteenth century work of von Treitschke and Mommsen should even appear at all is a significant improvement over the first exhibition, which began in January 1933, with the entry of the NSDAP into the government. No information on the early formation of the party, or even the antecedents of Nazi racial ideology appeared in any detail. This period of history was thus presented as detached from other previous or subsequent times, as though it was a disconnected aberration of German history. Those wishing to understand the origins of antisemitism in Europe, or the development of racially driven pseudoscientific research would not have been able to gather this information from the exhibition, if
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they even knew to look for it at all. In order to amend this, the new exhibition devotes two rooms directly to “racism and anti-Judaism” and to “Integration and anti-Semitism in the Weimar Republic.” These rooms thus explore the origins of antisemitism in medieval Christian anti-Judaism, as well as the growth of racial ideology as a means to justify colonialism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Overall these changes reflect significant shifts in historical and pedagogical approaches to the Holocaust. No longer are documents meant to simply speak for themselves, or to be de-contextualised in order to support a more direct, though problematic rendering of the history of the genocide, but rather primary source evidence as well as guided historical interpretations provide a more nuanced reading of this history. Furthermore the incorporation of recent scholarship on the perpetrators reflects an awareness of major international research, thus reinforcing the theoretical complexity and rigour of the exhibition. The more open-ended approach also, enabled it to connect with a wider academic audience, and avoid a fatalistic interpretation, which would have presented the Holocaust as an inevitable product of historical forces beyond the control of individuals. Instead, as noted by Kampe, the new exhibition attempted to assess “the alternatives for action presented to the bystanders and the fight for survival of the victims,” thus again reinforcing the notion that alternative views and actions were possible and could have prevented the escalation of violence and persecution.  

In addition, certain changes to the exhibition’s content make it more accessible to younger audiences. For example, there are only a handful of images depicting mass death and the horrors of the extermination camps. In this respect there
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is a noticeable effort to carefully limit the number of these images, and to only present them towards the end of the exhibition (Room 14 “Forced Labour and Death in the Concentration Camps”) after the visitor has gained a firm grasp of the history leading to these atrocities, and can try to situate them within the larger historical context of the event. This change was not unique to the Wannsee memorial, but rather was also part of a general shift which occurred at former concentration camp memorial museums including Sachsenhausen.

Finally, instead of merely ending the exhibition with liberation, the new design sought to emphasise the enduring impact of the Holocaust into the present. Room 15 “The Presence of the Past” includes brief quotations from survivors, which range from the bitterly tragic to the oddly comedic. In addition, throughout the exhibition, the inclusion of survivor testimonies and interviews also subtly acknowledges the significance of post-war remembrance and the continuation of everyday life in the decades since the war. To include the recollections and reflections of these survivors demonstrates a clear effort to acknowledge the value of individual memories and experiences within the wider tragedy of the Holocaust. At the same time it is a subtle acknowledgement of the growth of memory studies within the field as a whole, as well as of the lingering debates on memory and representation that had consumed Germany (and particularly Berlin) in the wake of the competition to design the central Holocaust memorial to the murdered Jews of Europe.

What this room also reinforces is a common methodological approach found throughout the exhibition; the inclusion of four individual family biographies, which
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158 A quote from Yaakov Gilad read: “If I got bad marks or did something bad she (my mother) would say: ‘It’s a shame that I got out of Auschwitz to experience that.’” Haupt, Catalogue, 363.
159 Please see the historical background section of Chapter 3 for more detail.
first appear in the introductory room (Room 1). The personal histories of four individuals highlighted in this room, as well as the history of their family appear alongside more general information on the persecution of the Jews during the National Socialist regime. Furthermore this decision to include the biographies of individuals who suffered through (or perished in) the Holocaust, and to simultaneously exclude the accounts of the perpetrators, was not a new or unique approach by the Wannsee memorial. Within the wider context of international Holocaust memorialisation, that this change should come about after the opening of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, is highly suggestive. The USHMM’s inclusion of individual identity cards was both controversial, as well as unique at that time. Carden-Coyne, in her exploration of the USHMM’s usage of photographic images, has noted in particular how identity cards are transformed from a tool of memorialisation and remembrance to an easily “disposable consumerist object,” or at the very best an inexpensive souvenir. In spite of criticisms, the distribution of these cards to each visitor deliberately emphasised the fate of survivors, and particularly the stories of unique individuals. Similarly, in Germany following unification, similar shifts had begun to occur within Gymnasium textbooks, which began to focus more on personal histories and biographies. Though the approach of the Wannsee memorial is somewhat different, the outcome is similar to an extent.

The approach is a marked departure from the original exhibition, in which sources featuring the victims were largely excluded. On the whole coverage of life in
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the concentration camp included only snippets of survivor testimonies, and often only to include facts and further information on a specific facet of life in the camps. These quotations were not meant to inspire feelings of empathy or to provoke thoughtful reflection as the current Room 15 does, but rather to supplement or provide basic historical knowledge of the Holocaust.

Overall the inclusion of these biographies and family histories exemplifies the aforementioned characteristic of a globalised memory of the Holocaust, and its simultaneous embodiment of the universal and the particular. In this case it is literally a particular experience, which the memorial references through the histories of suffering and persecution of the Reiss, Silberstein, Halaunbrenner, and Tabaczynska families. Throughout the exhibition visitors learn of everyday life for these families prior to the war, the escalating violence and prejudices they faced, and finally the devastating consequences of the war and the Holocaust upon their lives. At the same time however, the memorial makes clear that the impact of the Holocaust is neither bound by spatial nor temporal limitations. As mentioned previously, the introductory room makes evident its global impact and the international dimension of this crime. For countries pictured on the map that may lack a strong history of remembrance or learning about the Holocaust, the map serves to reinforce the fact that these connections, and the event itself, are in fact a historical reality. With respect to temporal connections, the inclusion of survivor quotations such as those found in Room 15 emphasise the continued reverberations of the genocide into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and the enduring memory of the event (both communicative and institutional).

Schoenberner, *Permanent Exhibit*, 68.
Though not explicitly stated, the memorial more generally attests to the ways in which the Holocaust had a profound and enduring impact upon our understanding of the development of western civilisation—a conundrum, which Detlev Peukert has referred to as the crisis of cultural modernity.\footnote{To be clear, Peukert was not specifically referring to the Holocaust, but rather was analysing the demise of the Weimar Republic and the rise of National Socialism. \textit{The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity} (New York: Hill and Wang, 1992).} The memorial’s primary purpose is arguably to emphasise the rupture in civilisation that occurred in 1942, through a marked juxtaposition of the pre-WWI elegance of the villa, and the ugliness of its National Socialist history that will forever colour its identity. Visitors are encouraged to recognise and notice this contrast in order to understand the fundamental notion that civilisation and modernity are not concepts that are divorced from the atrocities of the Holocaust and the crimes of National Socialism, but rather remain fundamentally linked to one another. In this context, Theodor W. Adorno’s much touted though misinterpreted dictum, “to write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric,” is all the more applicable to the history of the Wannsee villa, when one considers how it seeks to reveal the general failure of the linear development of civilisation and enlightened objectivism, which resulted in the horrors of the Holocaust.\footnote{Geoff Ostrove, “Adorno, Auschwitz, and the New Categorical Imperative,” \textit{Perspectives on Global Development and Technology} 12 (2013): 301–303.} Its universal relevance is thus borne out of a shared history, as well as a shared need to understand the darker aspects of human nature, and the boundaries of civilisation. Ultimately, the inclusion of individual histories more obviously serves to remind visitors of the very real human cost of the genocide, and our own commonalities with the victims prior to the start of the conflict. This projected empathy, is thus perplexingly particular and yet a concept that is simultaneously universal.
Digital versus Physical Spaces

As argued by Seeck and Ratanen, the years following the Second World War saw the development of pre-staged media events and spectacles, and the growth of popular media (television broadcasting and the news in particular) as a means of shaping nationally grounded concepts of society. Yet with the growth of ‘globalised’ media, this top-down approach too has become a less relevant and less potent means of communication. According to Levy and Sznaider cosmopolitan memory develops as a result of improvements in communication and technology, and primarily through the growth of ‘transnational media’ and ‘mass culture.’ The ubiquity of electronic media, and the ease, with which information travels across borders, facilitates a global intercultural dialogue and interaction between participants of varying national and demographic backgrounds. Technological shifts thus foster the creation of ‘global media events,’ and an increasing awareness of international affairs in real time. This change has facilitated a shift in the previously nation-focused media, to a cosmopolitan memory of the international community. Though this shift can engender connections to the “distant suffering of others,” which in turn generates “a politics of compassion,” Bisht notes that this does not prevent memory contests, and comparisons between the suffering of different nations. These competitions to establish moral and political superiority are an inevitable outgrowth of the globalised-localisation relationship and dynamic.

In no other medium is the transcendence of national boundaries more obvious and apparent, than the Internet. The growth of the Internet as a medium through
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which to communicate information and facilitate intercultural communication has largely shaped our own expectations regarding the accessibility and immediacy of global news and information, and the ability to communicate across national borders. Given the significance and global interconnectedness of online media, it is now, more than ever, not only valuable for official institutions to have a digital presence, it is essential. In many respects, for any major organisation (or even individual), to lack a designated page or website, is to lack a defined identity, and opens oneself up to the possibility of being defined through unofficial and unmediated channels.\textsuperscript{168} To remain apart from the Internet is no longer the default option, but rather attests to a deliberate decision to remain outside of this global network, and to operate on a purely local or individual level. While there is an ongoing debate as to whether or not the Internet facilitates intercultural communication and erases cultural disparities; or instead increases cultural misunderstandings and the normalisation of English-speaking culture and values—it would be difficult to argue that the growth of the Internet has not altered our conceptualisations of community and society.\textsuperscript{169} Whether or not it is a ‘fitting’ medium for intercultural communication, it remains one of the most effective tools for facilitating an immediate and transnational dialogue.

Moreover a webpage is a visible, public, and potentially valuable form of cultural and social capital, through which to assert one’s identity. The quality and

\textsuperscript{168} Perhaps the best examples of this gap with respect to the memorialisation are the Tuol Sleng Genocide Museum and the S21 prison, which were established for the Cambodian genocide. Growing western interest in these sites has brought increased attention and tourism to the physical memorials and spaces. Though there are some websites devoted to these sites it is unclear whether or not these online webpages (in development currently) or sources are officially sanctioned or the result of private initiatives. Possible official sites include: “Tuol Sleng: Photographs from Pol Pot’s Secret Prison,” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://www.tuolsleng.com/}; and “The Killing Fields Museum of Cambodia,” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://www.killingfieldsmuseum.com/}.

extent of an institution’s presence on the Internet is thus crucial to communicating its impact, status, and relevance in the corporeal world. Additionally, the kind of information being communicated is equally significant. Web forums, web based learning programmes, and discussion boards allow for a more direct and interactive form of communication, while other sites such as blogs, tumblrs, online news media and official web pages are more limited in their ability to facilitate a direct and open dialogue and exchange of ideas. The official webpage of the House of the Wannsee Conference is a recently re-developed site, which primarily seeks to foster an online profile to highlight the key developments and programmes of the institution. In 2012 the site underwent a complete overhaul and redevelopment, to incorporate a more professional layout, and a more complete rendering of their educational programmes and exhibition spaces.

In recent years one can see the extent to which the site has evolved and expanded. The clunky layout of the older website included some translated information in English, though the majority of the content appeared in German. Additionally, reproduced photographs and documents appeared without a particular layout or order. Now the site, instead of trying to present merely an online version of the exhibition, better features the different educational programmes and facilities of the memorial. For example a clear history of the site is presented, along with major documents (translated versions as well) relevant to the history of the site, and a clear summary of the different seminars and workshop themes offered by the memorial. Furthermore, the website is officially linked to a wider network of memorials, museums, and websites devoted to the Holocaust and German heritage and history. Most recently it has been included in the Museums Portal of Berlin and Orte der Erinnerung 1933-1945, and also makes frequent contributes to well-established
On a very basic level it helps to foster an international presence by presenting the website in eighteen different languages including Turkish, Hebrew, and Japanese, as well as numerous other European languages. As noted by Marcoccia, the inclusion of different languages alone is not necessarily enough to foster global interaction and communication. He notes for example, the dominance of English-speaking users on the Internet (followed by Mandarin), and thus the tendency for non-English speakers to adopt English expressions and abbreviations. Yet similar to the aforementioned brochures, the inclusion of these different translations is not merely a practical way to cater to those whose first language is neither English nor German, but also a gesture to acknowledge a shared history, growing global interest in the Holocaust, and shifting demographic changes within Germany and Western Europe. In addition the inclusion of videos in DGS (Deutsche Gebärdensprache) for the hearing impaired to provide further information on the history of the villa and the permanent exhibition, also speaks to a wider effort to communicate to as broad and diverse a segment of the public as possible.

Furthermore the primary purpose of the site is not only to try to attract the attention of non-native (and non-English) speakers, but to facilitate individual and group visits, and to further provide educational tools and information to those unable to physically travel to the memorial. The amount of material available for educators
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to download has increased dramatically in the past two years. For example the entirety of the German-language text of the permanent exhibition has been reformatted and is available for download. Nearly all documents provided in German have been fully translated into English, and full texts related to the conference including the Protocol itself, biographies of those in attendance, selected excerpts of the Eichmann trial transcripts, and various letters and other documents are provided. Additionally, the website provides further information on present and past special exhibitions of the memorial, though these materials are provided primarily in German. Ideally, the purpose of the website however is not to serve as a documentation database, or archive, but to provide essential background information on the Conference as well as the memorial’s activities and programmes.

In many respects the website as well as the recent special exhibitions are not only a means of facilitating communication and the initiatives of the memorial across borders, but also promoting and emphasising the unique contribution of the villa to the Holocaust memorial landscape in Berlin. In recent decades the memorial has emphasised the singular nature of the villa and the value of its educational programmes. Though a means of global interconnectedness, the digital exhibition spaces are able to stress the unique value of the memorial, while at the same time promoting its shared goals with other historical sites, and making it more readily available to an international audience.

An early revised version of the website for example, offered a 360-degree panorama shot of the foreground of the house and every room of the exhibition, though there were clear limitations of the software. Since its initial inclusion in the
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172 These online changes correspond with the previously mentioned initiatives to translate the permanent exhibition fully into English. In addition abridged versions have also been translated into Spanish, French, Polish, Dutch, Italian, and Hebrew.
site the panorama has been completely redesigned to facilitate a more functional and
dynamic experience. The digital-spatial recreation of the site for example, is a tool
through which online users located outside of Berlin can ‘experience’ this particular
space through its digital recreation. In this sense the website attempts to collapse the
boundaries between the physical and the virtual world, and to minimise the distance
between the memorial and other Internet users across the globe. Though presenting a
virtual representation to visitors, the 360-degree replication does not supplant the
original space, but rather reaffirms its importance. Bound to the physical villa, the
intrinsic value of the virtual exhibition and the official webpage as a whole inevitably
derives from and serves to promote the actual physical memorial. Similarly, the
official webpage excludes much of the layout and other materials of the permanent
exhibition, and complete teaching and lesson plans and materials are not provided
online. Though the website has demonstrative pedagogical value that extends beyond
its connection to the materiality of the site, its impact is deliberately limited. In many
respects this deliberate truncation of resources available online is meant to ensure the
development and cultivation of an online presence without overshadowing the
original site. Additionally, Cameron notes the implicit bias against digitally recreated
objects and materials.\(^\text{173}\) There thus exists an underlying undervaluing of the digital
space, which though able to communicate and connect beyond national borders, is, in
the case of museal objects, seen as subservient to the original physical object, or site.
The premium placed upon the ‘authentic’ or ‘original,’ thus fuels this affirmation of
the uniqueness of the physical memorial space. This dichotomy between global

\(^{173}\) For a more in-depth discussion on shifting perceptions of and attitudes towards
digital objects please see Fiona Cameron, “Beyond the Cult of the Replicant:
Museums and Historical Digital Objects—Traditional Concerns, New Discourses” in
*Theorizing Digital Cultural Heritage: A Critical Discourse*, ed. Fiona Cameron and
Sarah Kenderdine (London, England and Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press,
2007), 49–76.
interconnectivity and the reassertion of a unique and/or specific identity highlights the interplay between emerging globalising and enduring localising forces.

In the case of the Wannsee memorial, both the online and physical exhibition spaces of the site have, in recent years, sought to emphasise the history of the villa, as well as the educational centre. Most notably, two special exhibitions in 2012, “’Meine eigentliche Universität war Auschwitz’ Joseph Wulf zum 100. Geburtstag” [My actual university was Auschwitz: Joseph Wulf on his 100th birthday] as well as “Villencolonie Alsen am Großen Wannsee” [The Villa Colony Alsen at Greater Wannsee] featured information exclusively on the post-war and pre-war years of the history of the villa respectively. Though modest in size the exhibitions were displayed in prominent locations on the grounds; Villencolonie was placed outside the front entranceway by the gardens, while the exhibition devoted to Wulf appeared outside of the Media Centre. Both served to mark the seventieth anniversary of the Wannsee Conference (and the twentieth anniversary of the memorial site). Yet in addition to marking these milestones it also sought to feature the particular history of the villa and memorial. Unlike previous special exhibitions, which focused either on those who had faced persecution under the National Socialist regime (topics included the histories of Else Ury [1997], the Chotzen family [2001], the Wahler family [2008]), or life under National Socialism (“Sports under the Star of David” [1999]), these exhibitions referenced the history of the villa exclusively, thus indicating the significance of the site itself in the wider narrative of the Holocaust.

In the two decades since the opening of the site, the memorial landscape of Berlin has radically altered and global education, research, and recognition of the genocide of the European Jews have grown dramatically. While these special exhibitions presented practical information on the history of the villa and the development of the memorial, which catered to visitor curiosity while serving a commemorative function, it also indicated that the Wannsee villa was not merely an educational centre or generic museum, but rather a historically rich space imbued with a history that stretched beyond National Socialism, into the pre-World War I and post-World War II eras. Its development and creation was part of a half-century long process that reflected the postwar struggles of memory in West Germany. These special exhibitions served to remind visitors of the villa’s peculiar circuitous history, and to reaffirm the significance of the villa as a site of remembrance. In doing so it reaffirmed its tie to the Holocaust, as well as its unique contribution to the increasingly crowded landscape of memorials and sites of remembrance devoted to the history of the Holocaust. Through these special exhibitions the process of memorialisation itself is made prominent, and the memorial and its surroundings emphasised as a unique point of interest. Given the growth of a globalised memory of the Holocaust, and the development of an international network of memorialisation, this reassertion of the particular contribution of the Wannsee villa to this wider network of sites of remembrance is telling of the need to establish and maintain its individual identity by reaffirming its local connections. In part this reflects an effort to prevent the site from being lumped into an undifferentiated mass of monuments, museums, and memorials; and to prevent an oversimplified understanding of its particular contribution to Holocaust memorialisation and education. These two recent special exhibitions attempted to counteract these
homogenising trends, by outlining the development of the memorial, and its early connection to the history of nineteenth century bourgeois culture in Berlin. In doing so it outlined the ways in which its local associations, and particular its historical path have influenced its connection to the region, and its development as an institution.

Overall the exhibition spaces, both physical and digital, reflect the tensions that arise when accommodating the broader trends of globalisation, while at the same time trying to foster a unique or particular identity through a reassertion of local ties or peculiar historical pathways. Ultimately however, the spaces outlined above reflect the ways in which a globalised memory of the Holocaust, as described by Levy and Sznaider, will necessarily reflect and be influenced by localising trends, and a desire to reassert particular histories and forms of regional identity. This symbiotic pull of forces does not compromise or preclude the creation of a globalised memory of the Holocaust, but rather engenders the development of regional or national interpretations or elements of these wider trends—or, as demonstrated in the above case, the reassertion of the unique identity of the site. This symbiotic relationship is not exclusive to the exhibitions spaces of the memorial, but extends also to the educational programmes conducted at the site. The wider shifts towards globalised memory, which simultaneously accompany efforts to connect to local or national pedagogical efforts, will be the focus of the following section of this chapter.

1.4 Educational Programmes

There are roughly three different kinds of educational programmes offered at the memorial. Since 1992 the House of the Wannsee Conference has offered small group work, study days and guided tours for secondary school and university age students
(ages 12 to 21+ years old); and programmes tailored to adult visitors (apprentices, bureaucrats and other professionals) including teacher training workshops. In addition, the memorial also sponsors lecture series and guest speakers for the general public. For youth groups and school classes the site typically focuses upon the persecution and genocide of the European Jews, and the history of National Socialism including its historical antecedents and the aftermath of the regime. Overarching educational themes for youths include Jews and Jewish life in Europe prior to 1933, Jews under the National Socialist regime, Everyday life under National Socialism, the planning and organisation of the genocide, the impact of the National Socialist regime in politics and society since 1945, and the current controversies and debates over the NS-regime and its crimes. Each of these broad themes is further broken down to target specific events or topics. For example, the theme of “Jews under the National Socialist Regime” offers study days on specific topics of “Life in the Ghetto” and “The November Pogrom.” Alternatively, adult educational programmes, including teacher-training workshops, seek to further forms of political and professional development. Study days are, as a rule, designed to cater to a specific profession. The central objective of each is to identify common assumed characteristics (stereotypes) of each role, learn about the history of their group during National Socialism, research how the profession contributed to the preparation and implementation of the genocide, and to then discuss possible alternative behaviours (those who refused to participate), as well as the relevance of the crimes of the past to the present day. Seminar themes focus on different aspects of the public sector including the civil service, law, local/municipal governments, financial sector, health

\[175\] For a full list of seminar topics and themes, including further descriptions (PDF downloads) and information, please see the main (German-language) version of the website. Each PDF summary sheet includes further aspects that will be covered and the methodology of the seminar.
care industry, federal bureaucracy, military or police, and the sciences and cultural sectors. Finally, seminars for educators and pedagogical colleagues offer advanced training on memorial pedagogy, and discussions on the educational concepts of the House, and the potential problems related to teaching National Socialism in the classroom.

The work of the Memorial and Educational Centre does not aim to supplant information taught in the classroom, but rather attempts to supplement those lessons through alternative methodological practices. Moreover, the lessons complement the existing initiatives of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs [Kultusminister Konferenz] or KMK. Though there is no centrally organised Ministry (or Department) of Education as each state in Germany organises their own educational curriculum, the KMK is a collective organisation founded in 1948, which “unites the ministers and senators of the Länder responsible for education, higher education and research as well as cultural affairs.”\(^\text{176}\) It helps to coordinate the educational programmes of each state, while providing recommendations on the content and implementation of the curriculum.\(^\text{177}\) With respect to instruction on National Socialism and the Holocaust, each state teaches this subject as part of the history or social sciences curriculum (religion or ethics). The topic is compulsory typically in grades nine or ten, though it is also occasionally taught in grade eight. In addition it is taught again in later years in greater depth


Since 1960 the KMK has recommended increased coverage of the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust in secondary school classrooms. More recently, in March 2009 a resolution by the KMK called for the strengthening of education on democratic principles, and an increase in cross-curricular and interdisciplinary teaching on recent German history, including National Socialism and the Communist dictatorship. In addition, a declaration by the KMK in December 2014 recognised the unique role of memory in shaping conceptions of modern European history in the twenty-first century. In particular, it noted the ways in which, “places of remembrance offer a particular opportunity of elucidating to the younger generation the significance of the past for their own life and times.”

---


the document acknowledges the ways in which the “media, commemoration days and places of remembrance” help to facilitate “specific encounters with the past,” which in turn help to “foster deep and effective learning.”  

The pedagogical work of memorial sites, and the wider improvements in mass media communication have thus become fundamental aspects of teaching and memorialising the past within Germany. Furthermore visits to these sites are often seen as a means of clarifying and refining information introduced in the classroom. Wolf Kaiser for example has criticised recent German textbooks for having published oversimplified or outright erroneous information on the Wannsee Conference.  

Visits to the memorial provide an opportunity to correct these errors, while offering a more nuanced understanding of this history.

Yet the KMK’s belated report, though recognising the impact of such memorial sites as Wannsee, merely brings to light a two-decade old trend. Since 1992 the memorial has hosted and implemented educational programmes for, on average, 1,300 groups each year. Given the steady number of participating groups, as well as the rise in overall visitor numbers, it is clear that educators have long acknowledged the potential benefits of memorial site visits. Furthermore, though school groups make up the majority of these visitors (roughly 50 to 55 percent between 2000 and 2011), adult participants still account for approximately 35 to 40 percent (not including University aged students). Qualitatively the nature of

---
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participation does vary according to age group, as the vast majority of adult and older secondary school student groups tend towards guided tours, while younger groups on the whole participate in small group work and study days.\textsuperscript{183} In addition, adult groups are typically limited with respect to their choice of topic, given that their assigned themes connect directly to their professional development. Finally, since the early 2000s there has been a steady rise in the number of non-German student groups visiting the site. By 2014 nearly two-thirds of all visiting student groups were from outside of Germany.\textsuperscript{184} This points to a shift in the kind of visitors engaging with the site, which extends beyond German school-age groups, to incorporate a wider demographic and international audience. Overall this change reflects the continued and deliberate effort on the part of the memorial, to foster international ties, address the growing trend of multi-culturalism in modern German society, and foster international relationships within the European Union and abroad.

**Educational Initiatives and the Formation of a Globalised Memory**

In part this move toward a more internationally diverse range of visitors and educational group participants is the result of a wider programme of workshops, seminars, and study days and other initiatives that offer a more nuanced pan-European or international perspective. From 2004/2005 to 2015 these have included multi-national groups (for school and university age students), visits by foreign national groups (teachers, military services), study trips abroad to Israel, Poland, Spain and other sites of remembrance, seminars for German students that seek to incorporate a wider European perspective or comparative approach, seminars that


\textsuperscript{184} Haupt, Tätigkeitsbericht 2013–2014, 27.
seek to explore demographic changes to a more ethnically and culturally diverse German society, and finally internship programmes and work exchanges for students from abroad.

Though official statistics do not indicate how many multi-national seminars and work groups visit the site each year, these programmes have been featured prominently in newsletters and annual reports since 2004/2005, and are enthusiastically promoted and emphasised through the site’s public relations. The first newsletter put forth by the memorial in June 2005, for example, published articles on a weeklong seminar (24 October to 1 November 2004) for German and Hungarian teachers, sponsored by the Hannah-Arendt Association, the city of Budapest, the Ravensbrück memorial, and the Anne Frank Centre of Berlin. In addition it covered programmes examining different national perspectives on memory and memorialisation of the Holocaust for students from Poland, France, and Germany; as well as a Polish-German symposium for memorial staff employees exploring the history of the Holocaust, from the Wannsee Conference to the extermination camps. Moreover it also presented a list of special programmes hosted by the site including research initiatives by University students from the United States, Japan, and other nations; teacher training seminars with Slovakian and German educators; information sessions with journalists from Israel and South Africa; and personal reflections from Austrian and Cambodian volunteers at the site.

Subsequent editions have similarly covered German-Israeli work groups on memorial site pedagogy; a week-long seminar programme bringing together
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Palestinian, Lebanese, and Serbian Jewish groups\textsuperscript{187}; visits by French travel groups touring sites of memory in Europe\textsuperscript{188}; visits by foreign dignitaries from Israel and abroad\textsuperscript{189}; comparisons of German and Italian histories of the Second World War by students of each respective group\textsuperscript{190}; long term projects coordinated with Berlin and Turkey, in which German students researched the history of National Socialism and migration and then travelled to Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir\textsuperscript{191}; and similarly trips by Berlin students to France and North Spain in order to better understand histories of flight and migration during the war.\textsuperscript{192}

Continuing this trend, more recently in 2015, the memorial featured plans to include topical seminars that addressed current German-Greek tensions, and the ways in which the history of the Second World War had resurfaced in light of the Greek debt crisis. Furthermore, the site hopes to facilitate a German-Greek exchange of school-age pupils, who will research the deportation of Jews from Thessaloniki, and has highlighted plans to forge new bonds with overseas memorial sites in South America. The proposed two-day workshop would include collaborations with survivors and memorial sites dedicated to those who were ‘disappeared’ within Colonia Dignidad (Villa Baviera) in Talca Chile. Moreover, the site has also sponsored a project of German-French students examining the repression of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{187} Newsletter 13 Oktober 2008: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz (Berlin: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 2008), 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{188} Newsletter 9 Juli 2007: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz (Berlin: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 2007), 10.
  \item \textsuperscript{189} Newsletter 31 Januar 2012: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz (Berlin: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 2012), 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{190} Newsletter 14 Januar 2009: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz (Berlin: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 2009), 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{191} Newsletter 21 Juli 2010: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz (Berlin: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 2010), 9.
  \item \textsuperscript{192} Newsletter 31 Januar 2012, 6.
\end{itemize}
media and dictatorships; and has helped to facilitate the travel of Berlin students to Israel in order to further examine discrimination of the Bedouin in Israel and the Roma and Sinti in Germany. The most recent annual report for 2013–2014 provides a comprehensive summary of the activities of the memorial including further detailed descriptions of all major educational programmes.

Internationally focused seminar themes and multi-national projects have become a fundamental part of the official offerings of the memorial site. According to the official website the memorial offers special study trips to explore the histories of concentration and death camps of Poland and the Czech Republic, and to also explore the meaning of the *Shoah* in Israeli society. The former offers students the opportunity to further explore different forms of national memory and remembrance, and to forge international (German-Polish, and German-Czech) relationships. Students travelling to Israel further explore the political impact of the Holocaust on Israeli and Middle Eastern politics as a whole. In addition, the memorial also offers seminars, which explore comparative aspects of the Holocaust including an examination of the Fascist government of Italy and the National Socialist government of Germany; the different aspects of the Holocaust within Europe (France, Romania, Greece, Lithuania); Christian and Muslim rescuers of Jews in

---

196 These seminar programmes include: “Vorbereitung auf Gedenkstättenreisen nach Polen,” “Vorbereitung auf Studienreisen in die Tschechische Republik,” and “Die Bedeutung der Shoah in der israelischen Gesellschaft.”
Europe as well as Tunisia and Sarajevo; and a comparison of post-dictator society in Chile, Argentina, Poland, Rwanda, and Cambodia.197

Given that the above examples are representative of only a portion of a larger more diverse and comprehensive programme, it is clear that the scope and objectives of the Wannsee memorial extends beyond the Berlin school system. Given that these specific instances are emphasised in both the newsletters, and reported in even greater detail in the annual reports, the memorial seeks to actively build cross-national connections with other European and non-European sites, schools, universities, and organisations. These multi-national collaborations both recognise the global dimensions of the Holocaust, and the need to establish and nurture relationships with students and educators outside of Germany, in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of the event. Furthermore these trends reflect a basic expectation, which has only grown since the end of the Cold War, that Holocaust education is not a nationally insular initiative, but rather, should incorporate an international perspective and scope by establishing these institutional affiliations across national borders. To lack this dimension is to lack a fundamental cooperative aspect of Holocaust education.

As noted by Assmann, the Holocaust was an international event in history given its scope and the range of groups affected. In one respect, this drives the

creation of these bi- and tri-national programmes, which foster a broader and more historically nuanced understanding of the Holocaust and National Socialism. This allows students to compare the different ways in which the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust has been presented to them in their respective countries, and also to challenge their preconceptions of different cultures, as well as broader national and ethnic stereotypes. Additionally, it provides an opportunity to develop cross-cultural and cross-national dialogues between students of different backgrounds, thus facilitating the ‘cognitive shift’ described by Macgilchrist and Christophe, by making students aware of their own participation within a wider community of remembrance, memorialisation, and historical inquiry. Furthermore such study day themes provide a means of comparative historical analysis with other major atrocities and dictatorial regimes of the twentieth century, while still maintaining a clear understanding of the historical context of each event. Thus students can study the atrocities perpetrated in Cambodia, Chile, Rwanda, and other sites and examine complex themes of victimisation, and the nature of the perpetrators, without reducing this examination to a historically generic trope. Furthermore, the comparative genocide seminar and study day, also seeks to link the Holocaust to the previously neglected histories of South East Asia, South America, and Africa. Though this study is limited in its scope and thus cannot attest to the direct impact of these numerous programmes upon the mentality of students, the intended aims of these workshops and seminars, as well as the growth in the number of foreign visitors, reflect this attempt to build relationships and ties within Germany, greater Europe and abroad.

In addition, the educational programmes of the memorial, particularly through the continued efforts of Elke Gryglewski, seek to challenge the assumption
that Germany is an ethnically homogenous society. Gryglewski analyses the complex relationship between second and third generation students and the wider German community. Often straddling two worlds, she notes how these students can view themselves as foreigners and feel neither fully German, nor fully comfortable adopting the culture of their parents or grandparents. Though their families typically immigrated in the 1970s (over 40 years prior), they themselves are often born in Germany, able to speak fluent German, and fully immersed in German culture and media. At times they can feel a pull between acknowledging personal family histories, while also acknowledging their identification with, and interest in, German culture and history. Furthermore, entrenched class and ethnic prejudices—and stereotypical assumptions against Turkish, Muslim, and Arabic-Palestinian migrant populations in German teaching practices—only discourage students from active involvement in the education system. Gryglewski’s work in pedagogical practices at the House of the Wannsee Conference, has sought to find ways to reengage students particularly of Turkish or Arabic background with the history of the Holocaust. Through her work and the work of others at the site, the memorial has developed pedagogical techniques to better engage with multi-cultural and multi-ethnic groups. Focusing on particular themes or aspects of the event, for example can prove useful, as second- and first-generation visitors are often interested in the subject of right-wing extremism, violence, and ideology, given the continued hostility that these groups face. Similarly, students can explore this period of German

199 Gryglewski, “Teaching about the Holocaust,” S46. The above summary cannot fully detail the complexities of this situation. The above paragraph seeks to highlight some of the key points of this debate.
history to further explore the themes of assimilation and integration in German society, as well as important aspects of the protection of human and civil rights.200

In order to cater to the differing interest among student participants, the memorial developed the “two-way guided tour” [wechselseitige Führung] for multi-ethnic groups. Designed for students in their 9th and 10th year, the ‘basic’ tour of the exhibition is divided into two parts. Firstly, students are given a traditional guided tour through the fifteen rooms of the exhibition. Following this however, they are then given the opportunity to further explore a room of their choice, and then time to prepare a brief (roughly seven minute) presentation on a topic related to that particular room. This method ensures that students are given more control over the content of their visit to the memorial, and to explore topics that they find significant. With multi-ethnic groups this format is of crucial importance as it provides an opportunity to focus on particular aspects of the Holocaust and National Socialism that they feel are appealing and directly relevant to them. At the same time it provides educators with a better understanding of the concepts and themes that most interest their students.201

Moreover the memorial also tailors particular study day themes and concepts to the needs of individual groups. Thus generic study day themes on the Nazi dictatorship, and Jewish life under National Socialism are honed to directly address, for example, the role of Turkey during the Second World War, or the experiences of non-German Jews in Germany during this time. Other study days can explore questions related to the concept of ‘racial hygiene,’ and the roots of racial ideology,

as well as the differing experiences of German-Jews versus migrant or non-assimilated families during the National Socialist period.202

Similarly, Franziska Ehricht and Elke Gryglewski’s project, Geschichte Teilen provides primary source material designed to facilitate seminar discussions and small group work for multi-ethnic student groups. Comprised of ten folders, each containing documents, photographs, excerpts from letters, diaries, and survivor testimonies, and other materials (mostly in German), the assembled collection is designed to address the increasing number of students within large German cities, whose families do not originate from Germany. Attempting to assuage feelings of exclusion from primarily non-European groups, these materials identify key aspects of the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust that may be of interest to these groups. Thus they explore the previously neglected histories of migrants, Turkish-Jews, and non-white German groups. Though the documents themselves are collected (unbound) in folders, apart from the introductory booklet, information on how to employ this material is fairly open. Suggested thematic motifs include love and partnership, the perspective of children, the restraints on work and flight and migration.203 The primary source packets themselves explore the subjects of racism under National Socialism with a particular emphasis on racism against Turkish-Jewish immigrants, Turkish-Jews during the Holocaust, the forced sterilisation of the Rhineland children (also known as the “Rhineland Bastards”), the experiences of black people within the National Socialist State, the stories of Arab rescuers, the lives of Jews in Tunisia under German occupation, Muslim helpers in Sarajevo, and so forth. These underexplored stories are told however in fragments and pre-selected

documents for further analysis and exploration by the students. Instead of being told directly about these histories students are tasked with piecing together these narratives and developing their own understanding of these materials.\textsuperscript{204}

In addition the site has seen a dramatic rise in the number of foreign student groups visiting the site. In 2002 the site saw 22,966 German group participants, and only 13,954 participants from outside of Germany. By 2005 the number of foreign participants was greater than that of German, and by 2014 the site hosted 36,739 foreign participants (or 67\% of the total).\textsuperscript{205}

Together, these programmes, which seek to address the growing demographic diversity within Germany, aim to ensure that students, regardless of their family’s origins, are not excluded from discussions on the Holocaust and the history of National Socialism. Though further emphasising the cultural differences of these student groups is potentially problematic, the task of generating critical engagement with this subject, while also revealing the intertwined histories of these groups within the wider history of Germany, must begin somewhere. Whether or not students will still find this material relevant or interesting in the future is questionable, as these communities become more and more assimilated into German culture, and later generations are further removed from the culture of their parents and grandparents. It is however, significant that issues of continued racial discrimination and prejudice continue to be discussed, particularly in mixed student groups where students from a traditional German backgrounds may remain unaware of the discrimination and prejudice that migrant students may face. Furthermore, these seminar topics explore previously under-researched aspects of this history, which reveal the extent of the

\textsuperscript{204} Further background information, and the full title for each documentation packet, is provided in the introductory booklet.

impact of National Socialism and the Holocaust beyond traditional western European frameworks. Programmes addressing second and third generation immigrants seek to address migration shifts from the 1970s onwards, as immigration remains a hotly debated subject within Germany and Europe as a whole. Beyond regular classroom instruction, the memorial affords an opportunity to address demographic shifts, and their impact upon German identity and institutional memory. Furthermore, the site seeks to insure that the pedagogical methods remain relevant and effective, in order to reach a more ethnically diverse generation of students in the present day. In addition, international and multi-ethnic programmes—in reaching a wider audience by establishing both European and non-European connections, forging links with student groups across the globe, engaging in discussions of comparative genocides with other non-European nations, and including a broader exploration of previously neglected histories—seek to ensure that the nature of Holocaust memorialisation in Germany, and historical inquiry into the National Socialist past, is not solely dependent or determined by the nation state, but the wider global community of remembrance.

The Continuation of National Forms of Remembrance

Yet growth of internationally focused educational programmes at the House of the Wannsee Conference is not without qualification. With respect to the significant rise in visitor numbers to the permanent exhibition and the memorial as a whole, increased numbers have not always translated into increased visitor participation. A breakdown of visitor statistics from 2000 to 2011 indicates a significant rise in the overall number of general visitors (or those who do not partake in the educational programmes); however, this rise is mostly with single visitors who choose to not take
a guided tour (this figure rose from 27,407 in 2000 to 53,123 in 2011), and groups who visit the site without any special guidance or assistance from memorial staff (this number rose from 7,579 in 2000 to 22,200 in 2011). In comparison the number of single visitors choosing to take a guided tour remained on average roughly 900 visitors per year from 2000 to 2009 (before rising sharply in 2011 to 2,211), and requests by groups for further guidance and assistance actually dipped slightly (this figure was 30,504 in 2000 and 28,064 in 2011).

Similarly, from 1999 to 2014, the number of educational programme offerings (guided tours [general, with discussion, public], small group work projects, study days, and special events) remained fairly constant; however, increased demand for guided tours (559 in 2002 to 650 in 2014), and public guided tours (65 in 2002 and 258 in 2014), was met with a decrease in the number of tours with follow-up discussion (83 in 2002 to 48 in 2014), as well as a decrease in small group work (136 in 2002 to 89 in 2014) and study days (356 in 2002 to 294 in 2014).

Additionally, from 2002 to 2014 the number of school-age participants from outside of Germany nearly doubled (8,634 in 2002 to 16,009 in 2014), whilst the number of groups from Berlin and other states dropped significantly (11,561 in 2002 to 8,282 in 2014). Yet the increase in foreign students to the site is not matched by a dramatic increase in the number of study days or small group work tasks. Arguably, the overall number of foreign guided tour participants has grown (2000 to 2011),
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207 “Allgemeine Besucherzahlen,” 5.
whilst the number of German participants has fallen. Thus by 2011 the percentage of foreign guided tour participants remained steady at 49%. Furthermore the number of foreign student groups participating in small group work activities (question and answer sections, two-way guided tours), and seminar days remains incredibly low making up only 0.5 % of the total offerings for each. The majority of foreign student groups thus choose to visit the site without further moderation or assistance from the memorial staff, as is evident in the significant rise in the number of foreign groups without mentoring from 1996 to 2011.

Furthermore, in 2014, though the memorial hosted groups from over 42 different countries (both European and non-European), including Brazil, China, Japan, Mauritius, Mexico, Singapore, and the United Arab Emirates—the vast majority of these groups (roughly 66%) originated from Israel, the United Kingdom, and the United States. An additional 15.4 % were from France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Canada. Students from these countries thus comprise 81.6% in total. Since the redesign of the memorial in 2006, roughly 70–74% of all educational programmes are conducted in German, and 20% in English, with the remainder in Hebrew, French and other various languages. In part this could reflect both demand, as well as the limitations of museum staff. Given that a large proportion of the educational programmes of the museum are conducted by temporary contract staff, it is likely

---


that the language offerings of the site vary according to the skills of the current available staff.

Overall the breakdown of visitor and educational programme statistics points to the wider limitations of practice and implementation. Practical limitations at times hinder the proper implementation of these programmes or dull their impact. Interviews with museum staff have revealed the difficulties in trying to engage international students with overburdened itineraries with visits to as many as four or five memorial sites in Berlin alone, and further travel abroad, all within the span of a few days. Such programmes prove taxing for both students and educators. More positively however, the memorial neither solicits group visits nor other forms of participation. The figures presented above thus reflect the actual demand for educational resources from the site. In this respect the reputation of the memorial and its work clearly extends beyond Europe, and it has proven successful in forging international ties.

Still, the Wannsee memorial’s focus is equally invested in programmes for German students, educators, and adult participants. Though the site is notable for its educational programs for secondary school children, programmes for university age students and adults, account for roughly 45% of all seminars, study days, and guided tours. These programmes are specifically meant for German professionals and apprentices, and are designed for such groups as medical professionals and nurses, lawyers and members of the judicial system, bakers, booksellers, treasury and tax professionals, the police and military, hairdressers, and union members. Developed by memorial staff members Annegret Ehmann and Lore Kleiber, the professional seminar programme as a whole is meant to draw attention to the way in which Nazi

ideology infiltrated all sectors of society during the National Socialist period, and also to examine the culpability of these groups and the ways in which they contributed to the persecution and genocide of the Jews of Europe.\textsuperscript{215} Each seminar is thus designed for a specific vocational group, and participants are tasked with examining how the, “general administrative structures and career specific thought and behavioural patterns were responsible for the smooth functioning of the mass collaboration needed to implement the Holocaust.”\textsuperscript{216}

For example, seminars for health care professionals, including medical students, nursing students, health care managers, and elderly care nurses, teach about the history of the ‘euthanasia ‘or T4 operations.\textsuperscript{217} Carried out discreetly by medical professionals of the National Socialist period, the operation involved the murder of the elderly, and the physically and mentally disabled, including infants and children.\textsuperscript{218} Participants are asked to analyse historical documents on ‘racial hygiene,” the role of nurses, and also eugenics and euthanasia in the present day. The program is meant to explore the direct and indirect involvement of health care professionals in carrying out these operations.

A majority of nursing schools in Berlin incorporate seminars such as these into their training programmes to accompany theoretical classroom training, as well as on-the-job vocational training. Participants are typically eighteen years or older. Over the course of two days, students are asked to both critically examine their own

\textsuperscript{215} Ehmann, “Learning from History,” 610.

\textsuperscript{216} Description in the “Introduction” of both “Posting: From Euthanasia to ‘Final Solution,’” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://learning-from-history.de/International/content/8539}; and “Posting; The Treasury and Tax Department and the Persecution of the Jews,” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://learning-from-history.de/International/content/8493}.

\textsuperscript{217} So named for the address of the operation’s main office 4 Tiergartenstraße in Berlin. This program was eventually exported to the concentration camp system under the name 14f13.

\textsuperscript{218} Ehmann, “Learning from History,” 612.
assumptions regarding race, involuntary sterilization, euthanasia, human genetics, and death, as well as Nazi propaganda, ideology and values, and the economics of health care. In addition, the seminar is tied to a discussion on both current social values, and an analysis of Nazi racial categories, and concepts of racial hygiene. Within smaller groups the students analyse excerpts from Hitler’s authorization for killing the incurably ill, as well as the different elements of Nazi ideology including the ways in which such concepts as “biologically based nationalism” seeped into both domestic and foreign policies. Analyses of the source material as well as general discussions help participants compare general public norms and perceptions with professional outlooks and ethics.

Similarly, the seminar exploring the Treasury and Tax Department—designed specifically for civil service employees, as well as students preparing for careers in the private and public sectors in real estate, residential management, tax assessment, and tax consultation in Berlin—is meant to help participants understand the ways in which the government administration and rigid bureaucratic systems contributed to the implementation of the Holocaust. Participants examine the administrative organization of the genocide, the division of labour within the governmental bureaucracy, and the reasons why ordinary employees in the public sector would knowingly contribute to the functioning of the Nazi regime. They are given a brief overview of the ideological and pseudo-scientific precedents of the genocide, the ways in which these ideologies translated into domestic and foreign policy, the political structure and administrative organization of the state, the technological developments that made the implementation of genocide possible, some of the

219 “From Euthanasia to ‘Final Solution.’”
221 “Treasury and Tax Department.”
economic “rational” for murder, and finally the actual process of genocide, as implemented through isolation, expropriation, concentration, and finally murder. Through this exploration future and existing members of the field remain wary of the ways in which their profession had become ethically and ideologically corrupted.

Designed with a similar structure and intent, apprenticeship seminars for bakers, hair dressers, and book sellers; look more generally at nutrition and food sources during the war, the cult of Aryan beauty, and censorship and the Aryanisation of businesses respectively. Hairdressing apprentices for example, examine, “how and through what methods” the Germans were, “conditioned to use and accept physical stereotypes as part of racial segregation,” and to also examine the ways in which, “the concept of race [was] visualized” through propaganda photographs, forms of branding such as the Star of David, and negative caricatures of the Jews. In addition participants are asked to further consider the dominant aesthetic norms of the period, the ways in which these reinforced gender norms and expectations, and how these norms contributed to a culture of marked visual exclusion and segregation from the rest of society.

A parallel seminar series for apprentice bakers, entitled “Nutrition and Politics” explores the topic related to “The Nutrition Situation of the Jewish Population in the Warsaw Ghetto,” “Reactions of the German Populations to the changing supply situation during the war,” “The nutrition situation in Berlin at the
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222 “Posting: Physical Culture & Aesthetic Norms in Nazi Germany,” accessed 22 January, 2013, http://learning-from-history.de/International/content/8644. Finally, the seminar designed for baker apprentices is not available online, and has not been published. I was able to view materials, such as handouts and documents, when visiting the memorial site. This last seminar has not been translated into English. The memorial staff provided some descriptions of the course of the seminar day, as well as information on typical participant reactions to the seminar.


224 “Physical Culture & Aesthetic Norms.”
end of hostilities in May/June 1945,” and “Food ration cards.” Overall it examines the way in which food supplies were regulated and affected by both the militaristic and ideological objectives of National Socialism. Finally, the booksellers apprenticeship seminar covers for example, the infamous book burnings in Bebelplatz across from Humboldt University, and the banning of scholarly and literary works by Jewish authors.

Though these seminars are meant for German participants to carefully examine aspects of their culture and historical past, source materials for these seminars, including lesson plans, photographs, handouts, questionnaires, documents, and suggested bibliographies are posted online on the Learning from History [Lernen aus der Geschichte] website. Materials are available for seminars related to hairdressers (“Physical Cultural & Aesthetic Norms in Nazi Germany”), nurses and those in the medical profession (“From Euthanasia to ‘Final Solution’”), accountants and tax collectors (“The Treasury and Tax Department and the Persecution of the Jews”), librarians and booksellers (“Booksellers and the Book Market in Nazi Germany”), and bakers (“Nutrition and Politics”). By making these materials available to a wider global audience (particularly by providing translations in English), the memorial both highlights the unique efforts of German educators and the particular approaches in German education to confront these aspects of their history. At the same time these posts provide a pedagogical template for other researchers outside of Germany to construct similarly themed projects and lesson plans utilising these methods. Moreover, the online posts can provide non-German
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225 All information on this seminar derives from notes taken on the work group packets I was able to view during my 2012 and 2013 research trips. These materials are not published, and are not held in an archive. Rather they are part of a personal collection of teaching materials held by a member of the memorial staff.

226 In May 1995 the “Empty Library” by Micha Ullman was unveiled in Bebelplatz. The memorial is underground, and consists of empty bookshelves.
educators with a better understanding of key documents and sources, as well as successful structuring of multi-day seminars, in order to help transfer these lessons to related projects outside of Germany. Regardless, sharing this information online allows similar educational organisations to better understand the work conducted at the memorial site.

Overall, the statistical information presented in this section as well as the summary of professional and apprentice seminars reflect the continuation of nationally focused aspects of memorial pedagogy. Though there are clear indications that memorials are engaging with the wider international community this is not at the exclusion of enduring national forms of remembrance. Projects that focus on the particular or unique aspect of German history and German society and culture, are vital to developing a nuanced and contextualised understanding of the past, and for allowing Germany to adequately address their unique relationship to this history. Implementing professional and apprenticeship seminars in other nations is possible, but this transposition will ultimately shift the nature of student engagement with this source material. Yet, as clearly demonstrated through the posting of materials online, this does not mean that the wider memorial community is excluded from commenting and reflecting on these programmes, adopting these approaches to teaching, or finding similarities and links within their own historical past, which help to establish similar programmes abroad. By posting this material online the profile of the memorial is enhanced, and its activities are purposefully introduced to the wider global community for further critique and discussion.

Moreover, though any attempt to reproduce these projects outside of Germany would require further modifications to these lessons, in many respects the apprenticeship and professional seminar programme perfectly embodies Dan Diner’s
principle of the universal and the particular. Particular lessons are drawn in relation
to a specific field during the period of National Socialism, yet broader lessons
regarding ethical and responsible professional practice are drawn from these
investigations in order to apply these lessons to the present.

1.5 Conclusions

As is apparent from the information and analyses set forth in this chapter, the
exhibition spaces and educational programmes of the House of the Wannsee
Conference reflect both trends in globalised Holocaust memory, as well as the
endurance and continuation of nationally focused forms of remembrance. Overall
this chapter has demonstrated how the Wannsee memorial has addressed the
international scope of the Holocaust, attempted to provide an international and multi-
national perspective of this history, utilised online media to better communicate and
disseminate information about their educational programmes and exhibition spaces,
adressed demographic shifts, and finally shown how the site loosely reflects Diner’s
concept of the universal and the particular, by presenting the particular histories of
four Jewish families. In addition through its educational programmes the memorial
has attempted to show how the particular histories of professionals and apprentices
during the National Socialist period can generate universal lessons regarding
professional ethics and the questioning of established professional norms.

Yet this chapter has also demonstrated the ways in which the memorial
continues to support national forms of remembrance and Holocaust education. As
illustrated through its educational programmes, the site continues to support seminars
and study days primarily for German school age students. Similarly, the professional
seminars and workshops are designed specifically for German participants, and
remain a fundamental part of the educational programme. Furthermore the exhibition spaces renewed emphasis on the history of the memorial, reflects a larger desire to make explicit its unique contribution to the wider landscape of memory in Germany. Though the memorial has engaged in concerted efforts with international schools and organisations abroad to facilitate international study days, these instances remain a small fraction of the larger number of activities offered at the site. Furthermore, foreign visitor engagement, while climbing, remains rather cursory in comparison to more in-depth multi-day and intensive programmes.

Overall however, the shift towards a serious engagement in the wider community of remembrance is clear at the memorial site. There thus exists a distinct balance between the wider forces of globalisation and the enduring trend of national memory. Whether or not these changes have resulted in a cognitive shift in the minds of visitors and education participants remains an open question. The impact of these shifts upon students, adult participants, and educators, would prove a fruitful source of further investigation for future projects, complementing this project, by joining the intention and aims of the memorial with a study on its subsequent impact.
CHAPTER 2: THE RAVENSBRÜCK MEMORIAL AND THE SACHSENHAUSEN MEMORIAL MUSEUM:
Exploring the Effects of Globalising Forces upon Memorial Spaces

2.1 Introduction: Scope and Aims

Chapter one outlined key characteristics and aspects of globalised memory, and explored the ways in which the educational initiatives and exhibition spaces of the House of the Wannsee Conference contributed to a globalised memory of the Holocaust, whilst simultaneously supporting national forms of remembrance. This chapter will continue to explore the growth of globalised memory, but also focus on its impact, and the endurance of national trends at the Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen memorial museums. As sites of former concentration camps, their relationship to the past is fundamentally different from that of the House of the Wannsee Conference. The latter was a site of planning and organisation removed from the implementation of genocide, whereas the former were places of imprisonment, murder, and atrocity. 227 In addition, the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück memorial museums possess layers of memory. The history of these sites extends well into the postwar period, with the establishment of the Soviet Special camp (and military base), and the original East German memorial museums, which served as two parts of a triumvirate of anti-fascist resistance (Buchenwald

227 Moreover the educational centre has dominated the identity and focus of the House of the Wannsee Conference. The site’s primary goals as outlined in the directive of the overseeing financial body have always been remembrance of the victims of National Socialism, imparting information on the crimes of National Socialism and “education in democracy and the defence of human rights.” “Article 2: Vereinszweck, Gemeinnützigkeit,” Satzung des Vereins ‘Erinnern für die Zukunft—Trägerverein des Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz e.V. (Berlin: Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, 2014), 1.
being the third part). This history thus adds a further layer of complexity to the current post-unification identities of these sites.

The themes of this chapter are connected and often overlap. Its organisation will roughly divide into five sections. Firstly, the remainder of the introduction will provide a brief review of the primary research questions, objectives, and methodologies of this chapter. Following this the second major section of this chapter will include a review of the historical background of each camp from the National Socialist period to the end of the German Democratic Republic. The third major section will explore how the exhibition spaces of the post-unification period to the present reflect the general displacement of national forms of memory in favour of a less dogmatic reflective approach towards memorialisation. Section four will explore the concepts of competing memorial pasts and hierarchies of memory, and will connect this to questions related to commercialisation and the ethical obligations of these memorials. This section will thus examine independent educational programmes, the policies of preservation and authenticity, as well as the controversy surrounding the decision to charge for guided tours at Sachsenhausen. The fifth and final section will present a summary of the chapter’s overall conclusions.

**Research Questions, Objectives, and Methodologies**

The primary objective of this chapter will be to further explore the impact of globalisation at sites directly connected to the Holocaust, as well as the continuation of Germany’s national legacy of remembrance and commemoration. In doing so it will examine how memory is shaped after the displacement of the nation state, the diversity of pasts and histories that are memorialised, and the different groups that continue to vie for recognition. Will Holocaust memory and
memorialisation in Germany always be inevitably informed by the nation’s particular historical connection to the Holocaust and National Socialism? What then is the impact of this indelible tie to the development of a globalised memory of this recent past? What functions do these sites now serve in Germany and global society as a whole in the post-unification period? What obligations and duties are conditional for their existence? Furthermore, what taboos are still connected to these spaces, and how may the identities of these sites change over time, as their connection to the past grows ever more distant? In exploring the exhibition spaces and educational initiatives of the Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen memorial museums this chapter will seek to answer these questions, while investigating the ways in which these memorial museum spaces engender broader issues and trends regarding remembrance and memory in the post-unification period.

Consequently, this chapter will primarily focus upon the past and current exhibition spaces of these memorials, which consist of dozens of permanent (physical and online) exhibitions, memorial statues, and monuments. In addition this chapter will also examine converted or renovated spaces, and previously or currently neglected spaces outside of the confines of the main memorial grounds. In addition, it will also incorporate some published and unpublished materials related to the educational programmes of the site, and will also draw upon interviews with museum staff and photographs gathered during my field research at these sites in the summers of 2012 and 2013.
2.2 Historical Background

The National Socialist Era, 1933–1945

Construction on the Sachsenhausen concentration camp began in July 1936.\textsuperscript{228} Apart from the main camp situated just north of Berlin near Oranienburg, an extensive network of several dozen sub-camps were scattered between the Elbe and Oder rivers in the Brandenburg region. The camp remained in operation from early 1937 until the end of the Second World War in April 1945, when the Soviet Army liberated the remaining 3,000 prisoners. While in 1937, 1,650 prisoners were housed in the camp, this number fluctuated, though steadily grew throughout its operation with as many as 28,000 prisoners housed within the camp system (including sub-camps) by 1943. By 1944, this number had risen to over 66,000 prisoners, and only further increased until the death marches into the northwest at the end of the war.\textsuperscript{229}

Given its close proximity to Berlin, the camp proved valuable as an area in which to detain those deemed to be potential ‘enemies’ or ‘threats’ to the National Socialist leadership. The demography of inmates evolved however, so that while

\textsuperscript{228} Though the means of classifying the different kinds of camps (i.e. forced labour, satellite, sub- camps) of the National Socialist period is not always exact, the Konzentrationslager (concentration camps) that were situated within Germany should not be conflated with the Vernichtungslager (extermination or death camps) erected in the eastern occupied territories. Plans to construct the latter did not begin until August 1941, and their proposed design continued to evolve throughout October of that year. Alternatively, concentration camps formed relatively soon after the Nazi seizure of power. This is evident through the Oranienburg Concentration Camp, which was established in some rudimentary form as early as March 1933. Klaus Drobisch, “Oranienburg—eines der ersten nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager” in Konzentrationslager Oranienburg, ed. Günter Morsch (Oranienburg: Stiftung Brandenburgische Gedenkstätten, 1994), 13; and Christopher R. Browning, The Origins of the Final Solution: The Evolution of Nazi Jewish Policy 1939–1942 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 353–354.

Initially the population was largely comprised of members of the Social Democratic and Communist parties, and clergy; after the November pogrom of 1938 nearly 6,000 Jews were incarcerated (the total Jewish population being 14,000) albeit for only a short time. Notable political figures to pass through the camp include the former Austrian chancellor Kurt von Schuschnigg and the anti-Nazi pastor Martin Niemöller. Although the number of Jews within the camp remained relatively small in relation to the total number of those incarcerated, Jews were singled out for harsh treatment. By October 1942 after Heinrich Himmler ordered the expulsion of Jews from the concentration camps within Germany’s pre-war borders, nearly all those in Sachsenhausen were deported to Auschwitz.\(^{230}\) Other groups detained in the camp included the Sinti and Roma, those that the Nazis deemed to be ‘asocial,’ the ‘work shy,’ Jehovah’s Witnesses—who refused to swear allegiance to Hitler and to serve in the military—and after 1939, foreign nationals, including Czechs, Poles, Dutch, Russians, and French.

Though the camp was never intended to be a site of systematic mass murder; cruelties, tortures, and punishments were characteristic of camp life. Thus massacres and extreme acts of brutality were common. Notorious acts of violence included the massacre of Soviet prisoners of war at Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald.\(^{231}\) As with other camps random killings occurred, as well as arbitrary punishments, beatings, medical experiments, and death through disease, malnutrition, or exhaustion. Overall it is estimated that approximately 40,000 to 50,000 prisoners were killed there.\(^{232}\)

---

\(^{230}\) Huebner, “Sachsenhausen,” 1257.


The Ravensbrück concentration camp—situated in close proximity to the small town of Fürstenberg in the lake district of Mecklenburg—opened on May 18th, 1939 and remained in operation until its liberation in April 1945.\footnote{Jack G. Morrison, \textit{Ravensbrück: Everyday Life in a Woman’s Concentration Camp 1939–45} (Princeton, New Jersey: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2000), 14–16.} As with Sachsenhausen, the Ravensbrück camp system, incorporated several underlying facilities including over 30 sub-camps stretching to as far as the Baltic Sea.\footnote{Irene Mayer, “Ravensbrück Subcamp System” in \textit{Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 1933–1945}. Vol. 1 Early Camps, Youth Camps, and Concentration Camps and Subcamps under the SS-Business Administration Main Office, ed. Geoffrey P. Megargee (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2009), 1192.} The camp is particularly notable as it housed female prisoners, who were watched exclusively by female guards—though a male SS commandant was in charge of its operation. These guards though known as “SS-women” were typically members of the \textit{weibliche SS-Gefolge} (SS Women’s Auxiliary), which was a separate organisation from the SS. Though initially 867 female prisoners were transferred to the camp from Lichtenburg, within a year, this figure had tripled, and by 1945 the number of inmates had grown to approximately 35,000.\footnote{Morrison, \textit{Ravensbrück}, 16; and Brenhard Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” in \textit{Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos, 1933–1945}. Vol. 1 Early Camps, Youth Camps, and Concentration Camps and Subcamps under the SS-Business Administration Main Office, ed. Geoffrey P. Megargee (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2009), 1188.}

Different categories of prisoners within the camp included, those convicted of crimes, ‘asocials’—particularly in the case of women this would include prostitutes and women who had had an abortion—members of the SPD and Communist party or wives of party members, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and Jews—including Jews convicted of “racial defilement,” or of having relations with an Aryan.\footnote{Morrison, \textit{Ravensbrück}, 38.} After the summer of 1941 the prisoner community became less defined by these categories, and more so
by nationality, with the majority of internees coming from Poland, the Soviet Union, Germany, and Austria.\textsuperscript{237} As with Sachsenhausen, the number of Jewish prisoners within the camp remained proportionately low at approximately 13% of the prisoner population, and did not considerably rise again after the mass deportations of 1942. This remained the case until the second half of 1944. In addition, given the nature of the population at Ravensbrück (predominately female), 881 children appear in the register, along with 522 births, and 48 miscarriages or instances of infant mortality.\textsuperscript{238}

Punishments for minor infractions (such as a dress code violation) within the camp were typical, and included \textit{Strafstehen}—standing at attention at times for days—the withholding of food and mail, or being assigned menial or physically demanding tasks.\textsuperscript{239} In addition, the infirmary was both a site of disease (typhus and diphtheria), and a place of pseudo medical experimentation, in which prisoners were deliberately infected or subject to unnecessary surgery.\textsuperscript{240} Women were at times forced to work, or were encouraged to “volunteer” in brothels at men’s camps. Often they were lured there with false promises that they would be released. Like Sachsenhausen, though the camp was not a site of systematic extermination, the 14f13 program, which was an extension of the T4 ‘euthanasia’ programme, resulted in the deaths of 1,600 female prisoners, and an additional 300 male prisoners.\textsuperscript{241} Overall it is estimated that between 25,000 to 26,000 female prisoners died at Ravensbrück throughout its six years of operation.\textsuperscript{242}

\textsuperscript{237} Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1188.
\textsuperscript{238} Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1188.
\textsuperscript{239} Morrison, \textit{Ravensbrück}, 224–228.
\textsuperscript{240} Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1189.
\textsuperscript{241} Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1190.
\textsuperscript{242} Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1188. There have been a handful of monographs on the histories of Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück. The majority of
Liberation and the Immediate Postwar Period

The liberation of Ravensbrück occurred in April 1945. Professor Carl Burckhardt, President of the International Red Cross, secured the evacuation of several hundred women at first by truck, and then later several thousand by train. By the end of April Himmler ordered the evacuation of the camp, thus forcing the remaining 6,000 male prisoners (arrived from Dora and Neuengamme) and 20,000 female prisoners to march toward the northwest through the Mecklenburg Lake district. As the organization of this death march disintegrated, inmates continued to push westward toward the American and British forces, finally reaching them in May 1945. Conversely by 30 April, the Soviet army arrived at the near empty Ravensbrück (only about 2,000 sick men and woman remained), and began the process of burying the dead, quelling the possible spread of disease, and cleaning the barracks. The Soviet Army’s liberation of Sachsenhausen occurred only eight days prior on 22 April. Of the 72 sub camps, which had made up the greater camp system, these studies however have been exhibition catalogues, publications that have resulted from sponsored workshops or conferences put on at the site, or commissioned studies and research sponsored by the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation. The majority of these works have been put forth by the directors or primary researchers of each site: Günter Morsch and Astrid Ley, and Insa Eschebach and Regina Mühlhäuser. These studies have explored specific aspects of the concentration camp on such topics as resistance, medical experimentation, sexual violence, music, the social structures of the camp, the Soviet Special camp, everyday life, Jewish prisoners, auxiliary camps, and the evolution of the permanent exhibitions. Non-affiliated studies include such recent works as Bernhard Strebel. Das KZ Ravensbrück: Geschichte eines Lagerkomplexes (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 2003); Judith Buber Agassi’s Jewish Women Prisoners of Ravensbrück (Oxford: One World, 2007).

243 Morrison, Ravensbrück, 300. This was part of a series of concessions by Himmler, in which he permitted the evacuation of several thousand inmates to Switzerland and Sweden, the Red Cross trucks to distribute food in the camps, and several concentration camps to be surrendered to the Allies. Hilberg, Destruction of the European Jews, 986–987.

244 Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1191.

245 Strebel, “Ravensbrück Main Camp,” 1191.

246 Morrison, Ravensbrück, 300–306.
nearly all were dissolved between February and April 1945, and their inmates transferred to the main camp. Only about 3,000 prisoners who had been too weak to be marched from the camp remained. All others were marched northwest, and were gradually liberated in subsequent weeks.247

The immediate postwar period saw the utilization of former concentration camp spaces for both educational and punitive purposes. As part of the early re-education programmes of the Allies, American troops marched residents of the neighbouring city of Weimar, through Buchenwald (which would later revert to Soviet control) to force them to confront National Socialist crimes, and prevent future accusations that these atrocities had been Allied fabrications or propaganda driven exaggerations.248 Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück were both repurposed for military use, and consequently suffered from significant neglect. Roughly 30,000 Soviet troops were stationed at Ravensbrück, and other parts of the camp were eventually sold and fell into a general state of disuse and dilapidation. The Soviets continued to use the main camp as a material and tank depot throughout the postwar period, and an active military base stood on the grounds of the former camp until 1994.

Alternatively, by August 1945, Buchenwald and Sachsenhausen, served as covert “Special Camps,” and remained in operation until March of 1950. The new camp ironically utilised the existing structures of the former concentration camp including the living barracks, sickbay, cellblock, prisoners’ kitchen and laundry rooms. There a mixture of low to mid-level former NSDAP functionaries, members

248 Gene Currivan, “Nazi Death Factory Shocks Germans on a Forced Tour,” in The New York Times, April 18th, 1945, 1 and 8. Similar viewings occurred in Woebbelin and Mathausen. Often times civilians were forced to help in the burying or cleaning of the camps.
of the police battalions, concentration camp guards, and youths suspected of being members of the *Werewolf* movement were imprisoned. On the whole, the camps served as prisons for political opponents of Communism, and thus in some cases people who had opposed the Nazis were once again imprisoned by the Soviets.\(^{249}\) Furthermore, judges, lawyers, large landowners, businessmen and others were held arbitrarily.\(^{250}\) It is estimated that of the 60,000 inmates imprisoned there, nearly 12,000 died of sickness, hunger, and physical and psychological illnesses.\(^{251}\) While the appropriation of these sites in the postwar period was not necessarily a means to overwrite and thus supplant the history of National Socialism, it unintentionally created a layer of history, largely ignored until after unification.

**Commemoration under the GDR: 1945 to 1988**

Due to the military occupation of both of these locations, early commemorative ceremonies did not take place directly within the grounds of the former camps. Instead improvised memorials for the survivors of Sachsenhausen were held in the nearby town square of Oranienburg.\(^{252}\) At Ravensbrück, from 1948 onwards, survivors utilised the area around the abandoned crematorium.\(^{253}\) Before their

\(^{249}\) Fox, *Stated Memory*, 45. The establishment of an exhibition space that focused exclusively on the postwar Soviet Special camp was a controversial and hotly contested development at the site of the former Nazi concentration camp. In 2001 a permanent exhibition was established largely as a result of public pressure to remember this past. The exhibition catalogue provides some limited background information on this debate. See Gunter Morsch and Ines Reich eds, *Sowjetisches Speziallager Nr. 7/Nr.1 in Sachsenhausen (1945–1950): Katalog der Ausstellung in der Gedenkstätte und Museum Sachsenhausen* (Berlin: Metropol, 2005), 13–48.

\(^{250}\) Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum (Berlin: Stadtwandel Verlag, 2011) 11–12.


\(^{253}\) Beßmann and Eschebach, *Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück*, 301–303.
disbanding, such survivor organisations as the short-lived VVN (Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Nazi-Regimes [Association of Victims of Nazi Persecution]), hosted annual days of remembrance in honour of those who had struggled “against war and fascism.”254 In July of that same year a committee comprised of the VVN, regional parties, and former prisoners, organised the restoration of the grounds at Ravensbrück. This included the establishment of a wooden monument in honour of the first memorial ceremony held there, the marking of the mass graves, and the addition of an inscription on the camp wall, which read “A tribute to the dead—an obligation to the living.”255

Throughout the late 1940s and 1950s however, these sites remained vulnerable. As is noted through photographs displayed in the new permanent exhibition, the site was so frequently vandalised after the end of the war, that a sign was posted outside of the camp walls in both German and Russian, requesting that individuals not “damage” the makeshift-memorial.256 In addition, in 1952 and 1953 the People’s Police of the GDR blew-up the crematorium and extermination camp at Sachsenhausen, and it was not uncommon for the local population to use the wood of the former barracks for the purposes of construction and fuel. Survivor groups repeatedly protested the dilapidate state of these camps. At Ravensbrück, the VVN director Fanny Mütze-Specht, strongly advocated the creation of a state sanctioned memorial, and with the aid of photographer R. Wagner, documented and exposed the rapid deterioration of the grounds.

Due in part to her efforts, the VVN put forth a proposal for the creation of a permanent memorial on the former campgrounds in June of 1949. By 2 December

254 Herf, Divided Memory, 164.
255 Beßmann and Eschebach, Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück, 299–303.
256 Beßmann and Eschebach, Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück, 300.
1953 the East German government began plans for the creation of three national memorials, which were to be designed by a group of architects known as the Buchenwald Collective. Consequently, fund raising for the Sachsenhausen memorial began in 1955, and Ludwig Deiters, Horst Kutzat, and Kurt Tausendschön began to plan the memorial’s design in 1956. That same year construction began on the Ravensbrück memorial, and the following year on the Sachsenhausen memorial as well. Both sites underwent a reshaping of their grounds in order to better serve their new ceremonial function. At Ravensbrück a new lower camp wall replaced the original, and a terrace and platform were added by the edge of the lake. In addition a podium (still visible today), was erected, and the sculpture of the Tragende (Burdened Woman) by Will Lammert—depicting one female prisoner nobly carrying the other—was added atop a raised obelisk. Modest in size, the original memorial and museum was, as a result of the military presence, only a fraction of the size it is today.

Figure 1 (Left): René Graetz's Befreiung at Sachsenhausen (Author, 2012).
Figure 2 (Right): Will Lammert's Tragende at Ravensbrück (Author 2012).
Similarly at Sachsenhausen, a formidable tower adorned with eighteen red triangles was erected before René Graetz’s *Befreiung* (Liberation) sculpture, depicting prisoners being both presented and shielded by a Red Army Soldier. Unsurprisingly both statues present a similar message of dignity in the face of suffering, triumph, progress, and the gift of freedom (bestowed on them by the Soviet forces). Moreover both settings were designed to support mass rallies and nationally coordinated commemorative services in honour of the state. When the Sachsenhausen memorial opened on 23 April 1961, more than 100,000 visitors gathered for the initial ceremony. Similarly the inauguration of Ravensbrück on 12 September 1959 saw over 70,000 East Germans and international visitors in attendance. These ceremonies served to communicate and underscore the GDR’s platform of anti-fascist resistance at these sites.

Overall, each of these three sites of remembrance (Sachsenhausen, Ravensbrück and Buchenwald) presented a uniform narrative that heavily emphasized the above doctrine, while simultaneously muting individual claims of victimhood. In contrast to West Germany—which arguably experienced only a limited public (or widespread) dialogue on the Holocaust until the early 1960s—East Germany emphasized their role in the destruction of Nazism in order to put forth a narrative in which Communism ‘liberated’ Germany from the corrupt and destructive forces of fascism—which was, according to this perspective, the ultimate culmination of capitalism. The Soviet bloc as a whole emphasized its role as both the victims of Nazism, and the ideological antithesis and solution to the problem of fascism. The camps in acting as vehicles for this narrative were instrumentalised by
the state in order to bolster and support this narrative, and elevate the GDR’s status as the legitimate successor to the German state.\textsuperscript{257}

This narrative of “liberation” thus supported two underlying notions. Firstly, that the Germans were in fact a conquered nation, and secondly that a subtext of violence underlay these sites of remembrance. Thomas Fox, in particular notes the positioning of a tank outside of the entrance of Ravensbrück, which served as a reminder both of Soviet liberation, and that the Red Army was willing to use violent force to maintain its authority in the Eastern bloc.\textsuperscript{258} Similarly, James Young posits that the Soviet preservation of sites of destruction, served as a reminder of their conquest over Germany during the war and a psychological means of asserting their dominance.\textsuperscript{259} Secondly, this narrative cloaks the importance of race in National Socialist ideology and policies, and instead reduces it to a form of class struggle or competition between competing economic systems. This emphasis denied the special status of victims targeted by National Socialists on strictly racial or ethnic grounds, such as the Jews or Roma and Sinti. In addition, in July 1945, the Berlin City Council’s Chief Committee for the Victims of Fascism (\textit{Hauptausschuss “Opfer des Fascismus”}) refused to include those they deemed “passive victims,” under the category of “victims of fascism.”\textsuperscript{260} Subsequently, this excluded Jehovah’s Witnesses and Jews. Though this decision by the Committee was eventually overturned, a ruling in 1949 maintained the distinction between seemingly passive “victims” verses active “resistance fighters,” with greater compensation provided for the later. Unsurprisingly, because Jews were treated as secondary victims within this hierarchy

\textsuperscript{257} Young, \textit{The Texture of Memory}, 72.
\textsuperscript{258} Fox, \textit{Stated Memory}, 42.
\textsuperscript{259} Young, \textit{The Texture of Memory}, 72.
\textsuperscript{260} Gilad Margalit, \textit{Guilt Suffering, and Memory: Germany Remembers Its Dead of World War II} (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2010), 80–81.
of memory, they were denied separate memorials, ceremonies and places of remembrance.\(^{261}\)

These themes pervaded exhibitions at the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück concentration camp sites. The “Face of the Anti-Fascist” exhibit at Sachsenhausen thus simplified camp life as a basic struggle between “fascist” and “antifascist.”\(^{262}\) This can also be seen in the first permanent exhibition at Ravensbrück, which was divided into six sections: “Women want to live in peace”; “militarism and fascism lead to war”; “Hitler’s fascism and World War II”; “concentration camps, penitentiaries, and prisons”; “Ravensbrück, the largest women’s concentration camp in Germany”; and “war and fascism—Never Again.”\(^{263}\) Little to no information was provided on the marginalised groups described above. When they did mention the history of the Jews, it was to showcase acts of resistance, or to demonstrate how the general programme of persecution was part of a larger policy of victimization against Communists.

Early incarnations of the new memorials were relatively modest in scope when compared to the current memorial museums. The main museum at Sachsenhausen for example was established in the former prisoner’s kitchen, and at

\(^{261}\) Margalit, *Guilt Suffering*, 88. Bill Niven takes this initial description even further, by positing that it was in fact not only the need for a more prominent historical memory, which drove the underrepresentation of Jews in anti-fascist Soviet rhetoric, but also the remnants of Stalinist antisemitism, and an East German anti-Israeli stance (Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past*, 23).

\(^{262}\) The webpage “Museum-Digital Brandenburg,” sponsored by the Brandenburg Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kultur, includes several hundred photographs of the original exhibitions at the Sachsenhausen Memorial, as well as images of the current memorial museum exhibitions. To an extent it has documented the evolution of the site, though the demolition of the ‘ring wall’ in particular. Accessed 22 August 2015, [http://www.museum-digital.de/brandenburg/index.php?sv=sachsenhausen&done=yes](http://www.museum-digital.de/brandenburg/index.php?sv=sachsenhausen&done=yes).

\(^{263}\) *Das Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück—Geschichte und Erinnerung* (Permanent Exhibition, 21 April 2013).
Ravensbrück the memorial consisted only of the ceremonial terrace, crematorium and cell building. Initially, the memorial rooms were housed in the basement of the cell building. Since the cells were originally for single occupancy, walls from adjoining cells were removed to house the entire exhibition.  

Throughout the 1980s the site hosted yearly ceremonies, which commemorated the role of anti-fascist resistance and youth education. By the end of the decade the rhetoric of these camps began to change. These changes were part of a wider easing of the political line, which was reflected in some of the changes and activities at the Ravensbrück site. On 2 September 1987 the memorial hosted an approved (and monitored) international demonstration protesting nuclear arms and called for the opening of the East-West border. In September 1984 the “Museum of Anti-Fascist Resistance” opened in the former SS headquarters of the women’s concentration camp. Previously up to 1977, Soviet Troops had used the building, which currently holds the permanent exhibition. The original museum housed in the cell building was thus rendered obsolete. In response, the administration began plans for the construction of eighteen rooms dedicated to the victims of individual countries in the early 1980s. The building reopened on 5 May 1986, and though survivor groups were granted spaces for commemoration based on nationality, the National Association of former prisoners designed the majority of the rooms, following predetermined guidelines. Furthermore rooms of countries situated in the

265 Beßmann and Eschebach, Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück, 303.
‘eastern bloc’ were typically created by officials or were commissioned by the state.266

Though individual groups, such as the Association of German Sinti, as well as the above national survivor organisation did vie for greater control over how they were represented within the memorial—or in some cases even an acknowledgement of their suffering—official recognition varied. Thus for example though the efforts of Vinzenz Rose in 1981 failed to establish a memorial dedicated solely to Sinti, in 1988 the memorial hosted the first ceremony dedicated to the memory of Jewish prisoners.267 Similarly in 1986, though the group “Lesbians in the Church” were granted permission to visit and tour the site, the memorial removed the guestbook they signed, which noted in particular the suffering faced by homosexual women in the camp.268

**From Unification to the Present: 1989 to 2015**

The opening of the Berlin Wall on November 9th, 1989, and the peaceful revolution that brought about the resignation of Erich Honecker and the withdrawal of the SED (Socialist Unity Party). On October 3rd, 1990, in an official ceremony in Berlin, East and West Germany were united, officially marking the end of the postwar period. With unification came a feverish desire to erase all traces of the now defunct East-West border (through the removal of guard towers, barbed wire, minefields etc.), and

266 Eschebach, “National Memorial Rooms,” 81. Compare, for example, the provenance of the Dutch room with that of Albania. Eschebach also questions why, if there were women from over forty countries imprisoned in Ravensbrück, only eighteen rooms were ever commissioned. In particular she notes the glaring absence of the United Kingdom.

267 “Upheaval and new beginnings,” in Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück.

268 “Memorial guestbook with an entry commemorating homosexual women in the camp dated 20 April 1986” in Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück.
to rapidly transform and westernize the East—a feat achieved both through the improvement of infrastructure, as well as the flood of western consumer goods into eastern markets. For Germans, it quickly became clear that unification meant not the joining of two equal states, but rather the expansion of West Germany over the economically and politically weaker East. Communist ideology did not survive unification, and ultimately resulted in the complete overhaul of social, political, and civil institutions.

The educational sector was no exception. The complete transformation of curricula and textbooks, pedagogic methods and teaching styles, and also the review and overhaul of primary and secondary school teaching staff throughout the former GDR was characteristic at this time. Arguably the overhaul of the anti-fascist rhetoric of East Germany (as well as the thawing of relations with Israel) officially began in April 12, 1990, when the first act of the new democratic government was to accept joint responsibility for Nazi crimes, and to “declare [its] willingness to contribute as much as possible to the healing of the mental and physical sufferings of survivors.” This statement was a radical break with the country’s Cold War stance, for it not only assumed responsibility for the Nazi past, but also acknowledged the special place of Jewish suffering and victimization.

It was in this general atmosphere of unification and uncertainty that the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück memorial sites faced a complete overhaul of the prior rhetoric that had informed their Cold War incarnations. After the opening of the wall the directors at these two memorials were dismissed, and eventually replaced by former West German scholars with backgrounds in history. GDR anti-fascist

---


270 Herf, *Divided Memory*, 365.
renderings of the camp, along with monuments, and exhibits that put forth Communist rhetoric were removed.\textsuperscript{271} Considerable effort was made to revise the previous historical narratives of the camp, whilst simultaneously discrediting the earlier East German rendering of the National Socialist past.

The transition however to a unified state was not entirely smooth, and resulted in additional problems within the former GDR. High unemployment, the decline of East German industries, and the overall economic downturn in the former East German territories, as well as cultural clashes contributed to a nostalgic romanticised view of the past, as well as a “re-nationalisation” of portions of the united Germany. Even with the new state’s official commitment to remembrance of the Nazi past, the early 1990s saw a resurgence of neo-Nazi violence and hostility directed towards immigrants and ethnic minorities in both the former GDR and FRG.\textsuperscript{272} A 1991 Survey by the Leipzig Institute for Youth Research conducted in the east, as well as an opinion poll conducted in 1992 in the west, found that a majority of the population (over half in both cases) held anti-immigration and anti-foreign views.\textsuperscript{273} Such outbreaks of violence, along with the long standing question in the 1990s, of what the new shape of German nationalism would look like led many scholars to warn of virulent forms of nationalism that could perpetuate these forms of

\textsuperscript{271} It should be noted that changes to materials at these memorial sites was not exclusive to the East. Western camps underwent a similar review of their exhibitions, but not nearly to the extent of former East German memorial sites.
\textsuperscript{272} Mary Fulbrook, \textit{A History of Germany 1918–2008: The Divided Nation}, Third Edition (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 295. Attacks occurred in Hoyerswerd and Rostock-Lichtenhagen (former East Germany), and in Mölln and Solingen (former West Germany).
extreme racism, xenophobia, repression, and exclusion.\textsuperscript{274} This question came home to Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen directly, when in 1989 an arson attack left the Sachsenhausen Jewish exhibition largely destroyed. A provisional exhibit was not established at the site until 1996, though a permanent exhibit was installed shortly after in 1997.\textsuperscript{275} In addition, another neo-Nazi attack in 1992 at Sachsenhausen nearly destroyed the Jewish Barracks.

At the Ravensbrück memorial, the absence of state organised commemorative ceremonies resulted in a sharp decline in attendance at the site. Additionally, in light of the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, government funding to the memorial also declined sharply. Further controversy arose soon after unification when in 1991 plans for a local supermarket and car dealership at Ravensbrück met with fierce protests. As described by Niven, to survivors, the construction of the supermarket was profoundly disrespectful to the memory of the dead, and a cheapening and crass commercialisation of the site. Alternatively to the residents of the economically depressed Fürstenberg, there was a very real need for the store and the economic benefits that it would bring. In their view the protests dredged up an old and tired past, which was to them remained unconnected to the current township.\textsuperscript{276} The German Ravensbrück survivors association and the International Ravensbrück Committee held protests throughout the summer, which were covered by the media. Though the building intended to house the Kaiser’s supermarket was built, the business never opened, and the building was finally demolished in 2011.

\textsuperscript{274} There exists an interesting group of increasingly outdated essays in the volume, Reinhard Alter and Peter Monteath, ed., \textit{Rewriting the German Past: History and Identity in the New Germany} (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1997). The essays reflect the anxieties and fears of the German and European academic community, and their hypothesis regarding the future direction of Germany.

\textsuperscript{275} Fox, \textit{Stated Memory}, 64.

\textsuperscript{276} Niven, \textit{Facing the Nazi Past}, 29.
In 1993 the government established the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation (\textit{Stiftung Brandenburgische Gedenkstätten}), which was funded by both the state of Brandenburg and the Federal Government. From the early 1990s onward the Ravensbrück site underwent a radical transformation, in order to restore the grounds that had been neglected after decades of Soviet occupation. Plans to renovate and redesign the grounds began in 1993 and have continued well into this past decade. In 1997 the town of Fürstenberg subsequently held an international landscape design competition in order to reclaim the lost topographies of the original camp. First prize identified three different sections of the grounds (the main camp, the Siemens camp and the Youth Detention camp), and called for the demolition of Soviet buildings, and the physical highlighting of the former camp barracks through gravel pit depressions.\footnote{Philipp Oswalt and Stefanie Brauer, et. al. \textit{Ehemaliges Frauenkonzentrationslager Ravensbrück: Internationaler landschaftsplanerischer Wettbewerb 1998, 1. Preis} (Berlin: Burger and Tischer Landschaftsarchitekten, 1998).} Plans for the central camp were implemented in 2001; however, as will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter, the auxiliary camps have not yet undergone this redesign, and are unlikely to the near future.

Overall the ending of the Communist regime has resulted in an expansion in the number of groups that participate in this culture of remembrance. Those previously excluded from or in conflict with the anti-fascist narrative of resistance put forth by the GDR, included Jews, “asocials,” Roma and Sinti, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and homosexuals. In the post-unification era, these exclusions began to be corrected. The latter for example, housed an exhibit on Jehovah’s Witnesses in the mid-1990s, while commemoration ceremonies at Ravensbrück in the early 1990s focused on honouring “forgotten” prisoner groups.\footnote{Insa Eschenbach, “Soil, Ashes, Commemoration: Processes of Sacralization at the Ravensbrück Former Concentration Camp,” \textit{History and Memory} 23 (2011): 149.} Similarly the former anti-
fascist exhibits were dismantled in the early 1990s, and the memorials have since featured several exhibits on Jews interned at the concentration camp, and have sought to mark the sites of mass graves.

In addition the permanent exhibition was replaced yet again by two new exhibitions in the SS headquarters, while three new memorial rooms were added to the cell building. These rooms were dedicated to those imprisoned for the 20 July assassination plot (1991), the camp’s Jewish prisoners (1992), and for the Sinti and Roma (1995). Several new exhibitions and spaces have opened in subsequent years. In 2002 the International Youth Hostel and Educational Centre opened in the former female SS barracks. The site also housed an exhibition on the female guards, which opened in 2004 in one of these renovated buildings. In 2006 a revised exhibition on the cell building was reopened, and the following year the newly erected Visitor Centre opened adjacent to the hostel. More recently, the former Soviet military garages were restored in order to house administrative offices, a small theatre, and the library and archives, and in 2011 the two permanent exhibitions, “Ravensbrückerinnen” and “Ravensbrück Topographie und Geschichte des Frauen-KZ” were closed in order to make way for the new central permanent exhibition, which opened in 2013 in the former SS headquarters.

2.3 The Displacement of Nationalism

Similar to the House of the Wannsee Conference, the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück Memorial Museums are sites of remembrance with ties to the wider international community, and an educational and commemorative scope that extends beyond that of the nation state. Though located within Germany, the history of the site as a destination of forced labour, imprisonment and murder for individuals from
all over Europe has mandated an equally broad international focus for its educational and memorial activities. Educational programmes and exhibition spaces and memorials commemorating the various national groups to perish at the site remain a fundamental part of the wider memorial topography. Since unification the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück exhibitions include information on both the different kinds of groups persecuted at the site (those classified by the Nazis as ‘workshy,’ ‘asocial,’ Jewish [regardless of actual religious affiliation], homosexuals, Jehovah’s witnesses, and so forth), as well as information on the different national groups imprisoned within the camps.279 In addition the site has also developed international educational programmes including week-long ‘work camp’ seminars (established in 1992), which bring together students from all over Europe, Asia and the United States; multi-lingual guided tours that are offered primarily in Spanish and English, as well as German, Italian, French, Norwegian, Dutch, Danish, Finish, Turkish, and Hebrew; and numerous seminars and workshops for non-German student groups.280 Furthermore, the central location of Oranienburg and the relatively close proximity of Furstenburg to Berlin, make both sites popular destinations for

279 See for example Barack 39: The ‘Everyday Life’ of Prisoners in Sachsenhausen 1936–1945 and The Prison within the Concentration Camp 1936–1945 at Sachsenhausen and the new permanent exhibition at Ravensbrück, which includes computer terminals where one can research country-specific information on various prisoner groups, and notable former prisoners.

280 Statistics were provided by the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation.

tourists and school groups. Since its initial opening in 1993 the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum has seen a steady rise in the number of visitors, with over 500,000 in 2012. Similarly, visitor numbers at Ravensbrück have remained fairly steady at roughly 110,000 since 2010. At the Sachsenhausen memorial, roughly 39% of all visitors (in 2011) participated in some form of educational initiative (guided tour, project day, work camp, multi-day project); and approximately 18% at the Ravensbrück memorial.

Underlying these wider trends however is a denationalised narrative of history, which permeates the current topography of both memorials. The disavowal of the East German regime is naturally fundamental to the current legitimacy of the site, as its international reputation is based upon a more objective less ideologically imbued interpretation of the past. Yet in the years following unification one form of nationalism was not exchanged for another. Rather, extending beyond this, both sites incorporate an inherent scepticism of nationally informed rhetoric and interpretive frameworks as a whole through a clear transparency of the memorialisation process, which attempts to displace or at least unsettle attempts at the creation of secular-sacred (rather than historical) spaces. In addition these sites incorporate a more self-reflexive exhibition space that addresses the extended history of the site beyond the National Socialist period. The remnants of the East German past remain not only as reminders and artefacts of a now defunct regime, but also serve to undermine the notion of definitive historical interpretations of the past. This wariness of the previously dogmatic narratives prevalent under the GDR, and a more clear and open depiction of the creation and evolution of the memorial grounds, exposes the ways in
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281 In whole numbers this breaks down to roughly 2,897 guided tours (or 72,328 participants) and 496 project days at Sachsenhausen; and 380 guided tours and 277 project days at Ravensbrück. *Besucherstatistik 2012.*
which museal spaces construct and influence institutional memory. Thus this encourages further questioning of and reflection on the role of the nation state in shaping the memory of this period.

This can be seen in part through the defunct artefacts of the former East German regime, which contribute to this displacement of nationalist narratives. At Sachsenhausen, the most conspicuous remnants of the former GDR museum include Walter Womacka’s stained-glass windows *International Resistance Struggle against Fascism* in the entranceway of the New Museum (as well as other anti-fascist placards that remain within the building), the aforementioned 40-metre high obelisk, René Graetz’s statue “Liberation” found at its base; and Waldemar Grzimek’s sculpture situated before “Station Z” (1961). Similar traces remain scattered throughout the grounds at Ravensbrück, including a Soviet tank situated before the entrance of the memorial, the aforementioned sculpture and pedestal “Burdened Woman” by Will Lammert as well as his companion studies “Two Standing Figures” (Zwei Stehende) a large inscription chiselled in stone by Anna Seghers, dedicated to the women who fought against the “fascist terror”; and Fritz Cremer’s sculpture entitled “Mothers” (“Müttergruppe,” 1965). Though they now remain as iconic artefacts of the former East German state, they endure as iconic links to the past, and testaments to the homogenised rhetoric of anti-fascist resistance.

Buchenwald (1958), Ravensbrück (1959), and Sachsenhausen (1961), were developed and inaugurated together as three “national monuments and memorials”—a state sponsored collective (the Buchenwald-Kollektiv) that was designed to
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282 Seghers text is inscribed in stone by the memorial terrace. It reads: “They are mothers and sisters to us all. You could neither learn nor play freely today—indeed, you might never have been born—had such women not placed their slight, frail bodies like a steel shield before you and your future throughout the period of fascist terror.”
demonstrate the East German’s ability to address the National Socialist history of Germany in contrast to the West.\footnote{Endlich, \textit{Wege zur Erinnerung}, 507.} As noted by Jeffrey Herf, Walter Ulbricht’s inauguration address at Sachsenhausen, through his ‘praise of past heroes,’ “drew a straight line connecting the anti-Nazi resistance...with the East German propaganda offensive against West Germany.”\footnote{Herf, \textit{Divided Memory}, 180.} Politically, these sites served to bolster a history glorifying antifascist resistance fighters, whilst simultaneously criticising West Germany for its inability to root out former Nazi functionaries from its government, address the history of National Socialism through similar acts of memorialisation, “learn the lessons of the Second World War,” and prevent the ‘remilitarisation’ and ‘re-emergence of fascism.’\footnote{Walter Ulbricht quoted in Herf, \textit{Divided Memory}, 180.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{Walter Womacka, \textit{Internationaler Widerstands kampf gegen den Faschismus} (Author, 2012).}
\end{figure}

The artistic composition of each site was intended to present an idyllic and unified heritage of anti-fascist resistance. For example, the stained-glass windows together presented a utopian depiction of socialist unity in vibrant colour. The left window
represented German resistance against the Nazi regime, the right of the European partisans, while the middle depicted the world liberated by Socialism. The prominent red flag in the central panel serves as a banner, under which the figures of the mural stand-in for the themes of militarism, defiance, family, unity and triumph. All attention is drawn to the Soviet soldier at the centre, thus underscoring victory of the Soviet Union over Germany, and the GDR’s incorporation into the Eastern Bloc, and adherence to the Communist ideology.

Sculptures and monuments were expected to adhere to a pre-determined aesthetic and thematic interpretation of the past, and were modified when they failed to do so. Most infamously, drafts of Graetz’s earlier work on the statue at Sachsenhausen underwent review by a designated advisor, who lamented that Graetz had not fully understood the intended ideological concept of the memorial. The sculpture was revised in order to ensure that the figures depicted appeared as a united group ‘triumphing over Fascism.’ As a result the figure of the Soviet soldier was changed to appear more imposing and prominent than his ‘brother-in-arms,’ and the historically authentic depiction of the prisoners, which were described as ‘Elendsgestalten’ or ‘miserable figures,’ were altered to look more aesthetically pleasing. At Ravensbrück similar motifs of triumph, forbearance, and resistance permeated its sculptures and artwork, though this message was modified in order to fit common tropes of motherhood sacrifice and maternal strength. As noted by Janet


Jacobs the original memorial, and particularly Cremer’s sculpture were intended to “present these [mothers] as heroic figures in the fight against fascism.” Depictions of feminine suffering and emotional devastation are presented with renderings of martyrdom, motherhood, and sacrifice. These themes while analogous with those at Sachsenhausen, contrast with its highly masculine renderings of active (and armed) male resistance, as opposed to passive forms of female forbearance.

Figure 4: "Heart with Barbed Wire," Greek Memorial Room (Author, 2012).

Figure 5: Tragende (Close-up, Author, 2012).

This theme of female sacrifice is further emphasised through a reliance on classic Christian symbolism. The two figures of the Burdened Woman recall the Pietà, or that of Mary cradling the body of Jesus in her arms. In addition, Jacobs notes the way in which Christian themes appear throughout the national memorials within The Exhibit of Nations, noting the figure of a woman within the Hungarian Memorial, surrounded by boards and nails bearing similarities to Christ’s crucifixion.


Similarly the Greek Memorial Room (designed in 1959 by Winifried Wunderlich) features the sculpture “Heart with Barbed Wire,” again recalling images of the Sacred Heart of Christ, which is often depicted illuminated by fire and surrounded in a crown of thorns to symbolise the manner of his death.

As noted by Thomas Fox, “the East German antifascist concentration camp memorials functioned...as the ‘churches of socialism.’” Annual ritual ceremonies of commemoration centrally focused (literally) through the design of the memorial contributed to the formation of secular-sacred spaces, in which the sacrifices and martyrs of those who perished in the fight against fascism could be worshiped. Fox in particular notes the ways in which the speaker’s podium resembled that of an altar of worship, at which all prominent citizens of the East German state were expected to assemble to honour the dead. Saint-like or deified figures permeated these memorials. Fox observes the ways in which Ernst Thälmann, leader of the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) who was murdered at Buchenwald, and Rosa Thälmann, his wife who was imprisoned at Ravensbrück, have been elevated to near Christ-like figures. Similarly, a more recent temporary exhibition on Ernst Schneller also exposed the degree to which his story of resistance was utilised in the former GDR. Achieving near ‘secular-sainthood’ his image appeared, as evident from the exhibition, on postage stamps, minted coins and memorial posters. Niven further expands upon the development of secular-sacred rituals by connecting this emphasis
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290 Fox, Stated Memory, 39.
291 At the opening of the Sachsenhausen Memorial in 1961 nearly 200,000 people were in attendance.
on suffering to a desire to rewrite the history of these camps to fit a narrative of transcendence through pain, salvation and self-liberation.\textsuperscript{293}

The establishment of secular rituals, as well as the utilisation of religious imagery is not uncommon for museum spaces in general, and sites of the Holocaust or National Socialism in particular. Carol Duncan’s work on “civilising rituals” describes the art museum, for example, as form of “ritual structure.” As Duncan observes, “like the traditional temples…they so often emulate, art museums are complex entities in which both art and architecture are parts of a larger whole.”\textsuperscript{294} In this respect objects situated within the space of the museum are afforded a greater significance, or even a kind of ritualistic framing. Duncan for example notes the tendency to present works in isolation for visual contemplation. Though this serves a practical purpose in allowing viewers to reflect upon the artistic skill of the piece, it can also elevate these works to iconographic status. Depending on how these pieces are framed, the space it occupies can be transformed into a kind of secular altar.\textsuperscript{295} In addition, Peter Novick has remarked on “how ‘un-Jewish’—how \textit{Christian}” commemoration of the Jewish Holocaust has become. He notes the tendency for exhibitions at major museums to resemble the Stations of the Cross; or the similarity between Holocaust objects to be treated like “fragments of the True Cross or shin bones of saints.”\textsuperscript{296}

Flora Kaplan expands upon this notion, likening exhibitions “within given historical and cultural contexts” to “kinds of public, secular rituals…which serve as a

\textsuperscript{293} Niven, \textit{Facing the Nazi Past}, 20–21.
\textsuperscript{295} Duncan, \textit{Civilizing Rituals}, 16–18.
\textsuperscript{296} Novick, \textit{Collective Memory}, 11.
social representation of [the] collective ‘self.’”

Both Bennett and Levin and Karp allude to the construction and support of particular narratives, adopted by museum spaces that hold special significance and meaning to their society—albeit within a given period of time. Additionally, Bennett, posits that museums can function as “cultural resources that might be deployed as governmental instruments.”

Underpinning his theories is the notion that the museum exhibition is a purposefully constructed space designed to both reflect and affect the culture in which it is situated. This view is more explicitly argued by Levin and Karp, who state that “every museum exhibition, whatever its overt subject inevitably draws on the cultural assumptions and resources of the people who make it. Decisions are made to emphasize one element and to downplay others, to assert some truths and to ignore others.”

The East German concentration camp memorials proved no exception, as narratives that failed to fit this mould were marginalised or suppressed. Most notably, the history of the Jews was minimised and distorted as indicated earlier. Jews were either not mentioned, or the exact reasons for their persecution and the racial ideology of the Nazis was not made clear, as the genocide of an entire race did not fit neatly within the narrative of political martyrs and those persecuted due to their political beliefs or affiliation with Communism. Similarly, the histories of the Roma and Sinti, Allied POWs, Jehovah’s Witnesses, homosexuals, ‘asocials,’ and those forced to work in the camp brothel were completely omitted from the original

300 Herf, Divided Memory, 179.
memorial. It was the forced classification of prisoner groups based upon nationality, which purposefully helped to suppress these alternative histories of the camp. With respect to the post war period, no mention was made of the existence of the Soviet Special Camps at Sachsenhausen in the 1950s, and the grounds of the original concentration camp continued to be restricted at Ravensbrück until unification due to the continued presence of the Soviet military.

Yet as noted by Claudia Koonz, the suppression of these histories did not mean that the memory of these events was erased. Individuals could informally (and unintentionally) have their memories triggered by these narratives regardless of the intended meaning of the exhibition spaces.\textsuperscript{301} Similarly, she notes how public cynicism and the obvious resentment felt by local townspeople toward these memorial sites undermined the development of secular-sacred sentiments at these sites. In the post-unification era these resentments would come forth when governmental restraints were no longer in place, and proposals were put forth to re-appropriate the land surrounding these memorial sites. At Sachsenhausen this included an attempt to convert the museum building into a financial office, and at Ravensbrück this involved the aforementioned attempt to build a pedestrian mall incorporating a Kaiser’s supermarket and Renault showroom.\textsuperscript{302}

Yet regardless of the reception of these memorial sites during the Cold War, if it was the East German government that produced and commissioned these sculptures and memorials, how then does their meaning change once the state and ideology behind these artefacts no longer exists? How then can we attempt to characterise the afterlife of these symbols within the post-unification period?


\textsuperscript{302} Koonz, “Between Memory and Oblivion,” 270–271.
Arguably the significance of museum objects is directly connected to the process of re-contextualisation within the space of the museum. In this respect the significance of artefacts shifts with every new context and repositioning. For example, Adorno presents Valéry’s observation that art galleries are a form of “disorder strangely organised,” where works or art made in different contexts, and, for different purposes, are forced occupy a single space. Through this contextual repositioning the museum creates a kind of “afterlife” for objects on display.\footnote{Theodore W Adorno, “Valéry Proust Museum,” \textit{Prisms} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT, 1967), 183.} In the case of Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück, the memorial itself was transformed into an object of historical interest following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the disappearance of the East German state. Particularly following the redesign of the majority of its memorial spaces, the significance of these remaining artefacts of the original memorial site radically changed.

It is important to note, that the transformation of these sites was not instantaneous. Rather their redesign remains part of an ongoing process of renovation that began in 1993 and continues into the present. For example, the removal of the ‘ring wall’ at Sachsenhausen, which had been constructed for the original memorial in 1961, was only demolished in 2011. Furthermore, the park-like atmosphere (green fields, trees and shade) that was purposefully developed under the GDR has now been minimised, and a thin layer of rocky gravel covers the majority of the grounds. Similarly at Ravensbrück the remaining military structures were not completely removed from the former main campgrounds until 2000/2001.

Still, the continued existence of these GDR memorials is not accidental, but rather a purposeful decision. Following unification the question of what to do with memorials from the GDR period spurred heated debates and ultimately ended with
the creation of the Commission for Post-War Political Monuments in East Berlin.\textsuperscript{304}

As part of this commission very few memorials within East Berlin were removed (except for those that explicitly supported the Communist dictatorship). In this context the significance of these sculptures and artistic works is redefined. No longer supported by the rhetoric of antifascist resistance, these sculptures have transformed from symbols of state-sanctioned power to defunct artefacts. They are not devoid of symbolic worth, but rather stand now as both a caution against homogenised memory as controlled by the nation state, and ironically as evidence of the transformation of the site, and its increasing distance from nationally imposed narratives of the past.

With the demolition of the camp wall at Sachsenhausen, and significant expansion of the grounds at Ravensbrück, the structural focus (both physically and ideologically) of both sites has dissipated in favour of a decentralised design, which allows visitors to explore uninhibited by a particular rhetoric of remembrance, and furthermore to allow the museum to further expand and develop its coverage of previously neglected victim groups.\textsuperscript{305} Though the aforementioned sculptures remain prominent, even iconic aspects of the memorial they appear now as peculiar oddities, and are no longer buttressed by ceremonies of commemoration. The visual message they convey is now historicized, and merely folded into another layer of memory, which such exhibitions as “From Memory to Monument: 1950–1990” (2002) at Sachsenhausen; and the recently opened permanent exhibition at Ravensbrück, “The Women-Concentration Camp Ravensbrück: History and Memory” (2013), seek to make more transparent. Now the process by which the memorial was developed, the strategic purposes for its design, and the functions that it served for the East German state, are

\textsuperscript{304} For further information on this process please see Mia Lee, “GDR Monuments in Unified Germany” in \textit{Memorialization in Germany since 1945}, ed. Bill Niven and Chloe Paver (New York: Palgrave, 2010), 314.

\textsuperscript{305} Niven, \textit{Facing the Nazi Past}, 38.
made clear to visitors seeking further explanations for these remnants of the former East German government.

Further eroding the legitimacy of these previous narratives new exhibition spaces present the previously suppressed histories of the Soviet Special Camp (2001), Jewish Prisoners (“Barrack 38”), and other prisoner groups at Sachsenhausen; and the stories of sexual violence and the former camp brothel at Ravensbrück. At Sachsenhausen, acknowledgement of the Soviet Special Camp began almost immediately following unification. As early as 1990 visitors began to hear (in English) about the continuation of “human rights violations” between 1945 and 1950 at the Soviet Special Camp, though it would only be after considerable debate that a permanent exhibition (museum) dedicated to this history would be established at the site, as will be discussed in greater detail in the following section.

In recent years, the design of these exhibition spaces has also contributed to the decline of authoritative nationalistic narratives of history by exposing the historical layers of these sites upon which the exhibition spaces are grafted. At Ravensbrück, the aforementioned new permanent exhibition housed in the former camp administration building, positions photographic glass plates, or glass windows in strategic locations throughout the building. The site’s historical significance and origins are illustrated through the use of carefully placed photographic plates and memorial windows. In total there are four photographic plates mounted in the exhibition. Each is a photograph of the building from the period of National

307 Koonz, “Between Memory and Oblivion,” 272. Koonz connects this particular history to an ‘Ossie’ form of memory, which saw the desire of former GDR citizens to acknowledge the persecution of Germans in the postwar period.
Socialism, and shows it ‘as it once appeared.’ Thus one plate shows an ornamental window in the SS headquarters building, taken by an SS officer around 1941.

![Plate showing an ornamental window](image1)

![Commandant's office photograph](image2)

**Figure 6** Two plate glass ‘windows’ on display at the Ravensbrück Permanent Exhibition (Author, 2013).

The plate depicts the imperial eagle with a swastika surrounded by a wreath of oak leaves. Most importantly however it is positioned before the windows of the central staircase, before the location of the original window. 308 Similarly, another photograph of the commandant’s office from the same year is also mounted on a glass pane roughly where the original photographer would have stood. The perspective of the modern viewer thus mirrors the perspective of the photograph. A small table with a photo album (appropriately) appears in the exact location of the original desk depicted in the photograph.

Though such touches as the table and album echo the past they do not recreate it. Rather the photographs present a stark contrast with the present, which both speaks to the origins of the building and simultaneously emphases its new role as a memorial museum. Similarly, references to the GDR period appear in the form of glass ‘windows’ that reveal portions of Friedrich Porsdorf’s original murals for the

308 Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück.
1984 Museum of Antifascist Resistance. Layers of history that are physically manifest in the site are literally pulled away to expose the historical provenance of the building. The past through these windows is both present and transparent, yet also inaccessible and disconnected from the current function and identity of the museum.

Similarly at Sachsenhausen, Barrack 38, where the Jewish prisoners were housed, represents a similar form of preservation and transparency. In 1992, arsonists destroyed a portion of the barrack as part of an antisemitic hate crime. To ensure the integrity of the original structure, a new modern exhibition space was developed underneath the original barrack, which presents a more detailed history of Jewish prisoners interned at Sachsenhausen. Additionally, instead of restoring the damage inflicted by the attack, a protective glass wall was installed on the outside of the building. The charred and visibly blackened exterior serves as a reminder of enduring antisemitism in contemporary Germany, and preserves a further layer of history now indelibly printed upon the landscape of the memorial. Through their design, these exhibition spaces have transparently displayed the many-varied layers of history inherent in the physical history of these spaces. In doing so it exposes the ways in which the significance of these memorials has shifted and evolved throughout their roughly 50-year existence. By peeling back these layers of history, these sites undermine definitive narratives of the past as may be constructed by the nation state, and instead force visitors to confront the shifting foundations upon which our conceptions of memory and remembrance of the past are built.
Yet dismantling the historical narratives, ideology, and aura built by the East German state, should not imply that these sites are devoid of secular-sacred spaces. The Book of the Dead (itself a loaded term) is featured at Sachsenhausen, and through the exhibition “The Place of Names” at Ravensbrück. Situated atop a table (in the case of the latter), the only object within a secluded exhibition space, the oversize manuscript possesses 13,161 names of the dead gathered in 2005. The entire back wall of the small building is covered with images of women who perished at the camp. Within this space, this object transcends its regular status as a mere book, in order to take on both the appearance and function of a holy text. Its connection to the memory and the identity of the dead, as well as its clear framing as an object of importance elevates its status.

The marking of mass graves in the post-unification period, as organised by individuals and survivor communities (rather than state imposed forms of remembrance), creates new spaces that straddle the boundaries between sacred or
religious spaces, and spaces of historical or institutional remembrance. Though lacking explicit religious affiliations these spaces at times are imbued with religious iconography in order to honour the dead. At a mass grave of roughly 7,000 victims of the Soviet Special Camp, located just outside of the North West gate of the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum, an oversized black cross has been erected, and is clearly visible from the main campgrounds. The cross represents a clear attempt to equate the memorial with a cemetery, akin to consecrated ground. Similarly, six elongated stone slabs mark the mass grave of those who perished in April 1945 in the hospital barracks shortly before liberation. Though unsolicited by the memorial, visitors have maintained a personal tradition of placing stones on the graves of the deceased. These markers thus serve as makeshift gravestones, allowing visitors the opportunity to mourn the dead. Similarly, at Ravensbrück the terrace and statue of the burdened woman remains a sacred space. This however is not because of a nationalist framework, but rather because the ashes from the crematorium were unceremoniously deposited in Schwedtsee. Survivors and other groups continue the ritual of casting roses into the water in order to honour and remember the nameless dead. For those who cannot (or can no longer) physically travel to the memorial, a website has even been established to cast virtual roses, in memory of the women of Ravensbrück.\(^{309}\)

Overall it is the combination of enduring yet recontextualised icons of the GDR period, new exhibition spaces that explicitly address the constructed landscape of the memorial, and the refashioning of secular-sacred spaces at these sites that contribute to the displacement of nationally constructed narratives of the past. As

noted by Beck, the sociology of globalisation, “refers essentially to the whole set of social and power relations that are not organised on a national basis,” and “for which territorial state guarantees of order...lose their binding character.”310 The state in this sense was previously the ‘container’ of society and according to Beck the “state’s claim to exercise power and control was the foundation of society.”311 In detailing the breakdown of this system, Levy and Sznaider expand upon Beck’s assertions, noting how cosmopolitan or a globalised memory arises when “global concerns become part of local experiences...[and] as global concerns provide a political and moral frame of reference for local experiences.”312 This interaction between global and local is thus embodied in these sites, which reflect a displacement of nationalism within post-unification Germany, whilst simultaneously participating in and being shaped by the interests of the wider international community.

2.4 Contests, Commercialisation, and Hierarchies

With the displacement of national forms of memory, and the growth of a globalised memory of the Holocaust, the impact of these shifts begs further investigation. Given that memory is no longer primarily shaped by the nation state, but rather by an interplay of local and/or national communities within the larger global arena, it is clear that what is remembered no longer follows a straight-forward or clearly predictable path as outlined by the interests of the state. Rather in the post-Cold War period memory, remembrance, and memorialisation is comprised of a multiplicity of voices seeking recognition, institutional manifestations, and a clear presence in the

311 Beck, *What is Globalization?* 64.
international discourse. The memory of the Holocaust, as evident from the previous section, is no different with respect to the different groups seeking recognition.

In recent years the Holocaust has been criticised for its perceived dominance in international (and particularly American) consciousness and the memorial and historical sphere of remembrance. Consequently, it has been seen as over represented in politics, public remembrance, education, and history, to the detriment of other historical tragedies, genocides, and conflicts. Michael Rothberg has for example cited the assertions of Walter Benn Michaels, who questions why the United States has constructed, on the National Mall, a memorial museum dedicated to the Holocaust before establishing a museum to slavery or the decimation of the American Indian populations. In response to Michaels, Rothberg criticises what he describes as the theory of ‘screen memory,’ or the belief that nations like the United States choose to focus on the Holocaust (an event which can clearly be described as categorically wrong), because it provides a greater “level of ‘comfort’ than confrontation with more ‘local’ problems would allow.” Borrowing from psychoanalytic theory, the Holocaust thus acts as a screen to cover over other traumatic events that cannot be directly addressed or confronted, whilst also acting as a surface on which to project latent fears, desires, and fantasies. Thus “screen
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313 Rothberg discusses Michaels extensively in the introduction to his text *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2009). Peter Novick, through his work, *The Holocaust and Collective Memory*, does not attempt to evaluate whether or not the Holocaust should dominate American consciousness, but rather has attempted to historically trace how and when it began to occupy such a large part of the American cultural landscape.

memories stand in for and distract from something disturbing—either a traumatic event or an illicit, unacknowledged desire.”

Similarly, Assmann notes the ways in which honouring the Holocaust can raise the moral profile of a nation while simultaneously allowing that nation to avoid awkward aspects of its own dubious past. The recent opening of the Jewish Museum and Tolerance Centre in Moscow (2012), for example is in part strategically intended to reshape global perceptions of Russia’s relationship with and cultural attitudes towards the Jewish population, as much as it is intended to provide a history of Jewish life within the country. With respect to Germany, coverage of the unveiling of the memorial to the murdered Roma and Sinti, accompanied criticism over the contemporary prejudices these groups faced, and scepticism over whether or not the motivations for its creation were not an opportune means of paying lip-service to their past suffering without having to address the current prejudices and inequalities these groups faced. In addition the staunch argument that the Holocaust is indeed a unique and catastrophic event in history, as well as fears that the Holocaust may inadvertently become a generic symbol of evil loosened from its historical context—has according to Rothberg, discouraged scholars from exploring the potential connections and similarities between the Holocaust and other conflicts.

Rothberg however has criticised this conceptualisation of the historical and memorial field, and competitive understandings of memory. To him, “fundamental to the conception of competitive memory is a notion of the public sphere as a pre-given,
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315 Rothberg, Multidirectional Memory, 16.
316 Assman, “Global Memory?” 105.
limited space,” which implies that “collective memory obeys a logic of scarcity.” Questioning this characterisation, Rothberg argues against a “zero-sum struggle for pre-eminence” and “recognition, in which there can only be winners and losers.” Instead he posits that memory must be considered “multidirectional: as subject to ongoing negotiation, cross-referencing, and borrowing.” Attention and recognition paid to one historical event can in turn foster connections to other similar cases, encourage an interchange of ideas, draw previously unrecognised events to the forefront of social consciousness, and provide the theoretical, cultural and conceptual framework upon, which to better comprehend previously neglected histories. Furthermore, Rothberg argues in favour of comparative history (especially in the case of the Holocaust) and traversing national and ethnic boundaries. In his estimation, comparison does not entail equating the two events, and remains vital to producing new understandings and ‘lines of historical insight.’ Thus far from sacrosanct, the Holocaust cannot be isolated from the wider historical discourse of memory and remembrance.

This however does not necessarily imply that historical comparison, or the increased coverage of previously underdeveloped subjects, is unproblematic. Robert Moeller for example details the ways in which contentious legacies of the Second World War—the Allied bombing campaign, the mass violence directed toward German women (and almost all women) at the conclusion of the war, and the expulsion of ethnic Germans from the eastern territories—remained problematic into the post-unification period. At times these histories were oversimplified, distorted, or instrumentalised in order to create a narrative of German suffering, which attempted
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318 Rothberg, Multidirectional Memory, 2–5.
319 Rothberg, Multidirectional Memory, 3. (His emphasis).
320 Rothberg, Multidirectional Memory, 17–19.
to relativise or equate this suffering with the Holocaust. Though through his historiographical study Moeller reveals the difficulties in exploring this history, he optimistically notes how the post-Cold War era has provided an unprecedented opportunity to investigate previously distorted or ignored histories of the Second World War, and to explore the complex and at times overlapping identities of victim and perpetrator.\footnote{See his article Robert G. Moeller, “Germans as Victims?: Thoughts on Post-Cold War History of World War II’s Legacies,” \textit{History and Memory} 17 no. 1–2 (2005): 145–194.} Niven has similarly explored the ways in which the topographies of concentration camp memorials were able to incorporate previously under represented aspects of their history in 1990, noting turns to commemorate Christian victims, Jews, Sinti and Jehovah’s Witnesses.\footnote{Niven, \textit{Facing the Nazi Past}, 34.} Yet Niven also explores the development of exhibitions on the Soviet Special Camps at the former Buchenwald and Sachsenhausen concentration camps, and the practical difficulties faced when addressing multiple layers of history. He notes in particular how, the allocation of space reflects the ways in which the “National Socialist past dwarfs all.”\footnote{Niven, \textit{Facing the Nazi Past}, 47.} The original temporary exhibition was situated in the far corner of the exhibition, and was housed in a completely original non-historical structure with no connection to National Socialism. Though the site was built upon the principle that the “crimes of the Nazis may not be belittled by dealing with the crimes of Stalinism” and “Stalinist crimes may not be trivialised by references to the crimes of the Nazis,” this does not prevent what Niven sees as the fundamental creation of a hierarchy of memory, in
which the history of National Socialism takes clear precedence over the history of the postwar period.\textsuperscript{324}

In recent years however, the gap between remembrance of the Nazi and Soviet pasts has closed to a certain degree. The location of the new exhibition building in the Northern corner of Sachsenhausen, according to Morsch, was intended to be in close proximity to the mass grave of former Soviet camp prisoners. The aforementioned personal forms of commemoration (wooden crosses, memorial markers acting as makeshift tombstones, a garden of remembrance), are not visible from the closed grounds of the memorial museum, but are easily accessible through an electronic gate and marked by an information placard (within the memorial grounds). The museum, designed by Schneider and Schumacher is a large and imposing grey and black rectangular “hermetic building, which with its strict and sober clarity encourages contemplation,” and to express the “sense of shock and distress at the mass deaths that occurred in the...special camp.”\textsuperscript{325} Functioning as a museum within a (memorial) museum it does not attempt to hide the dubious pasts of the former internees at the camp, but rather presents a complex picture of culpability and excessive persecution in a neutral and objective tone. To Gad Yair however, the exhibition and architectural design of the museum is in fact too successful in presenting a neutral and historically objective space for visitors, emphasising “a traditional rhetoric of objectivity [which] values learning, reason, and scholarly knowledge above enjoyment, emotion, and art.” The museum to Yair, in attempting to make up for fifty years of silence, overwhelms the visitor with a deluge of information, while denying visitors any “clues that would create a hierarchy of

\textsuperscript{324} Concluding Report of the Committee of Inquiry quoted in Günter Morsch and Ines Reich, eds., \textit{Sowjetische Speziallager Nr. 7/Nr. 1 in Sachsenhausen (1945–1950)} (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2005), 31.
\textsuperscript{325} Morsch, \textit{Sowjetische Speziallager}, 19.
information.”326 Fears of misrepresenting or misinterpreting these histories has thus to Yair resulted in exhibitions completely sanitised of any form of moral or pedagogical lessons, and thus the significance of these spaces is lost in a sea of information for visitors.

Still an imperfect process, it would have been difficult for exhibition designers to develop any museum that would have proven wholly satisfactory to everyone. If the gap between Soviet and Nazi histories is closing however, this should not suggest that sites of remembrance connected to the Holocaust are without hierarchies of space and memory even within the memorial museums themselves. The plethora of new voices clamouring for recognition in the post-unification period, and scholarly pulls to investigate these claims leads, as is seen in the case of the Soviet Special Camp, to a disparity between the theoretical desire to explore these different histories equitably and unassumingly, and the practical difficulties and expectations involved in creating the physical representation (manifestation) of memory in the form of a public memorial or museum. Practical questions inevitably arise related to whose memory is more represented by these spaces; how should scarce federal resources be allocated; and how can memorial foundations find the staff, funds, time, and space available to expand exhibition spaces and acknowledge the different histories linked to these sites. Moreover, how are memorial sites able to provide pedagogical services (updated exhibitions spaces, guided tours, seminars and work days), and maintain their exhibition spaces, and preserve decades old memorial grounds, and maintain visitor numbers and interests, without falling into the trap of commercialisation?

326 Gad Yair, “Neutrality, Objectivity, and Dissociation: Cultural Trauma and Educational Messages in German Holocaust Memorial Sites and Documentation Centers,” Holocaust and Genocide Studies 26 no. 3 (2014): 487.
Levy and Sznaider connect the perceived commercialisation of the Holocaust with its perceived ‘Americanisation’ or ‘instrumentalisation,’ in which the Holocaust is co-opted economically or symbolically by different interest groups. Americanised versions of Holocaust history, such as the 1978 TV series *Holocaust* or Spielberg’s *Schindler’s List* (1993) are dismissed as products of the mass market, and a, “profit-driven culture industry.” This trend, epitomised by American culture, refers however to a broader critique of mass culture as a whole. As described by Levy and Sznaider, mass culture and commercialisation is viewed as a “destructive force against reason,” which trivialises the Holocaust and transforms it into something “vulgar.” Through this argument, culture is thus something too important and sacred to be left to the masses, and should remain within the hands of the experts. Yet as noted by Levy and Sznaider, commercialisation is something that should not be categorically dismissed, as the consumer is neither passive nor uncritical, and popular media makes previously complex or overwhelming histories accessible to the broader public.

As noted by Yair, engagement and visitor interest prove just as significant to the pedagogical effectiveness of these sites as historical rigour and scholarly objectivity. Furthermore, Levy and Sznaider, Yair, and Niven expose questions related to the duties and roles that these memorial museums should fulfil. Is there an expectation that these sites should remain unaffected by popular culture, abstain from any form of perceived popularisation or commercialisation, provide educational
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328 Levy and Sznaider, *Holocaust and Memory*, 134.
programmes for all visitors regardless of cost, and equally represent any and all
groups historically connected to these landscapes? Or alternatively is there a similar
expectation that these sites should try to reach the wider public and beyond, engage
visitors and cater to their interests in order to maintain visitor numbers, operate
within a limited budget, address and acknowledge popular or topical issues related to
these histories, and focus primarily upon the history of National Socialism above all
else? Furthermore, as noted by Cohen sites of ‘dark tourism,’ or tourism of sites
related to death and disaster, “spans a spectrum of ‘shades of darkness,’” which can
incorporate individuals travelling to Holocaust memorial sites for the sake of
entertainment or potentially education, or for reasons related to their identity or
heritage.\footnote{331} These varying motivations need not be mutually exclusive and often
overlap.

Arguably the Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen memorial museums have,
since the end of the Cold War, straddled the line between commercial tourism and
historical scholarship. Even during the National Socialist period, these sites remained
peculiar spaces with juxtaposing identities. As concentration camps, they functioned
as spaces of control, isolation, and deviation. Operating as an extreme form of
incarceration and isolation from the rest of society, access to these spaces was
restricted and knowledge of them intended to be limited. At the same time they also
encompassed settings of domestic tranquillity, as the homes of SS officers were often
located in the near vicinity to sites of mass suffering, execution, starvation and
death.\footnote{332} One remark by Stanka Simoneti, on her arrival to the Uckermark camp

\footnote{331} Erik H. Cohen, “Educational Dark Tourism at an In Populo Site: The Holocaust
\footnote{332} This contradiction is made clear through \textit{The Officer’s House: Everyday Life and
Crimes at Ravensbrück} (Permanent Exhibition, Mahn- und Gedenkstätte
Ravensbrück, 2010). In addition the exhibition, \textit{In the Auxiliary of the SS: Matrons of
observes, “We went by foot from Ravensbrück to Uckermark. We wished, that it would be as beautiful a place as it appeared, but it proved to be all an illusion.”

Following the war and throughout the GDR period, Fürstenberg, and the nearby town of Himmelpfort remained a popular vacation resort for East Berliners wishing to enjoy the natural tranquillity of the nearby lakes (and with few opportunities to travel outside of East Germany).

In the present day, this juxtaposition still endures at the memorial site, albeit in a different form. Perhaps the best example can be found on the northern end of the memorial complex, at the site of the “Ravensbrück” train stop between Lychen and Templin. The northern platform is located on the edge of the concentration camp complex. Its preservation along with the exhibition, attests to the participation of the German Reich Railway in the implementation and execution of the National Socialist system of persecution, murder, and oppression. These aspects of the memorial site, are meant to remind visitors that, “without the cooperation of the German Reich Railway staff…large-scale deportations would not have been possible.”

Today however, the tracks are used as part of a tourist gimmick, in which individuals can
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the Women’s KZ Ravensbrück (Permanent Exhibition, Mahn- und Gedenkstätte Ravensbrück, 2004), specifically emphasises the continuation of normal everyday life for the female SS guards in its panel “Off Duty.” Though a similar exhibition does not exist at Sachsenhausen, I was informed by memorial staff that the homes of the former SS guards were still standing in Oranienburg in the very near vicinity to the former main camp.

333 Quotation posted at a make-shift banner in the Uckermark camp. The translation is my own. Original quotation reads: “Wir gingen zu Fuß von Ravensbrück nach Uckermark. Wir wünschten, dass es ein so schöner Ort sei, wie er aussah, aber das erwies sich als Illusion.”

334 This stop should not be confused with the railway track platform located at the southern end of the memorial site, adjacent to the Siemens and Halske Production Facilities, or Siemens work camp. Though the majority of deportees arrived in the town of Fürstenberg (Havel), until the establishment of the northern railway stop in 1941/1942, the exhibition Trains to Ravensbrück (Permanent Exhibition, Mahn- und Gedenkstätte Ravensbrück, 2005) was installed at this southern most goods depot.

335 Karolin Steinke, Züge nach Ravensbrück: Transporte mit der Reichsbahn 1939-1945 (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2009), 25.
rent handcars and push themselves along the tracks. This fact has become such common knowledge that even the information placard for the memorial makes note of it. Overall the region remains fundamentally connected to tourist routes for camping, biking, and canoeing, so much so that a cycle route runs along a portion of the former memorial grounds through the north and eastern edges of the memorial.

Yet what is problematic with the above dichotomy is an assumption that tourism and memorial museums are in fact separate from one another in either a physical or conceptual sense. As with the small stretch of railroad track and main bike route into Himmelpfort, these two elements are overlapping and ultimately occupy the same space. Regardless of their educational or commemorative intent, the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück memorial museums remain a destination for tourists as well as students, as is evident through their visitor statistics. Similar to the argument posited by Levy and Sznaider, tourism engages visitor interest and contributes to an increase in visitor numbers.\textsuperscript{336} Any Internet search will reveal dozens of package tours (primarily for Sachsenhausen and other historical sites of the Cold War and National Socialism) run by private companies. Guided tours run by outside companies expose the difficulties in defining ‘good’ and ‘bad’ kinds of tourism or ‘educational’ verses ‘dark’ tourism. Though these tours ultimately profit from these public (and freely accessible) memorial spaces they draw tourists to this site. This trend will be discussed in greater detail later in this section.

Furthermore the function of the museum space itself can prove contentious. Sharon Macdonald for example explores the ways in which the museum shop

\textsuperscript{336} So much so that the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation even attempts to keep statistical information on unaffiliated (private company) guided tours conducted at the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum.
functions as both an extension of the museum and a separate commercial entity.\textsuperscript{337} The shop should in theory, function as more than just a profit driven enterprise, but rather must create an ‘indexical’ relationship to the museum. As noted by Macdonald, it draws upon the modes of display of the museum, as well as the objects themselves, in part to encourage the “economy of possession” (visitors ironically seek to possess that which is authentic and unique through museum replicas), and sates the desire to touch objects, which are untouchable within the museum space.\textsuperscript{338} Though the museum shop attempts to cloak its commercial ties by adopting the visual language of the museum—in that objects can be displayed in a similar fashion to objects in the museum—it remains, according to Macdonald, a fundamental part of the institution’s “financial economy,” and may play a crucial role in sustaining temporary exhibitions and the museums’ activities.\textsuperscript{339} Similarly, Daniel Libeskind, architect of such notable works as the Jewish Museum in Berlin and the Imperial War Museum North in Manchester, has argued that such areas as the museum shop and café have become a fundamental and practical part of the overall museum experience.\textsuperscript{340}

In the case of the Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen Memorial Museums, the gift shops function as an extension of the educational initiatives of the site. Though these sites sell some trinkets (mostly postcards of photographs with the insignia of the museum) the majority of items sold include brochures, information booklets, videos, and scholarly texts related to the memorial or the history of National Socialism and the postwar period. Arguably, the pedagogical function of the shop is meant to legitimise its existence within the space of the memorial, encouraging

\textsuperscript{338} Macdonald, “The Shop,” 52.
\textsuperscript{339} Macdonald, “The Shop,” 52.
visitors to expand their understanding of the history of the camp beyond their visit to the memorial. Though these texts blur the boundaries between the commercial and the educational, a student designed project at Buchenwald in 2004 sought to stretch the boundaries of acceptability, and address the undercurrent of tourism and kitsch at the memorial site. Designing several tourist trinkets including a postcard with a detachable button (a clear reference to the everyday prisoner objects displayed in the camp), a small pamphlet (pocket sized-plaque), and a seedling and planter of a small beech tree from the former camp site—the project sought to argue that souvenirs, as commercially produced objects, were not a fundamentally inappropriate medium by which to remember the Nazi past.\footnote{\textit{\textquotedblleft Studenten entwerfen KZ-Andenken: Souvenirs aus Buchenwald,	extquotedblright} \textit{Spiegel Online} 14 July 2004, accessed 27 August 2015, \url{http://www.spiegel.de/unispiegel/wunderbar/studenten-entwerfen-kz-andenken-souvenirs-aus-buchenwald-a-308546.html}.} Avoiding kitsch, and classic souvenirs (such as T-shirts, caps, buttons, etc.), the students from the Bauhaus-Universität, sought to design objects that would allow visitors their own “access to the site,” manifest through a physical link to the memorial.\footnote{Gunnar Rikola-Lüttgenau, quoted in \textit{Der Spiegel}. “Wir haben die Erfahrung gemacht, dass Gegenstände den Besuchern helfen, ihren eigenen Zugang zum Ort zu schaffen.”}

Similarly at Ravensbrück a university intern at the site, sought to also apply this concept to the museum shop by helping to design a workshop on Holocaust tourism. Students created their own logos for the memorial site, which were printed on cloth bags and made available for sale in the visitor centre’s main shop. Though according to museum staff responses to this workshop were mixed—in some cases this workshop garnered passionate responses from visitors who felt that such materialism trivialised and was disrespectful to the history of the site—the workshop drew interest and furthered a debate regarding the boundaries of commercialisation,
legitimate versus kitsch, and acceptable forms of remembrance and commemoration at former sites of the Holocaust. As is clear from these initiatives these lines remain deeply subjective and personal, and have not yet been determined. Furthermore the controversy engendered by these projects exposes a general discomfort with any form of commercialisation at these sites that is not fundamentally tied to education. The inability to accept the ways in which commercialisation, tourism, marketing, memory, remembrance, and musealisation remain interconnected themes, prevents one from recognising the ways in which distinctions between ‘acceptable’ souvenirs (educational texts and other materials, information booklets and brochures, and postcards), and ‘unacceptable’ souvenirs (items which seem to trivialise the past—t-shirts, caps, bags) are at times arbitrary.

Furthermore, as noted by Yair, the line between education and entertainment is at times blurred, and projects such as those at Buchenwald and Ravensbrück relate the fact that education and commemoration is not necessarily mutually exclusive, and one neither redeems nor taints the other. Additionally, drawing upon popular media and culture can at times prove beneficial. When the Austrian film, Die Fälscher (The Counterfeiters) won the Oscar for best foreign language film in 2008, this drew considerable attention to the lesser-known history of the counterfeiting operation (Operation Bernhard) that began in the fall of 1942 in barrack 19 at the Sachsenhausen concentration camp. Shortly after the release of the film a small temporary exhibition, as well as a permanent online exhibition were established at the memorial and on its main website respectively. Both the temporary exhibition and the online exhibition directly reference the film (and memoir by Adolf Burger), purposefully aligning themselves with its popularity and the general public interest it
garnered.\footnote{“Die Fälscherwerkstatt: im KZ Sachsenhausen 1942–1945,” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://www.stiftung-bg.de/gums/faelscher/}. This reference appears on the introductory page of the website. Please note that the online exhibition is only accessible through the German-language version of the website.} Using the attention drawn from the film as an introductory point, it expands upon the limited perspectives shown in the film—which focuses primarily upon the struggles between Burger and Salomon Sorowitsch—to include interview clips of Burger and some brief biographical information on Sorowitsch, but also information on other participants in the workshop and general information on barrack 19, and its wider operation. The dramatization of the film and its simplified narrative was what made this history of the camp accessible and engaging for the wider public, and drew considerable interest to this obscure chapter of history. Therefore, the international popularity of films such as \textit{The Counterfeiters}, and its contribution to commercialisation of the Holocaust, is in the estimation of Levy and Sznaider, vital to the development of a globalised memory of the Holocaust.\footnote{Levy and Sznaider, \textit{Holocaust and Memory}, 136–137.} Memorial museums are not immune from varying forms of commercialisation, and rather the growing international reputation of these sites, and their subsequent growth in tourism and visitor numbers overall, has only exposed the ways in which these trends are interlinked.

Still, concerns over the crass trivialisation or extreme distortion of the history of sites of National Socialism and the Holocaust are not unfounded. With any site that hosts close to half a million visitors each year, visitors will approach these sites with varying expectations and motivations. Though Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück Memorial Museums are essentially mass graves, and locations of past suffering, torture, and murder; as well as sites of education and internationally esteemed exhibition spaces—there is always the danger that these locations will be reduced to
mere tourist gimmicks. As evident from the picture below, the mother holds no qualms in asking her young children to pose and smile, before the sign marking the ‘neutral zone,’ where numerous prisoners had been killed. It is questionable whether or not her children, who appear to be under five years old, would even be able to comprehend the meaning of that particular area, let alone the larger museum. This photograph, akin to what one would snap at the Brandenburg Gate or Berliner Zoo, is a souvenir, or a cheap means of providing proof of (or remembering) their visit, without comprehending the nature of their interaction with the content of the exhibitions and the larger memorial site.³⁴⁵

**Figure 8** Children standing beside the sign (right) which reads: “Neutral Zone: We will without warning shoot,” Sachsenhausen rollcall yard (Author, 2013).

To a certain extent however the above photograph is not wholly unfathomable. The sign itself is a prop or recreation, which has been added in order to embellish the area-surrounding Tower A, while emphasising the National Socialist history of the

³⁴⁵ Philip Stone has researched the potential motivations behind ‘dark tourism.’ Through his study he notes how in part this could be attributed to individuals wishing to, “indulge their curiosity and fascination with thanatological concerns in a socially acceptable and, indeed, often sanctioned environment.” He goes onto argue that “war cemeteries, sites of mass disasters, memorials to individual or multiple deaths/acts of personal sacrifice and so on may be more powerful and positive means of confronting death than more ‘playful attractions.’” Philip Stone and Richard Sharpley, “Consuming Dark Tourism: A Thanatological Perspective,” *Annals of Tourism Research* 35 no. 2 (2008): 587.
camp. Particular artefacts and objects—such as barbed wire, the watchtowers, the striped prisoner uniform, the Jewish Star, or the “Arbeit Macht Frei” sign—have assumed an iconographic status, and have become an expected part of the visitor experience. Visitor photography is permitted at these sites, and it is quite a common practice to photograph the main campgrounds. According to museum staff it is not unusual for visitors to pose before the camp gate (while giving a thumbs up sign) in order to snap a photo. So crucial have these icons become that to not present them would be tantamount to an incomplete or unfinished exhibition. For example, prior to the opening of the permanent exhibition at Ravensbrück, a temporary exhibition on Jewish prisoners offered a very detailed photograph of a prisoner uniform. Though there was no object on display the exhibition treated the mere rendering of its image as something to be valued, placing it within a glass display case, for visitors to observe. This trend however will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Yet commercialisation of the Holocaust need not be limited to anxieties over its potential trivialisation and the growth of dark tourism. Rather this debate is also connected to practical matters regarding the operational costs of the memorial site—including maintenance, staffing, new exhibitions, educational offerings, and other programmes and events. Though these sites are funded at both the state and regional level, maintenance costs are substantial and ever growing as the site ages and visitor numbers increase. Pressure to develop and update exhibitions, provide educational programmes, incorporate technological updates, and renovate these spaces only increases pressure to find outside sources of funding and develop transnational affiliations and partnerships. When in 2011 the Sachsenhausen memorial began to
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346 According to memorial staff at all sites, federal and state funding is consistent yet not adjusted for inflation, and thus the budget has remained the same for years.
impose a fee of roughly one euro per person for guided tours in German to help mitigate the cost of the programme (foreign language tours are two euro per person), their new policy was met with sharp criticism. Though nearly all major Holocaust memorial museums now charge a nominal fee for their educational programmes—typically less than one Euro per person for guided tours, single-day seminars, work camps, teacher training workshops and other similar activities—it was the fee for guided tours that produced a fierce debate in the international media.

In June 2011 the Süddeutsche Zeitung broke the story in its highly critical article “Remembrance: One Euro.”[^347] Through not so subtle comparisons the article attempts to equate the charge for commercial guided tours to an informal entrance fee, as well as other forms of explicit marketing (the actions of a sausage vendor by the parking lot of the memorial for example). In addition it also provides unflattering comparisons between Sachsenhausen, and Dachau and Bergen-Belsen—noting how the latter sites operate on a considerably smaller budget without charging for fees—and presents a sympathetic portrayal of private tour companies impacted by the fee. The article ends by heavily implying that visitor numbers will in fact decrease as a result of this new charge.[^348]

The surge of responses was immediate and varied. Two minor news outlets, the New Zealand Herald and the UK’s Independent, mistakenly reported that the memorial was imposing an entrance fee for all visitors.[^349] Other popular news

[^348]: Though the Bergen-Belsen Memorial does still continue to offer guided tours free of charge, Dachau Memorial Museum has since imposed a similar fee for guided tours and other study days.
[^349]: The original article appeared in The Independent and was republished word-for-word by the New Zealand Herald. Toby Paterson, “Outrage as visitors are charged to
agencies continued to carry this misleading information initiated by Schmitz. Such news outlets as Canada’s *The Globe and Mail*, and *The Berliner Morgenpost*, ran article titles that used the term entrance fee to describe the new fees.\textsuperscript{350} Even the original article by Schmitz asked the misleading question, “Should a glimpse of the machinery of the Holocaust cost something?” Alternatively, *Spiegel Online* offered a more balanced representation of the story, as well as the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, which noted that survivors and the leaders of the Jewish community supported the new fees as a means of maintaining a higher standard for guided tours.\textsuperscript{351}

In spite of the varying reports from the global media, the controversy exposed many varying questions regarding whether or not it was ethical to impose any fees on the services offered by the memorial; if it was the duty of the memorial to provide educational services free of charge regardless of the real costs of operating these services; and finally who should ultimately decide these matters? As evident from the current educational curriculum of the individual states, there is an acceptance of the KMK’s sentiment that: “It is the duty of the schools to familiarize students with these decisive periods in Germany’s history.”\textsuperscript{352} Utilizing the same rhetoric, critics

\begin{itemize}
\item see former concentration camp,” *The New Zealand Herald*, 29 June 2011; and
\item “Former Nazi concentration camp charging visitors,” *The Independent*, 28 June 2011.
\item \textsuperscript{352} 28–29 September 1995 Meeting of the KMK in Halle on the Saale quoted in Ehmann and Rathenow, “Education about National Socialism,” 5.
\end{itemize}
of the educational fees referenced this general moral obligation with respect to the educational programmes of the former concentration camp memorials.

One spokeswoman from Bergen-Belsen argued, “It's up to every memorial site to find the right way but we here don't think it's right and fundamentally refrain from charging a fee because we think we have a duty to educate visitors and receive public money.” Reiner Deutschmann, the cultural policy spokesman for the Free Democratic Party (FDP) argued that, “visiting memorial sites must remain free of charge”, noting that remembrance of the horrors of Nazi rule is a “state duty,” as was evident by the millions of Euros of national and regional government funding these sites receive each year. To Deutschmann, “The memorial sites in particular have a duty to explain this darkest chapter of German history and the singularity of these Nazi crimes to new generations.”

Yet the question of what was actually being presented on commercial guided tours had become a sore point. Sonja Reichert, general secretary of the International Sachsenhausen Committee, and Stephan Kramer, general secretary of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, noted how some guided tourism firms had little knowledge or formal education regarding the history of the camps. Guided tours and mandatory training certifications thus became for some members of the Jewish community a positive means of ensuring that the tours remained historically accurate. Similarly, both Gunter Morsch and Horst Seferens, spokesman for the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation, have explicitly noted how these fees directly fund the educational programmes of the memorial enabling the site to further expand
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353 Spokeswoman for Bergen-Belsen quoted in Crossland, “Holocaust Remembrance.”
354 Reiner Deutschmann quoted in Crossland, “Holocaust Remembrance.”
355 Reiner Deutschmann quoted in Crossland, “Holocaust Remembrance.”
356 Axelrod, “Sachsenhausen’s new fees.”
its own official guided tours. In addition, Seferens clearly stated that this decision was only made after consulting survivor groups and leading Jewish organisations.\footnote{Seferen’s statements found in Axelrod, “Sachsenhausen’s new fees.” Morsch’s statements found in Schmitz, “Einmal erinnern: 1 Euro.”}

Undoubtedly few would deny the need to incorporate the history of National Socialism into the educational curriculum in Germany, or the responsibility of former sites of National Socialist persecution to teach this history. Heated reactions to this debate clouded the fact that this “duty” or moral imperative was never actually in question. If this truly had been the case then much more than a one Euro fee would have been at stake. Rather much of the controversy surrounding these fees, stemmed from the site itself. Though the Topography of Terror charges seventy Euros for group-guided tours, it faces little to no criticism. Arguably this is in large part because the site is not a location of the Holocaust but rather focuses on the administration of the SS and the Gestapo. Similarly the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe charges for nearly all of its educational programmes but has stirred no controversy, arguably because the site has relatively little topographical connection to the Holocaust. These sites unlike Sachsenhausen were not sites of mass suffering, torture, or death, but are still fundamentally linked to the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust. The imposition of fees at the former sites is therefore not seen as a barrier to education, memorialisation, or even commemoration.

For Sachsenhausen (and other sites) any funds not associated with state funding or donations tap into a deep-seated discomfort from any activity that could be perceived as profiting from this tragic history. In addition any fees that could be perceived as interfering with acts of mourning, commemorating, or honouring of the dead are immediately suspect and/or condemned. There is thus something
fundamentally different about such sites as Sachsenhausen or Ravensbrück, and the notion of a fee takes on a darker connotation, that other memorials not as physically connected to the Holocaust are able to avoid. From this comparison it is clear that the ‘duty’ or imperative to education does not have the same urgency for all sites, and more broadly there exist different kinds of memorial sites related to National Socialism and the Holocaust—including sites of persecution, the perpetrators, overlapping Soviet and National Socialist memory, murder and torture, extermination and genocide, and newly constructed sites and museums with little to no physical connection to the past. Different sites are held to different standards as some are considered more sacred, historical, or connected to the past than others. These underlying aspects inform and shape their identities, and thus different sites engender different expectations. This begs the questions: Why then is it permissible for some sites to charge for pedagogical services and not others? If it were a duty to educate and disseminate this information, why then would it not be expected that all state funded institutions related to this period of history offer their services for free?

In addition, why is it acceptable for private companies to profit from what is essentially a free public service, and yet unacceptable for a memorial site to charge a minimal fee to ensure that it can continue to provide officially sponsored educational seminars and guided tours? In the case of Sachsenhausen, the perception that the site is seeking to profit from these fees is unfounded. Criticism of guided tour fees downplays the very real financial burdens of these public institutions. Though the state and the Bundestag fund the memorial site, it remains, as Gunter Morsch argues, in need of further financial support as costs of maintaining the site rise. In the summer of 2013, for example a significant portion of the original camp wall
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358 The Schmitz article heavily implies that the funding of Sachsenhausen could be more suitably managed to prevent the imposition of fees.
collapsed during a heavy thunderstorm. Though efforts were made to repair it shortly after it collapsed, broken stones prevented it from being reconstructed out of completely original materials. This deterioration is not unusual, as an earlier incident also necessitated the pouring of a new foundation underneath a portion of the wall, to prevent a similar incident and further erosion.

![Photographs of a portion of the original camp wall at Sachsenhausen, which collapsed in August 2013 (Author).](image)

**Figure 9** Photographs of a portion of the original camp wall at Sachsenhausen, which collapsed in August 2013 (Author).

Furthermore, this need to maintain and improve the original camp buildings is a decades long project, which began in the years following unification. In part to keep the cost of maintaining the sites low, the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück memorial sites established international work camps shortly after the *Wende* (1992), which sought to, “connect historical learning in an authentic setting with practical work to care for and protect the memorial.”\(^{359}\) These projects last for a minimum of two days and a maximum of two weeks, bringing together students from different countries, to help landscape and repair the site, while simultaneously undertaking archival research, meeting survivors of the former camps, taking part in tours in the wider regions, and undertaking other necessary work for the memorial. Such projects have included archaeological excavations of the former Sachsenhausen camp, and at

Ravensbrück, projects related to the Siemens auxiliary camp, Uckermark youth camp, and other sites in Retzow, Grüneberg and Gut Damshöhe.\textsuperscript{360} Furthermore, as was discussed earlier, remnants of the former Soviet camp had, over time become unstable and derelict at both sites, thus requiring careful removal. This process remains ongoing; as for example at Sachsenhausen the site of the former Brickworks (\textit{Klinkerwerk}) remains a temporary exhibition because the memorial lacks the necessary resources to remove artillery shells and other artefacts from the area. Similarly at Ravensbrück the structures of the former Soviet camp are only gradually being demolished, as will be discussed in greater later in this chapter.

Such problems are endemic to the site, and require significant support to ensure that the memorial is preserved. In addition these institutions face continued pressure to develop new permanent and temporary exhibition spaces, as is clear by the continual development of research and exhibitions within the past twenty years. While it is desirable to offer educational seminars and intensive programmes free of charge, there is a very real cost in designing, developing, and implementing these projects. Though no one wishes to be in the embarrassing position of requesting a fee from a survivor, the choice of charging for pedagogical programmes in order to ensure the expansion and further development of these sites educational programmes, rather than reducing or eliminating them, is clear.

Overall this debate, and this section as a whole, reveals the danger of imposing a moral code unthinkingly. Notions of a moral obligation and duty, which are so often associated with Holocaust education, should not be blindly accepted, but critically re-examined. Taboos against imposing fees are perhaps the most difficult to overcome, though must be addressed as practical concerns related to funding,

\textsuperscript{360} “Die ganze Welt in Ravensbrück,” 37–39.
maintenance, and the sustainability of such educational programmes are at stake. Moreover, since 2011 visitor numbers have not significantly fallen (as was predicted), but rather continue to increase at both the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück memorials, and therefore have not significantly harmed these sites. This controversy provides an opportunity to reflect on the limitations and restrictions that we impose on these sites, in order to fit an idealised ethical or moral understanding of how to commemorate the past. Arguably, a greater self-awareness of these assumptions is necessary to allow our attitudes towards memorialisation to evolve.

In the 10-year overview of the educational activities of the site Matthias Heyl, the director of education, recounted a story in which two friends, who were visiting him at the camp, did not wish him to stay overnight at the Youth Hostel, for fear that a spectre may appear before him during the night. The fear reflected not only common superstition, but also the notion that these sites continue to bear the marks of the past that continue into the present day. Though this is true to an extent, the site is, in the words of Yvonne Nägel, an instructor at the memorial, “no longer the concentration camp Ravensbrück, but the Ravensbrück memorial and Youth Hostel.”

Overall the notion that a memorial site itself can only be framed in one kind of acceptable way (as a solemn near religious, or educational experience) is also problematic. The establishment of the Youth Hostel and education centre is arguably
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362 Yvonne Nägel, quoted in an interview in 10 Jahre Jugendherberge Ravensbrück, 17. The full quote reads, “Ravensbrück ist ein historisch besonders belasteter Ort, aber er ist Teil einer Umwelt, die von dieser historischen Belastung auch nicht frei ist. Den historischen Ort gegenwärtig anders zu füllen, deutlich zu machen, dass dies nicht mehr das KZ Ravensbrück, sondern die Gedenk- und Jugendbegegnungsstätte ist, gehört zu den besonderen Herausforderungen unserer Arbeit.”
attempting to break down these assumptions. Programmes hosted at the educational centre include for example multi-week summer camps, which offer a range of activities from survivor interviews, workshops with staff, and individual projects; but also canoeing, volleyball, barbeques, and daytrips to neighbouring areas. In addition, one weeklong seminar featured as part of the final presentation a hip-hop performances night put on by secondary school students. Their raps featured their thoughts on right-wing extremism and modern day racism in Germany. This performance took place on the memorial grounds, and thus challenged traditional modes of expression by employing novel pedagogic techniques in order to educate participants.\footnote{In many respects this discussion recalls Friedlander’s 1992 collection of essays, which addresses ethical representations of the Holocaust. The highlight of this volume consists of an exchange between Friedlander and Hayden White regarding the limitations of language, the difficulties of representing historical truth, and the ease with which the boundaries of representation of the Holocaust are transgressed. Friedlander, \textit{Probing the Limits of Representation}.} What this example reveals is not necessarily a juxtaposition of spaces, but rather spaces of memory, tourism and commerce, which are inevitably intertwined. Recognition of this fact perhaps demands a reconciliation of expectations with practical realities, in order to accept the fundamental connection between the culture of remembrance in Germany and the burgeoning tourist and commercial industry connected with it.

The Internal Hierarchy of Spaces

Given the limited financial resources of the site, and the vast geographical expanse of the original concentration camps, preservation of the memorial’s grounds follows an internal hierarchy reflected in the preservation, restoration, re-appropriation, neglect and demolition of various structures throughout both sites. In many respects this hierarchy reflects concerns regarding which histories comprise the main focus of
these memorials, and that they maintain the authenticity and integrity of the grounds. With the aforementioned growth of personal histories and different groups seeking recognition, dissatisfaction with this hierarchy is inevitable. At Ravensbrück however, alternative educational programmes (both formal, informal, and those that are somewhere in between) have provided a means of expressing dissatisfaction with the marginalisation of certain spaces of the memorial, and contribute to the growing diversification and fragmentation of Holocaust memory.

As noted previously by Niven—in contrast to Rothberg’s multi-directional memory—a “principle of hierarchy” exists between the Soviet and National Socialist histories at Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald. Though as argued previously in this chapter, the gap between these two histories is closing, his argument points to a general ‘hierarchy’ of spaces, or marked differences between the way in which different spaces are treated and preserved. These acts of preservation and restoration serve as strong statements regarding a structure’s perceived authenticity, and which structures are seen as best able to represent the shifting historical contexts of these camps. In part this can reflect the divides between Soviet and National Socialist history as Niven observes, but alternatively this hierarchy can also reflect the different buildings that comprised the original concentration camp. Overall this trend can be seen through the renovation of the former female SS-barracks and Soviet military garages at Ravensbrück, and the former Armoury, T-building, and New Museum at Sachsenhausen.

At Ravensbrück the boundaries of preservation and authenticity were roughly drawn at the Soviet era. This however is in large part due to the fact that the construction of the Soviet military base had largely displaced the former
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364 Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past*, 46.
concentration camp, and rendered it unrecognisable. Additionally, many of the original camp barracks had fallen into disrepair and had been torn down in the postwar period. In 1998 the neighbouring town of Fürstenberg sponsored a competition to restore the grounds of the memorial. The first prize design categorically designated Soviet structures within the main camp as false, and as obfuscating the authenticity of the original National Socialist site.\textsuperscript{365} Other organisations including the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation, survivors’ organisations, and the Länder were consulted when bestowing the award, and reviewing the basic concept of the proposal. Though the competition was not binding, the abstract proposal, which sought to establish the original outlines of the former camp structures, was eventually implemented. The new memorial design called for the creation of depressions filled with stones in order to clearly outline the location of the former camp barracks. Even though these aspects of the camp’s landscape had disappeared decades earlier, these depressions had to be manufactured in order to make visible the original layout of the site, while obliterating traces of the Soviet military base.

This distinction between pre- and post-liberation structures has carried through to the present day. For instance, the military garages and residences, located at the former Uckermark camp, had fallen into a state of dilapidation and disrepair, and were torn down in the summer of 2012. Though these structures arguably interfered with the history of the auxiliary camp, their demolition (literally) erases a historical layer from this site. The Soviet military base cannot be equated to the Soviet Special Camp in Sachsenhausen; however, the main memorial grounds have

\textsuperscript{365} Oswalt and Brauer, \textit{Ehemaliges Frauenkonzentrationslager Ravensbrück}, 6.
purposefully sought to remove the postwar history of this site, in order to return it to the National Socialist period.

![Figure 10 (Left) Soviet Garages at the Uckermark Camp (Author, 2012). Figure 11 (Right) Site of the former Soviet Garages (Author, 2013)](image)

All of these structures have historical ties to the main camp; however, it is only the history of the National Socialist period, which is deemed worthy of preservation. Ironically, the act of preservation thus becomes an act of destruction, as changes to the topography of the camp since liberation are subsequently erased. This trend however is hardly surprising given that the base was evidence of the prolonged occupation of Germany throughout the entirety of the Cold War (until 1994) by Soviet forces. Similar to the Soviet Special Camp its demolition may strangely represent Germany’s ability to come to terms with the history of the GDR while simultaneously seeking to confront the Nazi past.

Still the continued existence of derelict structures at these sites attests to the enormous expense of re-appropriation or even demolition. At Ravensbrück the spaces of the former auxiliary camps represent only a portion of the remaining structures littered throughout the site. Though some spaces have since been cleared, as is evident through the photographs below large fragments of the former military base remain in at the southwest corner of the memorial grounds. These sites remain fenced-off from the rest of the camp—though half-heartedly as one can reach them
easily through the main campgrounds and the surrounding woodland trails. Similarly, at Sachsenhausen, only the darker aspects of the history of the Soviet Special camp have been preserved, as the former Soviet housing complexes that still exist between the main camp grounds and the memorial’s youth hostel are still standing, though run-down and abandoned.

![Figure 12: Derelict Structures outside the main memorial grounds at Sachsenhausen (Author, 2013).](image)

Demolition of these structures would be costly and unnecessary given the sheer size and number of buildings, and also given the fact that the memorial does not plan to further develop these sites. Arguably, there is no significant dark history (or atrocity) attached to these locations as is the case with the Soviet Museum, and thus an exhibition would be seemingly unnecessary. Furthermore the expanse of these spaces is considerable, and a focused exhibition or even marker for these sites would be difficult to develop. Additionally, these wider spaces beyond the memorial site attest to the memorial’s physical distortion of space, given that the whole of the former campgrounds were significantly larger than what is preserved by the memorial. Decisions regarding preservation, marking, restoration and recognition thus ultimately reflect the hierarchies of space inherent in the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück Memorial Museums.
Regardless, this principle of hierarchies can be expanded to include other structures and spaces within the site itself. For example, the Armoury at Sachsenhausen currently houses the visitor centre, bookshop and reception, toilets, administrative offices, and a small overview of the exhibitions at the site. In addition the T-Building—which housed the administrative headquarters for the whole of the concentration camp system and now holds the newly opened exhibition “System of Terror: The Concentration Camps Inspectorate”—now functions primarily as the main offices for the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation, as well as the Revenue Offices of Oranienburg. The conversion of this space into something primarily functional and commercial speaks to its place on this hierarchical scale. Thus deemed to have enough significance to be renovated and refitted, it is not connected directly with the history or legacy of the prisoners. Moreover it is situated by the parking lot, and far enough from the main campgrounds that it is arguably seen as set apart from the main memorial. Given the relatively insignificant role of this structure, its refashioning is unproblematic. In addition the principle of distance and organisation of space is also significant. The library and archive depot for example are situated inconspicuously outside the western wall of the camp, and are not assigned a number or afforded a description on the visitor map. While a fundamental part of the memorial, their existence is downplayed and overshadowed by the remainder of the memorial grounds and exhibitions. In contrast the execution trench is left almost as it appeared during the National Socialist time period, and Barrack 38, the Jewish barrack, has left the washrooms unchanged, as well as some of the former sleeping areas. To preserve the integrity of the building, the permanent exhibition of the site is

expanded underneath the original structure. There the visitor encounters a more modern museum space where individual prisoner biographies and artefacts from the site are displayed. From this trend, it would appear that sites related to the perpetrators are ‘second’ and sites of the victims are ‘first.’ This is of course an oversimplification of this divide, yet very often a general guideline by which spaces at these sites are arranged.

Within the past ten years both Sachsenhausen (2005) and Ravensbrück (2008), have converted one or more buildings into youth hostels and educational spaces. At Sachsenhausen, the Szczypiorski House—named after the Polish author Andrzej Szczypiorski (1928–2000), a former prisoner of the camp who worked throughout his life for a mutual understanding between Poles and Germans—was established in the former home of the concentration camp’s chief of staff. The building can house up to thirty-two people, has a full kitchen, seminar rooms, multimedia teaching facilities and a modest library, as well as a sport and leisure area.367 Similarly, the relatively large youth hostel at Ravensbrück as mentioned previously, occupies the former women’s SS-barracks, and comprises eight buildings, including a cafeteria, communal hall, sports recreation area, and badminton/volleyball court.

In large part the utilization of this space is practical. By offering facilities for overnight visits, both sites are able to facilitate multi-day or multi-week projects for students and educators. The hostels’ close proximity to the camp reduces the time it takes to commute to the memorial, and also provides an extension of the active learning environment at the camp, as it provides a small library and computer room

for further study. International or out of state groups unfamiliar with the area, would also be more likely to participate in educational programs, if they could book this site sponsored space designed specifically for students. Thus previously neglected spaces are renovated, updated, and reintroduced as useful and functioning part of the exhibition.

Yet the re-appropriation of these spaces once again reflects this implicit hierarchy of memory within the memorial itself. Not all historically significant spaces are equal, or worthy of preservation and maintenance, as is also clear from the Ravensbrück memorial site, though arguably this neglect of outlying areas reflects a lack of sufficient financial support. For sites formerly used by the perpetrators, even when spaces are “maintained,” or “preserved” this does not necessitate that they will return to a state that reflects their original uses. Arguably, the Youth Hostels, “preserved” these structures, and prevented them from neglect and disrepair, in a way that was deemed acceptable. Within this spectrum of tasteful preservation, the homes and offices of the perpetrators are fair game for both a complete interior redesign, as well as the commercialization of these spaces. Though these sites are not historically neutral, they appear to be morally so. Their use for tourism or commercial exchange (book stores and souvenirs) seemingly breaks no taboos. The main webpage for the Ravensbrück Youth Hostel in particular emphasises sporting activities and family outings in addition to its work with the concentration camp. From the website it is clear that visitors to the memorial need not be the only occupants, but rather families and other groups taking advantage of the tourist attractions in the near vicinity are also welcome.368

Because these structures are not located within the main campgrounds of the memorial, they appear set apart from the remainder of the memorial museum. The conversion of these buildings seemingly extends the existing space of the memorial rather than appearing to alter or disrupt the authentic dimensions of the main concentration camp. Even though these inherent tensions were purposefully meant to be a part of this programme, the space of the Youth Centre as a whole could potentially be seen as problematic. The Brandenburg Memorial Foundation’s decision to utilize historic buildings original to the National Socialist period was made only after a considerable degree of careful thought. Their conversion and complete interior renovation, intentionally masked their original use by the female SS-auxiliary guard. As one staff member at the site described, there was a need to avoid enshrining or preserving the regalia of the NSDAP. The usage of these buildings also stirs many questions regarding the sanctity of original structures, and whether or not it is appropriate to alter them for current needs.

Furthermore the unusual usage of buildings encourages alternative educational initiatives and approaches. Perhaps the best example of this relatively unmediated approach, are the hip-hop seminars, which are coordinated with local German secondary schools. Students are paired with English speaking hip-hop artists and asked to develop their own hip-hop performance or even break dance routines. Hip-hop is thus seen as a fresh relatable medium, through which the students can explore and reflect on the complex disturbing themes of the Holocaust. Underlying this programme are questions regarding appropriate forms of commemoration, learning, and expression.

When first implemented questions arose as to whether or not it was disrespectful to hold a hip-hop concert on the grounds of a former concentration
camp. According to museum staff survivors who themselves had enjoyed the Swing and Jazz music in the 1930s and 1940s—which had been denigrated by the National Socialists as degenerate—compared hip hop to this alternative art form, of which extreme-right wing groups would similarly disapprove. Ultimately, the educational value, the clear engagement and enjoyment of students with this project, and the appeal of developing music about tolerance and acceptance met with the approval of survivor groups, and the concert was performed at the Youth Hostel.\footnote{369} Given the conversion of the space, which emphasised both its pedagogical and commercial function, as well as its role as a place of leisure and entertainment—the memorial can develop and offer alternative educational programmes without damaging the integrity of the original site, and can further expand our understanding of how to utilise these spaces.

Ultimately however, these hierarchies of space, at times prove dissatisfying among different survivor groups vying for recognition in the form of physical space exhibition spaces. As a result these sites have sought a better means of communicating with visitors in order to better understand how they interact and engage with these spaces and materials. At Sachsenhausen, the implementation of the Truth Booth, a project designed by a student intern, was intended to be “both a digital guest-book where visitors [could] record their impressions,” of the memorial; as well as, “a growing archive of visitor experiences that [could] help researchers and curators consider the ways Sachsenhausen’s past continues to impact us.”\footnote{370}

\footnote{369} This insight comes from an interview I conducted with a member of the museum’s educational staff in August 2012. 
In some instances the border between approved institutional programmes and independent initiatives is blurred. With respect to the work camps that focus on the auxiliary Uckermark and Siemens camps, this is very much the case. There are several work camps that maintain the grounds of the former Juvenile “protection” camp, and raise awareness of the history of the site. These work camps are created in association with partner youth-group organisations. One in particular, the Women, Lesbians, Transgender Work camp, (established in 1997), seeks to promote the creation of a separate memorial site dedicated to the history of the Uckermark concentration camp.\(^{371}\) In August 2001, this work camp began to construct a makeshift exhibition at the former Uckermark youth concentration camp for young women and female adolescents. This included not only the maintenance of the former camp grounds, but also the construction of memorial pathways, information placards, signs and banners directing tourists to the site of the former camp, the creation of information boxes stocked with leaflets about the camp, markers designating significant locations within the camp, translations of key documents, letters from survivors requesting the creation of an exhibition, mesh wire artwork and other sculptures, and an online website detailing their initiative, and offering further information about the site.

To this group the current site, which is in many respects no more than a set of barren lots, obscures the history of this site. Going beyond the resources of the memorial, the work camp’s projects have focused on making the history of this camp transparent, through the use of art installations, and signs marking the former gas chamber and camp entrance. These locations are now all but indistinguishable from the rest of the area. Though the work camp is run in conjunction with the educational department, their ultimate goals do not necessarily coincide. The extent to which the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation or the Memorial site supports the creation of a separate camp is not clear. Though one of the placards meant to direct visitors to the camp is featured in the new Permanent Exhibition, and a banner supporting their organisation appears in the visitor centre a more permanent exhibition space has not been developed from the initial efforts of the work camp participants. Ultimately, the website has proven the best means of maintaining interest in and presenting information about the former camp. An online exhibition, as well as numerous other materials are posted on the website, including an downloadable audio guide, 24-page exhibition catalogue, a document detailing the development of their project, and
various work camp reports (2001, 2004, 2007–2009, and 2012–2013), as well as recommendations for further literature and research on the camp.\(^{372}\)

Figure 14: Impromptu exhibition before the Siemens forced labour camp (Author, 2013).

Furthermore an impromptu exhibition staged directly in front of the former Siemens forced-labour camp buildings also serves to highlight the absence of a permanent exhibition devoted to this particular history of the camp. Artefacts (whether they were from the camp or from elsewhere is not known) were carefully laid out in front of one of the old main workshop buildings. These items included dishes, coins, buttons, a suitcase, and other similar household items. Posters bearing the faces of women had also been hastily tied to the fence designed to prevent individuals from entering the unstable building structures. This transgression beyond the proscribed boundaries of the memorial is both poignant and symbolic of the desire to draw attention to previously marginalised, absent, or underrepresented aspects of the history of the camp. These ‘guerrilla exhibitions’ appear quickly and subtly; as

\(^{372}\) In lieu of formal exhibition spaces the Internet has also provided forums in which to present more detailed information on the history of the site in lieu of permanent exhibition spaces. The Siemens@Ravensbrück seminar, which is sponsored by the current Siemens Company, provides numerous materials (videos, statements from participants, and project reports from 2010 to 2014). “Siemens Ravensbrück,” accessed 26 September 2015, [http://www.projekt-ravensbrueck.de/](http://www.projekt-ravensbrueck.de/).
interviews with the camp staff indicated that they had no knowledge of this development.

This kind of self-driven educational programme, while assisted by or (tolerated by) the memorial site, is indicative of underlying trends of both practical and ideological concerns that shape the dynamics of institutional narratives, commemoration, and Holocaust education. From this example, it is clear that it is not prudent to speak of education as a one-way process, but rather as a kind of dialogue, which is with respect to this group still open. Both groups seek to benefit from a kind of mutual exchange, while this work camp helps to maintain the site, the educational department grants them access to their resources such as their library and archives. The memorial in turn helps this group by allowing them to promote the creation of the separate exhibition space within the memorial grounds, and develop an exhibition space independently.

Consequently, though the educational department at Ravensbrück oversees, and is ultimately responsible for, the content of these sites, participants are permitted a large degree of independence. Not all time is directly supervised or structured. For example participants in the Siemens@Ravensbrück seminar are provided with the opportunity to interview survivors of the Siemens forced labour camp. They develop the content of these interviews, and work with media specialists to record and edit these videos, and create a polished film. Additionally, participants of the Service Civil International Work Camp organise their own research and project schedule. They are responsible for structuring their own time, and for ensuring that they meet their pre-determined pedagogical objectives. Longer programmes such as the above, often assume that students will be active in shaping and tailoring their time, and also be conscious of what they want to take away from these programmes. This may
translate into individual research projects, or even establishing relationships with other pedagogical groups in the area.

What arises from this programme is thus a host of questions on the way in which the past is remembered, which pasts are remembered, and the forces that drive this remembrance. Though the work camp uses grassroots techniques and methods to draw attention to the history of the camp, their ultimate goal is to achieve recognition for histories that have been marginalised, neglected, or not yet covered by the site. Though the means by which they attempt to achieve this include impromptu and semi-formal exhibition spaces, as seen with the Uckermark memorial, alternative methods including online exhibitions have proved increasingly useful in communicating a great deal of information in a professional way at a far smaller cost than a physical exhibition. Through online media the information is disseminated well beyond the physical memorial grounds to an international audience, and thus this provides one pathway to overcoming the hierarchies of memory and preservation inherent in these sites, whilst giving voice to a previously neglected history. Given these changes will it even possible for institutions to maintain a monopoly on memory when, there will always be dissatisfied groups seeking further recognition and focus on issues they deem important? Splinter groups will continue to seek recognition, and strive to expand the focus of these sites. Such groups are necessary in order to instigate change and develop the existing narratives of these institutions. In addition independent educational programmes and work camps support the development of these alternative methods of remembrance, and allow for these varying alternative interpretations of the history of these sites.
2.5 Conclusions

The primary aim of this chapter was to explore the effects of globalised memory on former sites of persecution and murder by examining the exhibition spaces and educational programmes of the Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück Memorial Museums. Consequently these sites both reflect the growth of a globalised memory of the Holocaust through their increasingly international institutional ties and visitor demographics, as well as the displacement of the national narratives of memory. At the same time they also reveal the endurance of local and national concerns and influences upon these sites of remembrance.

The continuation of Soviet iconography and sculptures exposes how the foundations of GDR secular-sacred narratives and the religion of the nation-state has been undermined by shifts in the post-unification period that emphasise a plurality of different voices and perspectives. While this has helped to foster the development of multi-directional approaches to memory with respect to the history of the Soviet Special Camp, and the opening up of previously restricted spaces at these sites, there remains a definite hierarchy of memory, particularly when memory is transformed from the theoretical to physical or cultural embodiments in the form of a museum or memorial space. Matters of space, preservation, restoration, and deterioration, as well as commercialisation all impact the way in which these memories are presented at these sites. While these trends reflect in part the growth of a globalised memory of the Holocaust, they also show the ways in which these sites remain fundamentally connected to national concerns and a particularly German history of the past.

Anxieties relating to the perceived or potential commercialisation of sites of remembrance—and more particularly spaces where victims of National Socialism were murdered—impact perceptions regarding acceptable and unacceptable forms of
commercial exchange. Though the educational can be a means of offsetting these concerns, this is not always the case as is evident from the Sachsenhausen Memorial guided tour fees controversy. Moreover very real concerns regarding operational costs and preserving the camp’s grounds necessitate an internal hierarchy of preservation and memorialisation. Thus the Brandenburg Memorial Foundation sets boundaries and priorities with respect to what buildings are preserved and whose memories and histories are represented.

Still globalisation has resulted in an increased plethora of voices at these sites, and the growth of the Internet and alternative approaches to education have provided unconventional pathways to ensuring that these voices are heard. From the educational programmes enumerated above, there exists an evident tension between official and unofficial narratives of the past, and it is clear that while there remains an official narrative it is not alone, as competing narratives vie for space and recognition. Ultimately, this chapter shows how the undermining of national narratives—or the ability to think beyond frameworks of memory that are constructed and set out by the nation state—has led to an opening up of memory through its fragmentation and pluralisation.

Arguably, however the nation state has not been fully discarded, but remains fundamental to the identity of these sites and how they commemorate and memorialise the history of the Holocaust and National Socialism. These sites will always remain situated within the German context and landscape. Yet in the post-unification period they are simultaneously places of specific local and community memory, as well as sites of globalised memory, which are not bound to these spaces because of the nation state, but rather their indexical relationship to the history of the site itself. There remains thus greater room for a diversity of memories to come forth,
and the possibility for further research and development. These opportunities remained limited however, by practical constraints of resources and funding. There thus remains a very real need to come to terms with these limitations, and embrace the ways in which the memorial museum straddles the commercial and the historical through hierarchies of remembrance.
CHAPTER 3: THE INFORMATION CENTRE OF THE MEMORIAL TO
THE MURDERED JEWS OF EUROPE:
From Communicative to Institutional Memory

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will examine the ‘Information Centre’ (Ort der Information) of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in order to show how it reflects a shift from communicative to institutional forms of commemoration, memorialisation, and remembrance. If the field of stelae serves as a national memorial that specifically represents Germany’s complex and enduring relationship with the memory of the Holocaust, the Information Centre presents a space that embodies international trends of remembrance, and in turn contributes to a globalised memory of the Holocaust. Overall the Centre illustrates this trend through the de-territorialisation (and re-territorialisation) of memory; the shift from lived experience to a more media driven or visual representation of the Holocaust; the increased pluralisation of memory and the increased emphasis on personal narratives; and the inclusion of educational programmes that focus on the process of memorialisation and the relationship between history and personal memory. As a result of these trends, the permanent exhibition draws upon images, selected texts, the constructed layout of spaces, affiliations and references to similar international institutions, and survivor testimonies, to manufacture a secular-sacred, authentic site of memory.

Though the location of the Information Centre is not historically connected to the victims of the Holocaust (in the same way as the House of the Wannsee Conference or the Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen Memorial Museums), it acquires its legitimacy through its participation in this wider form of globalised institutional
remembrance and commemoration. By drawing upon the common themes and approaches of such sites as the USHMM and Yad Vashem, the Information Centre contributes to the creation of a condensed symbolic language of the Holocaust, and reveals the ways in which memory can become both detached from specific locations or spaces of tragedy and significance, as well as transplantable and reconstructable. The Information Centre thus remains, through both its design and its institutional affiliations, fundamentally connected to and informed by these international institutions. Furthermore, new media and technological improvements in communication are crucial to facilitating this shift from communicative to institutional memory, as is evident from the survivor testimonies database, and its utilisation in educational programmes at the site.

**Methodology and Chapter Structure**

With respect to sources, this chapter will primarily draw upon the exhibition spaces of the Information Centre, materials gathered from interviews with memorial staff, statistical data provided by the Foundation, the survivor testimony database website and portal (located onsite), and other online materials from the institution. The primary source material for this chapter will be the photographs and archival films featured in the permanent exhibition, survivor testimonies utilised for pedagogical work, and worksheets other handouts given to me by the memorial staff.

Following the introduction, this chapter will begin with a brief historical background section on the history of the Memorial debate, as well as further information on the current operations of the site. The third major section, will explore how the Information Centre utilises reproduced visual media to generate an objective historical narrative of the past, as well as a personalised history of the
Holocaust. These two seemingly opposing trends will illustrate how the site reflects the intersections of communicative and institutional memory. In addition, it will explore how the Information Centre generates an aura of authenticity and seeks to create secular-sacred spaces by adopting, and drawing upon the commemorative practices of similar institutions.

The fourth major section will continue to examine the above trends, as well as the fragmentation and personalisation of memory through an analysis of the survivor testimony database. This section will demonstrate how these testimonies (through their inclusion at this site) embody the intersection of communicative or personal forms of memory and institutional forms of remembrance. Drawing from the trends outlined in the permanent exhibition, the fifth section of this chapter will explore how the fragmentation of memory, and even the process of memorialisation itself, is reflected in the educational programmes of this site. Drawing together these different sections, the conclusion will summarise the ways in which these trends contribute to the creation of an internationally intelligible, visualised, and media driven language of the Holocaust.

3.2 Historical Background

The Memorial Competition

In the early 1980s, the leadership of the West German government began to call for a central memorial dedicated to the victims of National Socialism. By May 1981, Helmut Schmidt sought the establishment of a “memorial for those who lost their lives as a result of the failings and the crimes of the Third Reich.” Similarly, in 1983 Parliamentary President Richard Stückeln envisioned a 40,000 square meter

monument devoted to the German dead of the World Wars. In response to such demands, Chancellor Helmut Kohl dedicated the Neue Wache, to “the fallen” with an enlarged version of Käthe Kollwitz’s Pieta centrally located within. The memorial however proved problematic as the overt Christian symbolism implicit in its design, excluded Jewish forms of suffering. Furthermore the generic dedication, and overly generalized message of victimization, seemingly equated German loss with the losses of those who had been persecuted under National Socialism.

Simultaneously however, the development of counter memorial culture in the late 1980s and early 1990s, paralleled these trends. In part this radical shift in aesthetic memorialisation and representation of the past, stemmed from a wider crisis of normalization after the cataclysmic events of the twentieth century, as has been discussed previously. If memorials and monuments prior to the Second (and even First) World War had sought to celebrate the ideals of heroism, militarism and nationalism; counter memorial culture attempted to invert these notions, and undermined traditional conceptions of permanence, commemoration, and the infallible authority of the state.

The Holocaust in particular benefited from this radicalisation of memorials, for the senseless violence and destruction of the event demanded a break with previous forms of representation. In 1987 a grassroots initiative, led by Lea Rosh and Eberhard Jäckel (and later the citizen’s initiate “Perspective Berlin e.V.”) began to call for the creation of a central memorial to the Holocaust in Germany. Campaigning through advertisements, street placards and rented billboards, petitions,
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374 Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past*, 198.
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376 Young discusses this point extensively in chapter four of his work, *At Memory’s Edge*, 90–119.
and private donations—the campaign gradually began to build momentum. In April of 1994, the Circle for Promoting the Construction of a Memorial to Europe’s Murdered Jews (Förderkreis) initiated a competition to design a centrally located memorial in Berlin. 528 entries from around the world were submitted, and judged by a jury made up of fifteen experts, lay people, members of the original citizen’s group, and individuals appointed by the Bundestag and Berlin Senate. From the very beginning two key issues emerged. The first was what form the new memorial should take, and the second questioned whether or not a single national memorial would be sufficient to honour the victims of the Holocaust.

With respect to the first point, some of the more extreme entries included Horst Hoheisel’s “Antisolution,” which proposed blowing up the Brandenburg Gate, grinding it into dust, sprinkling the remains over the former site, and finally covering the site in granite plates. The complete annihilation of one of the most famous icons of Germany would to Hoheisel, recall the annihilation of the Jews of Europe.
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377 Lea Rosh, “From Three to Four Years, Into Seventeen,” in Materials on the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Berlin: Nicolai in association with the Foundation for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, 2009), 9.
378 Discussion regarding the construction of a memorial to the victims of the Second World War occurred as early as 1977, with plans to erect such a monument in Bonn. Brief competitions in West Germany in 1984 to 1985 ultimately lead to nothing (Peter Carrier, Holocaust Monuments and National Memory Cultures in France and Germany since 1989: The Origins and Political Function of the Vél d’Hiv’ in Paris and the Holocaust Monument in Berlin [New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005], 101). With respect to calls for a Holocaust Memorial, a citizen’s action group, “Perspective for Berlin” initiated this discussion as early as January 1989 (Niven, Facing the Nazi Past, 214). To recount the numerous stops and starts on the way to approving the current Holocaust Monument would be the subject of another dissertation. I will provide merely a brief overview of some of the most relevant discussions in this debate. Ute Heimrod, Guenter Schlusche, Horst Seferens compiled a massive collection of articles, interviews, and media coverage on the memorial debate entitled Das Denkmal?: Die Debatte um das Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas: Eine Dokumentation (Frankfurt am Main: Philo, 1999).
379 Young, At Memory’s Edge, 189. This initially neat, organized process of assessing entries in this competition was soon over run by a hodgepodge of debate, controversy and conflicting organizational goals.
Conversely, Dani Karavan proposed the planting of a field of yellow flowers in the shape of the Star of David. The organic memorial would blossom, and then wither, each year, thus representing the ephemeral nature of memory and the need to always renew this decision to remember the past.\textsuperscript{380}

Overall, the winners of the first competition presented a more conventional memorial design. On 16/15 March 1995, first prize was divided between Berlin architect Christine Jakob-Marks, and New York artist Simon Ungers. Only Marks’ design was to be built, and consisted of a twenty-three foot thick concrete gravestone in the shape of a three hundred foot square. This square was be tilted at an angle running from six-feet to twenty-five feet, and engraved with the names of 4.5 million murdered Jews.\textsuperscript{381} Ultimately, the Jakob-Marks design engendered much public criticism, and was never approved by the German Bundestag. The competition ended abruptly, when in 1995, Chancellor Kohl cancelled it.

In 1997 a second competition was attempted, and accompanied by a series of public colloquia in January, March, and April. Instructions to the artists in the second competition requested that the design for the monument, not only commemorate the murdered Jews of Europe, but also “necessarily define Germany’s own present memory of the Holocaust.”\textsuperscript{382} This matter of present day relevance resonated in part with critics who questioned whether or not the construction of an imposing central monument in Berlin in fact betrayed the scattered memory of the genocide. On the subject of who was to be remembered, one of the most compelling arguments was for the establishment of a memorial to other victims of National Socialism, (and in

\textsuperscript{381} Young, \textit{At Memory’s Edge}, 189.
\textsuperscript{382} Quoted in Carrier, \textit{Holocaust Monuments}, 117.
particular to the Roma and Sinti). It would only be towards the conclusion of this debate however, that serious consideration was given to the construction of memorials to non-Jews victims of National Socialism.

Whether or not the memorial was a sufficient or an appropriate means of representation followed this debate to the bitter end. By November 1997 the competition had been narrowed down to eight finalists. Ultimately however, it was the design by Peter Eisenman and Richard Serra that caught the attention of the review committee. While originally designed to include 4,000 upright concrete slabs of varying height, in 1998 the memorial underwent considerable revision, reducing the number of slabs to 2,500 (Eisenman II).\textsuperscript{383} Yet a third version of the memorial (Eisenman III)—proposed by Michael Naumann, the cultural representative of the federal government—sought to reduce the number of stelae even further to provide space for a “House of Remembrance.” Though the Eisenman III proposal was ultimately rejected, on 25 June 1999 the Bundestag in Bonn voted in favour of Eisenmann II after a compromise was reached. An underground information centre was to be added to the design in order to enable visitors to learn about, “the victims whose memories were to be honoured, as well as to inform them about authentic memorial locations.”\textsuperscript{384}

In July 2000 a working group of historians outlined a proposal for the ‘Information Centre’ that sought to create a non-museal space, where the

\textsuperscript{383} It should be noted that Serra left the competition at this point, as he felt that these changes undermined its original design and representational intention.

abstractness of the memorial would be countered by concrete information and the personal histories of the victims.\textsuperscript{385} It thus served as an accompanying source of clarification, and also to further imbue the memorial with a pedagogical function. A sum of 27.6 million was approved in November 2000 to finance the project, and Dagmar von Wilcken’s design ultimately won the competition to design the interior of the Centre.\textsuperscript{386}

The Holocaust Memorial: Present Day

Thus the design for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe can be separated into two distinct parts: the five-acre field of 2,711 concrete block stelae and the subterranean Information Centre (\textit{Ort der Information}), containing the permanent exhibition, seminar rooms, and video archive portals of the site. Set on an uneven grid, the stelae are 95 centimetres wide and 2.375 meters in length thus forming solid rectangular blocks that vary in height from zero to four meters. Though viewed from a distance the memorial stelae appear to be of roughly equal height, their foundations slopes downward along two parallel grid patterns. As a result, the stelae stand at odd angles thus generating a feeling of instability. Forming a “wave-like impression” for outside observers, the design creates a feeling of disorientation and tension for those who enter.\textsuperscript{387} In addition, forty-one trees were strategically planted along the edges

\textsuperscript{385} Schlusche, “Memorial is Built,” 25.
\textsuperscript{386} Schlusche, “Memorial is Built,” 26.
of the memorial, in order to provide a seamless transition from the Tiergarten, and to blend into the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{388}

Further adjustments and modifications to “Eisenman II” consisted mostly of practical updates. For example, a lift was added in order to allow disabled visitors to access the Information Centre, and pathways between the stelae were expanded from 0.92 metres to 0.95 metres to enable wheelchair access. Furthermore, the planning for what would be the future United States Embassy demanded a renegotiation of the northern side of the memorial. Consequently, the field was shifted twenty meters south in 2004 to lessen the perceived security risk for the future embassy. Even the renaming of Cora-Berliner Straße and Hannah-Arendt Straße was in part strategic, as it was as assumed that these roads would be heavily trafficked (and bus parking areas), and thus most likely to be seen by visitors.\textsuperscript{389}

Two unintentional controversies arose from the construction and maintenance of the memorial including the scandal surrounding the chemical company Degussa, and the unexpected deterioration of the memorial stelae. In 2003, when construction of the memorial was under way, the chemicals from the German firm Degussa were utilised to strengthen the foundation of the memorial and cover the stelae in an anti-graffiti spray coating. Yet soon it came into public awareness that Degussa, had produced in fact produced Zyklon B, the poison used in the gas chambers, during the War.\textsuperscript{390} Reactions to this discovery ranged from dismissive of what some perceived to be a trivial matter, to scathing and indignant. In the press an article in \textit{Die Zeit} 

\textsuperscript{388} Very little about the design and aesthetic of the memorial was random or unintentional. The landscape architect Peter Josef Lenné was responsible for the arrangement of trees along Ebertstrasse.

\textsuperscript{389} Schlusche, “A Memorial is Built,” 26–27. Given the high volume of traffic, the Berlin Mitte District Administration in 1998 and 1999 believed that the renaming of these streets would “anchor [them] in the collective memory.”

\textsuperscript{390} During the war it was a subsidiary of the company, Degesch, which produced the chemical.
worried that this scandal would transform the memorial debate into an embarrassing “farce.” Overall however the article supported the continued participation of Degussa, whereas other outlets, such as The Economist, while noting the firm’s willingness to further investigate their sordid history, unequivocally described the company as, “the wrong firm to provide the anti-graffiti coating…if only for emotional reasons.” Whilst Lea Rosh, a board member and initiator for the memorial was vehemently opposed to Degussa, American architect Peter Eisenman stressed the insignificance of the matter, saying that he no longer wished to be held “hostage to political correctness.” Ultimately, the foundation board decided to uphold Degussa’s original contract given that it would be virtually impossible to create a completely “clean” memorial in Germany. Additionally, further delays in the construction of the monument would have increased the cost of production by 2.34 million euro, and possibly jeopardized the project. Degussa’s continued involvement thus became not a farce, but a means towards atonement, and was ironically refashioned as a step forward in coming to terms with the past.

The second controversy is yet to be satisfactorily resolved. As early as 2007, cracks in the concrete of the stelae began to appear. After an investigatory committee was established in 2010, and a provisional report was published on 30 January 2012, it found that twenty-three stelae would need to be fitted with a steel band in order to avoid the breaking off of concrete pieces. An additional pillar would be used to experiment with alternative means of improving its cohesion.\textsuperscript{394} Given that the memorial was barely two years old, this discovery again caused a stir in the media, but had reportedly already been foreseen as a possible issue by the Memorial Foundation.\textsuperscript{395}

In spite of these concerns, the popularity of the site and the number of visitors to the Information Centre has remained relatively constant since it opened in 2005. From 2006 to 2011 the average number of visitors per year was roughly 460,000, the majority of which came in the summer months (June to August). Of these visitors, 56.6 % travelled from outside of Germany. The highest concentration of foreign visitors came from Great Britain (17.33%), followed by the Netherlands (12.73%), and then the United States (11.68%).\textsuperscript{396} Of those who did visit the Information Centre, over half (53.50%) stay an average of 31 to 60 minutes. Furthermore while a


\textsuperscript{396} These figures come from official statistics from a worksheet provided by museum staff covering the years 2005 and 2011 respectively. It should be noted that the overall percentage of foreign visitors slightly increased from 2010, whose figure was 52.14 percent.
majority of visitors (57%) surveyed had prior knowledge of the existence of the Centre, a sizeable portion (43%) had never before heard of it.\textsuperscript{397}

Overall the exhibition consists of four main rooms—the Room of Dimensions, the Room of Families, the Room of Names, the Room of Sites—as well as the Starting Hall, the Video Archive, the Yad Vashem Portal, and Memorial Portal. These rooms will be discussed in further detail in the following sections below.

3.3 Photographs, Film, and Commemorative Practices

The permanent exhibition communicates the history of the Holocaust solely through reproduced materials including photographs, facsimiles, films and texts. In many respects these materials serve a variety of intended and unintended functions—as evidence and historical artefacts, as icons and symbols, as illustrations of individual suffering and experiences, and as a means to connect to the wider global language of remembrance and commemoration.

Overall the complete utilisation of reproduced images reflects a wider shift from communicative to institutional forms of memory. This change however is at times paradoxical. As communicative memory of the Holocaust fades and transitions into institutional memory, there exists a renewed focus on both establishing a historically objective narrative of events, as well as a desire to emphasise personal histories and experiences. Similarly, though the Information Centre actively tries to avoid incorporating iconographic images and films in its exhibition, this does not prevent it from drawing inspiration from the commemorative practices of other

\textsuperscript{397} One staff member noted in an interview that one newspaper had heavily criticized the memorial for failing to provide historical information on the genocide. It was clear from the author that they had been unaware of the existence of the Information Centre. It should also be noted that the main administrative offices for the memorial are not onsite, but are located on Friedrichstrasse.
institutions to create secular-sacred spaces and its own symbolic language of the Holocaust. This section will explore the ways in which photographs, films, and other reproduced materials function as evidence, represent personal histories and biographies of survivors, function as icons, and reflect the commemorative practices of other international institutions. In doing so, it will show the intersections between history, memory, representation, authenticity, and globalisation, in a site which embodies the transition from communicative to institutional memory.

**Historical Evidence and Personal Histories**

At their most basic level photographs function as evidence, or a kind of crude proof of what actually ‘happened’ in the past. The photographs included in the exhibit testify to the fact that these individuals existed, and in many cases are the only survivable traces of this existence. Yet as noted by Andrea Liss, photography possesses both an objective attachment to the real, as well as an undeniable subjectivity. Though she notes that the dangers of aestheticizing the Holocaust are not quite as acute with photography as with other artistic mediums, she goes on to argue that “their graphic relation to the lived world tantalises the erasure of the borders between the real and its representation.” In many respects this impetus to equate the photograph with the real, is due to its potential ability to seemingly recreate likenesses with “inhuman precision,” and has been consequently seen, since the early 1800s, as a means of accurately expressing the truth.

---


In this sense the photograph acts as an “object of historical truth,” and a form of witnessing, though the reality behind a photographic image may be neither so blunt nor unproblematic. Brad Prager, for instance notes in his analysis of Sebald’s *The Emigrants*, the ambiguous meanings and limits to the use of images of the Holocaust. In particular he analyses the “Litzmannstadt-Getto Teppichweberei,” photograph taken by German accountant Walter Genewein as a personal souvenir, and surmises that the image of workers looking towards the camera was most likely staged, and the shot “posed,” as the those photographed would need permission to halt their work for the camera.

Yet the notion that the photographic evidence of the Holocaust is problematic is not new. As early as the 1951 Hannah Arendt addressed the ‘misleading’ nature of Allied liberation photos in the *Origins of Totalitarianism*, noting their failure to fully depict the functioning of the concentration camps (Buchenwald, Dachau, and Bergen-Belsen), and in fact only portrayed the breakdown of the camp system in the final chaotic days of the war.

More recently, Barbie Zelizer’s work notes the tendency of photographs in the immediate postwar period to function as a kind of “testimony against atrocity.” Doing more than merely ‘authenticating the horror,’ photographs also ‘bore witness’ to the crimes of the Holocaust. This became especially pertinent with respect to the initial Allied programme of ‘re-education,’ which often forced German civilians
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to visit concentration camps to confront the horror of the camps. Zelizer also posits however, that the photographic postwar landscape was more complex, as atrocity photos underwent a kind of “strategic recycling.” Though the Allies took thousands of photographs, both official and personal, there developed in magazines and newspapers a specific language of atrocity, which favoured certain kinds of compositions and images.

In part photographs displayed at the memorial are meant to function as objective historical evidence, and provide visual confirmation and proof of the genocide and systematic policy of persecution against the Jews. As noted in the audio guide: “For the period from 1933 to 1937 the text [of the timeline] is very short, but there is for this period more photographs. From these images one can see exactly how the people were persecuted and humiliated.”404 These photographs are thus utilised in order to illustrate the progression and exact nature of National Socialist persecution in a way deemed more potent and effective than written text.

Though very little information is provided about the photographs themselves, the memorial draws upon common visual depictions of the Holocaust in order to establish an objective history of the event. Still additional information about these photographs (beyond the odd caption) is not included in the text, as it is assumed that the content or message of these images is self-evident. Drawing upon commonly reproduced images of the Holocaust the permanent exhibition includes images of the Warsaw, and Lodz ghetto, the ghetto wall, and the iconic bridge over Zgierska Street, as well as the public humiliation of Berthold Mainzer, the parading of ‘racial defilers’

in Norden, the cutting of the hair of Hersz Lasowski, the massacre at the ravine at Sdolvunov, the image of the brothers Zeilek and Zril Jacob, and the image of Arnold Blitz and Toni Mast walking in their prisoner uniforms. The inclusion of these images speaks to a willingness, to an extent, to draw upon existing visual narratives of the Holocaust in order to support a familiar illustrative history of the genocide.

At the same time that the memorial draws upon images to create this wider historical narrative, it simultaneously works to incorporate and maintain the individual personal histories of the Holocaust. With the exception of two images of the liberation of Bergen-Belsen, there exist very few images of violence or death. With the exception of the infamous images of the mass shootings at the ravine at Sdolbunov, very few photographs depict any scenes of blatant or horrific violence. In part this is due to recent (early 2000s) shifts in Holocaust education, which have seen a move away from graphic violence in exhibition spaces with a simultaneous shift toward individual stories and biographies (as was discussed in Chapter 1). In cautioning against the use of graphic material, Prager notes that there is always the danger that these images may in fact become pornographic, as the “author and the reader may find themselves inadvertently taking aesthetic, if not sadistic, pleasure in an apparently inappropriate object.”

Arguably, the timeline attempts to avoid this voyeuristic trend by attempting to show the faces of those photographed, and their expressions of worry, hunger, fear, and anticipation—thus emphasising their humanity. Though there are half a dozen photographs of the dead, their faces are never shown, and are consequently removed from the central focus of the timeline. Instead one’s attention is drawn more directly to images of the living. Arguably, by providing images in which the humanity of the
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victims is preserved while selectively utilising images of mass death—the images of the timeline, while typically shot by the perpetrators, are transformed into a sympathetic illustration of persecution rather than as a part of the systematic documentation of destruction. For example, the images of Berthold Mainzer’s forced cleaning of Social Democratic symbols, as well as the public parading and humiliation of Christine Neeman and her boyfriend through the city of Norden—though initially taken as a deliberate attempt to further degrade those depicted, evokes instead feelings of sympathy, shock, and outrage in contemporary viewers.

Such examples attest to the memorial’s aim to present individual histories through visual media. This is most evident within the Room of Families, where images of domestic life and family portraiture are displayed throughout the room. As noted by Sibylle Quack, the primary function of the Information Centre was to “personalise and individualise the horrors of the Holocaust,” and “make clear that individual fates lay behind the unfathomable murder of six million murdered European Jews.” Consequently, rich pre-war images of family and cultural life dominate this space, reminding visitors that the lives of victims extended well before and beyond the period of war and National Socialist persecution. In this sense, these images assert an identity separate from the ghettos and camps, and from what is presented in the timeline.

Almost every one of the fifteen family histories featured in the space, includes a formal group portrait. Not only does this underscore the sense of community and belonging in pre-war times, it also serves to emphasise the significant loss and total obliteration of these groups, the core breakdown of these communities, and the general destruction of Jewish culture and life in Europe. If the

406 Quack and von Wilcken, “Creating an Exhibition,” 40.
timeline presents a simplistic overview of what occurred in brief snapshots of time, the subsequent rooms and spaces of the exhibition, situate this initial summary within a wider social context.

Similarly, with respect to film, the inclusion of archival footage stresses the significance of individual biographies and narratives to communicate the disruption of familial and domestic life. The film attached to the Kagan display (a family of saddlers from Poland, Belarus) depicted the town of Nowogrodek, sports events, the historic market hall, farmers bringing goods for sale, and the local synagogue. Similarly, the film for the Peerebooms (a middle-class family from the Netherlands) depicts a wedding ceremony, the Jewish wedding canopy, female members of the family sewing, and a family outing at the beach complete with swimming and sunbathing. By showing the normality of life, the impact of the Holocaust is that much more devastating, as it is juxtaposed with the decimation of these families as described by the information panels for each of the fifteen families.

Similarly the Room of Dimensions, which presents letters, diary entries, families, names, and photographs—continues to stress the importance of individual stories and experiences. Easily reproducible media in lieu of physical objects succinctly and effectively communicate this history to visitors, while providing the most basic proof that these individuals had formed lives and identities well before the destruction of the Holocaust. In this sense they are presented to visitors as individuals who were part of a wider village community and social network, and thus this fragmentary representation, taken in the context of the Room of Families, seeks
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407 The film is an excerpt from a 1931 film made by the American Jewish lexiconographer, Alexander Hareav. Similarly, an American visited the city of Jurbarkas in 1927 and filmed members of the Krelitz family. Both films are obscure in origin, and generic footage is thus largely absent from the Information Centre.
to reaffirm the protracted distance between the normalcy of everyday life and the destruction of the Holocaust.

Reproducibility and Icons

The permanent exhibition is primarily composed of reproductions of documents and other ephemera. As photographs are continually, reproduced, referenced, printed, and recreated, there exists the danger of over utilising particular images, distorting or minimising their existing context, or transforming these images into symbols and icons. As noted by Sybil Milton, though there are more than two million photographs of the Holocaust and Second World War, there exists a notable repetition of a select few in scholarly and popular literature.

Kaye in trying to make sense of the proliferation of particular photographs notes, that “while [an image] is not important solely on the grounds of its ubiquity, its ubiquity may well be due to the importance of its visual message.”408 As noted by Barthes, at times what is striking—visually arresting; what he terms the punctum—for a particular photograph is often only evident after it is no longer in view. Barthes’ investigation of the punctum reveals the basic emotive power of images. He notes repeatedly through his work the feeling of being moved by particular photographs for reasons beyond explanation: “in this glum desert, suddenly a specific photograph reaches me; it animates me, and I animate it.”409 Similarly, Sontag argues

that "sentiment is more likely to crystallize around a photograph than around a verbal slogan."\(^{410}\)

Hirsch in her work acknowledges this trend, noting in particular that such images as the gates of Auschwitz, or the Allied photographs depicting the bulldozing of bodies into mass graves, have been reproduced to the extent that their original context is lost, and their provenance ‘immortal’.\(^{411}\) They thus are transformed into ‘icons of destruction’ and become ‘tropes for photography,’ which in turn facilitate as Zelizer argues, a means of superficially engaging with the past, and facilitating a means of forgetting. A viewer who recognises a symbolic or iconic photograph, assumes that they are familiar and/or knowledgeable about it, and as a consequence fails to engage meaningfully with the actual content of the photographic image. Thus “More images in wartime do not necessarily mean more information about war.”\(^{412}\)

Arguably however, the exhibition attempts to both draw upon established visual narratives, whilst simultaneously creating its own visual representation of the past. Thus for example the portraits of the six in the main foyer are unique, in that they are specifically featured in the exhibition of the Information Centre, and have not previously been the subject of mass-reproduction. Upon entering the permanent exhibition it is these six elongated, enlarged portraits, illuminated in sepia tones, and raised slightly above eye-level that catch one’s attention. Each individual portrayed perished in the Holocaust, and thus these six portraits aim to “represent the six million Jewish victims” of the genocide.

\(^{410}\) Sontag, Regarding the Pain of Others, 93.
\(^{412}\) Barbie Zelizer, “When War is Reduced to a Photograph” in Reporting War: Journalism in Wartime, ed. Stuart Allan and Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2004), 121.
Every image represents a specific gender and age group—female, male, child, adult, and elder. Additionally, as noted by Eva Brücker, historian and historical researcher for the site, these individuals came from different European lands, and “their experiences, personal histories, and fate are the most important part of the exhibition.” As posthumous representatives for the tragic fate of millions, the images of these six are intended to serve a practical as well as emotive purpose. As noted by Brücker, differences between these individuals are just as purposeful as the number of portraits, and are meant to both communicate the pan-European nature of the Holocaust, as well as the totality of the destruction and murder of the Jews. At the same time that they are representative (or rather symbolic) of this larger destructive force, they also present a personal or individual face to this history of mass murder.

Their faces appear, not only in the exhibition space, but also throughout the website, the annual report, the accompanying exhibition guide—and serve, when presented together, as a single photographic composition, and even motif of the genocide. That their reflection is often photographed in the glass panels of the timeline is not coincidental, but rather serves to show the conjunction between history and institutional memory, and individual experiences and personal stories.

---


414 Original text: “Ihre Erfahrungen, persönlichen Geschichten und Schicksale sind das Wichtigste in dieser Ausstellung.” Text from the “Hörführung” of the permanent exhibition.
Texts as Symbols, and International Ties to Commemorative Practice

Ironically, and in spite of Sontag’s assertions, texts, rather than visual media, also serve a symbolic function at the Information Centre. In the Room of Dimensions translated excerpts from survivor letters, eyewitness reports, diaries and carefully crafted accounts of life in the Ghetto, as well as hastily scribbled notes and postcards are displayed against illuminated panels in the room. Appearing next to facsimiles of the original documents, these quotations provide brief glimpses of fear, frustration, disbelief, resignation, and violence. Highlighting the uncertainty and lack of information available for the victims of the genocide, these letters also illustrate an overall awareness of their looming death. Abraham Lewin for example in July 1942 began to write his report of the horrors and crimes perpetrated in the Warsaw Ghetto in Hebrew rather than Yiddish, in anticipation of his impending martyrdom.\(^{415}\)

Similarly 12-year-old Judith Wischnjatskaja wrote, “31 July 1942—Dear father! I am saying goodbye to you before I die. We would so love to live, but they won’t let us and we will die...Goodbye forever. I kiss you tenderly. Yours J\(^{416}\) As with images, these emotive and powerful excerpts give voice to those who were murdered, personalising the genocide, and providing an affirmation of the victims’ prior existence, and preventing their erasure from memory.

The Room of Names offers a similar memorial and symbolic function, while deliberately recalling the Hall of Names at Yad Vashem, and Tower of Faces at the United States Memorial Museum. Zachor, or the Hebrew command “Remember” serves as a major aspect of Jewish beliefs and traditions. Though the burden of

\(^{415}\) Monika Richarz, “Writing in the Face of Death: Writings from the Ghettos and Camps, Their Authors, and How they Reached Us” in Materials on the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Berlin: Nicolai in association with the Foundation for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, 2009), 83.

\(^{416}\) Judith Wischnjatska quoted in Richarz, “Writing in the Face of Death,” 84.
remembrance had previously fallen upon the family of the dead, the Holocaust created a dilemma for the Jewish community, as the “existing patterns of commemoration and mourning were called into question due to the unprecedented scale of the disaster.” As early as 1942 the recording of victims’ names had become a fundamental part of Jewish commemoration and mourning of the dead, as is evident even in the name of Yad Vashem, which is taken from the Book of Isaiah, roughly translates into “a Monument and a Name.” The Hall of Names at the memorial is thus a collection 10-metres-high, containing 600 photographs of Holocaust victims along with fragments of pages of testimony.

Deliberately evoking a secular-sacred site of remembrance, Jenn Hansen-Glucklich notes how the very “effort to recall the names of every Jewish victim of the Holocaust...is already participating in a sacred act.” Both the structure and symbolic function of this space is echoed again within Yaffa Eliach’s Hall of Faces, which displays a collection of 1,032 images taken between 1890 and 1941 of a former Eastern European Shtetl community. The Jewish population, which had lived there for over 900 years, was completely wiped out in 1941 in two days. In an attempt to communicate this individual loss, the 45-foot tower displays the images of as many different families as possible (90% of those on display perished in the Holocaust), and was, as noted by Linenthal meant to contrast with the presence of death found in other areas of the museum. In addition, the USHMM hosts a reading of over 5,000 names each year during the Days of Remembrance (which runs

417 Avner Shalev, “‘Unto Every Person There Is A Name’: The Documentation of Holocaust Victims’ Names by Yad Vashem” in Materials on the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (Berlin: Nicolai in association with the Foundation for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, 2009), 123.
419 Linenthal, Preserving Memory, 185.
from the Sunday before Yom Hashoah to the following Sunday), and also encourages and helps to facilitate identical ceremonies in other communities.420

The Room of Names as well as the Room of Dimensions draws upon these precedents, in order to create a secular-sacred space of mourning through texts and visual media. The automated reading of names from a pre-existing database of biographies offers a modern method of performing this ritual and creating a sacred space of contemplation and remembrance, while echoing other international sites of mourning and memorialisation and working within the Information Centre’s spatial limitations. The mere act of reading the names thus allows the site to participate in this ceremony, and to join in this wider international community of remembrance and commemoration. Furthermore the Room of Names demonstrates how the Information Centre is both informed by and willing to adopt trends of the international community of remembrance, whilst still maintaining its own unique approaches and methods to fulfilling these obligations to honour the dead. Through the utilisation of common images, symbolism, and practices, the site thus constructs its own aura of authenticity, secular-sacred spaces of remembrance, and institutional forms of memory.

3.4 The Survivor Testimony Video Archive

The desire to recapture individual stories, and to re-personalise the Holocaust, leads to a greater fragmentation and pluralisation of memory, not only through the materials described above, but also through the incorporation and utilisation of survivor testimonies. Additionally, improvements in technology and visual media

have made testimonies more accessible and easier to use. As a result, the growing availability of survivor testimonies, according to Levy and Sznaider, results in the “publicising of private memories” and allows “differing points of view on the past to compete with one another.”

The ‘Information Centre’ houses the survivor testimony database, where hundreds of personal histories and stories related to the Holocaust are digitally stored. Though housed within the Information Centre, the testimony portal remains separate from the main exhibition rooms, and yet functions as a juncture between communicative and institutional memory. Survivor testimonies as a genre represent the overlapping and disparate nature of history and memory. This section will explore both the varying theories related to how survivor testimonies function as history, and contribute to institutional memory, and then follow with a closer examination of the survivor testimony portal of the Information Centre, and the new Memorial’s Survivor Testimony website.

Research on survivor testimonies within the field of Holocaust Studies is extensive, though roughly tends to examine the potential of testimony to act as a historical or educational source, or to mediate trauma and perform a psychologically therapeutic function for the survivor. What must be clear in examining survivor testimony is the fundamental difference between the experience of testifying, and the recorded video testimony as an independent entity. The former denotes a process within a particular space and time that has an unclear or unpredictable outcome, and the latter a fixed unchanging account often touted as a form of memory, which also is utilised as a historical tool. Studies by Browning, Felman, Langer, and Hartman do not always make the distinctions clear.

---

421 Levy and Sznaider, Holocaust and Memory, 151.
Browning has written extensively on the shortcomings and advantages to utilising survivor testimony as a historical source. In particular he identifies the problem that the emotional “desire to believe has been allowed to eclipse the normal critical approach that should apply to any source.”\(^{423}\) He thus calls into question Jan Gross’s assertion that one should accept testimony of a particular account as fact, until its statements are contradicted. Browning describes this broad willingness as problematic and serves as “too low an evidentiary threshold,” and cautions against the assumption that testimony should act as a “‘silver bullet’ that will answer all questions and solve all problems.”\(^{424}\) Alternatively he argues, as a historical source, one must subject it to the same level of scrutiny as any other historical source, even if this involves calling the authenticity of a survivor’s narrative into question.

As he makes clear through his article, there is no interview that is pristine. What is recorded as video testimony could be the result of hours of previous rehearsal, and is most likely not the first time that the survivor has communicated their personal history. Various factors, of a practical or accidental nature, such as the survivor getting tired, not wanting to focus on particular aspects of their history that interviewer wishes to address, and the very fact that both parties are aware of the fact that their sessions are going to be recorded and then made available to a wider public— influence the content and structure of these video testimonies.

More importantly, once these testimonies are filmed, they do not change. Caroline Wake in her examination of Soshana Felman’s much cited essay “Education and Crisis, or the Vicissitudes of Teaching,” criticises Felman’s assumption that recorded survivor testimony should be considered equivalent to witnessing an actual

\(^{423}\) Christopher Browning, *Collected Memories: Holocaust History and Postwar Testimony* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003), 42.  
\(^{424}\) Browning, *Collected Memories*, 43.
survivor interview. Still this assumption is common. Even the audio guide of the site describes the interviews as a personal encounter between the viewer and the interviewee. It goes onto say for example: “in these interviews these people speak directly to us. This is different from a written text. One hears the voice of the survivor; one sees whether they laugh or cry. One notices whether they are angry or desperate.”

This description is somewhat puzzling when followed with more practical instructions on language choice, computer terminal, and how to navigate and search the archive. The audio guide emphasises the human nature of the experience of viewing the testimonies, yet also must face the practical reality of quickly training visitors in how to use the archive. Still the script’s language describes a personal encounter, as though one is not watching a pre-recorded interview, but being ‘spoken to’—an active process that assumes variability and interaction, both of which are lacking from these experiences.

Caroline Wake’s article goes onto analyse the concept of witnessing, and the assumption that one must share a spatial temporal co-presence at the ‘scene of trauma’ in order to be considered a primary witness, and spatiotemporally co-present at the scene of testimony in order to be considered a secondary witness. Though critical of Felman’s characterisation of her students, who were emotionally impacted by their viewing of Holocaust testimonies in 1984, as ‘witnesses’—Wake instead

---


utilises similar terminology in creating the subset of tertiary witnesses who she defines as being spatio-temporally distant from the witness, while being simultaneously emotionally co-present. Wake defines these categories as representative of degrees of distant rather than representing a hierarchy of witnessing.

Though noting LaCapra’s criticism of Felman’s use of the term ‘witness’ and ‘trauma’ to describe the experiences of her students, as “no matter how distressing viewing these video testimonies may be, it cannot be compared to the experience of enduring the Holocaust.” Even though emotional co-presence, or an ability to empathise and feel sorrow for the survivors when listening to testimony is possible, this interaction is, as Wake outlines, extremely limited. Yet her utilisation of the term witness, regardless of the degrees of separation she attaches to it, is still problematic, and a loaded term, which diminishes the potency of the actual process of witnessing.

Alternatively, Lawrence Langer writes on the desire of survivors to “reconstruct a semblance of continuity” between their memories of their experiences, and the remainder of their lives. He notes in particular the futility of their efforts, as these experiences resulted in a rupture in their lives, which “invalidates the idea of continuity, and even chronology,” in which the “self” of the camp is thus a separate “self” of the prewar and postwar period. Utilising the work of Charlotte Delbo as a source for his analysis, it is perhaps the degrading and difficult circumstances of her life at the camps, which so completely contradicted her own understanding of her known self, which attributed to this inability to recognise who she had been during her experiences in the Holocaust.

428 Wake, “Regarding the Recording,” 113.
429 Wake, “Regarding the Recording,” 121.
430 Langer, Holocaust Testimonies, 3.
This extreme break with this period in her life, while understandable, underscores a problem with the recording of survivor testimonies. If the Holocaust can be considered both a defining yet anomalous period in the life of a survivor, is it not problematic to ‘capture’ and thus solidify this memory through film? As is clear from Delbo’s experience, one’s perception of oneself, and particularly their history is not necessarily constant, but subject to change with respect to present circumstances and subsequent experiences. Film, while preserving memory also prevents alteration of this testimony, and thus new information, nuances, and understandings of these events cannot be gleaned after a handful of viewings. Life changing events occurring after the interview cannot be included at a later time, thus one is viewing the survivor’s understanding and interpretation of their experiences at a fixed point in time. In addition if there is a rupture between the ‘then’ and ‘now’ is it not misleading to centre one’s life on the Holocaust? When one identifies his or herself as a survivor of the Holocaust, their identity, rightly or wrongly, is overpowered by this definition, regardless of how well it fits within the wider narrative of their life.

In addition, Langer reveals, in the first few pages of his text, the wide gulf between the survivors’ interpretation of their own experiences, and the interpretation of listeners upon hearing their testimony. In recounting his experience interviewing a couple who survived Auschwitz and their daughter, Langer observes the overall tone of hope and optimism in the perspective of the daughter, which drew “on a vocabulary of chronology and conjunction, while [the parents] used a lexicon of disruption, absence, and irreversible loss.”431 As Langer notes, though these two interpretations are incompatible, both reflected ‘a version of the truth,’ as each party understood it. Through this description the exact nature of the truth is tentative, when

431 Langer, Holocaust Testimonies, xi.
related to testimonies, and thus profoundly subjective. Langer through survivor interviews notes in particular the paradox faced by survivors, wishing to recount their story, and yet doubting that their ordeal could ever be properly understood.\textsuperscript{432}

This emphasis on subjective experience often trumps concerns over historical accuracy. Langer argues, that as a ‘human document’ testimonies “achieve a gravity that surpasses” these historiographical preoccupations.\textsuperscript{433} Geoffrey Hartman echoes these views, noting that at times testimonies may be factually inaccurate, yet “they speak from inside a situation rather than from the outside in an objectifying manner,” and “can provide a texture of truth that eludes those who adopt a prematurely unified voice.”\textsuperscript{434} As he notes, though survivor testimonies may be at times factually inaccurate, as “human witnesses to a dehumanizing situation” they ensure that it is not only the “images made by the perpetrators” that inhabit the wider discourse of memory. Yet it is this functional and practical role of testimonies that is also problematic.

Langer for example identifies the expectations that survivors are faced with when conducting interviews, which in turn can lead to a strong desire to imbue their testimony with the vocabulary of redemption and salvation. Arguably even if the survivor does not incorporate this language into their testimony, as the example above demonstrates the redemptive overtones may be read into their testimony regardless, especially within the context of the memorial site. For example, the location of the survivor testimony portal within the Information Centre, is directly adjacent to the final ‘colour’ foyer of the exhibition and the memorial database. It is not unreasonable to assume that one may connect the uplifting tone of this last room

\begin{itemize}
\item Langer, \textit{Holocaust Testimonies}, 37.
\item Langer, \textit{Holocaust Testimonies}, xv.
\end{itemize}
with these testimonies. One blanket understanding of survivor testimony is that it exists as a form of bearing witnesses, and functions as an act of defiance by affirming that the crimes of the genocide were real. Though this does not necessarily mean that the survivor does not experience a lack of continuity with their previous life, or even anxiety over whether or not their ordeal would be understood, it does offer an undertone of redemption, survival, and purposefulness when placed in this context. Furthermore the collecting of testimonies into the database—their recording, cataloguing and translation—transforms the interview from a personal process of the individual, to a didactic instrument, through which students can better expand their understanding of the Holocaust. Thus there is a conflicting message, which decries the tired notion of the ‘triumph of the human spirit,’ but that seemingly, seems to find some form of meaning or pedagogical usefulness from these materials.

**Survivor Testimony, Video Archive of the Information Centre, Background**—
Having in the previous section analysed the varied uses of and difficulties related to survivor testimonies, this section will examine the Survivor Testimony Video Archive of the ‘Information Centre’, in order to explore its pedagogical programme, and the ways in which it seeks to address and overcome the difficulties detailed above. Firstly, it will provide a brief introduction of the Video Archive, a summary of its educational seminars, and compare its holdings and approaches to similar institutions. Following this it will analyse the pedagogical methods of the designers of the seminar, and the relationship of their approach to their wider attitudes towards survivor testimonies. This analysis will then be expanded to include the archive’s relationship to the Information Centre as a whole, as well as the memorial. Finally this section will conclude with a general overview of the educational programmes
offered at the site, and their fundamental connection with the exhibition space. It will thus explore the ways in which these lessons address, utilise, and seek to overcome the general limitations of Holocaust education.

On 9 September 2008 the Video Archive of the ‘Information Centre’ opened, making accessible a portion of the larger digital holdings, roughly 150 interviews (at the time), to the general public. Available in ten built-in computer terminals, the public archive is held in a separate room in the southwest corner of the exhibition space. As with most survivor databases, access to the site is limited: it is only open to the public on Sunday. Visitors wishing to utilise the database in its entirety can request an appointment to search the larger database at the Foundation’s offices. In addition, the special computer terminals reinforce the notion that these testimonies (and hence survivor memory) are in fact part of the site itself.\footnote{Wake, “Regarding the Recording,” 127–128. Through her work, Wake has described the crafting of “spatial co-presence” by the way in which the site allows videos to be accessed. Thus she notes for example the fact that the “Fortunoff Archive insists that scholars come to the archive to view any videos.” A particular viewing space is thus mandated by the archive, which “reinforces’ the notion of a particular ‘place’ of memory directly connected to this testimony.}

In part the decision to limit access to the database is also educationally motivated. Restricted access subtly encourages booked appointments for large groups and classes given the limited number of terminals. The ways in which posting testimonies on the internet will impact their pedagogical function is not yet clear, but there currently exists a longstanding and growing anxiety within the field of museum studies regarding the growth of digital and online media.

When first designed, the archive was created not only as a historical resource, but also as a pedagogic tool for students. In this form the more complex and problematic nuances of working with survivor testimonies could be fully explained to secondary school and university level students, unfamiliar with working with
primary source material. Film thus provides the best means of preserving this memory, and thus transforming personal experience into an artefact for educational study. The following section of this project will examine the educational programmes offered at this site, and their fundamental connection to the aforementioned aspects of this exhibition space.

Each interview within the databank includes an overview of its contents, a transcript of the interview in the original language (as well as German subtitles of the contents where appropriate), and subject heading-links to direct the viewer to particular points of interest within the testimony. Though Visitor Services offers an introductory seminar to the archive, the official website hosts a brief introductory video with information on how to navigate the archive, as well as some of its key features. In addition to the public computer terminals, a database of over 900 interviews is held at the Memorial’s offices, and is available to researchers by appointment.

The complete holdings of the Video Archive include these several hundred digitised testimonies, from various affiliate institutions, as well as over sixty interviews conducted by the Foundation as part of the “Interview Project.” Video testimonies from similar archival organisations remain the bulk of the archive’s collection. Yale in particular remains one of the original (and largest) sources for these testimonies. Begun in 2004 from the behest of the well-known publicist Carolin Emcke, the memorial was able, through funding provided by the German Federal Cultural Foundation [Kulturstiftung des Bundes], to digitise 1,500 hours of film, or

850 interviews by 2007.\textsuperscript{438} Also included are interviews from Potsdam University’s “Archive of Memory,” and the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma in Heidelberg. In addition the archive includes testimonies from the Visual History Archive of the Shoah Foundation.\textsuperscript{439} Links to the latter’s complete archive are presented via the Freie Universität Berlin’s main webpage.\textsuperscript{440} In addition, the Foundation in cooperation with the Fernuniversität Hagen, has made available approximately 600 Video and Audio interviews with slave and forced labourers from twenty-seven different countries.\textsuperscript{441} Furthermore, from 2007 to 2014, the Memorial Foundation has conducted its own interviews with survivors. In this time the project has accrued over sixty interviews from survivors in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as Israel. Information on the Project is updated online frequently, as a general list of every interviewee, along with their date of birth, place of birth, date of the interview, and place of current residence is maintained on the site.\textsuperscript{442} Furthermore,

\textsuperscript{438} Uwe Neumärker, et. al. “Einleitung” in “Ich bin die Stimme der Sechs Millionen” Das Videearchiv im Ort der Information, ed. Daniel Baranowski (Berlin: Stiftung Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas, 2009), 10.

\textsuperscript{439} The archive of the University of Potsdam, would in theory relate to the Moses Mendelssohn Zentrum (MMZ). The MMZ conducted German-language interviews in partnership with Yale University. These interviews were later incorporated into the Fortunoff archive. Statistically however, the memorial distinguishes between these two collections when delineating the provenance of their materials.

\textsuperscript{440} “Die USC Shoah Foundation. The Institute for Visual History and Education,” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://www.vha.fu-berlin.de/archiv/sf/index.html}. It is in part because this local university is an official site of the complete USC Shoah Foundation Archive that they do not appear in the database of the Information Centre’s video archive.


\textsuperscript{442} In addition the “Current News” section of the main site frequently provides additional information whenever a new testimony is added. Brief biographies of these individuals appear alongside their photograph, with the latest addition on 13 March 2014. “Die Interviewpartner der Stiftung,” accessed 26 September 2015, \url{http://www.stiftung-denkmal.de/ausstellungen/ort-der-information-unter-dem-stelenfeld/videoarchiv/projekt/interviewpartner.html}. 
the Online Portal of the Memorial, with access to interviews conducted by the memorial, was launched in the spring of 2014, and will be discussed in greater depth later in this section.

Given the varied provenance of the testimonies, one could view the collection as either a hodgepodge of incongruous sources, or alternatively, a unique resource, constructed in order to fit the aims and pedagogical initiatives of the site. The truth, as in most cases, lies somewhere in between. If the selection of the public archive within the Information Centre is an indication of the intended emphasis of these different sources to the Foundation, then it is clear that the Foundation’s own interviews take precedence over other collections. Nearly all, (seventy-two and growing) are available to the public. Information on the latest initiatives of the project was consistently posted online from 2009 to 2014. Numerically however, roughly seventy-five percent, or over roughly 115 testimonies of the public archive are from Yale’s holdings and related institutions.443

In addition, the Foundation prominently advertises on its webpage the fact that the Video Archive, “is the only place where part of the significant Fortunoff Video Archive…is publicly presented” outside of New Haven.444 With respect to the educational section of the site, it is a selection of testimonies from Yale’s collection, which are utilised in its seminar programmes. Other collections, while advertised, are either not as heavily emphasised, or are presented on an external server. The testimonies of the Shoah Foundation are perhaps the most conspicuous example of

this, as only two testimonies from this well-known archive appear in the public archive. The reasons for their inclusion moreover, are due to these particular survivors’ direct relationship with the Memorial.

Even with this clear bias towards certain collections, the Archive still seeks to assemble testimonies created by different institutions, each of which utilises its own methods to conduct interviews. In some respects this is not wholly unprecedented. Though the USHMM exclusively presents testimonies from the Shoah Foundation in their onsite library, Yad Vashem includes collections from both their own initiatives, as well as the USC Shoah Foundation in their Visual Centre.

Still the Video Archive within the Information Centre represents a variable plethora of materials, which were often recorded at different times (even decades before), for reasons that may or may not reflect their current holder’s general philosophy for preserving these personal memories. Each of these archival collections were created and assembled for varying purposes that are rooted in a particular context. Consequently, the ways in which these institutions interpret the significance of these testimonies is reflective of their individual objectives, which, when gathered together, are not necessarily compatible. In comparing the origins and creeds of Yale, the Shoah Foundation, and the Memorial Foundation’s Video Archive, these differences are thrown into sharp relief.

Started in New Haven, Connecticut in 1979 as part of a grassroots initiative entitled the Holocaust Survivors Film Project, the collection was, in 1981, transferred to Yale University and opened to the public in 1982 as the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies. As of 2014 the archive holds over 4,400 testimonies, amounting to over 10,000 hours of material in twenty-two different languages.
Interview methodology crucially reflects the underlying philosophy of the institution. As noted by Gelbin through her work with the Archive of Memory, the Fortunoff Video Archive, “relies on a sparse aesthetic that consciously abstains from visual elements that could distract from the interviewees and their narrations.” Interviewees are filmed against a plain backdrop, with, “the camera occasionally zooming in to reveal details in facial expression, gestures, or the display of personal objects...or zooming out slightly for a broader appreciation of body language.” The focus solely on the survivor through this minimalism, not only shapes the process of interviewing, the but also the way in which the viewer engages with the video testimony. With the absence of a personal setting, or comforting domestic tone, one must focus solely on the words and body language of the survivor in order to glean meaning from the recording. In addition, through this technique, the media itself, or the awareness that one has of it is reduced to what Geoffrey Hartman calls, the witness accounts’ “special counter-cinematic integrity.” Survivor testimonies are thus distinguished from documentaries, and films that seek to recreate realism, or even archival footage because there is both a lack of the artificial, and the collapse of temporal distance, respectively. As a result, Hartman observes, “there is nothing between us and the survivor, nor, when an interview really gets going, between the survivor and his recollections.”

This perception however, is only a temporary illusion. Gelbin notes in particular that “the distinct aesthetic of the Fortunoff Video testimony” serves “to

---

446 Gelbin, “Gender and Sexuality,” 181.
emphasize veracity and authenticity...[attached] to the audio-visual genre.” This technique is thus a conscious choice of the archive and the filmmakers, and, she notes, serves as, “an important visual clue to its highly constructed and mediated nature.”

Furthermore the perceived collapse of temporal distance fades with the passage of time. Videotape has become a dated medium in which to record, testimonies, and the bleak blue-gray backdrop has become a signature of this prior flood of record testimonies in the early 1980s and 1990s. Though the initial intention may have been to collapse the distance between the viewer and the interviewee, when one views these previously recorded testimonies today, it serves to further underscore the fact that there had been, several decades prior, this deluge of memory, which will in the near future slow to a trickle as more and more survivors pass.

With respect to the actual testimony of the witness, the archive's interviewing methodology, “stresses the leadership role of the witness in structuring and telling his or her own story.” Witnesses are “given the initiative” through open-ended questions to discuss topics of their own choosing. Interviewers are advised to ask only for further clarification or information on subjects already raised by the interviewee. As noted by Geoffrey Hartman, the Director of the Archive, the impetus is to “allow survivors to speak for themselves. We should not speak for them; rather, we have a duty to listen.” The result is to him, the creation of an “uncalculated poetry,” which stems from the eloquence of inarticulateness, the absence of artifice, and the individuality of the language of the survivor.

449 Gelbin, “Gender and Sexuality,” 182.
Ironically however as the project continues on into the 2000s, this notion of the survivor testimonies as being “uncalculated poetry” is less clear. Witnesses who recorded testimonies in the 1970s and 1980s are welcome to return to record additional testimony. As noted by Joanne Rudof, “the perspective of a person who is still working, whose children are not fully grown…is not the same as that of a person seventy years of age or older.”\(^{452}\) At the very least this recalls the ways in which personal memories are shaped and impacted by the contexts, in which they exist. Testimony is not merely the spontaneous free flow of memory, but rather is the result of a conscious or unconscious process in which one culls or expands memories in order to shape their current identity and understanding of self.

Yale, in allowing survivors to re-record testimony decades after their initial interviews, acknowledges the fact that not only may one’s willingness to discuss these memories change over time, but also that the memories themselves may change, and be coloured by the witness’s subsequent life experiences. This tacit acceptance of the malleability of memory points to the archive’s view that survivor testimonies are not ‘unreliable’ historical sources, but are in their own right valuable pieces of a wider motif of the emotional struggles and individual histories of the survivor, which seeks to counteract the coldness of history.\(^{453}\) This focus on memory, and the psychological and emotional impact of the event, also coincides with Yale’s embrace of Primo Levi’s insightful observation: “All of us survivors are, by definition exceptions because in the Lager you were destined to die.”\(^{454}\) Levi stresses the exceptional nature of the survivor, and moreover points to the inability to ever truly


\(^{453}\) This notion of the “Cold storage of history” was introduced by Jean Améry, and adopted by Hartman.

\(^{454}\) Levi quoted in Joanne Rudof, “Research Use,” 455.
know or comprehend the ‘real’ or ‘complete’ experience of the Holocaust, which remains with those who were victims of the genocide. In this same vein, Hartman vehemently decries the “talk show” tendency to emphasise the act of survival, and thus rob the witness of an ‘honest’ articulation and understanding of their experiences. Charlotte Delbo once infamously professed: “I died in Auschwitz, and no one knows it”—thus exposing the complexity of this form of suffering, which cannot fit within a triumphant narrative of survival, and it is this view which serves as the foundation for the archive’s philosophy.455

Alternatively the survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation (now the USC Shoah Foundation Institute) offer a different philosophical and methodological outlook. Created through the initiative of famed Hollywood director Steven Spielberg, from 1994 to 1999 the institute interviewed approximately 51,696 survivors and witnesses to the Holocaust (from fifty-six countries) including Jewish, homosexual, Roma and Sinti, and Jehovah’s Witness survivors; political prisoners, liberators, war crimes trials participants, and victims of the ‘eugenics’ programme.456

In order to complete this massive project over 2,300 interview candidates in twenty-four countries, and over 1,000 videographers were recruited, as well as 100 regional coordinators in thirty-four countries. As the largest archive of videotaped testimonies, the sheer size of the project dwarfs similar initiatives. Instead of an ongoing, gradually expanding project, the Shoah Foundation was a multi-national intensive effort to gather the voices of survivors within a five-year period. In the subsequent years it has been thoroughly catalogued, digitised, hyperlinked, and distributed globally to partner universities across the globe, though its headquarters

455 Charlotte Delbo, Auschwitz and After (Binghamton, New York, Yale University Press, 1995), xviii.
remains in California. From its inception the “mission” of the institution was to videotape “before it [was] too late, first person accounts of 50,000 Holocaust survivors and other witnesses.”\textsuperscript{457} Within two years the VHA had recorded 10,000 testimonies, or over double the number currently held by Yale. By 1999 when the project concluded after reaching its initial aims, the process of digitisation and indexing began, along with the funding of educational initiatives, and the creation of alliances with partner institutions.

Given a project of this scope, and conducted within such a brief time period, it is logical that the way in which these interviews were constructed would drastically differ from that of Yale. For example, unlike Yale, which affords the opportunity to record addendums, and additional information at later dates, the interviews of the Shoah Foundation are generally conducted in one visit. More than one visit, according to the Interviewer Guidelines, is “rare.”\textsuperscript{458} Thus once the interview has stopped being filmed, the content of the account is considered complete, and the encounter with the survivor ended, save for a copy of their testimony that they receive afterwards. Whether or not there was a continued effort to maintain a relationship with the interviewee is not clear. Given this approach, what the filmmakers record, is thus a concrete experience in order to ‘capture,’ and ‘bottle’ the memory of survivors as a message for future generations.

Unlike Yale, which stresses the independence of the witness in crafting their own story and experience, the Shoah Foundation is very open about the structured nature of the interviews they conducted. Pre-interview questionnaires shaped a

chronological narrative with three periods of focus: pre-war, wartime, and postwar. Though encouraging open-ended questions to ensure that the interviewer does not eclipse the interviewee, interview guidelines also include a table explaining when a survivor may need “little/no guidance,” “some guidance,” or “strong guidance.” The last is recommended, particularly when an interviewee, “has difficulty expressing him/herself due to language... or emotional condition; there are lapses in memory; interviewee jumps from topic to topic.” Awkward pauses, ineloquence, and silence is thus to be avoided, or at the very least smoothed over, ironically to ensure that the “testimony flows” naturally.

Though trying to produce a more coherent narrative is not necessarily illogical, it in many ways denies the peculiarity of personal memories, in which the connections between ideas, events, and people, are not always clear, and the nature of memory is rarely linear or chronological. Lawrence Langer has observed this tendency to jump from one memory to the next in his analysis of survivor testimonies. While a degree of structure and construction is necessary to formulate a cohesive memory of the past, the survivor’s role in developing this construct is greatly reduced through this methodology. As argued by Wieviorka, the survivor, “is no longer at the centre of the enterprise but has been replaced by a concept, that of transmission.” Thus the importance lies in not merely the story, but in the telling of the story, and the ossification of memory in the medium of videotape. Ironically through this process, the survivor is no longer the focus of this project, as individualism and personal experience is lost amid the process of amassing this archive.

Wieviorka goes on to connect this perspective to the ‘Americanisation of the Holocaust,” or the desire to show how “ordinary people” have achieved a state of ‘normalcy’ by having survived the “shipwreck of war.” The Foundation’s emphasis on survival is apparent within their interview methodology. Survivors, for example, are not interviewed at a studio, but rather at their home. Though a subtle stylistic point, the furnishing and personal items of the domestic setting, adds a personal touch to the video, while literally keeping the current (successful) postwar life of the survivor in the background. In addition, they are also subtly encouraged to include their family members in the last few minutes of the film, and are also ‘invited’ to include personal photographs and/or artefacts at the end of the interview. As the guidelines suggest, “these items could include photos of parents, siblings, children, and grandchildren.” The appearance of individuals other than survivors is even more striking, as these outsiders are not allowed to appear in the video until its conclusion. Their presence is thus meant to punctuate the testimony, emphasising the continued legacy and endurance of the survivor, and presenting a positive framework in which to understand this memory, which is reflected in the overall mission of the Foundation.

In addition, these final minutes of the film, deliberately recall the final scene of Schindler’s List, and at the very least utilises the same device in order to emphasise this point. Arguably, this tie between popular media and the film—and more specifically the impact of the former on the latter—has, has been present from the beginning, not only for the Shoah Foundation, but also the Yale Archive. Wieviorka has noted for example how the American miniseries Holocaust helped to formulate the notion that it was necessary to record the experiences of survivors. In the same

---

vein she marks the direct connection between *Schindler’s List* (1994), and the creation of the Shoah Foundation’s collection. In reviewing both processes she comes to the “troubling” realisation that “two fictional films dealing with the genocide, viewed by dozens, even hundreds, of millions throughout the world, were also at the origin of the two most important testimony archives.” Spielberg does not seek to downplay this connection, but rather celebrates the way in which popular film and entertainment can provide the impetus to construct something more valuable and lasting. Yet even beyond this it became a way for him, to ensure that *Schindler’s List*, and the process of filming this history did not end, regardless of how the genre may have shifted.

Though the ‘Americanisation of the Holocaust’ is typically associated with this perspective, it also attests to the international dominance and dissemination of American ideas. The Shoah Foundation, and the USHMM in particular have been criticised for this trend. Although Yale is not typically included in this criticism, given the drastically different approach, it is ironic that the majority of testimonies within the Video Archive of the Information Centre, the central Holocaust memorial of Germany, would derive from American sources and institutions.

According to memorial staff, interviewers for the Information Centre’s video archive project were trained by, and chose to utilise the methodology developed by Yale. Unlike the Shoah Foundation, witnesses are not given a standard form on which to construct their personal history, but rather, “freely recount their life stories—there are no guideline in terms of content or length of the testimony, and the

---

interviews pose accompanying questions.” Given improvements in technology, the process of gathering testimony is radically simplified, as all interviews are digitally recorded, and deposited within the database after being processed for ease of navigation. In keeping with Yale’s recording technique, interviews are conducted against relatively blank, nondescript backdrops—to the extent that it is not apparent where the interview is taking place (e.g. a home, studio, or more commonly the ‘Information Centre’) —in order to ensure that the intended focus of the viewer remains on the face and voice of the survivor. Thus in analysing these testimonies one focuses not only on what is said by the witness, but also how they choose to tell their story.

In what order do they choose to explain events, and what priorities come forth from their testimonies? The means of expression is thus granted a special importance. This is particularly clear in transcription, which accepts the premise that, “every word, every word particle, also every word that is broken off” can potentially hold special weight. Consequently, transcriptions include all utterances of the speaker, and attempts to omit words such as ‘ah’ or ‘um’ or to correct his or her language—when for example an interviewee may mix different languages (Yiddish, German, and English)—are avoided. In addition, testimonies do not include

467 “Von der Aufnahme zum Zeugnis.”
469 Baranowski, “Die Singularität des Zeugnisses,” 75.
historical notations, or reference to additional sources through footnotes, rather only the testimony of the survivor is included.  

With respect to the location of the Archive, the Foundation consciously chose to separate the interviews from the existing exhibition, by “literally” providing them with their own space within the ‘Information Centre.’ This room is equally barren with no additional ‘effects’ to interfere with the viewing, such as music, alternative viewing screens, photographs and other materials. Thus by trying to separate the video archive from rest of the exhibition, the memorial seeks to underscore the divide between the historical construction of the past, and the personal memories and subjective experience of the individual, while still affirming the importance of both.

Yet in seeking to clearly separate these two modes of representing the past, the Foundation downplays the role of personal memories in shaping the content of the permanent exhibition. In the Room of Families for example, oral testimonies from surviving relations did aid in the construction of the historical timeline of the Haberman family from eastern Poland, and in explaining the background behind photographs of the family collected from the USHMM. Though it is logical to assume that surviving family members may have helped clarify and supplement archival information about these families, the role of these witnesses and the communicable history of these families are not explicit. Consequently, the relationship and interdependence of history and memory is simplified, and this simplification is reflected in the compartmentalisation of space.

---

470 Baranowski, “Die Singularität des Zeugnisses,” 76.
471 This does not however, negate my previous statements regarding the formation of an ‘uplifting’ or positive message of redemption. In part this is because, the only way to exit the memorial from the Video Archive is through this room of commemoration and remembrance.
Directly across from the entrance to the Video Archive are the words of Walter Frankenstein, who survived the Holocaust with his wife and children. A portion of this quotation reads: “[My wife’s] wish was to tell our story, in order to make it possible for the new Generation to learn something about the time, in which we lived. Unfortunately she can today, no longer be here, and that is why I also speak for her.” This sobering quote thus sets the tone of the space, emphasising both the educational imperative driving the project, as well as testifying to the deep personal connections and motivations underlying the witness’s desire to tell their story.

Daniel Baranowski, research associate of the Foundation, notes the quotation’s “disturbing” and “strange” character, which is off-putting to many visitors. Yet, in many respects, the very point of the quotation is to unsettle previous understandings and conceptions of survival. Furthermore, Baranowski argues that the Video Archive sought to change the “viewing habits” and expectations of visitors, by not providing “easily consumable” (leicht konsumierbaren) or “pre-packaged” film clips (vorgefertigten Filmschnipsel). Visitors are thus provided with the ‘highlights’ of the interview, but rather must listen to the interview itself at length before gathering a full understanding of the experiences of the witnesses. He concedes that this may be “an unreasonable demand for our traditional viewing and reception habits,” but that this method ultimately preserves the integrity and

---


474 The original text reads: “Ihr Wunsch war es, unsere Geschichte zu erzählen, um es der neuen Generation möglich zu machen, von der Zeit, in der wir gelebt haben, etwas zu erfahren. Leider kann sie heute nicht mehr hier sein, deswegen spreche ich auch für sie.”

475 Baranowski, “Eine Zumutung?”
character of video interviews as testimonies of personal experience and historical events.\textsuperscript{476}

In part Baranowski connects the preservation of this integrity, not only with the physical separation of the Video Archive, but also from its digital separation from the Internet. As of 2009, when the main text on the Video Archive was penned, these testimonies were not made readily available online.\textsuperscript{477} This situation as of 2014 has now changed, and the interviews conducted by the Foundation are available online.

Although the Shoah Foundation, has in recent months (since the fall of 2013) posted over one thousand full-length testimonies from their archive online (on YouTube no less), it is unlikely, given their enduring policy of firmly keeping their collection in New Haven, that Yale will ever allow their collection to be distributed on the Internet.\textsuperscript{478} Regarding the Shoah Foundation, of the videos they have posted online, there are approximately fifty ‘clips from survivors, which range from less than ten minutes to over thirty. In addition, one playlist entitled “Film Trailers and Classroom Products,” contains official trailers for documentaries, as well as what are essentially well-polished ‘promotional videos’ (commercials) for such teaching aids, such as the “Echoes & Reflections Curriculum.”\textsuperscript{479} Various educators lend their voice to a general chorus of endorsement, and even a clip from one survivor testimony is shown to help demonstrate the appeal of such video packages. In part the general pedagogical mission of the Shoah Foundation, serves as a loose

\textsuperscript{476} Baranowski, “Eine Zumutung?”
\textsuperscript{477} Baranowski, “Die Singularität des Zeugnisses,” 74.
\textsuperscript{478} New testimonies are posted frequently. For their main YouTube page see, “USC Shoah Foundation,” accessed 26 September 2015, 
https://www.youtube.com/user/USCShoahFoundation/featured.
\textsuperscript{479} “Echoes and Reflections Curriculum Promotional Video,” accessed 26 September 2016, 
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v_HSMkUI6Fo&list=PLA80FD4EE892552E8.
justification for this kind of advertising, though whether or not this ethical bypass is justified is questionable.

It is the very nature of the Internet however, and popular YouTube platform in particular, which allows for the presentation of such materials side-by-side. Unlike the Shoah Foundation portals, which are disseminated through the Internet but only available at designated partner institutions, YouTube, is an open access popular forum, which dispels any limitations as to when and where one can view (as well as duplicate and disseminate), these videos once they are posted.\textsuperscript{480} While it would be unthinkable for commercials or entertainment videos, or pop-up advertisements to appear (literally) alongside survivor testimonies in any official archive, this would be not only unavoidable online, but almost expected. In addition, YouTube allows viewers to comment on videos. These may vary from innocuous and/or positive, to unapologetically antisemitic and blatantly revisionist. Moreover, including comments raises the difficult problem of how best to monitor hate speech and the views of Holocaust deniers. Disabling user posts, no matter how offensive (or grammatically incorrect), opens the doors to accusations of censorship, and the centuries old (and paranoid) accusation that Jewish groups collude to ‘silence’ those who would oppose them. Allowing these comments to stand regardless of content however, means that these very personal and emotive stories are accompanied by a hodgepodge of voices, both enlightening and acrimonious.

Though it is doubtful whether or not individuals who originally agreed to be recorded for this project could have envisioned either the exponential growth of the Internet’s size and capabilities in the past two decades or the platform on which their testimonies have been utilised, their video recordings are not their own. The Shoah

\textsuperscript{480} Though these materials may be copyrighted this is no actual barrier to replicating and re-editing these videos.
Foundation does not seek to claim ownership of their actual story, but the current “Interview Release Agreement” clearly states that the survivor does not own the copyright of their tape. In addition, the Foundation may, “use the interview edited or unedited, by itself or combined with other interviews or with other materials in any medium including…computer-based (e.g. Internet) or any other medium now known or created in the future.”

Consequently, one views these video testimonies in a radically different and unpredictable environment, particularly on a public forum. Although survivor testimonies are seen as separate from historical scholarship, some historical background or knowledge of the Holocaust and the National Socialist period is necessary to fully comprehend the significance of these individual stories. As noted by Rudof, “one cannot ‘learn’ the history of the Holocaust simply from viewing testimonies…to begin to understand the testimonies, one must already have a thorough grounding in the history.” By posting these videos on YouTube there is no guarantee that viewers will go onto the Shoah Foundation’s main webpage, or try to seek out further information (from reliable sources) on these events. Furthermore, one may stop and start the interview as one pleases, jump to a different account, or a different webpage altogether, and casually scroll through the account. Ironically, though the web is meant to ease the distribution of information, all indexing, key words and other referencing is not included in these postings. Additionally, on a webpage where the majority of videos are short clips, the likelihood that one will watch a two and a half hour testimony from start to finish is slim. In contrast to

482 Rudof, “Research Use of Holocaust Testimonies,” 456.
Baranowski’s hope to change the viewing habits of the public, YouTube instead caters to the impulses and distracted interests of its patrons.

Ultimately however, the decision to post videos on YouTube reflects the values and priorities of the Shoah Foundation. Control over the environment in which individuals view these testimonies is deemed less significant than the actual dissemination of these materials. Arguably, utilising the flexibility of the Internet to achieve these ends is a logical step, which redefines archival practices, and ultimately forces similar institutions like the Video Archive of the Information Centre to question why the majority of their holdings are accessible to the public in only a very limited way. If one of the common goals of all of these institutions is to educate the wider public on the history of the Holocaust, then it makes little sense to only allow access to this vital dimension of this history to the few who can afford cross country or intercontinental travel. Instead of limiting the number of access points at which one can view these materials, is it not logical to store them on an equalising forum such as the Internet, even if the platform is unmediated and unpredictable?

The Information Centre has attempted to find a balance between these two extremes. Accessibility does not necessitate using YouTube, Facebook, Twitter or any other popular media forum. The Foundation has instead established its own video testimony website, which is in some ways an acceptance of this shift towards open access, without relinquishing their control of how their materials are accessed and viewed. The website does not enable discussions or comments, like YouTube, but rather is a page specifically designed by the Foundation. Access is restricted,

as visitors need to create a user profile and complete a registration form before are permitted to view the testimonies. Not intended to function as a social media site, but rather as an online database, users are not be permitted to post comments about these videos. Nearly all of the features of the video portals at the memorial are reproduced on the site, and the online database has a stylistically simple and straightforward design. No additional advertisements or unnecessary adornments are included on the page, though some information on the video archive project itself and the memorial site is included.

Overall, registration as an extra step is a strategic way affirming some level of control over the content of the site, as it allows administrators to ban users who misuse the site or post comments that are abusive, apply age restrictions to the use of their site, track the institutional affiliation of users, filter out spam bots and automated servers, and require users to agree to the host’s ‘Terms of Use.’ Moreover it separates those interested enough to go through this process from those that are not. Overall the decision to post testimonies online is not an indication that the Video Archive of the Information Centre is necessarily mimicking the Shoah Foundation, but rather that it is seeking to develop and broaden its profile beyond Yale and the archives from which it has previously drawn. In doing so it seeks to assert its own independent interpretation and understanding of this form of memory, while providing its own solution to the challenge of control and availability, and further broadening its international online profile.

Overall the growth of media has facilitated the dissemination of these materials, and the influences of both the Yale Fortunoff Archive and Shoah Foundation databases reveals the international connections and interactions between these differing institutions. Drawing upon different methodological approaches, the
Survivor Testimony Portal and the new online database reflect the specific approach of the Memorial Foundation, and the ways in which globalising forces are reflected and transformed to reflect the specific needs of national and local communities. As a whole the growing fascination with survivor testimonies reflects the desire to personalise the Holocaust, and also an anxiety over the disappearance of communicative forms of memory. To an extent this contributes to the already growing pluralisation and fragmentation of memory in the post-unification period, and the transition to institutional forms of remembrance. Furthermore it reveals the ways in which these individual testimonies have become a fundamental part these institutions, and a necessary component in the creation of authentic spaces of remembrance and memorialisation.

3.5 Holocaust Educational Programmes and Seminars

Holocaust educational programmes at the Information Centre attempt to reflect and incorporate these wider trends, through their seminars on memorialisation and survivor testimonies. Seminars utilising the survivor testimony database allow students to independently analyse primary source materials, and to focus upon individual histories connected to the Holocaust. These histories are then contextualised through the information rooms of the permanent exhibition. This introduces students to both the fragmentation and pluralisation of memory of the Holocaust in contrast to linear historical narratives. In general Holocaust education at times runs the danger of reducing this history to a particular moral lesson and common clichés, or merely a historical tool to present generic lessons of tolerance and acceptance. In contrast seminars the Information Centre focus on the construction of memory, and the differing personal histories of survivors, thus
exposing the nuances of remembrance and connecting and grounding the history of the event to personal histories rather than abstractions and generalisations. In addition, the seminar entitled “Denkmal und Gedächtnis” [Monument and Remembrance], reviews the process of memorialisation, and asks students to visit, observe, and analyse the Stelefeld and ‘Information Centre,’ as well as memorials in the surrounding area and Tiergarten.\textsuperscript{484} The project day seeks to go beyond the classroom curriculum to teach about the process of memorialisation, while utilising resources that are unique to the location. Simultaneously, it draws attention to the site’s primary objectives of remembrance and challenges classic forms of memorialisation. These seminars seek to address and further analyse the above-mentioned junctions of history, personal (individual) memory, technology, and institutional forms of remembrance and memorialisation.

Overall the educational programmes consist of guided tours, single-day seminars, and “Memorial Walks” of Berlin.\textsuperscript{485} The Information Centre offers nine different workshops for school groups of approximately three hours in length (two-and-a-half hours for the seminar and a half-hour for extra group work). Survivor testimony workdays are longer (typically five hours in total), and utilise a selection of at least four interviews from the Yale Fortunoff Video Archive.\textsuperscript{486} Topics are divided between the middle school and secondary school levels, and explore the fate of five different families, the diaries and letters of the persecuted; the isolation, legal discrimination and exclusion of the Jews in Germany; and memorialisation and

\textsuperscript{484} At the time, when I interviewed staff regarding this seminar, the Roma and Sinti and T4 memorial had not yet been opened, though it is logical to assume that they will be included in this seminar.
\textsuperscript{485} Approximately seventy-two percent of visitors only stay for less than sixty minutes, and nearly twenty percent after thirty minutes. Official statistics provided by the memorial staff.
\textsuperscript{486} Educational programmes are rarely more than five hours in part because of the poor lighting in the rooms and lack of windows.
monuments. Secondary school topics cover Treblinka, Babi Yar and Auschwitz, the life of Mendel Grossman while in the Lodz ghetto, and the persecution and murder of homosexuals and Sinti and Roma during the National Socialist period. Presentations are done, not with paper and posters, but with projectors, PowerPoint, and Bluetooth operated keyboards.

Though distinct from the established state curriculum, memorial pedagogical programmes are not immune from the wider concerns and methodological trends common to Holocaust education as a whole. Rather, Bryan L. Davis and Elaine Rubinstein-Avila, have noted, through their exploration of global trends in Holocaust education, the “symbiotic relationship” between memorialisation and education. As they observe, the rising “trajectory of HE [Holocaust Education] in Europe is inextricably connected to Holocaust commemoration,” in that the two inevitably support and develop in tandem with each other. Thus they posit that the role of educational programmes and teacher training at sites of remembrance (“museums and historical sites of memory”) helps to establish and enhance lessons within the classroom, and, in turn, the entrenchment of Holocaust education in the curriculum supports visits and participation in the educational programmes of these sites.

Overall, this ‘exchange’ of ideas has translated into the adoption of such arguments as those of French philosophers Deleuze and Guattari, which posit that “knowledge is like a rhizome—thus, rather than being linear or hierarchical...[it] is a

487 Furthermore it should be noted that the website includes preparation materials for both middle and secondary school for the four previously mentioned topics.

488 In part this is because there is no way to display physical posters or other materials within the seminar room.


‘chaotically complex networking of stems.’”\textsuperscript{491} Thus knowledge is not conductive to a “neatly packaged (happy) ending,” but rather is always “coming and going rather than starting and finishing.”\textsuperscript{492} Davis applies this theory to Holocaust curriculum, envisioning lessons as an expanding network of interlocking and related ideas, which ultimately results in an unpredictable and dynamic learning process. Consequently, this theory encourages a greater level of questioning and independent development from students, as the authoritative structure of the traditional top-down model of education is ultimately undermined.

Similarly Felicitas Macgilchrist and Barbara Christophe have noted a similar cognitive shift in German Holocaust education, in which resources do not present “clear-cut heroes and villains,” but rather ‘ambiguous’ actors with varying motivations and perspectives.\textsuperscript{493} In their analysis of the graphic novel \textit{The Search}, they note in particular how lessons utilising this source adopt Matthais Heyl’s complex historical model outlining the “Society of the Holocaust,” which details the overlapping and interconnected relationships of those affected by the genocide. Expanding upon (and challenging) the traditional categories of ‘perpetrators,’ ‘bystanders,’ ‘victims’ first outlined by Raul Hilberg—Heyl’s model, as Macgilchrist and Christophe observe, prevents any simple or absolute definition of any one group’s role, and is ultimately meant to ‘perturb’ or ‘disconcert’ students. This destabilisation of previously set categories thus prompts students to ‘ask questions’ and reflect upon their own assumptions, lessons, and knowledge, without offering any definite solution or final answer to their uncertainties.\textsuperscript{494} Either these tentative

\textsuperscript{491} Davis, “Holocaust Education: Global Forces,” 152.
\textsuperscript{492} Davis, “Holocaust Education: Global Forces,” 152.
\textsuperscript{493} Macgilchrist and Christoph, “Translating Globalization,” 152.
\textsuperscript{494} Macgilchrist and Christoph, “Translating Globalisation,” 153.
views remain, or students must ultimately form their own precarious conclusions, which may be subject to future revision or shifts.

At the same time these theoretical and methodological trends, as noted by Macgilchrist and Christophe, have been accompanied by the general shift away from ‘horrific’ or ‘shocking’ imagery, and the graphic representation of death and genocide in both the classroom and exhibitions at memorial sites, as stated previously. With respect to education, David Lindquist argues for caution and mediation when utilising such images. Providing the example of Resnais’s *Night and Fog*, he notes that such depictions, “while accurate historically, are too overpowering to be appropriate for use in most secondary school classrooms.”

Graphic images, he contests may cause students to either ‘shut down,’ ‘turn away from the topic,’ or alternatively ‘become entranced’ by the images they see. Furthermore, there is the danger of dehumanising the victims, and reducing the Holocaust to a curiosity or spectacle.

Almost in response to this fear, seminars of the Information Centre attempt to utilise survivor testimonies and family histories in order to present a humanised and personal understanding of the Holocaust. As has been noted earlier in this chapter, the Room of Families as well as the exhibition as a whole, presents the personal experiences of those who perished in the Holocaust. Individual stories provide a plurality of narratives, each of which can either support or undermine the dominant historical account of the Holocaust. At the same time as noted by Macgilchrist and Christophe, students through their “emotional engagement with individual figures or persons” are once again ‘destabilised’ and are thus able to reflect on the Holocaust not “through violence,” but instead through a personal “empathetic connection” with

---

these individuals. Sabrina Moisan echoes this sentiment, arguing that survivor testimonies help to establish an emotional connection between the viewer and the interviewee, thus adding an extra dimension to the learning process. The forging of these “personal links” translates into a level of emotional investment, which in turn increases the student’s desire to learn more about this subject. Moisan however is careful to separate survivor interviews from the wider historical discourse, stating that “all personal narrations show the subjective viewpoint of the speaker,” and their own individual interpretations of events. In this sense the trend toward individual biographies is not meant to fully supplant the wider historical narrative, but to augment or problematise it.

Survivor testimony seminars at the Information Centre draw from eight video testimonies. In part the purpose of the seminar is not to replicate a classroom visit by simply listening to a recorded interview, but to acquaint students with the multimedia tools of the survivor testimony portal. Selections from the testimonies are roughly twelve to sixteen minutes in length. Nearly all that are chosen originated from the Archiv der Erinnerung [Archive of Memory] of the Moses Mendelssohn Zentrum, University of Potsdam, and were originally recorded in Berlin in the mid to late-1990s. One exception is the testimony of Norbert S., whose interview derives

496 Macgilchrist and Christoph, “Translating Globalisation,” 155.
499 Stacey Zembrzycki and Steven High, “‘When I was your age’: Bearing Witness in Holocaust Education in Montreal” The Canadian Historical Review 93 no. 3 (2012): 424. Zembrzycki further examines and analyses presentations and talks by survivors, and notes the differences between classroom visits and recorded testimonies. Furthermore with the passage of time the number of survivors who are able to contribute directly to such sites is diminishing, and many aging survivors are physically unable to travel for classroom visits, or volunteer as docents. In part it is their awareness of their advancing age, which drives them to record and store their personal histories in these databases.
from the larger Fortunoff Video Archive holdings of Yale, and was recorded in New York City.\textsuperscript{500} All testimonies are in German, with an accompanying transcript, table of contents, summary (both shortened and extended), map of significant locations, and information on the making of the recording (date, location, institution, interviewers, sound technicians, and others present in the room including family members).

Given that the seminar project day was originally designed for Berlin secondary school students, testimonies were chosen based on certain criteria, which took into account practical as well as theoretical considerations. There was for example a desire to provide a representative cross-section of experience, age, background, gender, and country of origin. The story of child survivors is thus presented with that of teenagers, and even those who were well into their thirties at the outbreak of the war. In addition, there is a balance between male and female witnesses; a range of nationalities including Romanian, Polish, German, Greek, and Czechoslovakian; and a diverse representation of economic and family backgrounds and varying levels of religious observance.

One of the deciding factors in determining which testimonies were chose was language. Given that the testimonies would be used with school children from Berlin and Brandenburg (primarily), it was necessary that the speaker communicate intelligibly in the German language. Thus the clarity of their speech, and whether or not they spoke a dialect or used heavily regionalised vocabulary, the thickness of their accent, the way in which they articulated their story, and even the names they

\textsuperscript{500} The full names of all participants from the Fortunoff archive are not available to the public. This anonymity is in part due to the Memorial’s loan agreement with Yale, which stated that the identity of the survivors should remain protected. For this reason the first few minutes of every video acquired from Yale is cut as to remove the point at which the interviewee introduces him or herself.
gave to geographic locations—were practical considerations that had to be taken into account. The justification was that if students struggled to understand even the basic language of the speaker or were easily confused by their references and allusions to certain events and places, it would prevent them from engaging with the testimony, learning from it, and ultimately defeat the overall objective of the project day.

The question of language however is a perplexing. Though variations in language, such as the blending of two distinct languages (Yiddish, German, and English for example) and the use of dialects (Jacques S. for example has a very heavy Jewish-Greek German dialect) may be impractical for a seminar of students aged fourteen to sixteen, it reflects the experiences of survivors, who either emigrated, or were deported across Europe as a consequence of the Holocaust. Arguably the formation of language, especially in younger survivors, was disrupted, and thus formulated into, as Daniel Baranowski terms, a kind of “shattered language” of the Holocaust—combining one’s mother tongue with later learned languages.

Overall in an attempt to overcome these obstacles in communication, the Information Centre is currently in the process of digitising, transcribing, and even subtitling the majority of these testimonies as part of an ongoing project. Though as late as 2006, the Fortunoff Archive continued to store all testimonies on videotape, the memorial began a project to transfer these tapes to a new digital medium to ease access, transference, and usability. Furthermore, this project also sought to add updated summaries, and an embedded table of contents for each tape.\textsuperscript{501} In previous years Yale had made the conscious decision not to transcribe their testimonies, as the archive viewed it as a form of translation or mediation, which ultimately distracted the viewer from the actual visual aspect of the survivor testimony. By only focusing

\textsuperscript{501} The Bundestag provided the majority of the funding for this project.
on the words of the survivor, one ultimately misses their expressions, body language, and other subtle cues. The transcriptions offered at the video archive do attempt to include any movement (coughs, tilts of the head, shifts in position), but they cannot be a complete description of every visual change in the video. Though they are in this sense imperfect, to exclude them is equally problematic and impractical, as they allow students to more easily interact with the video testimonies, navigate their way through the film, and at times, even comprehend the language of the survivor. The employment of new technological media thus enables the wider dispersal and dissemination of these materials for educational purposes.\footnote{Given that Yale is a notoriously closed archive it is thus significant that a portal with a vast portion of their collection is available at the Information Centre.}

The seminar programme overall consists of two main activities. Firstly, students engage in a mock interview technique. They are given a worksheet in which they are asked to answer basic questions about themselves, their family life, and their background, and also recount a previously embarrassing, humiliating, or uncomfortable experience. Students are then asked to break out into groups and have one person present their writing. Other members of the group are asked to take special note of the information they present, but most particularly, the way in which the presenter recounts the humiliating and/or embarrassing experience from their past. In this sense the participants of the group are asked to go beyond the mere content of the interview they are witnessing, but to observe the presenter, and their reactions to having to recount their story to the rest of the group. As is clear from the design of the first half of this workshop, students are first introduced to a very basic understanding of how to work with interviews both by relating to individuals who are interviewed, and taking on the role of an observer. Students are made be cautious of how information is presented to them, and the ways in which they themselves may
hide or distort uncomfortable truths when asked to recount the past. Similarly, the
way they present the topic to others, may in fact alter their behaviour, pattern of
speech, and also their posture and body language.

With this awareness in mind they are then broken into smaller groups. Each
group works with a single survivor testimony. Participants are free to choose from
eight possible survivor testimonies (Willi F., Sara W., Rudolf R., Norbert S.,
Mordechai W., Jacques S., Hertha B., Edith F.). As with the other two programmes
mentioned above there is very little variation in structure between the different
groups. Each group is asked to focus on a particular twelve to fifteen minute portion
of the larger interview, and are asked to answer questions about these excerpts. For
example students listening to the testimony of Hertha B are asked to take note of her
experiences during the November 1938 Pogrom, while students viewing the
testimony of Jacques S are asked to describe the conditions he faced during his
deporation and arrival to Auschwitz. Other topics include the role of non-Jews in
aiding the survival of Jews, the SS-personnel, encounters with the Gestapo, the
experience of non-Germans during the Anschluss, the 1936 Olympic games in Berlin,
the fate of family members, life in the camps, and the auxiliary camps, and the
exclusion of Jews in education (specifically the Gymnasium).

Although nearly every survivor discusses their family and everyday life prior
to the war, only with the testimony of Rudolf R. are students asked to explore his
theme in any depth. This is most likely because his early childhood was marked by
antisemitic prejudice and violence, specifically at his Gymnaisum in Pankow (an
eastern suburb of Berlin), where he was one of only four other Jewish children in his
class. While there he faced daily verbal abuse and racial slurs from his peers,
punishment for standing up to a student dressed in a Hitler Youth uniform,
intimidation as he was forced to salute the Nazi flag at school every morning, as well as physical abuse at the hands of his mathematics teacher, and eventual expulsion because of his Jewish background. Although he was eventually deported with his brother to Auschwitz in 1943, students are asked to only focus on this particular aspect of his life, and it is the later testimonies of Willi F. and Jacques S. that cover both themes of deportation and arrival in Auschwitz instead. In an attempt to ameliorate this narrow focus, each student is tasked with reviewing the Curriculum Vitae, interview summaries, and table of contents in order to gain a greater picture of the survivor’s life. Undoubtedly, students are asked to focus on the more disturbing and painful aspects of this group’s experiences, in order to understand the way in which National Socialism destroyed the lives of these individuals. Thus the choice to focus on Rudolf R., instead of Jacques S. and Edith F.—the latter had relatively stable and uneventful childhoods and early adulthoods prior to the start of the war—is a means of highlighting the persecution that could have been faced, rather than what was necessarily faced by all individuals.

Though it is unfortunate that more varied examples of this early form of persecution are truncated—such as the story of Hertha B., who was forced out of her studies early, and was not able to complete them until she moved to West Berlin—time constraints force educators to choose which aspects of the testimonies they wish to feature. At times however, these choices can be fairly heavy-handed. As mentioned previously, the testimonies of Willi F. and Jacques S. both feature their arrival in Auschwitz, but only the testimony of Willi F. discusses his deportation via boxcar to the extermination camp. His story, the more familiar, and infamous of the two is featured, whereas Jacques S.’s trip with his pregnant wife in a relatively uneventful, though crowded and rowdy train car is not included in the text.
This may suggest that educators seek to find examples illustrating the more ‘typical’ narratives of the Holocaust, while marginalising those that would conflict with these stories. Yet students are not prevented from further exploring these materials either in the course of the project day or at a later visit. Arguably, because students are asked to start their segment at a point in the testimony that is often mid-sentence, there is an impetus to listen to additional testimony both before and after the selection. Furthermore, even with this selectivity students are introduced to a plurality of experiences—Mordecai W.’s testimony for example details his life as a Zionist partisan fighter, Edith’s F.’s testimony details her attempt to emigrate to England with her future husband, and though Norbert S. was also deported to Auschwitz, it is the testimony related to his time in Buchenwald that students are asked to watch. The overarching point is to impress upon the student the variety of experiences that survivors faced, the pluralisation of experiences faced by these individuals, and most importantly the lack of a single narrative of persecution.

Yet these personal narratives are again connected to the Information Centre, and the wider history of the Holocaust in order to frame these personal histories within a wider historical context. After listening to individual testimonies, all groups are asked to do two things. First they go to the Room of Dimensions and find the home country of the interviewee, and compare the number of victims killed in their home country to the rest of Europe. They are then asked to go to the Room of Sites, and try to connect the information presented in the room with the interviewee’s experiences.

Thus for example if one group were looking at the testimony of Wili F. they would compare the fate of Jews in Germany to other countries in Europe, before going to the portion of the Room of Sites that focused on Auschwitz-Monowitz.
They would then try to connect his experiences to the larger history of the camp. Similarly, students are then asked to look at the timeline of National Socialism, and to try to plot the major events of the interviewee’s life against this wider experience. Participants are asked to also plot the course of this individual’s life on a map, showing important places such as their birthplace, and movements throughout the war. To help illustrate their experiences, students are given a set of historical photographs (both digital and hard copies), and asked to select three that best reflect particular or significant events in the life of the survivor. Thus for example a photograph of the November Pogrom could best be used to highlight the experiences of Hertha B. Students are asked to explain why they were particularly drawn to this survivor’s story, or what in particular intrigued them, whether it be a particular situation or experience. Finally, they are asked some questions specific to the interview they observed, for example groups observing Norbert S.’s testimony are asked why he did not return to his homeland, and groups listening to Sarah W.’s story are asked what ‘liberation’ from the camp actually meant for her.

By connecting these personal histories to the content of the permanent exhibition, the seminar emphasises the relationship between personal memories and history, and the ways in which multi-media facilitates the transition from communicative (lived memory) to forms of institutional memory (survivor testimony portal, Holocaust educational programmes, the Information Centre) and remembrance. The intersection and interaction of memory and history, and the ways in which individual memories enhance and support the development of institutional memory, is thus a fundamental theoretical component of this seminar day. Similarly, the educational programmes of the Information Centre further explore the fragmentation of memory and the process of memorialisation through the memorial
walk and seminar. These sessions focus largely on the interpretation and significance of memorial culture in Germany. This debate is itself imbued in the controversial and atypical design of the field of stelae. The workshop is in many respects a logical outgrowth to the memorial site, and a counterpoint to the educational programme described above.

Participants are asked to not only observe and analyse the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, but other related memorials in the near vicinity including the Memorial to the Persecuted Homosexuals, and the Goethe Denkmal located within the Tiergarten, and the recently opened (October 2012) Memorial to the Murdered Roma and Sinti. Students are equipped with digital cameras, and provided with a series of questions meant to further raise their awareness about the ways in which memorials are constructed. This seminar programme is more flexible in its structure, as it can be designed as either a walking tour (as mentioned previously) with brief discussions, or a tour combined with a more interactive workshop.

The second portion of the workshop following the walking tour consists of separate group work with six possible topics. Unlike the previous seminar, there are only four sources that participants are asked to consider: the memorial field itself, the Information Centre, the Memorial to the Homosexuals, and the Goethe memorial. Participants are given a grid workbook with these four sites listed on one side, and separate boxes in which to fill in their analysis of these different memorials. The desire that participants ultimately compare these different sites is thus clear from the beginning. Each group is tasked with an overarching question, whose answer is made clearer by the series of supporting questions posed in the work sheet. Thus for example Group 1 is asked “Which aspects of these historical events appear as themes within these individual memorials?” In order to help students answer this question,
the worksheet’s subsequent follow-up questions ask them more specifically to observe the ways in which themes of marginalisation, persecution, and murder appear (or fail to appear) in the first three memorial sites. Contrasting this they are asked to discern the ways that aspects of Goethe’s life and work may appear in the memorial dedicated to him. Each subsequent worksheet follows the same basic structure, but focuses on a different aspect of analysis. Group 2 is asked to consider the ways in which memorials are reflections of the present; Group 3 is asked to consider who should or could identify with the given memorials by considering who created them, and for whom they were originally intended; Group 4 is asked to consider the form of the memorial, its imagery, language, and the rituals that surround it; Group 5 analyses the role of the memorial in the surrounding environment by looking at its location and place within the city; and finally Group 6 is asked to consider the relationship of the memorial to its visitors, and those that observe and experience it.

Unlike the previous groups there is little differentiation between the subject matter and/or the learning styles of the different topics. Students are asked instead to consider different aspects of the same basic theme of official and public memorialisation (and commemoration). Though less content driven than the previous seminar, its focus on observation and analysis is far greater. Ultimately the goal of the seminar is to make participants aware of the structured purposeful design of memorials, where everything from their materials, and the shrubbery were pre-planned and intentional. Once aware of this design, students are encouraged to formulate their own questions in group discussion. According to staff, participants often ask about the basic cost of the memorial, but also more complex questions regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the reasons why a generic memorial to
all of the victims of the Holocaust was not created. The group as a whole is thus asked to review different aspects of memorial culture, and thus doing so is encouraged to view these sites as complex, multi-layered, and intentional in their design. Instead of taking their location, aesthetics, and inscriptions for granted, students are asked to try to read and interpret the language of these memorials, and thus are encouraged to take a critical approach to their experience. Memory and memorialisation is, through this seminar, revealed to be not a pre-determined or inevitable outgrowth of history or individual remembrance, but part of a concerted effort and deliberate process.

Furthermore this seminar reveals the increased fragmentation of Holocaust memorialisation and remembrance since unification, as was discussed in the previous chapter. Subsidiary memorials dedicated to the persecuted Homosexuals, the Sinti and Roma, and those murdered as part of the Tier 4 operation, are granted memorial space though at times this inclusion can be bitter sweet. With respect to the Memorial to the Murdered Roma and Sinti, what began in 1992 as an offshoot to the central Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (2005), stalled for nearly twenty years, over disputes regarding the design and cost, and even the terminology of its name. During much of this time the northeastern corner of the Tiergarten remained a fenced off lot.

Recently, on October 24th of last year, a modest ceremony in Berlin was held to inaugurate the Memorial dedicated to the 500,000 Sinti and Roma murdered by the Nazis. In attendance were one hundred Holocaust survivors, the head of the German Central Council of Sinti and Roma\textsuperscript{503} as well as several prominent German

politicians. Chancellor Angela Merkel presided over the opening ceremony.\textsuperscript{504} In her speech before the survivor community, Merkel stressed the central and prominent location of the memorial in the heart of Berlin, while underlining the need to remember and commemorate this long neglected history. Expressing her own reflections on this past she stated that ensuring that these events do not occur again is “not only the responsibility of educational institutions...but the responsibility of each and every one of us.”\textsuperscript{505}

Although international and national newspapers had positive coverage of the inauguration, other commentators such as Klaus Hillenbrand in Die Tageszeitung and Gerrit Bartels in Der Tagesspiegel pointedly remarked on current prejudices against Roma and Sinti and their continued stigmatization.\textsuperscript{506} In particular Hillenbrand referred to recent comments of Interior Minister Hans-Peter Friedrich’s recent denunciations of what he termed “Asylum Fraud,” from people in Serbia and Macedonia. Most recently in December, an article in Der Spiegel found that a report by the Human Rights and Humanitarian Aid Committee of the Bundestag noted widespread prejudice and xenophobia directed against Sinti and Roma throughout Germany, as well as several incidents of assault and arson.\textsuperscript{507}


\textsuperscript{505} Merkel, “Roma Holocaust memorial.”


This brief episode illustrates the shifting landscape of commemoration, and the continued importance of Holocaust education. Merkel, by referencing the role of education in her speech, ties the act of commemoration to the process of both institutional learning and continued self-awareness and reflection. As is indicated in her speech, education is not a passive process, but rather is something in which the individual must actively engage in order to prevent similar events from happening. Though Merkel describes institutional education as “only” a starting point, it is still a crucial foundation in formulating an understanding of the past. Memorialization and commemoration are incomplete without an understanding of the past, and education is one means of obtaining this understanding, whether it be through permanent exhibitions, guided tours, seminar programs or student work days.

As is clear from the unveiling of the Roma and Sinti memorial, issues of memorialization, education, and diversity remain relevant questions in the political and cultural climate of Germany. Since unification the content of educational programs has changed to accommodate an increasingly diverse and multi-ethnic European population. In addition memorial sites try to offer seminars and exhibitions on previously marginalized groups. This shift in focus to offer programs and materials in foreign languages, or to try to relate to an increasingly diverse demographic has been one important facet of post-unification education.

Yet the question remains of whether or not Holocaust education provides a sufficient, or genuine means to actually address issues of racial tension, and the exclusion of minorities and other groups from not only the dialogue of the Holocaust, but the general national narrative of Germany as a whole. One of the most difficult questions facing Holocaust educators is whether or not the Holocaust should be utilised to impose a ‘moral’ lesson of tolerance, survival, and equality to students, or
if it should be taught merely as another, albeit complex and nuanced, period of history. Is there an educational imperative when teaching the Holocaust for students to not only learn about its history, but to also adopt a revised moral code, and develop a sense of responsibility to prevent future acts of genocide, racism and intolerance?

In part this question seeks to define the ultimate objectives to Holocaust education, and whether or not one “should learn about the Holocaust or learn from the Holocaust.” Answers to this question are divided. As argued by Lindquist, to shy away from this moral imperative, reveals a wider trend of “fair-minded” and “nonjudgmental” stance of academia, which can ultimately devolve into a form of “intellectual nihilism” and “the negation of moral value.” To Lindquist, the Holocaust offers the “unique opportunity to study complex moral and ethical problems that play a fundamental role in understanding the world in which we live,” and to thus not address these issues is in fact missing the overall point.

Surprisingly, though Van Driel’s research on educational packs in the United States and Europe found that while there was some mention of combating racism, stereotyping, and other forms of discrimination—these prompts appeared only at the end, and in a superficial way. As he notes: “Many education packs seem to embrace the argument that a kind of osmosis effect will take place,” and that learning about the Holocaust will subsequently transform students into a “more moral, more tolerant and more accepting human beings.” Though Lindquist may be correct in assuming

---

508 van Driel quoted in Davis and Rubinstein-Avila, “Holocaust Education,” 160.
that the Holocaust is a prime opportunity to discuss the ethical dilemmas and conundrums that arise from studying this history, there is the danger of treating these discussions not as the main objective, but as an afterthought or tedious obligatory point.

Furthermore this need to emphasise prevention and positive ways in which one can combat intolerance, in many respects side-steps more serious investigations into the roots of prejudice and anti-Semitism. Moreover this trend is reflective of the previously mentioned, and often criticised, Americanisation of the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{512} The optimism of this view, and its need to stress goodness and triumph over adversity, means that the ultimate message of the Holocaust cannot be that six million Jews were murdered, but rather that future generations are learning lessons in equality and diversity to make the world a more accepting and inclusive place. Overall the Shoah Foundation largely adopts this view. Testimonies are not just documents of personal experience, but in fact serve to transform one’s moral and critical outlook. Merely by viewing them they can help students’ reflect upon their own biases, behaviours and moral choices, “inspire dialogue about their roles in contemporary society” and “compel viewers to examine themselves and the myriad of social and cultural issues surrounding them.”\textsuperscript{513} In keeping with van Driel’s observation, it is almost assumed that this transformation will occur instantaneously, and effortlessly.

In both adopting this view, and superficially examining the moral implications of the Holocaust, one is in danger of inadvertently espousing the tired clichés of ‘Never Again,’ ‘Always Remember,’ and ‘Never Forget,’ among others. Not only do these phrases contribute little to our understanding of the impact of the

\textsuperscript{512} Wieviorka, “Witness in History,” 394.
\textsuperscript{513} USC Shoah Foundation Institute, “Promote relevancy for your students,” in “Guidelines for Using Visual History Testimonies in Education” (USC Shoah Foundation, 2010), 8, accessed April 2014, \texttt{www.college.usc.edu/vhi}. 
Holocaust, but as noted by Samuel Totten, often mask a lack of serious analysis and consideration of this history and actually hinder any in-depth or practical discussion into the ways in which similar atrocities may be prevented in the future.514 At times, as noted by Doris Bergen, such clichés as “The Power of One” serve more as a comforting illusion, in which the crushing power of a governmental system can in fact be defeated by the initiatives and efforts of the individual.515 Other times, such mantras as “Never Again” preclude any serious or detailed discussion of subsequent genocides of the twentieth century. Paradoxically however, as noted by Bergen, it also seems to imply that there are certain “patterns” that appear again and again that “link” the Holocaust to these later events—such as the use of propaganda, totalising ideologies of genocide, and the motivations of the perpetrators.516 Consequently, it is unsurprising that the Shoah Foundation has over the past several years been expanding its collection to include testimonies and documents from the Armenian, Cambodian, and Rwandan genocides, as well as the Nanjing Massacre. Because each event shares these characteristics of genocide, all are equally instructive and able to impart lessons of tolerance and warn against the dangers of prejudice and hatred, and ultimately seek to enlighten the next generation.

To return to the initial question—of whether or not the Holocaust should be studied as a thing in itself, or be utilised as a lesson to combat contemporary racism and prejudice—the above examples have illustrated many of the potential problems and pitfalls for educators when teaching the Holocaust. Whether or not teachers ‘should’ seek to ensure that their students apply their knowledge of the Holocaust to contemporary events and their everyday lives is immaterial. Both options are subject

to their own potential problems and valuable insights. Those wishing to focus on the history of the Holocaust may argue that contemporary issues, in fact detract from actually acquiring a detailed and nuanced understanding of the history. Moreover educators may wish to avoid the temptation to compare the Holocaust to other genocides and conflicts, or inadvertently seek to draw generic ‘lessons’ that do not take into account the specific historical context of the event. Furthermore there is the danger of relativising the Holocaust as merely another horrific event in history.

Alternatively, one could argue that students miss a unique opportunity to consider the full impact of the genocide, and the ways in which it has transformed contemporary understandings and attitudes towards genocide, racism, and prejudice. It is not necessarily incorrect to assume that students who have failed to reflect upon their own moral values and outlook after studying the Holocaust have in many respects not fully comprehended its significance and wider impact. Yet this process cannot be forced, or triggered by merely learning about the history of the Holocaust. Arguably, to assume that one may teach the history of the Holocaust without some reference to or questioning of recent history is somewhat misguided. As the event recedes into the past, and as survivors grow fewer in number, the need to reinforce the reasons why the Holocaust remains relevant to contemporary society, and why it remains an enduring source of fascination for historians (and society in general), will be ever more imperative. These fundamental questions will need to be addressed in any programme on the Holocaust.

3.6 Conclusions

Overall this chapter sought to examine the ways in which the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe reflected the transition from
communicative to institutional forms of memory. In addition it explored the ways in which the site drew upon the approaches of existing institutions to generate an aura of authenticity and secular-sacredness. The Information Centre is able to create this aura largely because of technological improvements, which allow for the reproducibility of visual media (photographs, archival films, facsimiles), the facilitation of commemorative ceremonies, and the transfer and digitisation of survivor video testimonies.

These materials contribute to the fragmentation of memory of the Holocaust and its pluralisation, as different individual stories and histories are presented to visitors. In particular the survivor testimony portal at the site, as well as the new survivor testimony website, reveal the intersections between history and memory, technology and new media, and aura and authenticity. At the same time that memory is becoming increasingly fragmented, it is also contributing to a wider globalised community of remembrance. The construction of a common language of the Holocaust, and the dissemination of personal memories through the survivor testimony database, thus transfers into and informs not only the permanent exhibition of the Information Centre, but also the educational programmes offered there. Particular focus on memorialisation and the construction of memory, along with the utilisation of survivor testimonies and the relationship between personal memory and history is thus a major theme of seminar workshops at the site. These more independently driven forms of learning reflect the ambiguities of this transition from communicative (or lived) memory to institutional forms of remembrance. Yet the Memorial and the Information Centre’s success in establishing itself as an authentic, globally recognised and influential site of memory and commemoration attests to its
ability to adapt to shifts in how the Holocaust is remembered and represented within Germany and abroad in the post-unification period.

Ironically however, the engagement of this site in the wider global community of remembrance further reflects the endurance of the particularly nationally grounded imperative that Germans remain cognisant of their National Socialist past. That the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe and the Information Centre exist at all, testifies to the global expectation that Germany and Germans should continue to confront the Holocaust and the crimes of National Socialism. Engagement with the wider global community is thus, reflective of the cosmopolitan exchange noted by Levy and Sznaider, between the forces of globalisation and the endurance of national and local influences that drive the imperative that Germany in particular should host this memorial. That the Memorial should in many respects reflect the enduring interplay of these two movements is fitting for its role as the primary Holocaust memorial in Berlin and arguably the Germany as a whole.
CONCLUSIONS

Through an examination of the exhibition spaces and educational programmes at the House of the Wannsee Conference Memorial and Educational Centre, Ravensbrück Memorial, Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum, and the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, I attempted to show how Berlin’s memorial landscape is fundamentally shaped by and contributes to a globalised memory of the Holocaust. In addition, I explored the continuation of national forms of remembrance, the impact of globalising forces upon these spaces, and the ways in which communicative and institutional forms of memory overlap and intersect with one another. Overall the primary aim of this thesis was to identify current trends in memorial culture in Germany, and to demonstrate how characteristics of globalised memory remain a fundamental part of post-unification memory in Berlin and Brandenburg.

Chapter 1 explored how the House of the Wannsee Conference reflected both the emergence of these globalising trends, and the endurance of national forms of remembrance. By examining the exhibition spaces of the site, it demonstrated how the memorial sought to emphasise the global impact and scale of the Holocaust beyond the boundaries of Europe, incorporate a less dogmatic interpretation of the genocide by utilising the interpretations of international scholars, acknowledge the interests of non-German groups through its brochures and translated exhibition spaces, reach a wider audience through drastic improvements to its official website, and by posting educational materials online through international web-based forums. In addition by reviewing the educational programmes of the site, Chapter 1 clearly revealed the international scope of the educational programmes, as it hosts a variety
of multi-national seminar days and teacher-training workshops, fosters affiliations
and relationships with schools and other educational institutions from abroad,
provides guided tours and educational programmes in over a dozen different
languages, and seeks to establish student exchanges and educational trips to Israel,
Spain, and other nations. Furthermore, the establishment of programmes which seek
to address the growing ethnic diversity in Germany reflect an acknowledgement of
the wider demographic shifts in Europe as a whole.

Yet Chapter 1 also demonstrated the endurance of national forms of
remembrance. In recent years the rise in the number of memorials in Berlin and
Germany as a whole, challenges the Wannsee memorial’s status as a unique
institution of memorialisation and education. Two exhibitions on Joseph Wulf and
the history of the Wannsee region, thus reflect the desire to reaffirm the particular
history of the villa and the specific significance of the memorial to the wider
landscape of remembrance in Germany. In addition, a closer examination of statistics
on visitor numbers and the educational programmes reveals that the diversity of
international visitors is not as great as the rising number of foreign visitors would
suggest. In depth engagement in the form of educational programmes or guided tours
has not risen to match the increase in the overall number of foreign visitors.
Furthermore, seminars that are designed specifically for German government
workers, professionals, and apprentices remain a fundamental part of their
educational programmes. Still this does not preclude these seminars from being
adapted to suit the particular circumstances of other nations, as the posting of these
lessons online would suggest. Overall, Chapter 1 demonstrates how globalising and
nationalising forces need not be opposing trends, but rather can co-exist and
influence one another within the same memorial space.
The primary aim of Chapter 2 was to explore the impact of globalised memory at the Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen Memorial Museums. From the onset the chapter sought to demonstrate how the post-unification incarnations of these spaces reflected the displacement of the nation state as the primary shaper of memory. By first demonstrating how the East German memorial established a secular-sacred space, which extolled the narrative of anti-fascist resistance the chapter went on to show how unification and the collapse of the GDR, thus contributed to the undermining of nationally grounded narratives of memory. Chapter 2 thus demonstrated how, in the post-unification period, there has emerged a plurality of voices and memories vying for recognition and memorialisation.

With respect to the complex Soviet history of Sachsenhausen, and previously marginalised groups (Jews, Roma and Sinti, Jehovah’s Witnesses, etc.), this shift proved beneficial. The dual memory identified by Niven, between the victims of National Socialist and Soviet crimes has in recent years been somewhat softened. Furthermore this chapter explored the concept of multi-directional memory as outlined by Rothberg. Though his theory posits that memory is not a zero-sum game (with clear winners or those who gain recognition, and losers who are pushed to the background), Chapter 2 argues that practical realities and limitations of funding, physical space, and staff resources do not always allow for the equitable representation of these different groups. There thus exists within the memorials themselves a hierarchy of memory, where the designated uses of particular buildings, the level of preservation, and the extent to which areas of the site are developed and incorporated into the central exhibition, all reflect particular priorities that tend toward preserving the spaces of victimisation over those of the perpetrators.
Furthermore Chapter 2 explored how these hierarchies connected to anxieties and debates regarding the potential commercialisation of these sites. In reviewing the fees scandal at Sachsenhausen, the chapter revealed how practical concerns and realities at times push conventional ethical boundaries. Fundamentally however, it attempted to question the criticisms against commercialisation, and to explore the boundaries of tasteful consumption at these sites. With respect to educational programmes, the final section of the chapter, drew from the above discussions to examine independent educational programmes, and particularly the efforts of the Uckermark work camp. In doing so it attempted to show how the plurality of different narratives, the undermining of official narratives of memory, and limitations of resources contributed to the creation of independent or ‘guerrilla’ exhibitions and educational initiatives at these sites. Overall the chapter aimed to question latent assumptions regarding commercialisation, and the way in which these sites are preserved and reflect the plurality of memory in the post-unification period.

While the issues detailed above reflect the impact of globalisation, this should not suggest the absence of enduring national and local forces. Rather the continuation of tensions between local and globalising forces remains apparent at these memorial museums, and is reflected in the of local issues and concerns. As in the case of the proposed supermarket at Ravensbrück, at times these conflicts reflect local, national, and even global expectations regarding remembrance and commemoration.

Finally Chapter 3 explored the transition from communicative to institutional memory, and the ways in which history, personal memories, international narratives of remembrance, and technological improvements in reproducing and disseminating information intersected at the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. Embodying the shift from lived experience to institutional forms of
memory, the chapter’s exploration of the use of reproduced material (photographs, archival films, and documents) demonstrated both a shift towards a more personalised history of the Holocaust, as well as the development of a general generic, easily-recognisable visual narrative of the Holocaust. The Room of Names further explored how the Information Centre drew upon the existing commemorative practices of the USHMM and Yad Vashem in order to create a secular-sacred space of memory and remembrance. Through these means the site has established itself as a legitimate and internationally recognised memorial site, though it is fundamentally and artificial and constructed site of memory.

Additionally, the survivor testimonies database and educational initiatives at the site further established this shift from communicative to institutional remembrance, and the ways in which post-unification memory is based upon a plurality of voices and perspectives on the past. The educational seminars of the site that utilise survivor testimonies explore the impact of the Holocaust upon individual lives, and thus attempt to go beyond the wider historically objective depiction of events. These seminars, as well as seminars on memorials and the process of memorialisation, seek to lay bare the methods by which institutional memory is shaped and constructed. Overall the primary aim of this chapter was to adopt the position of Levy and Sznaider, reveal the legitimacy of institutional memory, and demonstrate the ways in which sites like the Information Centre can build and construct an aura of legitimacy by drawing upon particular forms of communicative memory, and existing international narratives of remembrance and commemoration.

As a whole however, it concluded that there remains a balance between globalising influences and trends, and the endurance of a particularly German approach to memory and remembrance. Informed by Germany’s particular history
with National Socialism and role in perpetrating the Holocaust, the Memorial and Information Centre remain informed and shaped by this specific national and local connection to this recent past. The site itself thus embodies the interplay between international influences and connections, and the ways in which they shape national representation and memorialisation of the past.

Overall this thesis attempted to show how these four memorial sites in Berlin and Brandenburg contributed to a globalised memory of the Holocaust. In addition, it sought to sketch the contemporary memorial landscape of Berlin, and identify common trends and areas of concerns for these memorial sites. Though each site offers its own complex and varying perspective, together they point to a globally connected network of memory and remembrance, which far from unified, encapsulates a plurality of voices and perspectives with new methods and technology at their disposal to communicate their divergent histories and memories of the past. At the same time it revealed the enduring impact of nationally grounded forms of memory and remembrance. Exploring the impact of these shifts on visitors and educational participants, through further empirical study, is thus the next logical step for future research.
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“Textheft der ständigen Ausstellung ‘Die Wannsee-Konferenz und der Völkermord


Interviews Conducted by Author (at the following locations):

**House of the Wannsee Conference:**

Senior permanent staff member at the House of the Wannsee Conference, in discussion with the author. Multiple interviews conducted in August 2012 and August 2013.

Teacher and permanent staff member at the House of the Wannsee Conference in discussion with author. Multiple interviews conducted in August 2012, August 2013, and August 2014.

**Ravensbrück Memorial:**

Senior staff member in the educational department at the Ravensbrück Memorial, in discussion with author. Multiple Interviews conducted in August 2012 and August 2013.

**Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum:**

Teacher and educational coordinator at the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum, in discussion with the author. Multiple interviews conducted in August 2012, August 2012, and August 2013.

Media and communications assistant at the administrative offices of the Sachsenhausen Memorial Museum, in discussion with the author. Interview conducted in August 2013.

**Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe:**

Educational administrator and teacher at the Information Centre to the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, in discussion with the author. Interview conducted in August 2012.

Educational staff member of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, in discussion with the author. Interview conducted in August 2012.

Researcher and permanent staff member at the administrative offices of the Information Centre of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, in discussion with the author. Interview conducted in August 2014.