



Research Article

Gender in the Archive: The Dialogic Potential of Public Memory in the Outtakes from Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*

Lisa A Costello ✉

Professor, Dept of English and Director of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Statesboro Campus, Georgia Southern University, USA

Abstract

The original version of the film *Shoah* had an enormous impact on the revival of Holocaust memory. However, women appeared only a few times over the course of those nine long hours. Even though Lanzmann's film achieved complexity in its representation of places, it failed to equally represent the experiences of both women and men, which is a disservice to all survivors. In 2016, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) released over 220 hours of additional outtake footage from *Shoah*, never seen by the public. The outtakes reveal longer interviews with women, and these missing voices shed light on women's experiences during the Holocaust in more detail.

I argue that the "outtakes" of this film can be used by audiences to deconstruct gender "neutralities" around testimony to reimagine public memory narratives and spaces about the Holocaust as highly gendered. In the "rhetorical process of gendering" in public memory, so-called "neutral" public memory narratives can be challenged by newly discovered artifacts like the outtakes. Though *Shoah* had elements of ambiguity, there was no way to challenge its strict binary in gender representation—until now. This active audience engagement with Holocaust artifacts, what I call *performative memorialization*, marks a *kairotic* force in Holocaust memorialization; the past collapses into the present to elicit a dialogic of active audience participation.

Keywords: gender, performative, public memory, Shoah, kairos, Claude Lanzmann

Funding: No funding was received for this research and publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declared no conflicts of interest.

Article History: Received: July 22, 2024. Revised: October 12, 2024. Accepted: October 12, 2024. First published: October 13, 2024.

Copyright: © 2024 by the author/s.

License: Critical Gender Studies Network (CGSN), India. Distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Publisher: Critical Gender Studies Network (CGSN)

Citation: Costello, L. A. (2024). Gender in the Archive: The Dialogic Potential of Public Memory in the Outtakes from Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*. *Critical Gender Studies Journal*. 1:2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21659/cgsj.v1n2.02>



Introduction

Shoah was an astounding film for its time, using only oral testimony and footage of the abandoned concentration and death camp locations filmed in the present.ⁱ No one had ever filmed the concentration camp sites in this way. *Shoah* changed so much of what audiences thought they “knew” about the Holocaust; it allowed new conversations and voices to be heard, opening a dialogic space for interactive memorial processes. Lanzmann tells the story of the Holocaust, jumping from past to present, interweaving testimony about the past with geographical sites and people in the present. Audiences expect histories to be chronological but *Shoah* does not present the Holocaust chronologically, as in “*chronos*” the “duration” of time (Hawhee 2004, p. 66). *Shoah*’s time “jumps,” which “marks force” as in “*kairos*” (p. 71). Interviewing survivors in those historical places so they could “re-construct” their memory was *kairotic*, but it was also problematic. It pictured the landscape, growing over ashes and bodies, almost erasing the event, and the voices Lanzmann showcased turned out to be quite partial.ⁱⁱ

Shoah presents itself as a repository of “neutral” survivor, perpetrator, and bystander perspectives (a neutrality that is always already masculine), but by excluding women or subverting their experiences of the Holocaust, it has reified existing gender binaries of public memory. Though *Shoah* cast light anew on Holocaust memory, the almost complete absence of women’s experiences—women appeared only a few times over the course of those nine, long hours—means their story is incomplete. While Lanzmann’s film achieves ambiguity in its representation of people and places, Lanzmann either consciously minimized the role of women or unconsciously deferred to a patriarchal system that values the male voice more. Failing to fully represent the experiences of both women and men is a disservice to all survivors.ⁱⁱⁱ

In 2016, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) released additional outtake footage from *Shoah* never before seen by the public. These are jointly owned by the USHMM and Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and are called the *Claude Lanzmann Shoah Collection*. These missing women’s voices shed light on women’s experiences during the Holocaust in more detail.

ⁱ Though it is categorized in the genre of documentary film, Lanzmann “insists that it is a work of art, an ‘originary event’ constructed with ‘traces of traces’” (Liebman 2007, p.4).

ⁱⁱ This article is a significantly reworked portion of my chapter, “Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah* and the Opening of Testimony Archives: Gender and Performance in Public Memory,” which focuses on gender and the outtakes from this film (Costello 2019). My focus in this article is still on Srebnik, Elias, and Mueller, a focus that is echoed by work that followed it (see Sanyal, Zissleberger, and Wolfson in Chapters 10, 11 and 12 in *The Construction of Testimony* 2020). My original piece frames the argument through the performance of memory. This article delves more deeply into my original theory of performative memorialization.

ⁱⁱⁱ According to Magilow (2019, p.325), “He developed several other lengthy films from outtakes that did not make the final cut, notably *A Visitor from the Living* (1999); *Sobibór, October 14, 1943, 4 p.m.* (2001); *The Karski Report* (2010); *The Last of the Unjust* (2013); and his final film, *Four Sisters* (2018).” These make artistic statements about Lanzmann’s additional thoughts on the outtakes as the decades went by. Notably the film on women was the last (it came out shortly before he died), over thirty years after *Shoah* was released.

While *Shoah* shows how public memory artifacts replicate unequal gender dynamics of power while “seeming” to depict universal experience, this extended footage, when added to the edited film, *actually* achieves the complexity in Holocaust memory that Lanzmann wanted with its initial release. When we aren’t allowed to encounter a full spectrum of women’s experiences (and men’s for that matter), the patriarchal “norms” of gender dominate what audiences see as the Holocaust survivor or experience. When the film *Shoah* includes its outtakes footage, a more complete gender representation is possible.

The *Shoah* interview “outtakes” contain over 220 hours of interview and site footage, which open the memorialization in *Shoah* to the spectrum of *both* male *and* female survivor perspectives that challenge a dominant or “universal” (masculinist by default) narrative. I argue that the “outtakes” of this film can be used by audiences to deconstruct gender “neutralities” around testimony to reimagine public memory narratives and spaces about the Holocaust as not neutral and, in fact, highly gendered. When we talk about the “rhetorical process of gendering” in public memory relies on “discursive, material, and embodied articulations and performances that create and disturb gendered distinctions,” says Enoch (2013, p. 68), and in these ways so-called “neutral” public memory narratives can be challenged by newly discovered artifacts like the outtakes. Though *Shoah* had elements of ambiguity, there was no way to challenge its strict binary in gender representation—until now. This active audience engagement with Holocaust artifacts, what I call *performative memorialization*, marks a *kairotic* force in Holocaust memorialization; the past collapses into the present to elicit a dialogic of active audience participation.

Theoretical Framing: Performative Public Memory

In order to see how the outtakes add complexity to survivor representation and engage audiences, we have to frame it through a theoretical lens. I have been establishing the concept of performative memory in my work on the Holocaust for almost twenty years, which includes the performative, rhetoric, and gender. Popescu and Schult (2020, p.6-7) agree that the performative remains an important aspect of Holocaust public memory and has been the focus of art installations, museums, and scholarly work from Young, Stier, Hirsch, Patraka, and Costello.^{iv}

In this article, I focus on performative memorialization as it relates to the *Shoah* outtakes. These new scenes from the film have “transformative potential,” (Popescu and Schutz 2020, p. 6) because they can re-contextualize and reframe gender in Lanzmann’s *Shoah*.^v Specifically I explore how the outtakes disturb “universal”^{vi} or seemingly gender neutral representations in *Shoah*.

^{iv} See the bibliography for more from these authors.

^v McGlothlin and Prager (2020) pose interesting questions in their Introduction about Lanzmann’s personal archive of oral testimonies, from which he made several films after *Shoah*, what they have called the “not-yet-edited” archive and the outtakes held at the museum, which might constitute a “never-to-be-edited” archive. Lanzmann had expressed a desire at one point to destroy all the outtakes (p.6). We are grateful he did not.

^{vi} I use the term “universal” to define the neutrally gendered practices societies have become accustomed to; that is, “universal” often defaults to the masculine experience. I am aware of conversations around the

Performative disturbances provided by the outtakes lead to the creation of *kairotic* moments, where the force of the moment overcomes the chronological timelines—they collapse the past into the present. This is especially true because the outtakes were made public so many decades after the film's original release. In my theory of *performative memorialization*^{vii} the performative, rhetorical, and gendered interactions of audiences with Holocaust memory and artifacts, as well as with authors and evolving socio-historical contexts, creates a dialogic. In order to bring connection to the past, these conversations must be ongoing. In the case of *Shoah*, its initial release (1985), the subsequent release of its outtakes in the archives (2016), and the continuing conversations today, provide an ideal case of an ongoing dialogic around Holocaust memory.

The Performative

The term "performative" is often misused to discuss memorialization or other practices as superficial (Sanyal 2020, Smith 2021).^{viii} In fact, the term is decidedly *not* superficial; Pollock's sense of the performative is that words and visual/spatial texts have the power to *do* something in the world (1998, p.75). Popescu and Schult remind us that the "performative" includes both a "certain repertoire (following Taylor's interpretation) of Holocaust memorialisation, namely the audience participatory and the performance-like character of memorial actions and the performances of visitors" and the "the transformative potential of such practices" on audiences (6-7). Performative memorialization, therefore, constitutes new interpretations and exists in shifting spaces and contexts with a lot of transformative potential.^{ix} Similar to Love, who names Performance Studies as truly interdisciplinary, "bring[ing] together ideas" from various disciplines (2007, p.14), *performative memorialization*, brings together performance studies, rhetorical studies, Holocaust Studies, and gender studies to create a new theoretical lens. It shows us the "impossibility of maintaining the distinction between temporal tenses, between an absolutely singular beginning and ending. (Phelan 1998, p. 8). There is power inherent in spaces in between. Indeed, performance and rhetoric, with gender, build a link that is "insistent on connection" says Love (2018), and performative memorialization seeks connection in the Holocaust memory project by building a dialogic with audiences. This process is asking audiences to do something.

"universal" and Holocaust as "parabolization and metaphorization" (as in Firleg 2020), but this is not the way that I am using the term. I focus on the false neutrality of public memory as "ungendered."

^{vii} My first iteration of this theory was on Art Spiegelman's *Maus* (2006).

^{viii} Smith (2022) uses the term to mean superficial public memory gestures and it is used similarly by Sanyal (2020, p. 326-7) to mean something is only a "reenactment." Pollock and others define "performative" as words that "do" something," based on the concept of speech acts so eloquently described by Austin (1975), Bakhtin (1991), and revisited by Felman and Laub (1992) with regard to Holocaust testimony.

^{ix} For more on the performative, see Austin (1975), DeCerteau (1984), Love (2008), and Pollock (1998),

Rhetoric

Public memory is rhetorical because it allows for interpretation based on these competing perspectives (Blair, Dickinson, and Ott 2010, p. 2). Public memory is constructed, which means it is part of hegemonic systems that create but also erase or rewrite histories, and these processes are in flux over time. There is also a fluctuation in public memory of remembering and forgetting (Baer and Sznajder, 2017; Bernard-Donals, 2009; Davis, 2022). Public memory is also rhetorical as an iteration of the needs of the present through “a vernacular presentation of the past” (Enoch, 2013, p. 62).^x The rhetorical approach, however, has often failed to account for gender.^{xi}

Gender

Theories of gender make visible the highly constructed processes of public memory that claim to be “universal” or neutral. Holocaust Studies has been dominated by historical and cultural studies perspectives that often marginalize gender or ignore it completely.^{xii} Concepts of gender and the performative originated with Judith Butler (1990, 1997, 2009) and have been influential in several fields. In the 1990s, there was still resistance to studying gender and the Holocaust, but the last thirty years have seen an expansion.^{xiii} Hirsch’s *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* discusses gender and the Holocaust (2012). Goldenberg and Shapiro’s edited collection addresses the absence of gender in historical analyses (2013). Further studies focusing on gender and the Holocaust thus, continue to be crucial, with texts like “On Women’s Bodies: Experiences of Dehumanization during the Holocaust” (Ephgrave 2016), *Sexual Violence Against Jewish Women During the Holocaust* (2010), *Haunted Memories: Portraits of Women in the Holocaust* (Eichengreen 2011) and *Different Horrors, Same Hell* (2013) appearing just in the last ten to fifteen years. With regard to *Shoah*, the absence of gender was explored by Hirsch and Spitzer, as were images by Koch in the influential anthology *Claude Lanzmann’s Shoah: Key Essays* (Liebman 2007). Gender has been newly explored with regard to *Shoah* in the anthology *The Construction of Testimony* (2020).

Enoch suggests that societies “formulate the past in ways that confirm or disturb ideas about the way things are or should be” such as with rigidly constructed gender roles and representations (Enoch 2013, p. 62). Although American public memory around the Holocaust has become particularly visible, it must be noted that the “seen” is often what society finds allowable or ideal. This “ideal” manifests in narratives that are mostly masculinized. When women are present, they

^x See also Blair, Dickinson, and Ott 2010; Vivian 2012; Zelizer 2001, 2004.

^{xi} See Phillips 2004.

^{xii} See Rosenfeld 2013 for one example.

^{xiii} Esther Fuchs (1999) notes that “questions about the invisibility of women in Holocaust Studies” began with two studies: *Different Voices: Women and the Holocaust* (1993) and *Making Stories, Making Selves: Feminist Reflections on the Holocaust* (1993) and the criticism of the lack of representation of and information about the female Holocaust experience began with Debra R. Kaufman (1996), *Women in the Holocaust*, a special journal issue. Thirty years later texts are still being recovered and analyzed, as with the *Shoah* Outtakes.

have rigidly constructed gender roles or are simply made absent or silent. In *Shoah* this is true, but with the outtakes, audiences can see instead wider experiences and roles for both women and men. Public memory artifacts that make gender visible, help audiences re-orient themselves to form meaningful connections to the past and increase their ability to connect with others in the present.

The Audience

In their seminal work on testimony Felman and Laub (1992, p.3) note, "by virtue of the fact that the testimony is *addressed* to others, the witness, from within the solitude of his own stance, is the vehicle of an occurrence, a reality, a stance or a dimension *beyond himself*." This act of writing/representing experience is a social act that performs memory by demanding response, which can be achieved in the case of *Shoah* through outtakes in the archive. The interactive dialogic of performative memorialization that audiences *could* enact with the outtakes disrupts the gender binary Lanzmann insists upon in his film, but how can we know that someone really is listening?

Building on Felman and Laub's (1992) construction of testimony as speech acts to understand audience response, I use Debra Hawhee's modern conception of the *kairotic* force to discover how audience reception relates to performative memorial force.^{xiv} Hawhee presents *kairos* as a force of time that is sometimes in opposition to *chronos* (as chronological time) because it exerts pressure at unexpected moments. The juxtaposition of *chronos* and *kairos* allow for a dialogic space to open for audiences to engage (Hawhee 2004, p. 66). Blom (2016, p.15) claims that, "No longer a neutral background or foundation, time and temporalization has become a dynamic foreground, a critical object in its own right." Examining its dynamism can be a fruitful way to discern the power of audience interaction. The give and take of duration and force creates an "act of listening," which is an "active, transformative act for hearers and speakers" (Hawhee 2004, p. 77-78). *Kairos* is not just a force that marks and disrupts the "neutral" public memory of the Holocaust, but it is also an aperture that creates a performative space where the, "rhetor opens [himself] to the immediate situation, allowing for more of an exchange," (p. 71) which becomes the dialogic of performative memorialization as the survivors in the outtakes speak and audiences listen.

According to Skloot (2012, p.266), *Shoah* has always been premised on audience participation, because "participating in the 'painful difficulties' someone experiences is the empathetic response at the crucial center of live performance" of the film. Liebman (2007, p. 14-15) claims that the "voices and bodies of those who had seen or themselves been through the worst, and yet were still capable of making their experiences come alive in the present, bear the principal burdens of conveying the truth of what happened." That testimony, however, does not become a true dialogic if some voices are purposely muted. Lanzmann wanted to elicit specific responses from

^{xiv} See Langer's seminal work (1991) and more recently Pollin-Gay (2018) for more on oral testimony and witnessing.

his audience, but these responses would always be incomplete because Lanzmann limited the gender representations.

The *Shoah* outtakes first give audiences a window into why survivors took such a long time to tell their stories, especially women. Paula Biren says after the war she did want to talk, "but no one wanted to hear," so she "clammed up" (Film ID: 3108). Ruth Elias says in Clip 7 of the outtakes that "Nobody understood or wanted to understand what the survivors had been through at that time" (Film ID: 3118). Lanzmann, by saving these outtakes has given audiences a chance to make Holocaust narratives speak into the contextual present with *Shoah*; audiences then will have to work at truly listening.^{xv}

Opening Scene: Absent Voices

Before we delve into the absence of women and what their presence adds back to the impact of the film, we can start with the opening scene to understand just how much the outtakes will help audiences see a survivor's experience more fully as they exert testimonial agency. With this agency they bear witness for themselves and their listeners. The film opens with the sound of a train, before the audience sees anything else. A quote flashes on the screen, then we see a calm and peaceful river and a boat. As the boat creeps into the camera frame, we hear singing. It is child survivor Simon Srebnik, who we learn later has been asked back to this place by Lanzmann to recreate his experience on this river as a boy in the concentration camp singing for Nazi soldiers. Srebnik is given only a singing voice in this opening scene, as he was once forced to do by the Nazis. The absence of his real voice persists in every subsequent scene. Although Lanzmann might have wanted the survivor experience to be seen by audiences as fragmented to punctuate the trauma, the absence of Srebnik's own voice, speech, and agency, is more disturbing because it mutes his real self in the present. Lanzmann attempts to disorient his viewers and create a discomfort that forces the memorial "work" he wanted to elicit, but without strong orientation to the breadth of survivor experiences to begin with, which starts with their voices and whole memories, it often falls short in terms of gender representation.

Audiences can relate only to the absence or presence of selected voices and bodies, ultimately "othering" the subjects of the film, especially those not given any voice. Although there are many opportunities to engage with the reconstruction of sites and experiences, Lanzmann chose primarily male perspectives. While Lanzmann may have wanted to disturb the processes of memorialization and public memory, he was also strangely methodical in not disturbing the representation of gender as binary. Gender is simplified: women are passive, and men are not. In this opening scene, however, not even Srebnik returning to the site is able to assert his agency in testimony. I argue that the rhetorical force in *Shoah* is lost because the participants in the

^{xv} Lanzmann was concerned with the ways in which the destruction of European Jewry would be portrayed culturally. He saw his work as material traces linked to the sites of destruction (the camps). He was disappointed with the production of the 1970s miniseries *The Holocaust* (Lanzmann 2007, p.29-30). There was no strong narrative or chronological explanation for how the Holocaust was engineered. He saw that lack as a degradation of the event. Oddly, he did not see the simplification of gender in that way.

exchange are limited by the absence of gender complexity and the agency of their whole voices.^{xvi} With the outtakes, however, audiences are able to see performative memorialization in action: survivors choose how they want to tell their story, and while directed by Lanzmann's questions, they can tell more than is asked. Survivors assert agency in their longer testimonies in this way, even when Lanzmann pushes them to do otherwise. Their words are consequential speech acts (Felman and Laub 1992) of testimony that performatively create action in those who listen—the dialogic is between witness and listener as well as with those who came before and those who will come after.

Women in the Film: Traditional Gender Roles

Almost all the interviewees in the film are men, and when women do appear, they are passive in both act and speech.^{xvii} In general, women appear as translators for Lanzmann, as observers of others' stories, and as gender "foils," who either facilitate a man's testimony or underscore women's perspectives as petty. Polish peasant women, for example, are portrayed as only concerned with their men being attracted to beautiful Jewish women: "It's crazy how the Poles liked the little Jewesses!" they exclaim (Ash 2007, p.141).^{xviii} Relegating women's contributions in this film to petty competitors for men's attention or as "assistant" (to the director) reifies the perceived gender binary of men as leaders and women as followers. With regard to survivor testimony, according to Hirsch and Spitzer (2007, p.180), women's roles in the film in "hiding, passivity, lament, invisibility," are "supported in the men's narratives about women," as Lanzmann constructs his film aesthetic with gendered purpose. Any woman who shows resistance to these limited roles is presented in the film as tormented and helpless, and when she turns to some kind of action, it is usually futile. Lanzmann orients audiences not to the Holocaust experience as a

^{xvi} Though the original analyses in this piece appeared prior to Zisselberger's chapter "Challenging *Shoah's* Paradigms of Witnessing and Survival: From Filip Mueller to Ruth Elias" (2020), the publication of this reworked version answers Zisselberger's call for both an "empathetic" and "critical" approach with a "careful analysis of the many other female voices in the film's outtakes" as well as a "comparative reconsideration" of some of the men's testimonies (361) with a look at multiple women's voices and a reexamination of Mueller's testimony.

^{xvii} Hirsch and Spitzer noted this gender absence in their 2007 essay. Zisselberger reiterates (2020, p.337). The descriptions here serve as a comparative to understand how women and men appear in the film and how they appear more fully in their outtakes.

^{xviii} Ash points out that although Lanzmann claimed "nothing essential in what regards the Poles is left out," his depiction of them in the film is as a callous people without compassion. What other research reveals, however, is that many details (as I am arguing about the missing gender piece of this film) are left out. Ash cites one text, Nechama Tec's *When Light Pierced Darkness*, which has over 500 case studies of Poles helping Jews (1987, p.143). See also Glowacka's chapter (2020), "'Traduttore traditore': Claude Lanzmann's Polish Translations" in *The Construction of Testimony*.

whole but rather to a patriarchal gender hierarchy they “expect,” presenting it as a “universal” public memory.^{xix}

The first Jewish female survivor who appears on screen, for example, is Hanna Zaidl, who appears only in the background with her family, smoking and silent. Paula Biren, survivor of the Łódź ghetto, appears next. She is interviewed only briefly and does not appear again (as other male survivors do) to describe her experience in the ghetto at length. In the outtakes, her actual interview is over *two hours long*, and she is calm, composed, and detailed in her information about experiences with Nuremberg Laws, in the Łódź ghetto, and in postwar Poland (much like the men who tell the same story). It seems that her testimony could have served as further evidence for the narrative of Polish antisemitism and bystander behavior that Lanzmann focuses on in the film, yet he presents only one minute of her story.

Inge Deutschkron is the only woman asked to relive her experience in the present (as Lanzmann had asked Srebnik to do), and it was in hiding. This hidden position, however, according to Hirsch and Spitzer (2007, p.179):

Emblematizes the position of women in the film as a whole. Unlike most of the male witnesses whose faces fill the screen for long periods of time, Inge Deutschkron is little more than a disembodied voice: her narrative is largely presented in voice-over as scenes of Berlin and departing trains occupy the space of the screen; her face and name appear only at the very end of her brief account.

Inge’s testimony serves as a conduit for the testimonies of men or for the overarching narrative of the film.

Another interview is with Ruth Elias. On Disc Four of the film (Second Era: Part II), the final disc, Elias appears to describe some of the conditions in the Theresienstadt family camp.^{xx} She begins a story about resistance in Theresienstadt’s family camp and the group’s transport to Auschwitz that seems to lead to a description of the resistance activities in the camp. But Lanzmann picks up the story from this point in the film using only testimony from Rudolf Vrba and Filip Mueller. There is no detailing of Elias’s time in Auschwitz, her relationships, her witnessing of death, or anything else about her experiences with great detail, though they were certainly unique (as I will discuss below). Her segments are provided in order to “set[s] the scene” and “provide[s] atmosphere, the affect, and not the facts or details,” limiting the ways in which her complex experience could be portrayed (Hirsch and Spitzer 2007, p.179). With Lanzmann’s “true” witness, “a masculine subject of traumatic complicity” who is emotional (Sanyal 2020, p.306), the audience is directed to see gender as an either/or binary. Men speak and do, and we turn toward that. Women are silent and without agency, and we turn away. Audiences are not allowed to see women’s or men’s representations that challenge this simple binary—and thus, gender as complex or as a spectrum, remain invisible. Sara Ahmed suggests that “truths” are only realized through emotion and by

^{xix} Zisselberger has an interesting discussion of Lanzman’s desire to tell the “fate of the collective ” rather than focus on the individual (2020, p.337).

^{xx} Theresienstadt was the “model camp” that the Nazi leaders showed to international Red Cross representatives to prove that the Nazi treatment of prisoners was humane.

what “moves” us, by how “sticky with affect” something is (2015, p.11); therefore, when audiences orient themselves to the past as dynamic public memory—as gendered, rhetorical, and performative—they participate by a turning toward the past as a part of their present, which includes an array of gendered experiences.

The last two Jewish women onscreen, who precede the final description of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising (Disc 4: Second Era: Part II), are Gertrude Schneider and her mother (who remains nameless in the film). They come onscreen to “sing a ghetto song.”^{xxi} The mother cannot sing the entire piece; she ends up lamenting, and neither woman speaks. These scenes continue to uphold a binary of female/song and male/speech. Audiences are asked to see those who sing and lament as either setting the stage, as I have noted before, or as vessels through which others speak. Audiences, especially modern ones, are capable of seeing testimony as more complex and gendered. The digitized *Shoah* outtakes at the USHMM provide this crucial opportunity, as I detail below.

A Fuller Picture: Gender and Audience Participation

The promise of the outtakes in these open archives is that memorial practices become more accessible and participatory. Public memory as *kairotic* opens apertures for dialogue (Hawhee 2004, p.71) and performance memorialization helps audiences connect to the past by becoming witnesses in the present. Haskins (2007, p.405) agrees that online memorialization does have that potential. I quote her again in this piece in full, because her concepts are so important to understanding how audiences *could* interact performatively:

Instead of only official accounts disseminated by mainstream media and the government, all kinds of stories can now become part of an evolving patchwork of public memory. Formerly limited in time and space, ephemeral gestures can be preserved in still and moving images, ready to be viewed and replayed on demand. Previously banished to dark storage rooms, mementos left at memorial sites can be displayed for all to see. The boundaries between the official and the vernacular, the public and the private, the permanent and the evanescent will cease to matter, for all stories and images will be equally fit to represent and comment on the past.

Access to “all stories” that are available marks a disruption in present time, and certainly this availability poses its own danger to the integrity of factual history and testimony and its uses or abuses. Cole and Hackett (2010, p.112) suggest that “one of the benefits of the digital revolution has been its fundamentally egalitarian nature—the availability of resources online will, to a large extent, free researchers from the intervention of librarians, archivists, and other traditional gatekeepers of the cultural record.” But they note that the need for such human experts has not gone away. I would argue that with digital artifacts like the outtakes, such human expertise is necessary not only to restore and preserve artifacts but also to contextualize them for public access, as the USHMM does.^{xxii}

^{xxi} For more on women singing in the film and the outtakes see Wolfson (2020).

^{xxii} The USHMM archives are rigorously cataloged and protected while being accessible. The museum has a

A result of access to these extensive outtakes made available to the public is the disruption of Lanzmann's narrative in *Shoah*. The survivor stories can finally be told "in their own words," to become more representative of their whole experience. For instance, in the *Shoah* outtakes, Gertrude Schneider's interview is actually *2 hours and 18 minutes long* (Film ID: 3221-3225), a great deal longer than the 1.5 minutes she appears on screen in the film. The interview includes Schneider's mother but the outtakes also reveal that the interview includes Schneider's sister, who does not appear in the final cuts of *Shoah* (she and Gertrude were 11 and 13 at the time of the Holocaust).

Their interview gives detailed information about the Riga ghetto and how women were targeted in specific ways. In the outtakes, at the end of Clip 1, Lanzmann asks about sex and abortion in the ghetto. At the beginning of Clip 2, Gertrude's sister says very frankly that pregnant women in the hospital ghetto were forced to have abortions, no matter how late in the pregnancy, even in the eighth month. She says doctors in the ghetto also were ordered to sterilize women. There was even a special room for these procedures, because there was "supposed to be no record." The three women also talk about one woman in the ghetto, who had a child named Moses Ben Ghetto, but he was discovered by the Nazis and killed. They recall the decrees that forbade sex in the ghetto and how "ridiculous" these were because they could not be enforced. Gertrude says she found these orders "interesting" evidence of the dehumanization process. They were meant to, "subdue any idea that one is human" (Clip 2).

This kind of concrete evidence of the dehumanization process regarding sex and abortion reveals very gender-focused practices by the Nazis, but Lanzmann does not include any of this information in the film. Further, Gertrude, her sister, and her mother all speak very clearly, calmly, and with detail throughout the interview. There is no point at which they break down. All three Schneider women recount horrific stories with very little emotion in these outtakes. These images conflict with Lanzmann's portrayal of a patriarchal gender binary where men speak and women don't. The behaviors of the Schneiders are contrary to the "traditional" gender representation of them in the final version of *Shoah* as either silent, lamenting, or passive women, and the outtakes reveal to audiences female survivors with emotions and behaviors that disrupt a patriarchal binary by being both "feminine" and "masculine." The only portion of this interview Lanzmann used in the film is the women singing, a scene which appears at the very end of *Shoah*. In the outtakes interview, however, only at the end of Clip 3 do the women begin to discuss singing (in the third hour of the interview). The three women describe talented singers who sang on the transports (one might assume to raise morale). At this point Gertrude says: "what was sad is that so many died and nobody cared."

Although in the final film Gertrude's mother remains voiceless, at this point in the outtakes, she says very forthrightly in agreement with Gertrude: "This was the greatest shame, that no one cared." Yet Lanzmann, even in the outtake interview, glosses over these observations of human

strict user citation policy: <https://www.ushmm.org/collections/ask-a-research-question/how-to-cite-museum-materials#from-the-museums-film-oral-history-recorded-sound-archive> and a Terms of Use policy: <https://www.ushmm.org/copyright-and-legal-information/terms-of-use>. All users need permission to employ images from the site in public displays or on public sites. With accurate use, this open access means all stories can become part of the "evolving patchwork of public memory" (Haskins 2007, p.405).

behavior. These women pass judgment on silent bystanders to the Holocaust. Their words could create action in audiences by bringing their attention to what can happen when people do and say nothing. Yet, Lanzmann focuses only on their traditional gender representations: women must comfort, lament, or remain silent, and prompts them again to sing together. They do, but the mother interjects once more—refusing to be silent—to say that a man in Minsk was killed for helping Jews, but Lanzmann turns them away from the topic of rescuers to sing once more. The women do not choose to do so; Lanzmann prompts them. The fact that Lanzmann asks women, even commands them to “sing” is striking as a shocking gesture of domination. These gestures by Lanzmann are only revealed in the outtakes.

Such scenes in the outtakes are further evidence of the director’s male dominance that limits the true and lasting *kairotic* force of the interviews in their original version. These women are repeatedly told how to behave and what to say, even when they resist. These brief clips of the women singing are the only portions of this lengthy interview that make the final cut. They sing the songs that were sung by others to comfort fellow prisoners. They are not allowed to comment on the ethics of society’s behavior writ large. The idea that women were overly emotional and therefore “unreasonable” and unreliable is part of a false binary that not only excludes women from “the realm of thought and rationality,” but also “works to conceal the emotional and embodied aspects of thought and reason” that are present *in everyone* [my emphasis] (Ahmed 2015, p.170). The outtakes of the Schneider women disrupt that binary by showing gendered testimony that is both reasoned and emotional. These three women demonstrate (in their own voices) agency, strength, and survival in the face of gendered torture around reproduction—key details that undercut Lanzmann’s insistence on gender binaries and strict gender roles. Audiences can perform memory by re-constructing those cut pieces into a whole representation that calls audiences to recognize the gendered nature of torture, the complex responses to that violence, and the agency of these women in insisting on their own testimonial authority.

The Kairotic Force of Women’s Testimony Persists

The absence of women’s testimony in *Shoah* creates an incomplete picture of the Holocaust experience. There are almost fourteen hours of Jewish women’s testimony in the outtakes, yet women occupy less than thirty minutes of final film time. The importance of women’s testimony was, however, recognized in other global arenas. Lanzmann’s interview with Ada Lichtman, for instance, is three hours long, and her testimony does not appear in the film at all (Film ID: 3270-3277). Her testimony on the global stage had import and impact: it was used to convict Adolf Eichmann in his 1965 trial. She also reveals in her interview that Jewish women were “taken by the Germans for their personal use,” which was not common knowledge at that time, all while she sews a doll—the job she had in the Sobibor death camp—cleaning and sewing victims’ dolls for the children of the SS.^{xxiii} Research on the sexual assault of Jewish women is recent;^{xxiv} having testimony like Lichtman’s might have opened this research path earlier, but it is also true that

^{xxiii} This reenactment is part of how Lanzmann asked interviewees to “re-live” their story of the past as they testified in the present (similar to Srebnik and others not mentioned in this article).

^{xxiv} Eichengreen (2011), Goldenberg and Shapiro (2013), and Hedgepeth (2010).

women's experiences of sexual violence are often not valued or even believed.

Other testimony reveals the pivotal role women had in the resistance movements, where their presence had also been less documented. Malka Goldberg's testimony, though only twelve minutes long and audio only (Film ID: 3869-3870), reveals that she was a part of the Warsaw Ghetto resistance and uprising, a culminating event in the final version of *Shoah*, to which her testimony could have added a new and gendered perspective. In the short interview, Goldberg tells Lanzmann that she was in the ghetto resistance, a revelation he glosses over like he does with the Schneiders, choosing to ask instead that she and her male companion sing a Yiddish resistance song. Women are constructed not as individuals, with agency and the ability to fight physically as Goldberg clearly does, but as moral support for the group. Again, the longer outtakes of Malka actively disrupt Lanzmann's binary gender narrative with new knowledge by presenting a woman in resistance with a strong voice. Malka relates the resistance story in a narrative both reasonable and emotional, underscoring Ahmed's reminder that all humans are both rational and emotional. These are not characteristics determined by any gender identity or sex determination. Lanzmann is shown repeatedly commanding women to sing instead of listening to them speak about their experiences, which results in their unwilling silence in *Shoah*. The outtakes provide a more complete picture.

Hearing testimony from female survivors through the digital outtakes, shifts the *orientation* of audiences to public memory about the Holocaust from the patriarchal "universal binary" of "who should and should not be remembered in the first place"" (Enoch 2013, p.64), both to empower those who testified and to help individual audience members become their own personal archivists. They can access full interviews in the outtakes and multiply their knowledge of the Holocaust experience from *Shoah* to include both men and women extensively. Audiences are given the tools with which to resist an orientation that "others" the survivors, and instead have access to new images that make visible a complex gender representation of active roles in resistance, collaboration, and postwar trials. The opening that is created in this *kairotic* moment is *performative* because it creates a dialogic—not only about gender and Holocaust survival, but also about representation in public memory in general. If this many voices were absent from such a landmark film (that stood alone for several decades), what other voices might be absent from other narratives in public memory? The outtakes present complex retellings of personal narratives from female survivors that are emotional and unemotional, passive and active. As Ahmed suggests, emotion and reason are the purview of everyone, and when we can see both at once, the impact on audiences powerfully re-orient them to listen in the present, turning toward the person who speaks from the past.^{xxv}

The Case of Ruth Elias

Creating a more complete survivor experience is possible through knowing what women saw, how they resisted, and what they thought about it. Lanzmann does not give this whole picture to

^{xxv} Gender representation should include the complex, emotional stories of men, and the outtakes provide evidence of a bigger picture than the one Lanzmann originally constructed for men as well, which I discuss in a few pages.

audiences. In *Shoah*, Lanzmann only uses portions of Elias's interview to "set the scene" for Rudolf Vrba and Filip Mueller^{xxvi} to describe their active resistance to the Nazis. What the outtakes actually reveal is that Elias herself had much detail to offer not only about women in resistance in Theresienstadt and Auschwitz, but also a chilling story of her resistance to the gendered torture of medical experimenters and to the fate planned for her by Dr. Mengele (Film ID: 3112-3118, Clips 1-7).^{xxvii} In part six of the seven-part clips openly accessible on the USHMM website, Elias describes the experiments that were performed on her on the order of Dr. Mengele. Though the idea of Mengele and these experiments in general have become somewhat "familiar" to audiences, the experimentation Elias endured is specifically gendered and quite *unfamiliar* to audiences. Experiments with childbirth and breastfeeding can only be performed on women to seek results about women. Elias actively refused the fate dictated by Mengele for her and her daughter. Elias's outtakes show again that, though Lanzmann wanted to show Jewish resistance, his film designates those activities as "male." Her testimony shows that, not only is resistance not just the male purview, it also took many forms.

Elias explained she was an inmate at the Auschwitz concentration and death camp and was experimented upon by the "notorious" Dr. Mengele (Elias, Clip 5). When Ruth's pregnancy was discovered, she was brought to the medical unit. Once she gave birth Dr. Mengele wanted to know how long a child could survive without being breastfed. Ruth's breasts were bound, and she was made to lie next to her screaming infant as her daughter grew weaker and weaker, day after day.

Sara Ahmed argues that "truths" are only realized through emotion and by what "moves" us, by how "sticky with affect" something is (2015, p.11). But affect is the end result of engagement and connection; it *is not* synonymous with emotion. Affect comes from a relationship with the past. When audiences "see" that past in public memory without "seeing" its false neutrality or degendered nature, they might think they "know" it, but it is incomplete, static knowledge. When audiences orient themselves to the past as dynamic public memory—as gendered, rhetorical, and performative—they can participate in bringing that history wholly to life in the present. In the uncut version of Elias's outtake, audiences can see that she embodies gender representations of both strong and weak, emotional and rational, and they have the opportunity to re-construct her experience as a whole testimony that *she* directs, allowing us to listen to her and with her. She has endured torture at the hands of Mengele, which *Shoah* has not shown us. *Shoah* also has not shown us her unique form of resistance. It fails to give us the full spectrum of her experience and the spectrum of resistance itself.

In the later portion of Elias's testimony, we learn of a horrific choice that shows how resistance can look for different people. After Elias describes giving birth, she says the camp doctor (also a

^{xxvi} My argument here is a reworked portion from a much longer chapter in my 2019 book (*Costello, American*). I have directed it to a new audience for a new purpose but have retained my general analysis of specific testimonies. Elias's and Mueller's outtakes are also discussed with gendered implications in Sanyal (2020) and Zisselberger (2020).

^{xxvii} Sanyal (2020, p.305-6) also notes Schneider's and Elias's resistance to Lanzmann's directives in their interviews.

prisoner) told her Mengele's plans for both of them to die. If she injects the baby with a needle full of morphine, she argues, at least Ruth can live (Clip 6). Elias says she asked: "how can I be the murderer of my child?" The doctor replied "You are young," she says, "and I must save you. Look at your child, how it looks." (Clip 6) Elias says she was persuaded and gave the child the injection. She cried as she recalled that it took the child one or two hours to die. Infanticide functioned as resistance to the Final Solution because the survival of the mother meant that there would be children in the future.^{xxviii}

When Mengele came back, he asked: "Where is the child?" "It died," says Elias. Corpses were generally collected at the camp and placed in "heaps" in the middle of the camp. They took the child's corpse away early that morning and added it to the pile. "I want to see the corpse," she says Mengele ordered, but he was unable to find the tiny body in the heap. Beyond the horror of infanticide, a documented form of resistance, she also shows resistance by moving the child's body to prevent its use by Mengele. She had stopped Mengele's plan to record research from her dead baby's body, but she says, "I was broken. I didn't care to stay or go." She is sent on the next transport to a Leipzig work camp, where she survived the war working together with groups of women to share food and aid each other's survival. Both strands of these narratives defy the "universal" narrative as gender neutral by showing gender specific torture. Elias defied the Nazi's plans and, the camp doctor "saved her life," showing the courageous ability of women to make difficult life/death decisions (even infanticide), as well as the cooperative work that she engaged in with other women later in the work camp, which demonstrates the resilience of women surviving with strength and solidarity. This powerful *kairotic* moment is a force in time—a past that breaks into the present—and opens an aperture for audiences to participate in that digital archive space to see survivor experiences more fully. Elias's experience in the outtake is not "othered" into an edited narrative that upholds a binary of male/female or rational/emotional. She embodies both.

The testimony of Ruth Elias is an example of how audiences can reorient their perspective on the Holocaust survivor with affect—they create a relationship to the past by confronting the gender self-presentation of Elias. She speaks and the story is her own, full of details about how she resisted but also how she felt broken. This is the real experience of a survivor. Audiences see her vacillate between emotional and unemotional retellings in this video outtake as she describes heretofore hidden truths about the gendered nature of torture.

The gruesome details in all of these interviews with women confront audiences with the baseness of brutality and murder—a complex message Lanzmann sought for his film—yet neither this part of Elias's interview, nor any of the others, ever made it into the film. This interview could have disrupted the construction of torture as "genderless," because as later research showed, Nazi policies and torture targeted females and pregnancy in very specific ways.^{xxix} It would have also

^{xxviii} Sanyal (2020, p. 323) notes this and the research of Bennett (1999) and Goldenberg (2013).

^{xxix} See for instance, Gisela Bock (1983): "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State" which came out two years before *Shoah*, and the USHMM's extensively researched traveling exhibition: "Deadly Medicine: Creating the Master Race," (Bachrach 2004), and Hedgepeth (2010).

disturbed the stereotypical, gendered narrative where males “actively” resist and females “passively” do not.

Lanzmann’s *Shoah* shows how gender is neutralized to serve a “universal” public memory narrative, and a director’s masculinized aesthetic. His interviews in *Shoah* do not represent a spectrum of gender. The woman who testifies has less value for Lanzmann, but with the outtakes, audiences can now *choose* to see women like Elias and hear her voice for themselves. They can reorient themselves to her “whole story” and turn toward her story in its depth. The unique experiences of the strong women noted here, now accessible to anyone with the Internet through these outtakes in the USHMM archive, contribute to the concept of the performative *kairotic* moment, the force in time that opens and extends gender into public memory in the present. Audiences are given the opportunity to see how constructions of gender in public memory so obviously privileges male agency while rendering women silent. Knowing more can reorient audiences to the *sticky affect* of whole experiences, not the manufactured effect of selective editing.

Re-seeing Men’s Testimony

Lanzmann’s selective editing for the interviews he includes in *Shoah* also shows a lack of attention to a gender spectrum for men as well. I will look only at Filip Mueller, a survivor of the Auschwitz^{xxx} death camp, who has a long and detailed story to tell.^{xxxi} In the interview, Lanzmann directed the camera’s focus on a close-up of Mueller’s face as he speaks in great detail about the gruesome experience of being a *Sonderkommando*.^{xxxii} The telling is difficult, and the unrelenting close-up on Mueller’s face makes the listening especially difficult for audiences. As Mueller pauses at times to “collect” himself and control his emotional reactions to describing the burning of bodies and other atrocities, the audience is directed to wait with him and to feel uncomfortable as they watch him from a distance. The close-up does not bring audiences closer; the discomfort of his retelling casts Mueller as an “other” for audiences by disorienting them. There is no opening into which audiences can re-orient to Mueller by connecting to him, by seeing him as a survivor with agency over his story. Lanzmann exerts too much control. Mueller is only portrayed as a broken man, attempting to wrestle with his experiences, which places him into the same category as the child and woman made to sing. He is allowed no agency in this portion of the interview in the film.

^{xxx} The publication of this article allows me to correct an inadvertent typographical error from my 2019 text that wrongly printed “Sobibor” instead of “Auschwitz.”

^{xxxi} “Filip Müller and his moving 1979 report *Sonderbehandlung: Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz* (Special Treatment: Three Years in the Crematoria and Gas Chambers of Auschwitz, published in the United States as *Eyewitness Auschwitz*) have shaped generations of Auschwitz researchers” and it was “marketed as a ‘unique document’ and ‘the testimony of the only man who saw the Jewish people die and survived to report on it’” (Kilian and Lande 2015, p. 348, 350).

^{xxxii} *Sonderkommandos* were assigned to burn the bodies that had been gassed. These were usually strong men, who were then killed after a few months to destroy the possibility of testimonial evidence of what they had seen. Mueller is one of the only a few survivors who served in this role and lived to tell about it.

In the outtakes, contrastingly, the audience hears more of Mueller's story without these staged moments of difficulty at the center. They are allowed to step away from the unrelenting gaze of the camera on Mueller's face and see him with Lanzmann sitting on a couch, experiencing the storytelling together, or stopping for a cut in the filming. They see Mueller as both emotional and rational, not one or the other. They are allowed to see Mueller recalling that although he had very little power to change the imminent deaths of victims, he did have the power to tell their stories to the world as they wished them to be told.

For example, Mueller relates in his last scene in the *Shoah* film that a transport came in from Czechoslovakia, his home country. It was late in the war, and the people arriving knew where they were, unlike those on earlier transports. Mueller states that in order to get them to file toward the gas chamber, in this case, the "violence used" by the SS "was extraordinary" (Disc Four, Second Era: Part II). They asked the victims to undress at the gas chamber, but only about one third complied, while the rest refused. They had to be beaten again and again to undress. As they were beaten, they began to sing the Czech national anthem, recalls Mueller, and then the Haktiva. "That moved me terribly," he says and then breaks down crying.

At this point, he says to Lanzmann, "Please stop," but Lanzmann continues to film, not giving him a choice. Mueller continues: "That was happening to my countrymen and I realized my life was meaningless. Why go on living? For what? So, I went into the gas chamber with them. I resolved to die with them." A group of women came up to him and said, "So, you want to die? It's senseless. Your death won't give us back our lives. You must get out alive. You must bear witness to our suffering and to the injustice done to us" (Disc Four, Second Era: Part II). Up to this point, Mueller had felt not only helplessness, but also despair at finding any meaning in these deaths. The women give him back that meaning and purpose. They make their own death meaningful because he will bear witness to their suffering. Lanzmann finally begins to provide an opening for audiences to connect with Mueller in his human desire for hope.

The outtakes with Mueller, however, show the details that Lanzmann will not: the women Mueller refers to are not nameless (Box 3207, Clip 4). Mueller knows the woman to whom he speaks; he calls her Jana in the outtakes. He knows her betrothed; she gives him a necklace to give to that man. These are details about what was said between humans just before death. It recovers the humanity and the connections of the people who were dehumanized, and allows audiences to be affected by that connection and feel closer to the past. It gives a name to a woman burned to ashes and shows her courage; she was already thinking beyond her own experience about the historical record and her people in the broadest of ways. The outtake clip also gives audiences a chance to see Mueller decide what to share and when. It was important for him to remember this woman and this encounter. After this event, he says: "*Es war genug. Ich war voll*" (It was enough. I was done.) (Clip 4).

The subjects of *Shoah* are unable to become active agents in the creation of public memory, or to share their unedited story with audiences, which as Blair, Dickinson, and Ott argue, "construct[ing] senses of communal belonging" (2010, p.6). Lanzmann takes away that sense of belonging and connection because the agency in this film resides mostly with the director. With the opening of the USHMM archives with newly acquired outtakes from the film, however, audiences can access the testimony footage left out of the film and begin to collaboratively build

a different patchwork of memory around the events detailed in *Shoah*, especially concerning gender and agency. The representations of survivors, who show a spectrum of gendered behavior, build a fuller picture of survivors from the past into the present. These *kairotic* moments create space for a negotiation of intergenerational meaning-making. For new generations, who perform memory within new parameters of what memory and meaning-making can *do*, these are new paths that connect their present to the past. The aperture is opened. A dialogic can begin. This is the power of performative memorialization.

What Ruth Elias says to a 2024 audience about reproductive “choice” will resonate in different ways than it did in previous decades, especially in America where that choice was taken away in 2022. It will be interesting to see how audiences engage with Elias in another decade. In the scenes with Mueller, the gender expectations for masculinity are subverted when men break down; Lanzmann staged many of these crying scenes with men to stand alone without the complexity of a range of emotions; perhaps he was striving for the maximum emotional disturbance for audiences rooted in the gender binary that asserts that men do not cry?

In the outtakes, like the women, men (as we saw with Mueller), embrace the spectrum of gender that includes strength, vulnerability, agency, and emotion. What Lanzmann could not predict is that audiences in the twenty-first century might find gender complexity inspiring. They might prefer to see the outtakes of the interviews more than the film itself because they can reorient themselves to connect with the complete testimonies of these people who speak to us in the present. With access to videos like Elias’s and Mueller’s perhaps that third or fourth generation of audiences will walk away with new conceptions of gender representations or gendered resistance (especially unarmed) and what it means to be a woman or a man in crisis.

The ability to engage with the testimonies from *Shoah*, without the heavy-handed mediation of Lanzmann, opens up the possibility of building a collaborative archive of memory that is interactive—it shifts audiences’ orientation to the past and connects them through the performance of a dialogue. When audiences watch Ruth Elias talk about her experiences and then talk back to Lanzmann, audiences see an active memory dialogic with which they can also engage. They can play Elias’s testimony in order or play each clip at will. They can search the USHMM archive to find other materials related to Elias and her experiences, other testimonies, maps of sites, biographies of people like Mengele. The site itself promotes cross-referencing that performs memory. The audience listens to Elias unedited. They can acknowledge that her interview is still guided by certain questions, as most Holocaust testimonies are, but the audience also has the option of seeking more information through links on the Elias page or with references cited at the bottom of the page.

Conclusion

But *will* audiences become active participants? This is perhaps *the* question that persists for Holocaust memory scholars of the 21st century. What compels audiences, and how and why? Audiences tend to become numb to trauma as civil wars rage worldwide and mass shootings and terrorist bombings increase. How does any artifact or site compel active remembrance? How do they produce relationships based on affect when we are so prone to numbness? The level of a

memorial object's potential "interactivity" cannot define this. As Haskins suggests (2007, p.406), the digital era encourages more access but: "one cannot ignore that today's memorializing occurs in a climate of rapid obsolescence and the disappearance of historical consciousness." Framed in this way, the acquisition of knowledge—especially digital knowledge— has a passive quality.

Audiences can absorb the knowledge and not engage in a dialogic. They could just reflect on themselves in an eternal present, outside of any culturally or historically contextualized past or present. As audiences grow increasingly distant in time from the Holocaust, the way that public memory is transmitted depends on the positionality and experience of public memory itself, and its historical contextualization, as well as the audience for that memorial act. One mechanism that stimulates participation in the construction of Holocaust public memory is the fact that artifacts of memorialization *do not* exist in a temporal void of the eternal present. They are linked, sometimes intimately, often intergenerationally, to those artifacts or stories that have come before, and may come after. The "linked-ness" forms a relationship that defies temporality. *Shoah* depended on the testimony work that David Boder performed in the 1940s.^{xxxiii} It depended on the trust of the survivors Lanzmann interviewed. Its further relevance as a memorial act depends on audiences who watch the outtakes to understand the truly gendered nature of that public remembrance tomorrow and in a decade. Hawhee's *kairotic* force opens a space that audiences can step into reorientation—a turning toward and connecting to a full spectrum of gendered experiences of the Holocaust. They can listen and respond, and are asked to consider stories and the ways they link with their own. This is bearing witness—listening to testimony as a powerful speech act—creates action. As witnesses, this listening means that we bear that knowledge; we carry it and, in the best case, share it.

Perhaps the master Director Lanzmann himself might have the last word on what might be possible in the future in a posthumous statement about the importance of complex gender representations. Although he returned many times to the outtakes of *Shoah* himself to make related and shorter documentaries, one stands out in this analysis. *Les quatre soeurs (Shoah: Four Sisters)*. Before his death in 2018, Lanzmann released this documentary that focuses only on the voices of women. He took the interviews with Elias, Biren, and Lichtman, as well as Hanna Marton, and extended these into a four-hour documentary about the experiences of women in the Holocaust. Perhaps it will be this film that prods audiences to seek their own viewing of outtakes at the USHMM. Perhaps they will only see it on YouTube. Will it remain simply *chronos*, a point on a timeline, or will it become *kairos*, that force that can open dialogic witness? In either case, the new memory artifacts seek to open spaces that performatively bridge the "betweens" of past and present to connect people to the traumatic experiences of others.

Audiences play an important role in performative memorialization of the outtakes of *Shoah* in the USHMM archives. By engaging with the full stories, unedited, they help build a fuller picture of survival. The outtakes at the USHMM, though originally "authored" by Lanzmann, take on a life of

^{xxxiii} Historical Commissions in Poland and the Soviet Union convened even before the war was over. Testimony from survivors was invited by Eisenhower and recorded as early as 1946 by people like psychologist David Boder. (Colotla and Jurado 2014). Lanzmann would not have had access to all of Boder's tapes, but it was well known that Boder had done these postwar interviews and that other such interviews existed.

their own when audiences are able to choose in the present what to look at and when. The outtakes overpower Lanzmann's work by de-gendering the film's masculine gaze.^{xxxiv} Audiences can shift their gaze, lessening the limited gender representations of the subjects. The modern, intergenerational experience is more fluid around these issues. This is the audience that is now engaging with Holocaust memory; thus, for this history and these memories to remain relevant in the present, it is important to understand how that memory work might be best performed to create action and response.

Performative memorialization for audiences now is not only necessary but also essential to the deconstruction of an exclusive, dominant narrative in public memory and the Holocaust. The consequences of not performing memory, of resisting a shift in our orientations toward others, are not only continued Holocaust denial,^{xxxv} but also deeper racial and ethnic strife and far right nationalism that scapegoats immigrants and other groups as "others." It becomes a never-ending battle of us versus them, much like the ways we once understood gender and are tending toward understanding gender now—as an unresolvable, combative binary. The Holocaust was a broad, gendered experience that exists, as traumatic experiences do, on a spectrum. Audiences are well served by confronting the complexity of memory, not by reducing it to a simplistic gender binary. Access to archives, like the outtakes of *Shoah*, opens the public memory space to a spectrum of representations of gender to make it possible for audiences to perform memory with newly contextualized knowledge. We don't have to rely on universal memory narratives that only tell part of the whole story. We can turn toward the opening of *kairos* and the movement of orientations to embrace the gendered complexity of experience. Listening and bearing witness, create spaces where we can *affectively* connect.

Works Cited

- Ahmed, Sara. (2015). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Ash, Timothy Garton. (2007). "The Life of Death" *Shoah*-A Film by Claude Lanzmann." *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. Edited by Stuart Liebman. Oxford UP, 135-148.
- Austin, John Langshaw (J.L.). (1975). *How to Do Things with Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Bachrach, Susan. Project Director. Kuntz, Dieter, Ed. (2004). *Deadly Medicine: Creating the Master Race*. Washington DC: United States Holocaust Museum.
- Baer, Alejandro and Natan Sznajder. (2017). *Memory and Forgetting in the Post-Holocaust Era: The Ethics of never again*. London: Routledge.

^{xxxiv} See Mulvey (1975) for the first iteration of this concept.

^{xxxv} Historical denial and ideological politics are the elements that lead to the recurring rise of both Neo-Nazism and its primary ideology: antisemitism (Goldberg 2015, Sherwood 2017). Denial of the Holocaust has persisted for decades. See Deborah Lipstadt's (1994) *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. Holocaust denial has been soaring in online spaces (Doward 2017) and antisemitic and anti-muslim speech has increased since the Hamas attack and Gaza War. (Frenkel and Lee 2023).

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1991). "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. U of Texas P, 259-434.
- (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee, U of Texas P.
- Bennett, Rab (1999). *Under the Shadow of the Swastika: The Moral Dilemmas of Resistance and Collaboration in Hitler's Europe*. Macmillan, 88-90.
- Bernard-Donals, Michael. (2009). *Forgetful Memory: Representation and Remembrance in the Wake of the Holocaust*. State U of New York P.
- Blair, Carole, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott. (2010). "Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place." *The Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Edited by Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, Brian L. Ott. University of Alabama Press, 1-54.
- Blom, Ina (2016). "Introduction." *Rethinking Social Memory: Archives, Technology, and the Social*. Amsterdam UP, 11-38.
- Bock, Gisela. 1983. "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State." *Signs* vol. 8 no. 3 (Spring): 400-421. *Jstor*.
- Butler, Judith (1990): *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- (1997) "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Writing the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory*. Edited by Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury. Columbia UP, 401-418.
- (2009) "Performativity, Precarity, and Sexual Politics." Lecture given at Universidad Complutense de Madrid. AIBR. Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana. Volumen 4, Número 3. Septiembre-Diciembre 2009. Pp. i-xiii Madrid: Antropólogos Iberoamericanos en Red. Web. Accessed 02 January 2016. < www.aibr.org >
- Chevrie, Marc and Herve Le Roux. (2007). "Site and Speech: An Interview with Claude Lanzmann about Shoah." *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. Edited by Stuart Liebman. Oxford UP, 37-50.
- Cole, Robert and Chris Hackett (2010). "Search vs. Research: Full-Text Repositories, Granularity, and the Concept of 'Source' in the Digital Environment." Eds. Holmlund, Mona and Cheryl Avery. *Better Off Forgetting? Essays on Archives, Public Policy and Collective Memory*. University of Toronto Press, 2010. *Project MUSE* muse.jhu.edu/book/105603. 111-123.
- Colotla, Victor A. and Samuel Jurado, (2014). Ph.D. "Silenced Voices." *American Psychological Association* <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2014/12/silenced-voices.aspx>. 45(11).
- Costello, Lisa A. (2019). *American Cultural Memory and the Holocaust: Performing Gender, Shifting Orientations*. Lexington Books, an imprint of Rowman and Littlefield.
- (2006) "History and Memory in a Dialogic of 'Performative Memorialization' in Art Spiegelman's *Maus: A Survivor's Tale*." *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association (JMMLA)* 39(2), 22-42.
- (2011 Winter). "Performative Auto/biography in Ruth Klüger's *Still Alive: A Holocaust Girlhood Remembered*." *a/b: Auto/Biography Studies* 26(2). 238-264.

- (2013 December). "Performative Memory: Form and Content in The Jewish Museum Berlin." *Liminalities* 9(4). <http://liminalities.net/9-4/index.html>
- Davis, Colin. (2022 June). "Recounting and Forgetting: The Epistemological and Ethical Limits of Narrative" *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, 20.2, pp. 321-336. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pan.2022.0018>
- De Certeau, Michel. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Steve Translated by Rendall. Berkeley: U of California P.
- Doward, Jamie. "New Online Generation Takes Up Holocaust Denial." *The Guardian*. www.theguardian.com. 21 January 2017. Web. Accessed 17 March 2017.
- Eichengreen, Lucille. (2011). *Haunted Memories: Portraits of Women in the Holocaust*. Publishing Works.
- Enoch, Jessica. (2013). "Releasing Hold: Feminist Historiography without Tradition." *Theorizing Histories of Rhetoric*. Edited by Michelle Ballif. Southern Illinois UP, 58-73.
- Ephgrave, Nicole. (2016, summer). "On Women's Bodies: Experiences of Dehumanization during the Holocaust." *Journal of Women's History* 28(2), 12-32.
- Felman, Shoshana, and Dori Laub. (1992). *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. Routledge.
- Firfej, Agata. (2022). "Who's Afraid of Walter Benjamin? Dealing with the Problem of 'Universalization' of Shoah Narration in Czech Literature." In *The Afterlife of the Shoah in Central and Eastern European Cultures: Concepts, Problems, and the Aesthetics of Post Catastrophic Narration*. Eds. Anna Artwinska and Anja Tippner. New York: Routledge. 249-264.
- Frenkel, Sheera and Steven Lee. (2023, November 25). "Antisemitic and Anti-Muslin Hate Speech Surges across the Internet." *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/15/technology/hate-speech-israel-gaza-internet.html>
- Fuchs, Esther. (1999). *Women in Jewish Life and Culture*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Glowacka, Dorota. "Traduttore and traditore: Claude Lanzmann's Polish Translations." In *The Construction of Testimony: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah and Its Outtakes*. Eds Erin McGlothlin, Brad Prager, and Markus Zisselberger. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2020, 141-174.
- Goldberg, Jeffrey. "Is It Time for the Jews to Leave Europe?" *The Atlantic*. April 2015.
- Goldenberg, Myrna and Amy Shapiro Eds. (2013). *Different Horrors, Same Hell: Gender and the Holocaust*. U of Washington P.
- Goldenberg, Myrna. (2013). "Sex-Based Violence and the Politics and Ethics of Survival." *Different Horrors, Same Hell: Gender and the Holocaust*, 99-127.
- Haskins, Ekaterina. (2007). "Between Archive and Participation: Public Memory in the Digital Age." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 37, 401-422.
- Hawhee, Debra. (2004). *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*. U of Texas P.
- Hedgepeth, Sonja Maria, and Rochelle G. Saidel, Editors. (2010). "Introduction." *Sexual Violence Against Jewish Women During the Holocaust*. Brandeis University Press, 2010. 1-10.
- Hirsch, Marianne. (1997). *Family Frames: Photographs, Narrative, and Postmemory*. Harvard UP.

- (2012). *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Hirsch, Marianne and Leo Spitzer. (2007). "Gendered Translations: Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*." *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. Edited by Stuart Liebman. Oxford UP, 175-190.
- Kaufman, D. R. (1996). The Holocaust and sociological inquiry: A feminist analysis. *Contemporary Jewry*, 17, 6-17.
- Kilian, Andreas and Peter Lande. (2015 fall). "Obituary: In Memoriam: Filip Müller." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 29(2), 348-350.
- Koch, Gertrud. (2007). "The Aesthetic Transformation of the Image of the Unimaginable: Notes on Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*." *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. Edited by Stuart Liebman. Oxford UP, 125-134.
- Langer, Lawrence L. (1991). *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory*. Yale UP.
- Lanzmann, Claude. (2007). "From the Holocaust to 'Holocaust'." *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. Edited by Stuart Liebman. Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 27-36.
- (1999). Dir. *A Visitor From the Living*.
- (2018). Dir. *Four Sisters*.
- (1985). Dir. *Shoah*.
- (2001). Dir. *Sobibór, October 14, 1943, 4 p.m.*
- (2010). Dir. *The Karski Report*.
- (2013). Dir. *The Last of the Unjust*.
- Liebman, Stuart. "Introduction. (2007). " *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. Edited by Stuart Liebman. Oxford UP, 3-26.
- Linden, Ruth R. (1993). *Making Stories, Making Selves: Feminist Reflections on the Holocaust*. Ohio State UP.
- Lipstadt, Deborah (1994). *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. Plume.
- Love, Meredith. (2018 March). "Call for Papers." *Conference on College Composition and Communication*.
- (2007). "Composing through the Performative Screen: Translating Performance Studies into Writing Pedagogy." *Composition Studies* 35.2 (fall): 11-30.
- Magilow, David H. (2019 fall): Claude Lanzmann. "Obituary." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 33(2), 325-328. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/744410>
- McGlothlin, Erin and Brad Prager (2020). "Introduction: Inventing According to the Truth: The Long Arc of Lanzmann's *Shoah*." In *The Construction of Testimony: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah and Its Outtakes*. Eds Erin McGlothlin, Brad Prager, and Markus Zisselberger. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1-32.
- Mulvey, Laura. (1975 Autumn). "Visual Pleasure and the Narrative Cinema. *Screen* 16(3), 6-18.
- Patraka, Vivian. (1999). *Spectacular Suffering: Theatre, Fascism, and the Holocaust*. Indiana UP.
- Phelan, Peggy. (1998). "Introduction." *The Ends of Performance*. Edited by Peggy Phelan and Jill Lane. New York UP, 1-19.

- Phillips, Kendall. (2004). "Introduction." *Framing Public Memory*. Edited by Kendall Phillips. U of Alabama P.
- Pollin-Gay, Hannah. (2018). *Ecologies of Witnessing: Language, Place, and Holocaust Testimony*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.
- Pollock, Della. (1998). "Performing Writing." *The Ends of Performance*. Edited by Peggy Phelan and Jill Lane. New York UP, 73-103.
- Popescu, Diana and Schult, T. (2020) "Performative Holocaust Commemoration in the 21st Century." *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 26(2), 135-151.
- RG-60-5001. Oral History with Paula Biren. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5003. Oral History with Ruth Elias. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5012. Oral History with Filip Mueller. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5015. Oral History with Gertrude Schneider. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5023. Oral History with Ada Lichtman. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5024. Oral History with Simon Srebnik. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5044. Oral History with Inge Deutschkron. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- RG-60-5068. Oral History with Malka Goldberg. *The Claude Lanzmann SHOAH Collection of Outtakes*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC.
- Rosenfeld, Alvin H. (2013). *The End of the Holocaust*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Sanyal, Debarati. (2020). "The Gender of Testimony: Ruth Elias and the Challenge to Lanzmann's Paradigm of Witnessing." In *The Construction of Testimony: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah and Its Outtakes*. Eds Erin McGlothlin, Brad Prager, and Markus Zisselberger. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 303-334.
- Sherwood, Harriet. (2017, February 1). "Reports of Antisemitic Incidents Increase to Record Levels in the UK." *The Guardian*. www.theguardian.com. Web. Accessed 26 July 2017.
- Skloot, Robert (2012 fall): "Lanzmann's Shoah after Twenty-Five Years: An Overview and a Further View" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 26.2, pp. 261-275. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/484744>
- Smith, Clint. (2022 December). "Monuments to the Unthinkable.(How Germany Remembers the Holocaust and What America Can Learn about Atonement)" *The Atlantic*. 22-41.
- Stier, Oren Baruch. (2005). "Different Trains: Holocaust Artifacts and the Ideologies of Remembrance." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 19(1), 81-106.
- (2015) *Holocaust Icons: Symbolizing the Shoah in History and Memory*. New Brunswick, Rutgers UP.
- Tec, Nechama. (1987). *When Light Pierced the Darkness: Christian Rescue of Jews in Nazi-Occupied Poland*. Oxford UP.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *How to Cite Museum Materials*. How to Cite Museum Materials. <https://www.ushmm.org/collections/ask-a-research-question/how-to-cite-museum-materials> Accessed 20 July 2024.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *Terms of Use*. Terms of Use. <https://www.ushmm.org/copyright-and-legal-information/terms-of-use>. Accessed 20, July 2024.

Vivian, Bradford. (2012). "The Paradox of Regret: Remembering and Forgetting the History of Slavery in GeorgeW. Bush's Goree Island Address." *History and Memory* 24(1), 5-38.

Wolfson, Leah. (2020) "They were killing us and we were singing" The Role of Song in Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah* Outtakes." In *The Construction of Testimony: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah and Its Outtakes*. Eds Erin McGlothlin, Brad Prager, and Markus Zisselberger. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 369-390.

Zelizer, Barbie, Editor. (2001). " *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*. Rutgers University Press.

— (2004) "The Voice and the Visual in Memory." in *Framing Public Memory*. Ed. Kendall Phillips. U of Alabama P, 157-186.

Zisslberger, Markus. (2020). "Challenging *Shoah's* Paradigms of Witnessing and Survival: From Filip Mueller to Ruth Elias." In *The Construction of Testimony: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah and Its Outtakes*. Eds Erin McGlothlin, Brad Prager, and Markus Zisselberger. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 335-368.