ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation:	GENOCIDE RHETORICS IN US POPULAR CULTURE: ANXIETY, AGENCY, AND AUTHORITY
	Theresa A. Donofrio, Doctor of Philosophy, 2013
Dissertation directed by:	Dr. Shawn J. Parry-Giles
	Department of Communication

Genocide is a notoriously difficult problem to define, represent, resolve, and remember. Popular cultural texts addressing genocide often showcase considerable inconsistency in their attempts to engage each of these four arenas. In part, the textual vacillations contained within such popular cultural treatments of genocide reflect extent tensions in scholarly discussions of atrocity. Both popular and scholarly discourses on genocide demonstrate a substantive ambivalence over the relationships among state authority, public agency, and genocidal violence.

Genocide Rhetorics in US Popular Culture departs from existing work on atrocity concerned with the unstable relationships among state power, public power, and violence. Instead, this study centers on the competing ways popular cultural texts constitute state authority and public agency within their attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide. Because these texts commonly contain contradictory messages about

each of these four topics, this study also looks at how these texts manage the palpable anxiety that arises from such textual incongruences. In the process, it spotlights genocidal discourse contained in two museums (the Los Angeles-based Museum of Tolerance and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C.) and one documentary (Daniel Goldhagen's *Worse Than War*), and is informed by the literature in rhetoric, critical/cultural studies, media studies, memory studies, as well as Holocaust and genocide studies.

These texts distinctively manage the anxiety created by inconsistent assessments of state authority and public agency, working to sublimate, exacerbate, or recognize these tensions. Ultimately, the texts converge in validating state power on matters of genocide. Despite paying lip service to popular power, all three of the cases centralize the nation-state or empowered political actors as critical to genocide intervention or prevention. In spite of such shortcomings, this study concludes that the anxiety residing within these texts is productive in so far as it imparts messages about audience accountability and prompts critical reflection on issues of state power, public agency, and genocidal violence.

GENOCIDE RHETORICS IN US POPULAR CULTURE: ANXIETY, AGENCY, AND
AUTHORITY

by

Theresa A. Donofrio

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2013

Advisory Committee:

      Professor Shawn J. Parry-Giles, Chair
      Professor Linda Aldoory
      Professor Kristy Maddux
      Professor Trevor Parry-Giles
      Professor Linda Steiner

For Ross

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the Department of Communication, I am honored to have had the chance to work alongside such gifted scholars and wonderful people as Tim Barney, Lindsey Fox, Elizabeth Gardner, Ben Krueger, Tiffany Lewis, Sean Luechtefeld, Yoav Magid, Jade Olson, and Alyssa Samek. Special thanks go out to Elizabeth, Jade, and Thomas McCloskey for their willingness to read long parts of this dissertation and provide feedback. Countless others have listened to me talk through parts of this project and for their time, energy, and advice I am grateful.

Of course, I owe many thanks to the faculty in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland and to my dissertation committee. Linda Aldoory, Kristy Maddux, Trevor Parry-Giles, and Linda Steiner generously gave their time to reading and reviewing my work. These scholars have sharpened my critical sensibilities and have been invaluable mentors. Additionally, I consider it a gift to have had the opportunity to study under brilliant scholars such as Mari Boor Tonn, James Klumpp, and Robert Gaines. The many lessons I have learned from these individuals fed my curiosity and provided a strong foundation for the next stages of my academic career.

Special thanks are reserved for my advisor, Shawn J. Parry-Giles. I am a better writer, scholar, and researcher because of her tutelage. She has given countless hours to reading multiple drafts of this project, talking through obstacles in argument development, and providing encouragement during times of doubt. Her faith in her advisees' potential and commitment to their intellectual development inspires me to become a better educator. The best way I can conceive of saying "thank you" is to pay it all forward as I continue my teaching and research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION:
The Rhetoricity of Genocide

Popular culture and academic texts on genocide often begin with a story of rhetorical invention. This story foregrounds Raphael Lemkin, the Polish jurist credited with coining the word, "genocide."[1] As Power recounts the story, Lemkin, a student of languages, had long been interested in the history of mass slaughter. Upon hearing of the Armenian genocide and questioning the legality of that atrocity, Lemkin learned there was no international law condemning genocide. He was skeptical of a logic that criminalized piracy as an international crime but left no legal scaffolding for the international community to justify intervention when a nation was eliminating its own people. Dissatisfied with this lacuna amid the rise of Nazi power in the 1930s and 1940s, Lemkin combined the Greek word for race (*genos*) with the Latin word for killing (*cide*) to create the term "genocide." After World War II, he exerted considerable effort into ensuring the term was used during the Nuremberg Trials. Disappointed with the results, Lemkin then turned his attention to the United Nations, beginning an intensive lobbying campaign to criminalize genocide through international law.[2] The end product of this labor was the creation of the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, a legal and political touchstone for scholars and advocates invested in genocide prevention and intervention.

Lemkin's academic work, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, provided a figurative cornerstone for a new body of scholarship: Holocaust and genocide studies. Despite the publication of Lemkin's landmark text in the 1940s, only scattered scholarly works of note appeared between the 1950s and the start of the 1980s.[3] Gellately and Kiernan argue

that contextual forces in the 1960s and 1970s, such as the occurrence of atrocities in

Indonesia, East Timor, and Cambodia, helped stimulate additional interest in genocide as

did the opening of the Soviet archives toward the end of the century.[4] According to

Chalk and Jonassohn, "the shocks of the twentieth century" ushered in a rise of a culture

concerned with the victims of violence, providing a context conducive to the study of

genocide.[5] The field expanded during the 1980s with the publication of several seminal

texts and the formation of "the first International Conference on the Intervention and

Prevention of Genocide."[6] One decade into the twenty-first century, Holocaust and

genocide studies constitute a flourishing area of research, spawning countless books,

journals (e.g., *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, *Journal of Genocide Research*), and

numerous institutes or programs (e.g., Yale University's Genocide Studies Program,

Clark University's Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies, University of

Minnesota's Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies).

This robust and interdisciplinary body of scholarship on genocide exists in

marked contrast with Lemkin's struggles to publicize the term just seven decades earlier.[7]

Contemporary work in Holocaust and genocide studies incorporates a wide range of

disciplines including psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, history,

legal studies, literary studies, art studies, film and media studies, and philosophy.[8] Studies

range in focus from predictive social science studies examining the societal attributes that

may contribute to genocide to literary analyses of Holocaust testimony and artwork.[9]

Given the field's interdisciplinarity, genocide studies depart from a variety of theoretical

vantage points. Such works also commonly contain divergent epistemological

assumptions about critical terms involving truth, reality, identity, and most importantly

for this study, authority, agency, and violence.[10] The fault lines produced by these competing conceptualizations constitute one of the many sources of the tensions at the heart of this project.

This project extends existing conversations in Holocaust and genocide studies by offering a critical analysis of contemporary popular culture texts that address genocide cessation.[11] These texts, at least in part, discuss the need for intervention into existing genocides and/or the prevention of future genocides. In grappling with genocide cessation, these mass-mediated texts place differing emphases on the role of the state and the public in helping to bring an end to genocide. Within such popular culture depictions, the definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances of genocide that are woven into arguments about cessation offer insight into the perceived relationships between state and public authority. Textual attempts to articulate this relationship are fraught with anxieties which intimate larger questions about the links between US political life and genocidal violence—past, present, and future.

In what follows, I trace popular cultural interest in genocide and highlight the political stakes underlying the mass mediation of genocide. Heated debates over the relationship between the Holocaust and other genocides showcase the extent to which genocide discourses reflect substantive contestations associated with issues of identity, political recognition, and power.[12] Moreover, these discourses have the potential to expose discomforting narratives regarding moral ambiguity and the nation-state's connections to political violence. This introduction is designed to detail the critical foundation for the ensuing study—the ideological dimensions of genocide texts produced for popular audiences.

Popular Cultural Interest in Genocide

This study begins with the assumption that popular culture discourse influences how historical violence is understood and remembered. O'Neill and Hinton maintain, for example, that "[t]he politics and poetics of writing about genocide . . . produce situated knowledges that force us to ask how the act of representing genocide may make genocide itself into the cultural category we have come to know."[13] Simultaneously, these narratives shape the contours of genocide memory. Despite the abundance of popular culture texts engaging the topic of genocide in the early twentieth-first century, genocide has not always been a subject of popular interest. As fluctuations in public engagement with the Holocaust suggest, Holocaust and genocide representations and memories are imbricated in larger cultural politics. Following an increase in public interest in genocide toward the end of the twentieth and start of the twenty-first century, a surge in films, TV shows, and museum exhibitions has multiplied the stories told about genocide. These popular culture texts often borrow from and reflect other existing narratives about atrocity.[14] Collectively, these stories constitute the intertextual terrain upon which the meaning of the term "genocide" is produced.[15]

At the broadest levels, these mass-mediated texts compose the repository of narratives and images that constitute "genocide." Torchin refers to this repository as a "popular genocide imaginary" and argues that such discourses furnish the images and scripts used to make atrocities legible *as* genocide.[16] For instance, in her words, "pictures of bodies, boxcars, crematoria, and emaciated figures behind barbed wire have become iconic references points for charges of crimes against humanity and genocide."[17] These pictures not only "cue understanding," they also trigger "expectations of response."[18]

This collective repository consequently serves as an important rhetorical resource in the identification of genocide and the construction of claims related to genocide cessation.[19]

Mediated representations of atrocity provide one of the primary avenues through which the public builds that repository.[20] Torchin writes, "from early on, screen media have played a significant role in constructing the popular, political, and legal imaginary of genocide and human rights."[21] Corroborating such an assertion, Shandler alleges that mediated representations of atrocity may be all the more potent in the United States, a nation whose landscape is free from the physical scars of the Holocaust (and, by extension, other often-mediated European or African genocides).[22] From news accounts to fictionalized representations to art exhibitions and memorials, these texts play an important role in helping the public access and grapple with the multifaceted problem of genocide.[23] Despite the presence of witnesses such as Holocaust survivors, "the remembrance of the Shoah [and arguably other genocides]…has always been more dependent on mass-mediated forms of memory," argues Hansen.[24] Accordingly, these mediated representations of genocide have become a subject of considerable scholarly interest.[25]

Further, these mediated representations of genocide influence how violent historical events enter into public memory. Centralizing the role of media in the production of Holocaust knowledge and memories, Stier stresses: "media embody and transmit the material of the Holocaust – what matters – for the sake of memory. As such, the ways memory is made to matter intersect with the matter – the material – of memory."[26] Works operating from this perspective take the notion of mediation seriously in shaping the content of memory and the processing of mnemonic information.[27] As

Landsberg's work implies, the choices made in mediating genocide and the Holocaust have the potential to advance new ways of knowing and relating to the memories of these horrific events.[28]

Although US popular culture seems to be pervaded by mediations of the Holocaust and other genocides,[29] such an investment in atrocity remembrance has not been consistent. Zelizer, for example, presents the evolution of popular awareness and interest in the Holocaust (often held as the paradigmatic genocide) as progressing through three stages: initial memory (Holocaust – late 1940s), amnesia (late 1940s – late 1970s), and intense memory (late 1970s – present).[30] Although debate exists over the extent of public engagement with the Holocaust during the 1940s and 1950s,[31] common arguments about US public interest in the Holocaust in that period seem to support the conclusion that "the destruction of European Jewry was widely subsumed under the generic category of war casualties and crimes."[32] One interpretation of early Holocaust memory suggests that at the close of WWII, "The mushroom clouds over Hiroshima and Nagasaki appeared to many as ominous as the smoke rising from the crematoria of Auschwitz."[33] Furthermore, Mintz argues that Jewish communities had reasons for muting the event in the first few decades following the end of the war, including a strong desire to assimilate and avoid additional attention as special victims.[34] Public interest in the Holocaust, thus, does not emerge in a pronounced form until the 1960s and 1970s,[35] a time period marked by the popularization of mediated texts including the cinematic and theatrical productions of *The Diary of Ann Frank,* the NBC mini-series titled *Holocaust*, and the commencement of efforts to construct the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.[36]

The Holocaust assumed a central role in US public memory after the 1960s and 1970s with a high point of "Holocaust consciousness" in the 1990s; its successful popularization has enabled the Holocaust to serve as a touchstone for other atrocities seeking to garner public attention.[37] As the twentieth century drew to a close, Novick observes "the prominent role the Holocaust has come to play in both American Jewish and general American discourse."[38] The Holocaust has become such a common subject within popular culture texts, Mintz argues, that US youth in particular "cannot imagine a time in which the remembrance of the Holocaust was not a central American concern."[39]

During this time of "intensive memory work," [40] atrocity memories have diversified and circulated through numerous forms, including television shows, news programs, Web sites, films, DVDs, museums, and memorial displays. Beyond the Holocaust, other twentieth and twenty-first century genocides, including Armenia, Cambodia, Rwanda, Bosnia, and Darfur, have become the subjects of multiple interpretations. Although only a partial list, I nonetheless provide a brief introduction to the cultural narratives told about six genocides that are often the focus of filmmakers, television producers, curators, and authors who help popularize and explain genocidal violence. In highlighting these textual examples, I offer a glimpse into extant mediations of genocide memory.

Genocide Narratives in the US "Popular Genocide Imaginary"[41]

The Armenian Genocide. The Armenian genocide has been popularized and given a public presence through the rock band System of a Down. The band's attempts to raise awareness of the atrocity were featured in the 2006 film *Screamers*. Celebrities Julianna Margulies, Natalie Portman, and Orlando Bloom (among others) starred in a

controversial documentary on the Armenian genocide aired on PBS.[42] Plans are

purportedly in the works to give the Armenian genocide an increased public presence in

Washington, D.C. through the creation of the Armenian Genocide Museum of America,

to be located on the same street as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.[43]

In 2002, nearly ninety years after the events, the Armenian genocide was featured

in the award-winning film *Ararat*. *Ararat* presents an image of obliteration: first, the

mass slaughter of Turkey's Armenian population in 1915, and second, the obliteration of

genocide memory, portraying the controversy around Turkish responses to these events.

Ararat creatively works on two levels: It constructs a film within a film to impart some

information about the genocide, and it creates space to critique that film, emphasizing the

difficulty of mediating memory against the backdrop of amnesia and denial.[44] As

depicted in the film within the film, under the cover of World War I, Armenians were

rounded up and exiled from their homes and communities. Cities were turned into ruins,

and the Armenians were horrifically tortured. Women were raped and burned alive.

Ararat implies that Turks engaged in a particularly brutal practice of hammering

horseshoes to the feet of their victims. Starvation eliminated a number of others as they

marched through empty lands. All in all, over one million Armenians were killed. Worse

still, the events remain "disputed" by the Turkish community, some of whom continue to

argue that losses were suffered on both sides, and the massacre was more the byproduct

of the carnage of war rather than a genocide.[45]

The Holocaust. Books, such as *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust*

and *Holocaust and the Moving Image: Representations in Film and Television since*

1933,[46] attempt to make sense of the numerous ways this genocide has been depicted. It

has been the subject of celebrated films including *Schindler's List* (1993)*, Life is Beautiful* (1997)*, The Pianist* (2002), and *The Reader* (2008). Numerous memorials and museums exist to commemorate and educate about the Shoah, including, for example, the Florida Holocaust Museum, the Anne Frank Center USA, and the Holocaust and Intolerance Museum of New Mexico.[47] Additionally, graphic novels such as *Maus* and youth historical fiction books such as *Number the Stars* and *The Devil's Arithmetic* broaden the audiences exposed to this content.

A detailed picture of the Holocaust emerges from one of the preeminent US Holocaust "texts": the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. The narrative reflected in the permanent exhibition, as well as bolstered through special exhibitions like *Deadly Medicine* and the *Holocaust Encyclopedia* on the USHMM website, imparts a message akin to the following: With the rise of the Third Reich in Germany, in the aftermath of the devastation wrought by World War I, a stronger, renewed German state was promised through "needed" campaigns to rid the state of its undesirables, including Roma, Jehovah's Witnesses, homosexuals, the mentally or physically disabled, Poles, Communists, and Jews. Capitalizing on racial science (eugenics) and anti-Semitism, Jews and other victims targeted as enemies of the state were stripped of their businesses and property and were often relocated to "ghettos." Through an infrastructure of labor and concentration camps as well as Einsatzgruppen (mobile killing squads) and death marches, six millions Jews and millions of others were killed until the Allied victory at the close of World War II liberated the camps and marked the defeat of Nazi Germany.[48]

The Cambodian Genocide. The Cambodian genocide has been the subject of numerous documentaries, an award-winning feature film, and multiple US museums. The

Killing Fields Museum in Seattle and the Cambodian American Heritage Museum and Killing Fields Memorial in Chicago impart a version of the history of the Cambodian genocide. Similarly, MoMA featured an installation in 1997 of images of the Cambodian genocide's victims.[49] The genocide has been studied steadily throughout the close of the twentieth century and the start of the twenty-first, inspiring documentaries such as *Samsara: Death and Rebirth in Cambodia* (1990), *S21: The Khmer Rouge Killing Machine* (2003), *The Flute Player* (2003), and *Biography – Pol Pot: Secret Killer* (2006). Most notably, the Cambodian genocide was the subject of 1984 Oscar-winning feature film, *The Killing Fields*.

In *The Killing Fields*, audiences observe Cambodia's decimation at the hands of the Khmer Rouge through the eyes of Cambodian journalist Dith Pran. Following the Khmer Rouge's conquest of Phnom Penh, conditions in Cambodia quickly deteriorated. U.S. and other Western officials left the country after observing only a fraction of the Khmer Rouge's barbarity. *The Killing Fields* portrays a country reverting to "year zero," a time of no memories and no affection. Year Zero was marked by grueling physical (largely agrarian) labor. The bourgeoisie, individuals affiliated with the West, or those showing signs of advanced education, were targeted for execution; the people were also left to starve. In addition, the family unit was destroyed and children were reared to serve Angkor (the Party), functioning as its proxies and initiating executions. As Pran says, the people were to "be like the ox" – with no thought – as they ceaselessly toil. From the skeletons littering the Cambodian countryside, *The Killing Fields* provides a glimpse into the murderous toll extracted by the Khmer Rouge.[50]

The Rwandan Genocide. Rwanda, too, has been featured several times: from documentaries like *ICYIZERE: hope* and *Ghosts of Rwanda* (2004) to dramatic portrayals in *Hotel Rwanda* (2004) and *Shake Hands with the Devil* (2007). *Deogratias: A Tale of Rwanda* attempts to convey the story of the genocide through the format of the graphic novel. African attempts to commemorate and memorialize the genocide drive Harvard University's "Through A Glass Darkly" project, an online catalogue and mapping initiative, highlighting existing memorials to Rwandan victims.

The 2004 film, *Hotel Rwanda*, provides some historical background to the atrocity by discussing the vestiges of Belgium's colonial rule and informing audiences that the ethnic divisions that Belgium used to structure and order society into Hutu and Tutsi groups created the rifts in Rwandan society. The initial placement of the Tutsi (seen as "taller," "more elegant," and lighter in skin tone) in positions of political influence set into motion a chain of violence caused by disparities in relative amounts of power. In 1994, peace seemed to be on the horizon. Rwandan President Habyarimana journeyed to Tanzania to sign a peace agreement with Tutsi rebel groups. Under suspicious circumstances, however, the President's plane was shot down. The Tutsis were blamed, and this event became the trigger for mass slaughter. Armed primarily with machetes and aided by the hate-fueled rhetoric of Rwandan radio, Hutus pillaged and destroyed the land, slaughtering Tutsi adults and children in order to eliminate the next generation of "cockroaches." As violence escalated, the United States and other Western countries abandoned Rwanda, leaving Rwandans like Paul Rusesabagina of Hôtel des Mille Collines to fend for themselves. Almost one million individuals were slaughtered during the Rwandan genocide while Western audiences primarily stood by.[51]

The Bosnian Genocide. US memorializations of the Bosnian genocide have appeared in a variety of capacities. PBS hosted a website with lesson plans and other educational resources to promote the documentary *Srebrenica: A Cry from the Grave (1999).* The Bosnian genocide provides the background for the multi-million dollar action film entitled, *Behind Enemy Lines (2001),* featuring Owen Wilson and Gene Hackman. In 2011, Angelina Jolie added even more "star power" to the mediation of the Bosnian atrocity with the release of *In the Land of Blood and Honey*, a film she wrote and directed.

The genocide in Bosnia is a major part of the feature film, *Welcome to Sarajevo* (1997). *Welcome to Sarajevo* provides a glimpse into the genocide in Bosnia through the eyes of American and British journalists. Claiming to be premised on historical events in Sarajevo between 1992 and 1993, the film concentrates on attempts to evacuate an orphanage under siege, with particular attention given to the rescue of a nine-year-old child by a British journalist. Yet this rescue narrative is also more broadly situated within the declaration of Bosnia's independence as a part of the dissolution of Yugoslavia. This film suggests that as Yugoslavia began to fracture, Bosnian Serbs and Serbian troops worked to reassert dominance over the territory, seeking to "purge" Bosnia of its Muslims. Sarajevo, a "cosmopolitan city, [and] a symbol of inter-faith co-operation," became a target for violence. Numerous scenes focus on the bloodshed, death, and destruction wrought, in particular, by snipers poaching people in public places. A concentration camp is shown filled with emaciated men. Because the film is self-conscious about the role of mediation (scenes show the journalists working on their stories about the unfolding atrocities), the images of the genocide's violence are spliced

together with clips of Western world leaders offering unfulfilled promises or refusing to intervene. Although the nine-year-old child at the center the film does escape to England, the closing credits remind viewers that more than 275,000 people died and hundreds of thousands of others were injured or displaced.[52]

The Genocide in Darfur. As the most recent of these genocides, the tragedies in Darfur have been mediated in unique ways, harnessing the power of new media. mtvU hosted "an unprecedented competition bringing together student technology and activism to help stop the genocide in Darfur;" the end result of which was the online video game, "Darfur is Dying."[53] The genocide has also been the subject of museum exhibitions and films, including *They Turned Our Desert into Fire* (2007) and *Darfur Now* (2007). Highlighting both the power of intertextuality and celebrity, *Darfur Now* prominently features Don Cheadle, the actor playing a genocide survivor in *Hotel Rwanda*, advocating for the alleviation of suffering in Darfur.

Beyond Cheadle's involvement with the genocide, Brian Steidle, the US former Marine who went to Sudan in 2004 to monitor the ceasefire between northern and southern Sudan, has become well known for raising awareness and mediating the atrocities in Darfur. While in Sudan, Steidle began to obtain information about the conflict in Darfur. "Armed" only with a camera, Steidle took a series of harrowing photographs, some of which would later appear in Nicholas D. Kristof's articles in the *New York Times* and in the movie *The Devil Came on Horseback* (2007). As described by the film, the fighting in the Darfur region of the Sudan can be linked to an April 2003 attack on an airport launched by two Sudanese rebel groups: the SLA (Sudan Liberation Army) and the JEM (Justice and Equality Movement). The rebel groups, frustrated by

their treatment at the hands of the Sudanese government in Khartoum, destroyed airplanes and killed 75 people. In retaliation, the Sudanese government closed off Darfur and recruited the assistance of the "natural" enemies of the black African Darfuris, an Arab militia known as the *janjaweed*. Accompanied by a series of images from Steidle's collection, the film details the abuses perpetuated by the militia and sponsored by the government, including the burning of villages, the looting of properties, the raping of women, and the murdering of Darfuri adults and children, ultimately resulting in the deaths of 400,000 and the displacement of two and a half million persons.[54]

Collectively, these texts provide a brief introduction to some of the images and narratives that compose the "popular genocide imaginary."[55] Far from offering entirely original or unique representations, these texts invariably borrow from and reflect other cultural narratives about atrocity. Baron concisely captures the nature of this intertextual production of meaning in his discussion of cinematic representations of genocide. Although "each genocide has its own historical dynamics and litany of atrocities," he explains, "viewers do not enter theatres as a tabula rasa. Instead, they bring with them a mental storehouse of all the movies they have seen."[56] Within that "mental storehouse," Holocaust images are often predominant; popular understandings of genocide draw heavily on images and narratives associated with the Holocaust.[57] Baron holds that the Holocaust "furnishes audiences with iconic images of what genocide looks like and influences the ways narratives of other genocides get constructed by filmmakers."[58] This reliance on the Holocaust's "symbolic capital"[59] in popular cultural representations of genocide is considered controversial by some as it touches upon anxieties related to the appropriation of Holocaust memory.[60] Power offers the shorthand, "Holocaustizing," to

refer to this process of casting contemporary atrocities through the lens of the Holocaust.[61] Such analogies raise implicit questions about the relationship between the Holocaust and other genocides, prompting some of the field's most provocative debates.

Troubling the Ampersand in Holocaust & Genocide Studies: Debates over Uniqueness

The "and" in "Holocaust and genocide studies" has become the subject of considerable scrutiny.[62] Questions over the relationship between these terms are often encapsulated in the debate surrounding the *uniqueness* thesis. Put simply, the uniqueness thesis refers to a line of argument that says the Holocaust is not "merely" a genocide. Rather, it symbolizes either the pinnacle expression of genocide or an atrocity that exists on an entirely different register of violence.[63] The debates surrounding the uniqueness thesis constitute some of the most intense debates in the field.[64] Attesting to the continued scholarly interest in this question, debates over the uniqueness thesis have sustained three different editions of Rosenbaum's edited collection—*Is the Holocaust Unique?*[65] The ferocity of these debates reflects the politics at stake in assertions of uniqueness.[66]

The conflict surrounding the uniqueness thesis began during the second half of the twentieth century in response to a trend toward "'bilateral historicization,'" a process by which the Holocaust was understood in comparison to other historical events; these other historical events in turn were understood in comparison to the Holocaust.[67] In response to these comparative processes, uniqueness discourses increasingly emerged to defend the memory of the Holocaust, which some perceived to be under assault from multiple historical and political practices. Rosenfeld argues that these historical and political practices assumed a number of distinct forms. The historical practices to which he refers

include the efforts beginning in the 1950s to explain the Shoah as a part of larger intellectual histories linked to genocide, fascism, functionalism, totalitarianism, or modernism.[68] While such historical contextualization diminished the exceptionalism of the Holocaust, Rosenfeld charges that Holocaust memory was threatened by political appropriations as well, which obfuscated the atrocity's "unique" Jewish core.[69] In light of Rosenfeld's history of the uniqueness thesis debates, the thesis functions as a response utilized by individuals who Power argues, "believe they are staving off any attempt to normalize, historicize, relativize, marginalize, or trivialize the crimes of the Third Reich."[70]

Although uniqueness thesis arguments assume a variety of forms, at its most basic, proponents argue that the Holocaust is a distinct mass atrocity, separate and different from other genocides.[71] Bauer details three reasons for the Holocaust's uniqueness: First, he argues that the Shoah was ideologically motivated and not driven by the "pragmatic considerations" that underlie other genocides.[72] Second, he cites "its global, indeed, universal character," charging that "other genocides were limited geographically."[73] Finally, Bauer punctuates "its intended totality."[74] Katz devotes an entire book-length treatment to comparing the Holocaust to other historical incidents, from Roman slavery to the Crusades. He arrives at the conclusion that the Holocaust is unique among these atrocities based upon the perpetrators' intentions.[75] Katz contributes one of the most "inflammatory" theses in the uniqueness debates in suggesting that the Holocaust may be the only historical event that would qualify as a "genocide."[76]

Critics of the uniqueness thesis charge that privileging the Holocaust results in the creation of a racialized hierarchy and a hindrance to genocide prevention. Novick argues

that the insistence upon the "special status" of the Holocaust among other genocides is "deeply offensive."[77] The uniqueness thesis creates a "hierarchy of the horribles" that reflect racial inequities.[78] According to critics of the uniqueness thesis, privileging the memory of the Holocaust "above" all other atrocities translates into privileging its victims, specifically its Jewish victims, over the victims of other genocides or massacres.[79] As detractors are quick to note, this often amounts to a valuation of white, European bodies over black or non-white, non-European bodies.[80] From a slightly different perspective, other commentators on the uniqueness thesis argue that this configuration of Holocaust and genocide memory is especially detrimental to genocide prevention efforts as it "dulls our response" to contemporary atrocity and works to divert attention from other forms of suffering that may not quite match the Holocaust in terms of scope and scale.[81] Such memories may function as cognitive and emotional blocks, preventing the recognition of atrocities that are seen as not "measuring up" to the precedent set by the Holocaust.[82]

Other analysts of the uniqueness thesis debate charge that the intensity of the controversy reflects the heightened stakes; underlying uniqueness thesis arguments are claims to political recognition.[83] As numerous scholars note, atrocity memory has become a political tool employed to stimulate recognition and action.[84] Holocaust memory is often most effective in this regard given its perceived cultural "cache." As MacDonald argues, the success with which knowledge of the Holocaust thoroughly penetrated public culture has come to function as "benchmark" for other victims of genocide. He explains, "[t]he Holocaust's Americanization has given hope to other groups, especially since the 1990s, that they too might achieve the same level of

recognition and respect if they can provide solid proof of similar events in their collective past."[85] This function of the Holocaust's popularization has resulted in establishing a set of unofficial expectations for other victimized groups seeking to gain attention: "Demonstrate that what happened to 'your' group was comparable to what happened to the Jews under the Nazis, or that its perpetrators were similarly impelled by a racist worldview, and you have made the case."[86]

Put differently, uniqueness thesis debates are debates over recognition and status.[87] At their core, Rothberg and others contend these "debates … are primarily struggles over injustices of recognition, over whose history and culture will be recognized."[88] Accordingly, the "prize" to be attained consists of the acknowledgment of one group's suffering and abuse.[89] In other words, cultural and political identities are infused into these questions of recognition and comparison.[90] As a result, these contestations continue to attract popular and academic attention.[91] At the broadest level, the uniqueness thesis debate clearly showcases the politicized nature of Holocaust and genocide studies representations.

Discomforting Discourses: Ambivalence, Anxiety, and Authority

The debates over uniqueness provide a glimpse into the political implications associated with the genocide discourses targeting a popular audience. This study engages a line of argument prevalent in Holocaust and genocide studies related to the "threatening" nature of genocide rhetoric. Arguments adopting this perspective suggest that genocide rhetorics are discomforting because they contain within them the potential to reveal their audience's connection to the politics of genocidal violence. This study attends to how such anxieties are managed in textual practice through an examination of

the relationships among state authority, public power, and genocidal violence in popular depictions of genocide.

Ambivalence, ambiguity, and anxiety are common hallmarks of discussions in Holocaust and genocide studies.[92] Reflecting Levi's famous exploration of the "gray zone," Petropoulos and Roth punctuate the centrality of ambiguity to both scholarly and popular discourses on the Holocaust.[93] In contrast with arguments that the Holocaust represents "a moral touchstone,"[94] are those claims that the Holocaust and genocide discourses showcase "a painful and morally ambiguous reality in which there never is, and never has been, a 'moral high ground.'"[95] This lack of moral certitude disrupts the clear delineation of perpetrators and victims and raises broader questions about culpability and complicity.[96] Mandel argues that this lends discussions of the Holocaust, and by extension other genocides, a "most disturbing" edge insofar as they reveal the "complicity of contemporary culture" in the execution of genocidal violence.[97]

Beyond implicating audiences as complicit in such violence, genocide cessation discourses contain the seeds of arguments that challenge the authority of the nation-state. Drawing on the work of Žižek and others, Edkins posits that genocides and other traumatic events possess within them the potential to expose the violence embedded in contemporary configurations of political community. More specifically, her study of temporality reveals the ways in which the state obfuscates the connection between sovereign political authority and violence.[98] Popular discourses surrounding genocide thus become threatening because in these instances of violent rupture, "the symbolism and ideology that concealed the fragile and contingent nature of authority collapse altogether." The result "is a brief interregnum before the new order imposes a different

form of concealment."[99] Great potential exists in these moments to challenge state power.[100] For that reason, Edkins discusses representations and remembrances of genocide and other atrocities as "site[s] of struggle" wherein the critic can examine the complicated linkages among state authority, public power, and violence.[101]

Following Edkins, this project examines genocidal depictions in US popular culture as "site[s] of struggle" over state and public power. Far from simplistic or shallow, these popular cultural texts play a critical role in contributing to public understandings of the politics of genocide and genocide cessation.[102] As underscored throughout this Introduction, these representations are politically charged; matters of authority, power, and recognition are called into question. In the process, discussions of genocide threaten to reveal discomforting arguments about Western complicity in violence and prompt broader interrogations of the legitimacy of state authority. Given the stakes, these discourses are fraught with ambiguity and anxiety. This study accordingly poses two research questions associated with these tensions. First, *how do popular culture texts constitute notions of state authority and public agency through definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances of genocide*? Second, *how do popular culture texts rhetorically (re)configure the relationships among state authority, public agency, and genocidal violence and manage the anxiety created by competing assessments of state authority and public agency*? These two questions guide the examination of all three of the texts featured in this project.

Specifically, this study explores the interrelationships among authority, agency, and violence through a critical analysis of exhibits displayed in two museums and in an investigation featured in one documentary. These texts were selected based on two

criteria: (1) their use of past genocides as a framework for discussing political

intervention into existing and future atrocities; and (2) their development of popular,

multi-media, and interactive technology in explicating genocide cessation, including

films, blogs, and social media platforms for audience engagement.[103] These two criteria

ensure that the texts in this study construct sufficiently robust narratives about genocide

and political violence thereby facilitating an examination of the research questions above.

Each criterion connects the texts selected to the questions at the heart of this project.

First, by utilizing past genocides as a framework for current cessation efforts, the texts in

this study situate specific genocides within larger historical and political narratives.

Accordingly, these texts avoid an overly narrow focus on the particularities of any one

genocide; rather, they include overarching arguments about patterns of political violence.

In so doing, they widen their scope to consider the relationships among atrocities as well

as the relationships among violence, nation-states, and "average" citizens.[104] Second, the

use of popular and interactive technologies signals, at minimum, a modest endorsement

of their audiences' agency. The presence of such platforms for audience interaction is

interpreted within this study as evidence of an attempt to engage the general public in

conversations about the politics of genocide and genocide cessation. By working through

popular channels or creating technological opportunities for interactivity, the texts in this

study imply some level of support for popular power.

Each chapter centralizes an individual or institution that has attained some degree

of fame or notoriety for attempting to popularize Holocaust and genocide studies. These

individuals and institutions include Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, the Los Angeles-based

Museum of Tolerance, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Goldhagen

entered the public eye after the controversial success of his 1996 publication, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*. In 2009, Goldhagen broadened the scope of his work by publishing a sweeping meditation on the problem of genocide and genocide cessation, *Worse Than War*. In collaboration with PBS, *Worse Than War* became a film supported with an interactive website. Like Goldhagen, the Museum of Tolerance has enjoyed a considerable amount of public attention, perhaps driven in part by its efforts to market itself as a tourist destination. The institution's flashy displays and emotional appeals have drawn praise and criticism from numerous scholarly and popular voices. Nevertheless, its expansive mission invites discussion of the relationship among genocides and others forms of political violence.[105] Similar to the Museum of Tolerance, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has become a popular tourist destination as well as a stimulus for academic and public debate. Through a special exhibition titled, *From Memory to Action: Meeting the Challenge of Genocide*, the institution considers the Holocaust as part of a broader history of genocidal violence. In sum, Goldhagen's documentary and the exhibits from the two Holocaust museums offer numerous arguments about the politics of genocide and genocide cessation that help answer this study's research questions.

In each chapter, the study foregrounds notions of authority and agency across these texts that struggle to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocidal atrocities. The accompanying narratives and images provide an enriched discursive portrayal of state authority and public agency in popular cultural calls for genocide cessation.[106]

A Rhetorical Approach to Genocide: Genre Studies, Critical/Cultural Studies, Media Studies & Public Memory

This study draws on multiple bodies of knowledge in the analysis of these three cases. The arguments in the ensuing chapters are informed by scholarship in rhetoric, media studies, memory studies, critical/cultural studies, as well as Holocaust and genocide studies. More specifically, this study is predicated upon arguments about the rhetorical construction of "genocide," the significance of understanding genocide through genre studies, the importance of attending to temporality, and the value of a vocabulary enhanced by both media studies and critical/cultural studies. Finally, I explicate my understanding of these central constructs and introduce some of project's theoretical underpinnings.[107]

Genocide as a Rhetorical Designation

This project is predicated upon a social constructionist understanding of genocide politics and thus takes seriously the ideological implications of the use (or nonuse) of the term "genocide." In other words, I understand the term "genocide" as a construct that does much more than describe the forms of political violence to which the term refers. Toward those ends, this project disavows a positivist understanding of contemporary politics in favor of a view of "politics as spectacle."[108] From Edelman's perspective, "[p]roblems [such as genocide] come into discourse and therefore into existence as reinforcements of ideologies, not simply because they are there or because they are important for wellbeing."[109] Put differently, articulations of genocide are first and foremost ideological constructions that shape the ensuing interpretations of material violence and the political responses to such violence occurring in particular times and places. [110]

Of course, the power of genocide rhetoric is implicitly understood and recognized by many Holocaust and genocide studies scholars concerned with the relationship between language and political action as established in the 1948 UN Convention.[111] Yet, few articulate the ideological implications of this rhetorical designation as clearly as Herman and Peterson. In *The Politics of Genocide*, Herman and Peterson argue that the term "genocide" functions as a rhetorical warrant used selectively to advance US strategic interests by vilifying some countries while allowing the aggressive actions of the United States to go unnamed. The authors contend that during the 1990s, genocide rhetorics replaced Cold War era rationales as a means of legitimating foreign policy measures advantageous to the United States. Like the "'national security'" logics associated with the Cold War, US genocide discourse helps to justify "anything the U.S. government cho[o]se[s] to do in the realm of foreign policy, regardless of its brutality and criminality."[112] Herman and Peterson's writing clearly evinces an understanding of genocide as a rhetorical term imbricated in complex ideological matrices that privilege some, disadvantage others, and have no implicit relationship to the materiality of violence as it occurs in particular contexts. Borrowing from Herman and Peterson's language, the politics of genocide prevention and intervention reflect "choices regularly made that have nothing to do with crossing certain thresholds of scale, much less with whether events are inherently conscience-shocking. Instead, the distinction turns on *who* does *what* to *whom* – and *where does power lie*."[113]

Marking genocide as a rhetorical designation has several implications. First, as Edelman makes clear in his defense against positivist critiques,[114] embracing a constructionist stance on politics does not mean delegitimizing, minimizing, or denying

the materiality of violence whenever or wherever it may occur. Recognizing that political problems are built through discursive apparatuses is not the same as arguing that political violence exists in name only. In grappling with questions of truth in their work on genocide, O'Neill and Hinton offer a useful model. They write: "Did the Holocaust really happen? Of course. Were indigenous peoples throughout the Americas victims of genocide? Yes. Nevertheless, it is important that we remain open to exploring the ways in which *discourses about* truth have been deployed." Many authors thus move the debates away from claims about the occurrence of material events to focus on the discourses used to affirm or challenge the occurrences of genocide.[115] This rhetorical perspective illuminates the ways in which material violence comes to be understood through extant discursive frameworks,[116] which in turn shape the perceptions of political problems and their "appropriate" responses.

Second, the discursive tactics used to shape public understandings of genocidal violence represent an important part of these existing frameworks. These discursive strategies are not created anew with each occurrence of political violence.[117] As Torchin describes it, genocides are deciphered through pre-existing "interpretive gird[s],"[118] or the stories we tell about genocide that rely on forms of "emplotment" which structure public discourse about atrocity.[119] Put differently, both Torchin and Rothe invoke the language of "gird[s]" or "emplotment" to describe the ways genocide is constructed *generically*. Genres accordingly shape the way genocide enters into public discourse and the range of actions then associated with the stories told about genocide and genocide cessation.[120] By treating genocide as a rhetorical construction, this project is positioned to critique the ideologies implicated in US representations of genocide cessation in popular media texts.

Understanding Genocide Generically

Genre has gotten a "bad rap" among some rhetorical critics because of a perceived preoccupation with classification and form as well as an overemphasis on the power of the situation.[121] Early work on genre underscores its utility as an organizational tool, a way of classifying or making sense of *kinds* or *types* of discourse. Campbell and Jamieson's early definition of "genre" reflects this organizational logic. In their words, "[a] 'genre' is a classification based on the fusion and interrelation of elements in such a way that a unique kind of rhetorical act is created."[122] Similarly, Harrell and Linkugel argue "that rhetorical genres stem from *organizing principles* found in *recurring situations* that generate discourse characterized by a family of *common factors.*"[123] Not surprisingly, genre criticism became associated with a means of grouping or organizing texts, leading Fisher to assert that genre criticism is "not a critical method in and of itself;" rather, it is a first step in doing any kind of rhetorical criticism, a precursor to analysis.[124]

In the last thirty years, productive work on genre has been done in a number of disciplines. Devitt's efforts to synthesize the state of genre theory underscore the most productive turns in the development of genre studies. Devitt asserts that "views of genre have changed, shifting from a formalistic study of critics' classifications to a rhetorical study of the generic actions of everyday readers and writers."[125] Devitt emphasizes the role of genre in offering conceptual maps that help people process and categorize events.[126] "[S]tudying genre," according to Devitt, is "studying how people use language to make their way in the world."[127]

Furthermore, genre studies allow for a comparative approach that privileges an intertextual meaning-making process.[128] As Miller contends, "[T]he new is made familiar through the recognition of relevant similarities," and "those similarities become constituted as a type."[129] Genres thus function through pattern recognition wherein, according to Devitt, individuals recognize "perceived similarities among disparate situations."[130] Genre criticism recognizes that all works are predicated upon earlier work. Indeed, Jamieson's study of antecedent genres demonstrates the pull of the past on genre selection and rhetorical invention.[131] Ergo, genre work moves critics away from studying texts "in isolation" and creates a "critical history."[132] This comparative process provides scholars with the grounds for making claims about textual uniqueness.[133] Importantly, the act of comparison presumes a memory of past situations and past texts. Recollection and memory consequently come to play an important role in genre studies.

Public Memory Studies as a Vehicle for Understanding Temporality

Memory scholarship serves to examine temporality in this study, exploring the representations and intersections of past, present, and future. At its most basic level, memory, according to Terdiman, "is the modality of our relation to the past."[134] Of course, "the past" is a very nebulous rhetorical construct, and relationships to the past can be constructed in a variety of ways.[135] Additionally, the past cannot "be brought back intact;"[136] it is always (re)constructed in the present.[137] Memory represents one of the vehicles used to construct the past in the present. Although memory is associated with the past, it is commonly invoked to meet present or future needs.[138] Particularly relevant to this project, however, is public memory,[139] which Halbwachs fashioned as a public and shared event rather than a private function of the individual mind.[140]

Because public memory concerns the past, present, and future, it provides a theoretical framework for discussing and analyzing social conceptions of time. For some, the study of memory calls for suspending assumptions of a continuous linear flow (e.g., past → present → future).[141] Nora and Terdiman, for example, suggest different ways of thinking about how the concepts of past, present, and future relate. Nora parses his definitions of history and memory as contingent upon a sense of cleavage between past and present. History is treated as if there is a break between past and present; in memory, contrastingly, constructions of the past inform the present in a seamless fashion.[142] Terdiman offers an alternative conception of "what was" the past, "what is" the present, and how the two relate. "Memory," Terdiman argues, "complicates the rationalist segmentation of chronology into 'then' and 'now.' In memory, the time line becomes tangled and folds back on itself."[143] Vivian refers to this process as "temporal folding."[144] Terdiman, Nora, and Vivian remind us that the ways in which past, present, and future are constructed vis-à-vis one another constitute *arguments* about the nature of temporal flow.[145] As Huyssen and Edkins underscore, these temporalities have the potential to be reconfigured, particularly in the wake of "trauma" or atrocity.[146] These relationships and understandings of temporality are critical to this project insofar as rhetorics of genocide cessation draw upon conceptions of the past to motivate action in the present and future.

Media Studies, Critical/Cultural Studies, and Exnomination

Media studies provide the tools for deepening understandings of the ideologies and arguments that circulate within popular mediated texts. Although there are multiple ways of defining media studies, this project views media as serving three functions: epistemic, political, and (potentially) catalytic. Recognizing the media as an episteme

elevates media studies to a philosophy.[147] Hartley builds the case that media studies are in

and of themselves "a *philosophy of the popular*," fundamentally engaged in working

through the same tensions around knowing and being that concern the study of

philosophy.[148] Hartley contends,

> Media studies is therefore at least part of *the philosophy of the media age*:
> it produces both rational and empirical knowledge about how truths are
> told today, from the detail of individual strategies and techniques right up
> to those truths that have power to command on a society-wide basis and to
> a global extent.[149]

With its "epistemic authority,"[150] media subtly influence what audiences come to know.

In this capacity, media function as a public pedagogy, offering instruction on a variety of

topics, including politics and the viability of social change.[151] Media also produce and

reproduce an image of the *polis*,[152] illuminating its contours, highlighting key political

agents,[153] and identifying forms of political action. As Hariman and Lucaites argue

succinctly: "images in the public media display the public to itself."[154] Media can thus

offer prescriptions for action within the *polis*, defining and proffering templates for the

exercise of citizenship.[155] Although considerable debate exists about the media's ability

to serve as a (progressive) change agent, mediated texts nonetheless impart lessons about

the potential for social change.[156]

Intersecting scholarship from rhetorical and media studies yields two primary

benefits. First, it expands the perspectives that could be brought to bear on a text. As

Medhurst and Benson stress in defending a rhetorical approach to media studies, "critical

practice should be judged by the insights and understandings it affords the reader, not by

any *a priori* assertion of territorial rights;" thus a rhetorical study of the media diversifies the repertoire of critical perspectives available in analyzing the persuasive strategies contained in mediated texts.[157] Second, such a combination of lenses serves as a corrective to the potential proclivity within some forms of media studies to limit human agency. Certain media studies perspectives (like critical/cultural studies) risk eliminating a role for agency and choice. A strict political economy approach or interpretation of the media through the lens of the Frankfurt school risks eliminating agency as media messages and the reception of those messages are determined by the conditions of their production.[158] A rhetorical approach to the media, while not denying the influence of such conditions, maintains a belief in the importance of agency and choice in the production, dissemination, and reception of mediated messages.[159]

The use of critical/cultural studies scholarship further advances the study of ideology and politics.[160] As Schulman explains, cultural studies interrogates "meanings in human experience as they are realized in language and other signifying practices" while also "examining institutional practices…and contemporary political movements."[161] With a focus on meaning, texts, and the analysis of discourse, clear areas of overlap exist between rhetorical and cultural studies. Elaborating on this overlap, Rosteck creates space for what he terms "cultural rhetorical criticism" by returning to Wrage's initial efforts to expand "the objects of critical rhetorical analysis."[162] Culture is a "rhetorical mosaic writ large," argues Rosteck.[163]A project that intersects both rhetorical and cultural studies recognizes "[t]he textualization of culture."[164] Culture is viewed as existing in and through texts; texts, in turn, reflect and compose the culture.[165] At best, both cultural studies and rhetorical studies are deeply invested in studying "the circulation and

production of meaning in use"[166]—meanings that are historically and politically situated.

Yet, the marriage between rhetorical studies and critical/cultural studies is not always agreeable.[167] One of the chief problems of blending critical/cultural studies and rhetorical studies is the pull of ideological determinism.[168] At a basic level, ideology is "the partiality of ideas;"[169] it is the "ideas corresponding to the actions…[one] performs;"[170] yet ideology is also used to refer to a dominant system of thought,[171] a "master framework," with "claims to general representativeness."[172] Controversies arise over the extent to which ideology governs or drives behaviors; one peril within the critical/cultural studies approach is an overemphasis on power, discipline, coercion, and force.[173] Maintaining a commitment to a definition of rhetoric rooted in at least some measure of choice and agency serves as a potential corrective, enabling this study to highlight the operation of ideology while not casting ideology as a totalizing force.[174]

For the purposes of this project, cultural studies functions as a useful supplement to rhetorical studies, enriching this analysis by introducing a perspective sensitive to the power of audiences,[175] taking seriously popular discourses,[176] and providing a host of theories and vocabularies for furthering discussions of ideology, power, and politics as they converge in texts. Especially noteworthy, such discussions of ideology, power, and politics within critical/cultural studies contribute conceptual tools sensitive to issues of marginalization along the lines of various identity markers (e.g., race, class, gender, sexuality).[177] These markers become particularly important within a study of genocide cessation discourse as they are often the markers used to target victim groups.

Similarly, critical/cultural studies approaches bequeath a vocabulary useful in analyzing the interplay among speech, silence, and ideology.[178] This study draws heavily

on Barthes' concept of *exnomination*. Originally invoked within Barthes's work to describe the privilege of the French bourgeoisie, the exnominated, Barthes charges, is excluded from discourse.[179] Without being named, it cannot be challenged.[180] In Fiske's words, "[o]nly that which is not named appears to have no alternative, only that which is not named can achieve the status of the natural, of common sense."[181] In response, this study attends to such strategies as rhetorical intimation,[182] through which texts "hint" or "gesture" toward the unspeakable.[183] By recognizing the exnominated, this analysis is poised to critique the absences in narratives about genocide and interrogate the political implications of the unnamed.[184]

Précis

The instances of US genocide cessation discourse examined in this study reveal a deep-seated ambivalence about the relationships among state authority, public agency, and genocidal violence. The texts in this study contain multiple and often inconsistent messages about the definition, representation, resolution, and remembrance of genocide. The numerous textual vacillations and incongruences in each of these arenas reflect the extent tensions in scholarly discussions of atrocity. Such competing narratives about state and public authority ultimately create a palpable anxiety. Most revealing is how these texts work to manage these anxieties in distinct ways, acting to sublimate, exacerbate, or recognize these tensions.

On the surface, the two museums and single documentary featured in this project offer palatable and easy-to-consume messages about genocide and genocide cessation. Given the demands of attracting an audience of museum goers or documentary watchers,[185] the texts unsurprisingly contain optimistic messages about the viability of

ending genocide. The texts commonly depict the US nation-state and the US public as

potential genocide cessation agents. The US nation-state and its political officials

consequently are granted the authority and agency to intervene in genocidal violence or

prevent genocidal atrocity altogether; the US public is also authorized to remain vigilant

and informed in order to serve as genocide cessation actors.

At the same time, these texts intimate darker discourses regarding the role of state

authority and limitations on popular power. The texts simultaneously hint at

discomforting historical and theoretical arguments that connect state power and violence.

These intimations are conveyed through differing messages.[186] They manifest in

reminders of the state's genocidal power to eliminate its own citizens. Correspondingly,

such intimations can assume the form of haunting questions about the nature of

indigenous atrocities that often accompany discussions of genocide. These intimations

and others implicate Western nation-states and raise doubts about the benevolence of

state authority.

Similarly, these texts gesture toward the insufficiency of public agency. While

numerous popular culture texts suggest that "average individuals" have the power to stop

genocide, they also contain countervailing messages that exclude most from discussions

of genocide cessation. Alternatively, the texts question whether individuals and

collectives possess the resources needed to halt or prevent genocide. These contradictory

assessments of the role of state authority and public agency in matters of genocide create

a notable sense of anxiety over the future of genocide cessation within the texts under

study.

The complexity of the relationships among these constructs – state authority, public agency, and genocidal violence – is evidenced by inconsistencies in the textual attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide. The discourses analyzed in this study advance inconsistent arguments, blend incompatible genres, and rely on rhetorical intimation to gesture toward "that which is not named."[187] Put differently, these rhetorical strategies enable the texts to leave certain ideas or arguments *exnominated* or unarticulated, particularly sentiments suggesting that US political actions and ideologies contributed to genocidal violence. Attention to these silences and fissures stands to spotlight an expressed anxiety within these texts pertaining to the links among the US government, its citizens, and atrocity.

In the end, the texts elevate the nation-state and state actors as the most powerful genocide cessation agents. Despite paying lip service to popular power, the texts corroborate the authority of the nation-state. All three of the case studies examined in this project centralize the nation-state or empowered political actors as critical to genocide intervention or prevention efforts. They concurrently convey considerable doubt about popular agency, evincing a distrust of "average individuals" as genocide cessation agents. Although the texts are ostensibly engaging the non-expert public in their endeavors to end genocide, they afford their audiences a marginal role in genocide cessation work. This configuration of public agency within these popular culture representations of genocide normalizes genocide as a "foreign" affair divorced from the lives of US citizens.

Each of the texts in this study configures the relationships among state authority, public agency, and genocide in unique ways as they attempt to define, represent, resolve,

and remember genocide. Accordingly, each manages the anxieties created by competing assessments of state and public power differently.

Chapter One offers conflicting perspectives on the definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances of atrocity contained within scholarship from Holocaust and genocide studies. Although there are numerous points of contention in the field's discussion of each of these four arenas, the relationships among state authority, public agency, and violence underlie a considerable amount of debate in the field. The scholarship in each of these areas reflects an ambivalent assessment of the state and the public's role in the politics of genocide and genocide cessation. The inconsistent treatments in scholarly circles over the connections among the state, the public, and genocidal violence extend throughout the popular cultural treatments of genocide cessation discourse.

Chapter Two provides a bridge between the scholarly and popular culture treatments of genocide cessation by analyzing Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's documentary, *Worse Than War*. Goldhagen is a controversial figure as a scholar-turned-media celebrity. Even though he is a former Harvard professor, he is heavily critiqued by his peers in the academy. Given Goldhagen's embattled ethos, anxieties over authority reverberate throughout the film's attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide. Ultimately, *Worse Than War* emphasizes the authority afforded to Goldhagen through his spatial and experiential proximity to atrocity. Goldhagen is the son of a Holocaust survivor afforded the opportunity to travel to sites of genocidal violence, granting him a special forum to speak out on genocide and a level of ethos to do so. According to the underlying logic of the film, individuals lacking direct experiences with

atrocity or familial connections to trauma are seemingly denied such authority and are consequently excluded from genocide cessation work. In the end, the state is elevated as the principle actor in anti-genocide efforts.

Chapter Three examines the Los Angeles-based Museum of Tolerance (MOT). Genocide is one of numerous public problems addressed by the institution. This breadth in scope only intensifies the anxieties at the heart of this study because it further impedes the clear delineation of legitimate and illegitimate uses of state and public power. The MOT exacerbates such anxiety through its use of horror conventions. An abstract sense of fear or suspicion percolates throughout the MOT, shaping its definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances of genocide. Ultimately, this sense of fear bolsters the institution's elevation of state power over public power as integral to genocide cessation *even as* the institution contains haunting reminders of the state's connections to the politics of genocide.[188]

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's special exhibition, *From Memory to Action*, is the subject of Chapter Four. This institution—partly funded by private funds and partly funded by government funds—offers a nuanced assessment of the politics of genocide and genocide cessation. The museum includes competing portrayals of the role of the state and the public in the definition, representation, resolution, and remembrance of genocide. In each of these four arenas, *From Memory to Action* advances predominantly optimistic arguments about the feasibility of genocide cessation while gesturing toward less hopeful discourses concerning the limitations of state and public power. The exhibition manages the anxiety created by these

incongruences by utilizing the strategy of rhetorical intimation to recognize the complexity of genocide and genocide cessation work.

In the Afterword, I centralize the significance of the ambivalence reflected in these textual attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide. I argue that the anxiety engendered by textual inconsistencies and fragmentation is ultimately productive because it denies audiences the satisfaction of "easy answers" and fosters a sense of accountability. Similarly, the texts provide the impetus for broader conversations over the links among the nation-state, the public, and political violence. By gesturing toward discomforting narratives regarding the state's connections to violence, textual ambivalence suggests the importance of conditioning audiences to be alert to and critical of state behavior.

This project must begin by identifying the problems associated with defining, representing, resolving and remembering genocide within academic treatments of the subject before examining their treatment in popular culture constructs. The scholarship in Holocaust and genocide studies reviewed in the next chapter illuminates the rhetorical challenges confronting popular cultural attempts to craft palatable and optimistic messages regarding genocide cessation.

<div align="center">Notes</div>

[1] On the origins of the word, see Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 22; Kevin Lewis O'Neill and Alexander Laban Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory, and Representation: An Introduction" in *Genocide: Truth, Memory, and Representation*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton and Kevin Lewis O'Neill (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 2. See

also David Rieff, "An Age of Genocide: The Far Reaching Lessons of Rwanda," *The New Republic*, January 29, 1996, 33-34.

[2] This paragraph is a brief summary of Power's detailed exploration of Lemkin's work. See chapters 2-4 in Samantha Power, *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Perennial, 2003), 17-60.

[3] Samuel Totten and Steven Leonard Jacobs, "Introduction," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, ed. Samuel Totten and Steven Leonard Jacobs (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002), xi; Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, "A Review of the Literature," in *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 12-23. Of course, it is important to recognize the academic work that was done on the Holocaust and genocide prior to the 1980s. Baron's works features some of the early scholarship on the Holocaust (between 1945-1960). See Lawrence Baron, "The Holocaust and American Public Memory, 1945-1960," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 17, no. 1 (2003): 66-71. Further, as will be detailed later in this project, important studies, such as the Milgram study, were also conducted during this time period.

[4] Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan, "The Study of Mass Murder and Genocide," in *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*, ed. Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 6-8.

[5] Chalk and Jonassohn, "The Brutishness of the Past and Collective Denial," in *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 8. Chalk and Jonassohn also make clear how little regard was paid to the idea of "human rights" throughout much of human history: "The idea of

human rights is relatively new in Western society," they assert (7-8). See Chalk and Jonassohn, "The Brutishness of the Past and Collective Denial," 5-8.

[6] To be sure, using the designation "field" raises questions about disciplinarity: what constitutes a discrete academic field? Should this scholarship be treated as its own discipline? Although these debates have merit, I am less interested in advancing arguments about the place of genocide studies in the contemporary academy and seek only to provide a sense of the historical emergence of such scholarship before highlighting some of the critical conversations contained within such work. As such, I adopt the terminology used by Totten and Jacobs in their treatment of the development of genocide studies scholarship as they designate genocide studies "as an academic field." See Totten and Jacobs, "Introduction," xi.

[7] Mark Levene, "A Dissenting Voice: Or How Current Assumptions of Deterring and Preventing Genocide May Be Looking at the Problem Through the Wrong End of the Telescope, Part I," *Journal of Genocide Research* 6, no. 2 (2004): 154. See again Power, *"A Problem From Hell."*

[8] I offer representative examples of work in the following areas. For psychological approaches, see James Waller, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford, 2007). For sociological approaches, see Helen Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective* (London: Sage Publications, 1993); Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000); Kuper, *Genocide*. For anthropological approaches, see O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory." For political science, see Duncan Bell, "Introduction: Memory, Trauma, and World Politics" in *Memory, Trauma, and World*

Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present, ed. Duncan Bell

(New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 1-29; David B. MacDonald, *Identity Politics in

the Age of Genocide: The Holocaust and Historical Representation* (Abdington:

Routledge, 2008). Schaller describes historians' roles in Holocaust and genocide studies.

See Dominik J. Schaller, "From the Editor(s): Genocide Research, Preventionism and

Politics of Memory – a Personal Note," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 3 (2006):

246; see also Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin

Company, 1999). For legal studies, see Martin Mennecke, "Punishing Genocidaires: A

Deterrent Effect or Not?" *Human Rights Review* 8, no. 4 (2007): 319-339. For literary

studies, see Amy Hungerford, *The Holocaust of Texts: Genocide, Literature, and

Personification* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003). For art studies,

Stephen C. Feinstein, "Introduction: *A Scream/A Repetition/A Transformation*" in

Absence/Presence: Critical Essays on the Artistic Memory of the Holocaust, ed. Stephen

C. Feinstein (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2005), xxi-xxxii. For film studies

and media studies, Caroline Joan (Kay) S. Picart and David A. Frank, *Frames of Evil:

The Holocaust as Horror in American Film* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University

Press, 2006). For philosophical approaches, see John K. Roth, "Prologue: Philosophy and

Genocide" in *Genocide and Human Rights: A Philosophical Guide*, ed. John K. Roth

(New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), xvi-xxi.

[9] Barbara Harff, "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing the Risks

of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955," *American Political Science Review*

97, no. 1 (2003): 57-73; Lawrence L. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of

Memory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991); Feinstein, "Introduction," xxi-

xxxii. Other works in "genocide studies" include analyses of victims' bodies to produce a correlation between a population's general health and the occurrence of genocide, gender studies of Holocaust memorials, psychological profiles of victims, perpetrators, and bystanders, and studies of indigenous atrocity. Ashley Maxwell and Ann H. Ross, "Epidemiology of Genocide: An Example from the Former Yugoslavia," *Forensic Science Policy & Management: An International Journal* 2, no. 2 (2011): 94-102; Janet Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust: Gender, Genocide and Collective Memory* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010); Steven K. Baum, *The Psychology of Genocide: Perpetrators, Bystanders, and Rescuers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Ward Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present* (San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, 1997); David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); John H. Bodley, *Victims of Progress*, 2nd ed. (Menlo Park, CA: The Benjamin / Cummings Publishing Company, Inc., 1982).

[10] Though the field's interdisciplinarity is undoubtedly a strength, on the most obvious of levels, the lack of methodological or disciplinary coherence means that the participants in the "conversations" bear the vestiges of different disciplinary orientations to central constructs. See Michael Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 5-7.

[11] "Genocide cessation" is used throughout this dissertation project as a form of shorthand referring to efforts to end genocide. As such, it is used as an umbrella term, including both arguments for intervention and prevention. Of course, the term "cessation" implies the stopping of a behavior or an action already in progress. From such a

perspective, preventative goals can seem outside the bounds of cessation-based discourses.

Nevertheless, this study embraces the term "cessation" due, in part, to my perspective on the politics of genocide. Although specific genocides may end, the problem of genocidal violence transcends its particular iterations. This view of genocide treats genocide as an ongoing problem and thus subject to cessation appeals. From this vantage point, cessation is not only an appropriate term, it is a reflection of my philosophy on genocidal atrocity. The outlook on genocidal atrocity captured in this note is informed by the "post-liberal" perspective addressed at greater length in Chapter One.

[12] Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009). This argument is unpacked in greater length on pages 122-123.

[13] O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 18.

[14] This includes borrowing from fictional narratives as well as Picart and Frank's analysis of Holocaust films illustrates. Picart and Frank demonstrate the extent to which Holocaust films employ conventions of horror narratives. Picart and Frank, *Frames of Evil*.

[15] Torchin's book aptly illustrates the way the meaning of the term "genocide" is produced through intertextual exchanges. See Leshu Torchin, *Creating the Witness: Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the Internet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 216.

[16] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 3, 16.

O'Neill and Hinton also use the idea of the genocidal imaginary, but their understanding of the "genocidal imaginary" is not exclusively focused on the role of popular culture and media texts in contributing to a public understanding of genocide. O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 11.

[17] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 94. Similarly, Ebbrecht writes, "Well-known images of Nazism and the Holocaust comprise a basic part of our cultural reservoir of representing atrocities." Tobias Ebbrecht, "Migrating Images: Iconic Images of the Holocaust and the Representation of War in Popular Film," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 90. In Baron's words, "The extensive repository of Holocaust cinema furnishes audiences with iconic images of what genocide looks like and influences the ways narratives of other genocides get constructed by filmmakers." Lawrence Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema: Crossing Disciplinary, Genre, and Geographical Borders: Editor's Introduction," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 3.

[18] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 94.

[19] In thinking of this repository as a "rhetorical resource," I am reminded of Hariman and Lucaites's arguments about the "vectors of influence" associated with iconic photographs. Hariman and Lucaites discuss such photos as "providing figural resources for communicative action." In this capacity, the repository of genocide texts offers similar resources. Robert Hariman and John Louis Lucaites, *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 9.

[20] Of course, other avenues exist for acquiring knowledge of the Holocaust or other genocides. Holocaust education programs are one example. However, this study is primarily interested in the significant role mediation and popular culture play in the acquisition of such knowledge.

As Flanzbaum writes, "our knowledge of the Holocaust in America has rarely been delivered by direct witness; it comes to us by way of representations, and representations of representations, through editors and publishers, producers and directors." Hilene Flanzbaum, "Introduction: The Americanization of the Holocaust," in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed. Hilene Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press, 1999), 4.

[21] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 216.

Whereas I opt to centralize Torchin's work in the ensuing analysis because Torchin takes genocide as her subject specifically, Wendy Hesford's recent work also examines the role of visual rhetoric in the construction of human rights issues. Like Torchin, Hesford also accentuates the relationship between visual practices and the construction of our understanding of human rights abuses. See Wendy S. Hesford, *Spectacular Rhetorics: Human Rights Visions, Recognitions, Feminisms* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

[22] Shandler's case study is specifically about the mediation of Holocaust memory. With regards to the Holocaust, in contrast to places like Europe and Israel, where survivors abound, and the landscape itself bears the scars of these atrocities, "in America this subject [the Holocaust] has almost always been mediated through newspapers, magazines, books, theaters, exhibitions galleries, concert halls, or radio and television

broadcasting." Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), xv.

His point about the importance of mediation to our knowledge of these events is corroborated by others like Barbie Zelizer, as she holds, "Through films, television, cultural artifacts, art, comic books, and photographs, the Holocaust's visualization is so prevalent that it has become an integral part of our understanding and recollection of the atrocities of World War II. It is difficult to contemplate the Holocaust without traces of familiar visual images coming to mind." Barbie Zelizer, "Introduction: On Visualizing the Holocaust," in *Visual Culture and the Holocaust,* ed. Barbie Zelizer (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 1.

Young similar notes how issues related to place change such representations. In particular, he develops this argument in relationship to the ways this changes American Holocaust memorialization. Because American memorials are not built upon the sites of Holocaust atrocities, "In this sense, American memorials seem to be anchored not so much in history as in the ideals that generated them in the first place." James Young, "America's Holocaust: Memory and the Politics of Identity," in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed. Hilene Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press, 1999), 71.

[23] One significant strand within the literature on the mediation of genocide concerns the news media's coverage of genocide. Numerous studies have been conducted on the news media's framing of genocide, the frequency of the news media's coverage of genocide, the role of the media in fueling genocide or the failure of news media to trigger intervention. For examples of such work, see Laurel Leff, *Buried by the Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper* (Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press, 2005); Allan Thompson, ed., *The Media and the Rwanda Genocide* (London: Pluto Press, 2007); Lauren Kogen, "Why the Message Should Matter: Genocide and the Ethics of Global Journalism in the Mediapolis," *Journal of International Communication* 15, no. 2 (2009): 62-78; Chinedu Eke, "Darfur: Coverage of a Genocide by Three Major US TV Networks on their Evening News," *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics* 4, no. 3 (2008): 277-292; Emmanuel C. Alozie, "Voices in the Hills of Rwanda: African Press Accountability of the 1994 Pogrom," *International Communication Gazette* 72, no. 7 (2010): 589-617; Christine L. Kellow and H. Leslie Steeves, "The Role of Radio in the Rwandan Genocide," *Journal of Communication* 48, no. 3 (1998): 107-128.

[24] Miriam Bratu Hansen, "*Schindler's List* Is Not *Shoah*: The Second Commandment, Popular Modernism, and Public Memory," *Critical Inquiry* 22, no. 2 (1996): 310. Hansen regards the mass-mediated transmission of memory as a form of what Landsberg calls "prosthetic memory." See Alison Landsberg, "America, the Holocaust, and the Mass Culture of Memory: Toward a Radical Politics of Empathy," *New German Critique* 71 (1997): 63-86.

[25] These studies abound and are too numerous to exhaustively list. They include analyses of popular films, such as *Hotel Rwanda* or *Schindler's List*; or analyses of particular forms of mediation. For examples of former, see Yosefa Loshitzky, ed., *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on* Schindler's List (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997); Ann-Marie Cook, "Based on the True Story: Cinema's Mythologised Vision of the Rwandan Genocide," in *Promoting and Producing Evil*, ed. Nancy Billias (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010), 161-178. For examples of the latter, see Haggith and Newman, *Holocaust*; Shandler, *While America Watches*. Zelizer's 2001

edited collection offers a great example of studies of genocide presented according to the various ways they are visually mediated. See Barbie Zelizer, ed., *Visual Culture and the Holocaust* (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001).

Multiple studies of Holocaust and genocide museums and memorials also exist, including numerous analyses of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. For example, see Marouf Hasian Jr. and Rulon Wood, "Critical Museology, (Post)Colonial Communication, and the Gradual Mastering of Traumatic Pasts at the Royal Museum for Central Africa (RMCA)," *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 2 (2010): 128-149; Marouf Hasian Jr., "Remembering and Forgetting the 'Final Solution': A Rhetorical Pilgrimage through the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21, no. 1 (2004) 64-92; Edward T. Linenthal, *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); Theodore O. Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness, and Responsible: Collective Memory and Liminality in the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance," *Communication Quarterly* 51, no. 3 (2003): 351-366; James E. Young, "Introduction: The Texture of Memory," in *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

[26] Oren Baruch Stier, *Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 1-2.

[27] In *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*, Young holds that how knowledge or the memory of the Holocaust is transmitted is often as important to artists/architects born after the Shoah as the content itself. These artists' emphasis on the importance of *how* information is conveyed implies

a key role for mediation in constituting memories of the Holocaust/genocide itself. James E. Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 2.

[28] Landsberg, "America, the Holocaust."

[29] On the prevalence of Holocaust memory, see Alvin H. Rosenfeld, *The End of the Holocaust* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011). On Holocaust memory as providing a framework for expressions of trauma, see Anne Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture: Selling the Pain of Others in the Mass Media* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011).

[30] Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 14, 141-2. Notably, the story of the evolution of Holocaust memory, and in particular, the role of the Holocaust in U.S. public memory, is presented in numerous work as various authors highlight the factors they argue contribute to the popularization of Holocaust memory. In addition to the works cited in the next few notes, see also MacDonald, *Identity Politics*; Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*; Leon A. Jick, "The Holocaust: its Use and Abuse within the American Public," *Yad Vashem Studies* 14 (1981): 303-318.

[31] Baron, "The Holocaust."

[32] Baron, using the work of Peter Novick, Alan Mintz, and Deborah Lipstadt (amongst others), argues that this is the predominant way of interpreting the status of Holocaust memory immediately after the end of World War II. Baron devotes his article to arguing *against* this interpretation, highlighting early forms of Holocaust memory. Baron, "The Holocaust," 63. See also Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of*

Holocaust Memory in America (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001); Deborah

E. Lipstadt, "America and the Memory of the Holocaust," *Modern Judaism* 16 (1996):

195-215; Novick, *The Holocaust*.

[33] Baron, "The Holocaust," 63.

[34] Mintz, *Popular Culture*, 5-9.

[35] Mintz, *Popular Culture*; Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*; Novick, *The Holocaust*. Finkelstein locates the rise of Holocaust memory in a broader culture shift toward identity politics around this time. See Norman G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, 2nd. ed. (London: Verso, 2003), 32-38.

[36] Mintz, *Popular Culture*, 10. Mintz's list of the contextual factors that contributed to the popularization of Holocaust memory should be nuanced with a consideration of Lipstadt and Baron's contentions regarding the presence of earlier markers of Holocaust memory. See Baron, "The Holocaust;" Lipstadt, "America."

[37] This idea of a 1990s "Holocaust consciousness" is derived from Novick's work, which opens by questioning "how Americans became so 'Holocaust conscious'" toward the end of the twentieth century. Both Novick and Steinweis treat the 1990s as a unique moment in the evolution of Holocaust history, and this boom in Holocaust awareness becomes the curiosity that drives Novick's study. Intriguingly, both Novick and Steinweis anticipate the memory of the Holocaust declining after the 1990s. See Novick, *The Holocaust*, 1; Alan E. Steinweis, "The Auschwitz Analogy: Holocaust Memory and American Debates over Intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 19, no. 2 (2005) 276-289.

[38] Novick, *The Holocaust*, 1.

[39] Mintz, *Popular Culture*, 4. In supporting this assertion, Mintz turns to the numerous museums, books, video testimonies, and of course, the "profitable and high-profile film and television projects" on the Holocaust. Similarly Lipstadt affirms, "To say that the Holocaust has become a central symbol of the twentieth century, particularly for American Jews, is to state the obvious." See Lipstadt, "America," 195.

[40] Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 14, 142.

[41] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 16.

[42] This controversy was the byproduct of a decision PBS made to offer a follow-up program which would feature viewpoints contesting the nature of the genocide. Some perceived this as fueling contestations over genocide denial. Michael Getler, "Coming Soon to Viewers Like You: 'The Armenian Genocide,'" PBS Ombudsman Column, March 17, 2006, accessed May 22, 2011,

http://www.pbs.org/ombudsman/2006/03/coming_soon_to_viewers_like_you_the_armenian.html; "The Armenian Genocide," Two Cats Productions, accessed May 22, 2011, http://www.twocatstv.com/armenian-genocide/.

[43] "Welcome to the Future Home of the Armenian Genocide Museum of American," Armenian Genocide Museum of America, accessed March 31, 2011, http://www.armeniangenocidemuseum.org/.

[44] Markovitz offers a nuanced critique of *Ararat*, which explains how the film is able to both impart some information about the genocide and, more importantly, advance a critique about the difficulty of mediating genocide memory. Markovitz notes that if the film were just read as a vehicle for imparting knowledge about the genocide, it would be

a failure. The film only provided limited glimpses into the atrocities and does not develop

a very sophisticated historical context. Worse, the footage that is contained within the

film within the film is hyperbolic and lacks needed nuance. However, Markovitz argues

the film's merit lies in spotlighting the conventions of mediation while at the same time

securing the Armenian genocide some much needed publicity. See Jonathan Markovitz,

"*Ararat* and Collective Memories of the Armenian Genocide," *Holocaust and Genocide*

Studies 20, no. 2 (2006): 235-55.

[45] *Ararat*, DVD, directed by Atom Egoyan (Mirimax, 2002).

[46] Toby Haggith and Joanna Newman, ed. *Holocaust and the Moving Image:*

Representations in Film and Television Since 1933 (London: Wallflower Press, 2005);

Shandler, *While America Watches*.

[47] For an extensive listing of Holocaust organizations, see "Geographical Index of

Member Organizations," Association of Holocaust Organizations, accessed May 22,

2011, http://www.ahoinfo.org/membersdirectory.html.

[48] This summary of USHMM contents is derived from the author's first-hand

experience touring the USHMM's permanent exhibition and special exhibition, "Deadly

Medicine: Creating the Master Race." It is also supplemented with recourse to the

USHMM's Holocaust Encyclopedia. See "The Holocaust," United States Holocaust

Memorial Museum's *Holocaust Encyclopedia*, January 6 2011, accessed May 22, 2011,

http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/?ModuleId=10005143.

[49] For a detailed exploration and critique of the MoMA exhibition see Rachel

Hughes, "The Abject Artefacts of Memory: Photographs from Cambodia's Genocide,"

Media, Culture & Society 25 (2003): 23-44.

[50] *The Killing Fields*, DVD, directed by Roland Joffé (Warner Brothers, 1984).

[51] *Hotel Rwanda*, DVD, directed by Terry George (MGM Home Entertainment, 2005).

[52] *Welcome to Sarajevo*, DVD, directed by Michael Winterbottom (Burbank, CA: Buena Vista Home Entertainment, 1997).

[53] Darfur Is Dying, "About the Game," Darfur Digital Activist, 2009 http://www.darfurisdying.com/aboutgame.html (accessed May 22, 2011); Alex de Waal, "War Games: The West's Response to Darfur Reveals More About Its Own Agenda than the Reality of the Crisis," *Index on Censorship* 36, no. 4 (2007): 6-11.

[54] *The Devil Came on Horseback*, DVD, directed by Ricki Stern and Anne Sundberg (New York: Break Thru Films, 2007).

[55] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 16.

[56] Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema," 3.

[57] Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema;" Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 94, 98. See also Ebbrecht, "Migrating Images." For a pessimistic assessment of Holocaust representation, see Omer Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[58] Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema," 3.

[59] LaCapra connects Holocaust representations to Bourdieu's "symbolic capital." Dominick LaCapra, *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994), 63. See also Charles L. Briggs, "Introduction: The Power of Discourse in (Re)Creating Genocide," *Social Identities* 3, no. 3 (1997): 407-

414; Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson, trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

[60] See, for example, Rosenfeld, *The End*.

[61] Samantha Power, "To Suffer by Comparison?" *Daedalus* 128, no. 2 (1999): 31-66.

[62] In his introduction to the journal, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Bauer gestures toward the question of how these terms relate. Yehuda Bauer, "Editor's Introduction," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1, no. 1 (1986): 1-2.

[63] See Novick, *The Holocaust*, 9; Dan Stone, "The Historiography of Genocide: Beyond 'Uniqueness' and Ethnic Competition," in *History, Memory and Mass Atrocity: Essays on the Holocaust and Genocide* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2006), 236-251.

[64] In the words of Bischoping and Kalmin, "One of the most vigorous disputes in Holocaust and genocide studies concerns the uniqueness of the Holocaust." Katherine Bischoping and Andrea Kalmin, "Public Opinion about Comparisons to the Holocaust," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (1999): 485.

[65] Alan S. Rosenbaum, ed., *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Contemporary Genocide*, 3rd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2009).

[66] By way of evidencing the ferocity of the debates, detractors have argued that the power behind the defense of the uniqueness thesis can silence dissent lest those challenging the status of the Holocaust risk being labeled anti-Semitic. See Mayer's defense against such charges. Arno J. Mayer, "Memory and History: On the Poverty of Remembering and Forgetting the Judeocide," *Radical History Review* 56 (1993): 5-20.

Charny stresses that – far from being marginal – there is "a good deal of political power used in many places in academia, museums, and communities to back up these claims by pushing down and out nonadherents." Israel W. Charny, foreword to *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Contemporary Genocide*, edited by Alan S. Rosenbaum, 3rd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2009), x.

[67] Gavriel V. Rosenfeld, "The Politics of Uniqueness: Reflections on the Recent Polemical Turn in Holocaust and Genocide Scholarship," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 13, no. 1 (1999): 29.

Although I draw heavily on Rosenfeld's scholarship in this paragraph, Alexander also offers an account of the historical circumstances linked to the emergence of the uniqueness thesis. Jeffrey C. Alexander, "On the Social Construction of Moral Universals: The 'Holocaust' from War Crime to Trauma Drama," *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no. 1 (2002): 5-85.

[68] Rosenfeld explains that the emergence of genocide studies as a discipline or field within which to understand the Holocaust is problematic. See Rosenfeld, "The Politics," 32-33.

[69] Rosenfeld, "The Politics," 33-35.

[70] Power, "To Suffer," 56, 66n63. Power is drawing on Rosenbaum's work to make this claim. See also Rosenbaum, *Is the Holocaust Unique?* 4.

[71] Rosenfeld, "The Politics," 29.

[72] Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 47-48.

[73] Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust*, 48.

[74] Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust*, 49.

[75] Steven T. Katz, *The Holocaust in Historical Context,* vol 1, *The Holocaust and Mass Death before the Modern Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 10-11, 580. See Rosenfeld's synopsis, Rosenfeld, "The Politics," 37. See also Steven T. Katz, "The Uniqueness of the Holocaust: The Historical Dimension," in *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Contemporary Genocide*, edited by Alan S. Rosenbaum, 3rd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2009), 55-74.

[76] This is argument is found Rosenfeld's reading of Katz. See Rosenfeld, "The Politics," 37, 47; Katz, *The Holocaust*, 128-129.

[77] Novick, *The Holocaust*, 9.

[78] Power, "To Suffer," 56. Levene identifies one of the problems with such comparative discourse as "an unseemly jockeying for position on the hierarchy of suffering." Mark Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation-State*, vol. 1, *The Meaning of Genocide* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 6.

[79] Novick, *The Holocaust,* 9-10.

[80] See Stone, *History, Memory*, 241-242. Stone is gesturing toward a larger body of work that takes up the racial implications of the ascendancy of Holocaust memory vis-à-vis colonial practices. See, for example, Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972); Vinay Lal, "Genocide, Barbaric Others, and the Violence of Categories: A Response to Omer Bartov," *American Historical Review* 103, no, 4 (1998): 1187-1190.

[81] Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget,* 15. Variations of this argument are made by Power, "To Suffer," 57; Stone, *History, Memory,* ix-x; Young, "America's Holocaust," 74.

[82] Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 503. See also Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 10. Rothberg ultimately poses an understanding of memory as multidirectional which seeks to challenge the idea of Holocaust memories "blocking" other memories of suffering, atrocity, or violence. See the broader discussion of Rothberg's thesis developed in Chapter One.

[83] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 19-20. Rothberg's argument is grounded in Fraser's work. See Nancy Fraser, "Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World," *New Left Review* 36 (November-December 2005): 69-88.

[84] Rosenfeld argues that within a political context that values "victimization, a genocidal past is an obvious political asset." Rosenfeld, "The Politics," 46. Further, all of these scholars centralize the utility of Holocaust memory specifically as it is linked to recognition, identity claims, and action. Aleida Assmann, "The Holocaust – a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community," in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 111-112, 114; Levene, *Genocide in the Age*; MacDonald, *Identity Politics*; Power, "To Suffer."

[85] MacDonald, *Identity Politics*, 17.

[86] Levene, *Genocide in the Age*, 3.

[87] Charles S. Maier, "A Surfeit of Memory? Reflections on History, Melancholy and Denial," *History and Memory* 5, no. 2 (1993): 136-152.See also Ruffins on the

politics of recognition and status. Fath Davis Ruffins, "Culture Wars Won and Lost: Ethnic Museums on the Mall, Part I: The National Holocaust Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian," *Radical History Review* 68 (Spring 1997): 79-100.

[88] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 20.

[89] Maier aptly describes "competition" for such a "prize." He asserts, "In fact, modern American politics, it might be argued, has become a competition for enshrining grievances. Every group claims its share of public honor and public funds by pressing disabilities and injustices. National public life becomes the settlement of a collective malpractice suit in which all citizens are patients and physicians simultaneously." Maier, "A Surfeit of Memory?" 147. See also Novick, *The Holocaust*, 8.

[90] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*. See Novick's discussion on the links between Jewish identity and the Holocaust. Novick, *The Holocaust*, 6-9.

[91] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory.*

[92] Dean's work also foregrounds a sense of ambivalence in historical representations of the Holocaust pertaining to her exploration of understandings of empathy. See her discussion of Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*. Carolyn J. Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy after the Holocaust* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 43-56.

[93] Jonathan Petropoulos and John K. Roth, ed. *Gray Zones: Ambiguity and Compromise in the Holocaust and its Aftermath* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005). For more ambivalence in Holocaust memorialization, see Keil's insightful analysis of Auschwitz tourism, Chris Keil, "Sightseeing in the Mansions of the Dead," *Social & Cultural Geography* 6, no. 4 (2005): 479-94.

[94] Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "Revised Introduction to the English Edition," in *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, trans. Assenka Oksiloff (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2006), 18.

[95] Mandel's analysis becomes especially pertinent to this project because she argues that such a disconcerting recognition is staved off through an emphasis on silence; thusly, lending additional support to the importance of studying practices of exnomination. (See the explanation of exnomination later in this chapter.) I extend this to suggest that the threat lies within genocide discourses more broadly, not just rhetorics of the Holocaust. See Naomi Mandel, "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz': Against a Rhetoric of the Unspeakable in Holocaust Writing," *boundary 2* 28, no. 2 (2001): 228.

[96] Mandel, "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz,'" 217-219, 221-222, 226, 228. On disruption to the moral order and the discomfort created by such disruption, see Zygmunt Bauman, "Categorial Murder, Or: How to Remember the Holocaust," in *Re-Presenting the Shoah for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Ronit Lentin (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004), 25, 27.

[97] Again, such an assertion reflects an extended application of Mandel's insightful analysis regarding the role of silence in masking such awareness to apply it to genocidal violence broadly. Mandel, "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz,'" 223.

[98] Edkins writes, "Sovereign power produces and is itself produced by trauma: it provokes wars, genocides and famines. But it works by concealing its involvement and claiming to be a provider, not a destroyer of security…the state does this in no small part through the way in which it commemorates wars, genocides and famines. By rewriting these traumas into a linear narrative of national heroism, this book will argue, the state

conceals the trauma that it has, necessarily produced." Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), xv.

Edkins is most emphatic about the relationship between the state and violence. She expands upon this point early in the book. She contends, "[t]he modern state…is a contradictory institution: a promise of safety, security and meaning alongside a reality of abuse, control and coercion." Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, 6.

Her perspective on the links among the state, violence, and atrocity becomes all the more significant within the context of this study because it dovetails with extent arguments in Holocaust and genocide studies accentuating the nation-state's relationship to genocide causality. For more on the scholarly perspectives associating the nation-state with genocide, see the discussion of causality in Chapter One.

[99] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, 12-13.

[100] Jenny Edkins, "Remembering Relationality: Trauma Time and Politics," in *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*, ed. Duncan Bell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 101.

[101] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, 15.

[102] See the discussion on page 4-5 of the importance of such imaginary to the identification and comprehension of genocide. Further, Torchin discusses these representations as employing "a visual shorthand that cues recognition of suffering and injustice and thus makes emotional and ethical claims." Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 218.

[103] I pause here to offer one more distinction between my study and other existing work. There are scholars who are concerned with how changes to the media and

communication infrastructure might contribute to genocide cessation. Many of these works are interested in facilitating the spread of information and/or the role of surveillance. My study is less concerned with communication technologies as tools for promoting surveillance or breaking "news" about genocide. For examples of works concerned with medium changes and information distribution and/or surveillance, see Sarah E. Kreps, "Social Networks and Technology in the Prevention of Crimes Against Humanity," in *Mass Atrocity Crimes: Preventing Future Outrages*, ed. Robert I. Rotberg (Cambridge, MA: World Peace Foundation/Harvard Kennedy School Program on Intrastate Conflict; Washington, D.C., Brookings Institute Press, 2010), 175-191; John G. Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide: A Guide for Policymakers, Scholars, and the Concerned Citizen* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001), 257. Totten presents the "promise" of the media in contributing to genocide cessation, but then details why the media may not be able to fulfill its promise. Samuel Totten, "The Intervention and Prevention of Genocide: Where There *Is* the Political Will, There Is a Way," in *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, ed. Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1997), 470-475.

[104] For this reason, this study excludes some obvious examples of popular cultural genocide texts. Films, such *Hotel Rwanda* or *Schindler's List*, lack the broader focus on weaving these atrocities into overarching narratives about the nature of genocidal violence.

[105] More specifically, see the conclusion to Chapter Three and Patraka's arguments about the redeeming characteristics of the MOT. Vivian M. Patraka, "Situating History and Difference: The Performance of the Term *Holocaust* in Public Discourse," in

Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish Cultural Studies, ed. Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press: 1997), 54-78.

[106] In looking both across and within these texts, I treat this discourse "as a dynamic field of action." See James Jasinski, "A Constitutive Framework for Rhetorical Historiography: Toward an Understanding of the Discursive (Re)constitution of 'Constitution' in *The Federalist Papers*," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 83.

[107] In addition to this study's theoretical underpinnings, I bring my own politics and perspectives to this analysis. I am a white, straight woman and US citizen, privileged to be born into a middle to upper-middle class family. I have little personal experience with the forms of genocidal violence at the center of this project. Nevertheless, I am connected to the politics of genocide cessation as a former employee of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. In this capacity, I worked closely with Holocaust survivors. Unquestionably, these experiences have shaped my understanding of that institution's ties to the US government and obligations to the public.

Moreover, my political leanings predispose me to embrace "post-liberal" perspectives on genocide (see Chapter One), which undoubtedly influence my outlook on the nation-state's connections to atrocities.

[108] Murray Edelman, *Constructing the Political Spectacle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 120.

[109] Edelman, *Constructing*, 12.

[110] These ideological constructions are also significant sources of political power. Briggs, like Herman and Peterson below, is sensitive to the power inherent in genocide

discourse. He argues, "[t]he capacity to define genocide and to regulate what gets included under its aegis is both a consequence and a source of political power. A modernist, strictly referential view of language that construes discourses of genocide as the application of strictly defined terms that transparently represent language-external events thus erases awareness of their broader political significance." Briggs, "Introduction," http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=1443339&site=ehost-live.

[111] This relationship is taken up in greater detail in Chapter One. In short, the term "genocide" has juridical power in addition to its symbolic power. Under the 1948 UN Convention, atrocities deemed "genocide" are supposed trigger action by the global community. For this reasons, international actors have been historically cautious about their use of the term. Behind that caution lies a clear recognition of the power that adheres in that rhetorical act of naming.

Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 58. Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, David Rieff, "An Age of Genocide: The Far Reaching Lessons of Rwanda," *The New Republic*, January 29, 1996, 32.

[112] Edward S. Herman and David Peterson, *The Politics of Genocide* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010), 15. See also Noam Chomsky, *On Power and Ideology: The Managua Lectures* (Boston: South End Press, 1987); Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (London: Verso, 1991).

[113] Herman and Peterson, *The Politics*, 27. [emphasis in the original] Although I centralize Herman and Peterson's work in this paragraph, Mandel's work demonstrates a

similar sensitivity toward the ideological power of these discourses. Mandel, "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz.'"

[114] Edelman, *Constructing*, 4-6. Edelman's defense is not merely of social constructionism. In countering positivism, Edelman articulates the merits of relativism, embracing and attempting to redeem a somewhat problematic term.

[115] Rather than devote their text to seeking out "the truth," they remain focused on exploring representations and the "discourses about truth." They opt to "focus not on veracity or realism but on the cultural work that practices of truth, memory, and representation do in postgenocidal contexts." See O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 13, 21.

[116] In this capacity, this study's approach parallels Hesford's methodology, although this dissertation project centralizes different methodological constructs. Hesford favors a discussion of intercontextuality; whereas, I privilege genre below. Yet, in many ways, similar sentiments regarding the importance of attending to frameworks for meaning production are punctuated through both analyses. Hesford, *Spectacular Rhetorics*, 8-12.

[117] To use Baron's words again, articulations of genocide cessation claims do not emerge from "a tabula rasa." Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema," 3. As Torchin's book well establishes, the very legibility of these atrocities comes, in part, from their ability to tap into extant "visual traditions, popular film, and historical and social contexts," or "iconographic lexicons and tropes." Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 216, 218.

[118] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 2.

[119] Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 4.

[120] M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); M.M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986).

[121] Amy J. Devitt, *Writing Genre*s (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004), 4-5. Devitt's first chapter includes an excellent review of early genre scholarship, addressing these pitfalls. See Devitt, *Writing Genre*s, 1-19.

[122] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction," in *Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action*, ed. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (Falls Church, VA: The Speech Communication Association, 1978), 25.

[123] Jackson Harrell and Wil A. Linkugel, "On Rhetorical Genre: An Organizing Perspective," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 11, no. 4 (1978): 263-264. [emphasis in the original]

[124] Walter R. Fisher, "Genre: Concepts and Applications in Rhetorical Criticism," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44, no. 4 (1980): 299.

[125] Devitt, *Writing Genre*s, 1-2.

[126] Devitt, *Writing Genre*s; Amy J. Devitt, "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept," *College Composition and Communication* 44, no. 4 (1993): 573-586.

[127] Devitt, *Writing Genre*s, 9.

Rather than considering genre as "a classification created by critics" as early genre work did, Devitt highlights a turn toward thinking about genre as "a classification that people make as they use symbols to get along in the world." Devitt, *Writing Genre*s, 8. Devitt elevates Miller's work as critical to this shift. See reference to Miller below.

[128] Devitt, *Writing Genre*s, 15.

[129] Carolyn R. Miller, "Genre as Social Action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, no. 2 (1984): 156-157. Miller explains the function of genre by drawing on Schutz's research on types. See Alfred Schutz and Thomas Luckmann, *The Structures of the Life-World*, trans. Richard M. Zaner and H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr. (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973), 229-235.

[130] Devitt, *Writing Genre*s, 21. Similar arguments regarding genre as a form of comparison or pattern recognition can be found in Campbell and Jamieson, "Form and Genre;" Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68, no. 2 (1982): 146-157.

For a discussion of "pattern recognition" as a means of rhetorical criticism, see Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Rhetorical Criticism 2009: A Study in Method," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, ed. by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 86-107.

[131] Kathleen M. Jamieson, "Antecedent Genre as Rhetorical Constraint," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 4 (1975): 406-415.

[132] In Campbell and Jamieson's words, "A generic approach to rhetorical criticism would culminate in a developmental history of rhetoric that would permit the critic to generalize beyond the individual event which is constrained by time and place to

affinities and traditions across time. It would move from the study of rhetors and acts in isolation to the study of recurrent rhetorical action. It would produce a critical history exploring the ways in which rhetorical acts influence each other." Campbell and Jamieson, "Form and Genre," 27.

[133] Jamieson and Campbell, "Rhetorical Hybrids," 156-157.

[134] Richard Terdiman, "Historicizing Memory," in *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 7.

[135] Bruce E. Gronbeck, "The Rhetorics of the Past: History, Argument, and Collective Memory," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 47-60.

[136] Terdiman, "Historicizing Memory," 21. Similar notions about the inaccessibility of recalling the past can be found in Gronbeck, "The Rhetorics of the Past;" 48; E. Culpepper Clark and Raymie E. McKerrow, "The Rhetorical Construction of History," in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 39.

[137] "Human activity is ephemeral;" Gronbeck notes, "it can be remembered but not relived."Gronbeck, "The Rhetorics of the Past," 48.

[138] Gronbeck, "The Rhetorics of the Past." 57. Indeed, Casey holds, "public memory is radically bivalent in its temporality…public memory is both attached to a past (typically an originating event of some sort) *and* acts to ensure a future of further remembering of that same event." See Edward S. Casey, "Public Memory in Place and Time," in *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 17. For case studies, see Cheryl R. Jorgensen-Earp,

"Satisfaction of Metaphorical Expectations through Visual Display: The *Titanic Exhibition*," in *Rhetorics of Display*, ed. Lawrence J. Prelli (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 41-65; Theresa Ann Donofrio "Ground Zero and Place-Making Authority: The Conservative Metaphors in 9/11 Families' 'Take Back the Memorial' Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 2 (2010): 150-169.

[139] Halbwachs contends, "there exists a collective memory and social frameworks for memory," and "it is to the degree that our individual thought places itself in these frameworks and participates in this memory that it is capable of the act of recollection." Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. and ed. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38; As Phillips notes, Halbwachs' theory of memory is informed by Durkheim's sense of "collective conscience;" thus, the conditions of memory are predicated upon the conditions of collectivity. Kendall R. Phillips, "Introduction" in *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 1.

[140] Blair contends at the heart of collective memory studies is a sense of "memory as a collective or communal phenomenon, rather than as an individual, cognitive function." Carole Blair, "Communication as Collective Memory," in *Communication as…Perspectives on Theory*, ed. Gregory J. Shepherd, Jeffery St. John, and Ted Striphas (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2006), 52. Put differently, summarizing the trajectory of thought post-Halbwachs, Zelizer states, "scholars have come increasingly to see memory as a social activity, accomplished not in the privacy of one's own gray matter but via shared consciousness with others." Barbie Zelizer, "Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies," *Critical Studies in Mass*

Communication 12, no. 2 (1995): 215. See Casey, "Public Memory in Place," on the differences between individual, social, collective, and public memory.

[141] For an excellent overview of the connections between memory, the end of the twentieth century "memory boom," and temporality, see the introduction to Huyssen's argument in *Twilight Memories*. Andreas Huyssen, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 6-9. See also Edkins's discussion of memory and temporality. Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, xiv-xv.

[142] Pierre Nora, "General Introduction: Between Memory and History," in *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past,* vol. 1, *Conflicts and Divisions*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (1992; New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 1-20.

[143] Terdiman, "Historicizing Memory," 8.

[144] Bradford Vivian, "Times of Violence," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, no. 2 (2013): 211.

[145] This is where trauma studies have additional utility as well. See the discussion to follow of trauma and time in Chapter One, page 93.

[146] Huyssen, *Twilight Memories*, 6-9, 252-260; Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, xiv-xv, 15-16.

[147] John Hartley, *Television Truths* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 3.

[148] Hartley, *Television Truths*, 8.

[149] Hartley, *Television Truths*, 3.

[150] "Media" in this essay does not simply refer to television. It includes a broader category of mediation; thus, "museums" are a form of media. The idea of "epistemic

authority" is derived from Hein's work on museums and is extended in Bergman to include museums and documentary films. See Hilde S. Hein, *The Museum in Transition: A Philosophical Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 5; Teresa Bergman, "A Critical Analysis of the California State Railroad Museum's Orientation Films," *Western Journal of Communication* 67, no. 4 (2003): 430.

[151] My understanding of the media as a public pedagogy primarily emerges from Gunn's work; however, Giroux credits himself with coining the construct. See Joshua Gunn, "Father Trouble: Staging Sovereignty in Spielberg's *War of the Worlds*," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 1 (2008): 1-27; Henry A. Giroux, "Cultural Studies, Public Pedagogy, and the Responsibility of Intellectuals," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 62.   Numerous media studies scholars also afford media this pedagogic role. Tuchman, building on Lasswell, states, "Americans learn basic lessons about social life from the mass media." See Gaye Tuchman, "Introduction: The Symbolic Annihilation of Women by the Mass Media," in *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media*, ed. Gaye Tuchman, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, & James Benét (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 3. White operates based off a similar pedagogical premise. She suggests her study of television discourses "contributes to an understanding of the function of the popular media in what might be called the pedagogy of everyday life. From this perspective," she holds, "it is crucial to account for television's particular modes of meaning and subject production, while recognizing that this productivity occurs in a broader context of social-cultural practices and activities." See Mimi White, *Tele-advising: Therapeutic Discourse in American Television* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Press, 1992), 53.

[152] Departing from Anderson's notion of the "imagined community," both Hartley and Hariman and Lucaites suggest the ways the media shapes understandings of the *polis*. Hartley, in *The Politics of Pictures*, argues that "the public" only exists in texts, specifically, pictures or images. Noting that the bounds of the ancient Greek *polis* were delineated based upon the number of people that could be sighted at one time, Hartley argues the ways we come to see and understand "the public" today are no longer contingent upon how many people can literally be apprehended in a single glance but upon the image of the public conveyed through mediated texts. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (1983; London: Verso, 2006); John Hartley, *The Politics of Pictures: The Creation of the Public in the Age of Popular Media* (London: Routledge, 1992); Hariman and Lucaites, *No Caption Needed*.

[153] For more on the construction of leaders and enemies, see Edelman, *Constructing*, 37-89. Hariman and Lucaites' description of the "individual aggregate" illuminates the role of the individual in media texts. See Hariman and Lucaites, *No Caption Needed*, 88-89. Finally, for an example of a study highlighting a key political agent (the President), see also Trevor Parry-Giles and Shawn J. Parry-Giles, *The Prime-Time Presidency:* The West Wing *and U.S. Nationalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006).

[154] Hariman and Lucaites, *No Caption Needed,* 12. In building to this argument, Hariman and Lucaites are drawing on the work of Warner and Kaplan. They credit specifically: Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books,

2002), 74-76; Louis Kaplan, *American Exposures: Photography and Community in the Twentieth Century* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), xv.

[155] Notably, this study's view of citizenship is influenced by the discursive theory of citizenship advanced by Robert Asen. Citizenship, according to Asen, is more than a traditional set of explicitly acknowledged civic acts – voting, petitioning, running for office, etc. Rather, citizenship is situated "as a *mode of public engagement.*" Citizenship exists, then, not exclusively "in the halls of Congress or in the voting booth, but in everyday enactments of citizenship." See Robert Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 2 (2004): 191, 197. [italics in the original]

Such a view on citizenship creates space to recognize the importance of media in shaping conceptions of citizenship. As McGovern in his study of consumptive citizenship notes, "[c]itizenship does not depend on laws alone, as many scholars have noted. The law defines political status, but customs, beliefs and the material world all shape affiliation and meaning. It is indeed in culture -- in symbols, language, rituals, and forms of expression -- that nationality is made and redefined." See Charles F. McGovern, *Sold American: Consumption and Citizenship, 1890-1945* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 9. Luke, attentive to the construction of civic identities within museums, similarly affirms, "[c]reating citizens is, to a significant degree, a process of institutionally organized impersonation….Putting such systems of acculturation out at public museum sites may push and pull individual members of their audiences to impersonate the values assigned to their images." See Timothy W. Luke, *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota,

2002), 13. Finally, Hariman and Lucaites, again following on the heels of work by Warner and Kaplan, explicitly identify this function of the media in arguing that iconic photos provide "model[s] for civic life." See Hariman and Luciates, *No Caption Needed*, 11.

[156] In brief, debate over the media's progressive potential engages a number of critical concerns. Among the factors thought to undermine the media's ability to serve as a vehicle for social and political change, scholars have listed: the media's close connection to the capitalist system of production (thus no critique can ever be so radical as to overhaul the system the media depends on), its capitulation to the "mainstream" (another byproduct of the market model), the "passivity" of spectatorship, and the proclivity to couch all stories in past stories, making the framing inherently conservative. For a fuller explanation of these attributes, see the work of: George Gerbner and Larry Gross, "Living with Television: The Violence Profile," *Journal of Communication* 26, no. 2 (1976): 172-199; Larry Gross, "Out of the Mainstream: Sexual Minorities and the Mass Media," in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 405-423; Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles, "*Fahrenheit 9/11*—Virtual Realism and the Limits of Commodified Dissent," in *The Rhetoric of the New Political Documentary*, ed. Thomas W. Benson and Brian J. Snee (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 24-53; Carolyn Kitch, "'A Death in the American Family': Myth, Memory, and National Values in the Media Mourning of John F. Kennedy, Jr.," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2002): 304-305; Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and*

Law and Order (Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillian, 1978), 54; Darrell Y. Hamamoto,

Nervous Laughter: Television Situation Comedy and Liberal Democratic Ideology (New

York, Praeger, 1989); Tuchman, "Introduction;" Roderick P. Hart, *Seducing America:*

How Television Charms the Modern Voter (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

For case studies on the ways progressive representations of women, the feminist

movement, and the GLBTQI movement are undermined through mediated

representations, see Margaret J. Heide, *Television Culture and Women's Lives:*

thirtysomething *and the Contradictions of Gender* (Philadelphia: University of

Pennsylvania Press, 1995); Bonnie J. Dow, *Prime-Time Feminism: Television, Media*

Culture, and the Women's Movement Since 1970 (Philadelphia: University of

Pennsylvania Press, 1996); Bonnie J. Dow, "Fixing Feminism: Women's Liberation and

the Rhetoric of Television Documentary," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 1 (2004):

53-80; Dana L. Cloud, "The First Lady's Privates: Queering Eleanor Roosevelt for Public

Address Studies," in *Queering Public Address: Sexualities in American Historical*

Discourse, ed. Charles E. Morris III (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press,

2007), 23-44; Bonnie J. Dow, "*Ellen*, Television, and the Politics of Gay and Lesbian

Visibility," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 18, no. 2 (2001): 123-140; Charles

E. Morris III and John M. Sloop, "'What Lips These Lips Have Kissed': Refiguring the

Politics of Queer Public Kissing," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1

(2006): 1-26. Morris and Sloop attribute some of this conservative function to the process

of "*claw back*" identified in Fiske and Hartley's work. John Fiske and John Hartley,

"Bardic Television," in *Reading Television* (London: Methuen, 1978), 87.

[157] Martin J. Medhurst and Thomas W. Benson, "Introduction: Rhetorical Studies in a Media Age," in *Rhetorical Dimensions in Media: A Critical Casebook*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst and Thomas W. Benson (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1984), xviii.

[158] See, for example, the perspective on the media contained in Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception," in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing 2006), 41-72.

[159] Medhurst and Benson, "Introduction," x; Dow, *Prime-Time Feminism*, xxiii, 8-9.

[160] See George Lipsitz, "Listening to Learn and Learning to Listen: Popular Culture, Cultural Theory, and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1990): 615- 636; Richard Johnson, "What is Cultural Studies Anyway?" *Social Text* 16 (Winter 1986/87): 38-80; Stuart Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing 'the Popular,'" in *Cultural Resistance Reader*, ed. Stephen Duncombe (New York: Verso, 2002), 185-192; Norma Schulman, "Conditions of their Own Making: An Intellectual History of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 18, no. 1 (1993), http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewArticle/717; John M. Sloop and Mark Olson, "*Cultural* Struggle: A Politics of Meaning in Rhetorical Studies," in *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies,* ed. Thomas Rosteck (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999), 248-265.

[161] Schulman, "Conditions of Their Own Making," under "Putting Cultural Studies on the Intellectual Map."

[162] See Thomas Rosteck, "Form and Cultural Context In Rhetorical Criticism: Re-Reading Wrage," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84, no. 4 (1998): 475. Rosteck aspires that "[t]his impulse [cultural rhetoric] suggests a way to maintain the integrity of the concrete textual performance, while at the same time, to consider how ideology is materialized in textuality, and to position the nondiscursive background to surround and inform the analysis of the text." Rosteck, "Form and Cultural Context," 484.

[163] Rosteck argues that this is the position implicit in Wrage's work. See Rosteck, "Form and Cultural Context," 483. Notably, this seems to mimic the idea Johnson holds of the humanities as cultural studies "writ small" as he conceives of humanities as "cultural studies in embryo." See Johnson, "What is Cultural Studies?" 59.

[164] Rosteck, "Form and Cultural Context," 476.

[165] Rosteck, "Form and Cultural Context," 476-477.

[166] Sloop & Olson, "*Cultural* Struggle," 256; See also Thomas Rosteck, "Introduction: Approaching the Intersection: Issues of Identity, Politics, and Critical Practice," in *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies,* ed. Thomas Rosteck (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999), 1-23.

[167] In *At the Intersections*, numerous scholars debate the appropriate relationship between cultural studies and rhetorical studies, with some advancing arguments that thoroughly conflating the two dilutes cultural studies' commitment to politics and potentially overextends rhetoric, forcing it to venture into political territories that may not always be appropriate for the field (amid other subtlies lost in a total merger). Both Sloop

and Olson, "*Cultural* Struggle," and Rosteck, "Introduction," rehearse these critiques.

[168] Rosteck's review of Turner's book highlights some of the issues regarding ideological determinism, and he concludes by touching upon the consequences of embracing a "cultural studies" conception of ideology (nuancing the question of agency in his notes). See Thomas Rosteck, "Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81, no. 3 (1995): 389, 397, 402n19. See also Turner's elaboration upon the "problems" posed by ideology and cultural studies' responses to such complications. Graeme Turner, "Ideology," in *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2003), 166-195.

[169] Philip Wander, "The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism," *Central States Speech Journal* 34, no. 1 (1983): 1, 15.

[170] Alternatively, "the ideology of ideology thus recognizes, despite its imaginary distortion, that the 'ideas' of a human subject exist in his actions." Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)" in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing 2006), 83.

[171] This idea of "ideology" as a system of thought is derived from my reading of Fontana who sees "ideology" in Gramsci's work as "a system of beliefs." Quoting at length from Fontana: "What this means is that hegemony describes the ways and methods by which consent is generated and organized, which, in turn, is directly related to the mechanisms and processes by which knowledge and beliefs are first, produced, and second, disseminated. Here the crux is the formation of a 'conception of the world' and its dissemination throughout the people. A conception of the world (an 'ideology' or a

system of beliefs) is always opposed to differing conceptions of the world, so they are constantly in conflict, in a 'battle' against each other. The hegemonic conception is one that has become the 'common sense' of the people (Gramsci 1975, 1236, 1493). But a counterconception is constantly generated, even if only embryonically, to challenge the prevailing common sense." See Benedetto Fontana, "The Democratic Philosopher: Rhetoric as Hegemony in Gramsci," *Italian Culture* 23 (2005): 98.

[172] In explaining their case study, the authors of *Policing the Crisis* explain, "And this dominance [the dominance of the ideology they are studying], and its claims to general representativeness, are connected. It is dominant because it appears to be able to *catch up* quite contradictory life and class experiences within its master framework. Ideologies are easier to understand when they seem, within their own logic, to reflect or adequately correspond to the experiences, positions and interests of those who hold them." Hall and others, *Policing the Crisis*, 140. [italics in the original]

[173] Dana L. Cloud, "*The Matrix* and Critical Theory's Desertion of the Real," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 4 (2006): 329-354; Will Tregoning, "Authentic Self, Paranoid Critique and Getting a Good Night's Rest," *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 20, no. 2 (2006): 175-188.

[174] In conceptualizing ideology, I subscribe to Radway's belief about ideology as a "patchwork quilt." She holds "no ideology is a simple, uniform, organic thing." Thus, "[a]s a consequence, when two such practices intersect, as they invariably must, because the institutions within which they are situated themselves come into contact, their point of connection is often characterized by a seam, their joining is imperfect. Ideology is, finally, the product of a set of imperfectly joined practices; some are congruent, while

others are contradictory and even mutually interactive." The critic's job then becomes "to identify the seams" which enables "us to expose the ways in which the fit between ideological practices is not perfect." See Janice A. Radway, "Identifying Ideological Seams: Mass Culture, Analytical Method, and Political Practice," *Communication* 9, no. 1 (1986): 109, 108, 109, 110.

[175] Regarding audiences, Rosteck states, from some perspectives, "rhetoricians have traditionally invested in the idea of a dominant text and the single 'master' reading, while cultural studies more likely emphasized the affirmative power of readers over textuality." He argues this is a caricature of the two perspectives but affirms cultural studies' investment in audiences. See Rosteck, "Introduction," 18.

[176] Lipsitz and Hall note the salience of the popular. As Lipsitz states, "Popular culture intervenes in the construction of individual and group identity more than ever before. Presidents win popularity by quoting from Hollywood films ('make my day,' 'read my lips'), while serious political issues such as homelessness and hunger seem to enter public consciousness most fully when acknowledged by popular musicians or in made-for television movies." Lipsitz, "Listening to Learn," 360.

Justifying his attention to the subject, Hall holds, "Popular culture is one of the sites where this struggle for and against a culture of the powerful is engaged: it is also the stake to be won or lost in that struggle. It is the arena of consent and resistance. It is partly where hegemony arises, and where it is secured....That is why 'popular culture' matters. Otherwise, to tell you the truth, I don't give a damn about it." Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing," 192.

[177] For an excellent case study, see Hall and others, *Policing the Crisis.*

[178] Although this study employs a cultural studies vocabulary in elevating Barthes's concept of exnomination, a variety of critics have interrogated the power dynamics surrounding silences and absences in texts and communication processes. From a rhetorical perspective, this study is indebted to and draws heavily on the work of Charles E. Morris and Morris's critiques of the ideological functions of silence. See Charles E. Morris III, "Passing by Proxy: Collusive and Convulsive Silence in the Trial of Leopold and Loeb," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 3 (2005): 264-290; Charles E. Morris III, "Pink Herring & The Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 2 (2002): 228-244. See also Robin Patric Clair, *Organizing Silence: A World of Possibilities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998); Cheryl Glenn, *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004); Adam Jaworski, ed. *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997).

From a different perspective, these silences could also be explored through attention to the limits of rhetoric. For an excellent exploration of the capacity and limitations of human rights discourse, see Erik Doxtader, "The Rhetorical Question of Human Rights – A Preface," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 96, no. 4 (2010): 353-379.

[179] Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers (1957; New York: Hill and Wang, 1972), 137-139.

[180] John Fiske, *Television Culture* (1987; New York: Routledge, 2006), 42-43.

[181] Fiske, *Television Culture*, 43. See also Fiske, *Television Culture,* 290.

[182] This study's use of "rhetorical intimation" is inspired by Morris's discussion of "hiccups" and "yawps" in his articulation of "passing by proxy." See Morris, "Passing by

Proxy," 267. More specifically, Morris uses the words of D.A. Miller to describe the ways through which the unnamed can be *intimated*. See D.A. Miller, *The Novel and the Police* (Berkeley: University of California, 1988), 194.

[183] As Barthes explains, technically the bourgeoisie can be discussed but it attenuates the very language used to reference itself. See Barthes, *Mythologies*, 138. Fiske, *Television Culture*, 43.

Again, although I primarily choose to use the language of intimation and related terms such as "hint" or "gesture," Ray's exploration of "double-voicedness" offers yet another vehicle for interrogating the presence of competing narratives and ambivalences in textual practice. See Angela G. Ray, "'In My Own Hand Writing': Benjamin Banneker Addresses the Slaveholder of Monticello," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 387-405.

[184] In much the same way that silences are of interest to rhetorical scholars, a broader body of work probes the role of speech and silence in Holocaust and genocide studies. For examples, see Ruth Wajnryb, *The Silence: How Tragedy Shapes Talk* (Crows Nest, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 2001); Sara R. Horowitz, *Voicing the Void: Muteness and Memory in Holocaust Fiction* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997); George Steiner, *Language and Silence*: *Essa*ys *on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman* (New York: Athenum, 1967).

[185] See the discussion on page 282 and note 38 in Chapter Three. Lawrence Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema," 4. Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 168-171.

[186] The two example narratives I provide in this paragraph are rooted in differing philosophies on the nation-state's relationship to genocidal violence. The former tells a

story that is more closely linked to "liberal" approaches to genocide, and the latter

gestures toward "post-liberal" narratives. These terms, derived from the work of A. Dirk

Moses, are introduced and explained in Chapter One.

[187] Fiske, *Television Culture*, 43. See also Fiske, *Television Culture,* 290.

[188] In this way, I engage with and then expand upon Brown's reading of the

Museum of Tolerance. As is explained in greater detail in Chapter Three, Brown also

attends to the balance of power between the state and the public in the Museum of

Tolerance; however, her broader concern pertains to what such arguments mean for

rhetorics of tolerance. In this context of this study, I suggest that these tensions resonate

and are consistent with similar anxieties that percolate throughout messaging on genocide

in popular culture. See Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of

Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

CHAPTER ONE:
Tensions Surrounding Definition, Representation, Resolution, and Remembrance in Holocaust and Genocide Studies

Lemkin's moment of rhetorical invention proved to be a wellspring for debate over the legal definition of genocide. Lemkin's efforts to have the concept codified in international law incited controversy within the UN over the precise wording of the Convention text.[1] Narratives surrounding the drafting of the Convention accentuate the USSR's concern over the description of genocide victim groups. As Makino explains, the USSR "wanted the concept of genocide to be exclusively related to Nazi crimes," thus limiting the scope and reach of the Genocide Convention.[2] During the debates over the Convention text, the USSR advocated for the exclusion of "political groups" from the UN's definition of genocide.[3] Moves to broaden the description of the victims protected by the Convention text would expand the power of other countries to intervene in a state's domestic politics, in turn diminishing that state's sovereignty. Kuper describes the prospect of "the inclusion of political groups in the Convention" as provoking "anxiety" precisely because such inclusion "would expose nations to external interference in their internal affairs."[4] In other words, these early attempts to legally define and demarcate "genocide" incited apprehensiveness among UN member states over their authority and agency to manage affairs within their territories and to police atrocities abroad.[5]

After multiple drafts and revisions, Lemkin's concept was ensconced in international law through the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The Convention text defines genocide as follows:

> Article II: In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national,

ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.[6]

This definition is the legal touchstone to which numerous scholarly discussions of genocide refer given the definition's juridical power. Under the Convention, crimes meeting the specifications for genocide would demand the action of the Convention's signatories.[7] The UN definition consequently takes on enhanced significance because of its clear ties to genocide intervention and prevention politics.[8]

Although the UN Convention may set the legal benchmarks for international action, numerous scholars argue that the UN definition suffers from substantial flaws.[9] For example, a key part of the UN's definition is the "intent to destroy," which creates the additional burden of proving intent before a genocide can be named and recognized.[10] Due to the USSR's successful advocacy,[11] political groups are also not protected under the UN Convention; ergo, genocidal situations can be reclassified as "political conflicts," and such conflicts would not be protected under this definition.[12] Further, *cultural genocide*, a critical part of Lemkin's original conception of the term, is excluded entirely.[13] Cultural genocide, which pertains to the destruction of a group's way of life or expression of cultural identity,[14] "has . . . always been thought of as part of the crime."[15] In Makino's words, "[w]hilst opinions amongst researchers concerning the UN concept

of genocide may differ widely, on one point there is consensus: its *uselessness*."[16]
Despite Lemkin's hopes for the adoption of the term, many scholars express frustration
over the UN's legal conception of genocide.

The perceived "failure" of the UN's attempts to define genocide highlights a
central set of paradoxes in Holocaust and genocide studies related to state authority and
public agency. Early trepidation and anxiety surrounding the drafting of the UN
Convention text extends into a broader ambivalence about the role of the state in the
politics of genocide and genocide cessation. The tension at the core of this ambivalence is
linked to what Hesford identifies "as the fundamental paradox of international human
rights law, namely its dependency on the sovereignty of nation-states for its
implementation."[17] As applied to genocide studies, Hinton echoes Hesford's language in
arguing that "[t]he paradox of genocide lies in the fact that the very state that is supposed
to prevent genocide is usually the perpetrator."[18] The nation-state and state authority are
implicated as genocidal causal factors as well as key components of genocide cessation.
The state is often empowered within proposals to end genocide yet state sovereignty is
commonly discussed as a major hindrance to genocide cessation. These contradictions
lend the politics of genocide and genocide cessation a "schizophrenic" feel as Levene
alleges that nation-states are put in the position of adjudicating the forms of political
force on which they too rely or have relied historically.[19] Furthermore, this focus on the
state threatens to occlude a role for public agency in matters of genocide cessation. To the
extent that state actors become the primary actors in genocide cessation, the broader
public is seemingly disenfranchised from genocide cessation work.

In short, the scholarship in Holocaust and genocide studies offers inconsistent and

incompatible assessments of the role of state authority and public agency in the definition, representation, resolution, and remembrance of genocidal atrocity. Although there are numerous fault lines in the debates surrounding each of these four arenas, the relationships among state authority, public agency, and genocidal violence are prominent points of contention. At the level of definition, debates surrounding the applicability of the term "genocide" invariably reflect competing causal philosophies. Such causal philosophies in turn have the potential to implicate state authority in inciting violence. Representation controversies centralize questions pertaining to the authority and agency of the rhetor amid numerous contestations over the ineffability of atrocity and the sufficiency of the styles and genres selected to depict such horrors. Like definitional discourses, discussions of resolutions hinge upon arguments about the authority of the nation-state in aiding or stymieing genocide cessation while also prompting extended discussions about the public's agency to help end genocide. Lastly, recent considerations of the politics of genocide memory critique and challenge the links among collective memories, popular power, and the nation-state. The scholarly debates in each of these four arenas punctuate a sense of ambivalence regarding the interrelationships among the state, the public, and genocide.

In what follows, I centralize key tensions within Holocaust and genocide studies pertaining to each of the four aforementioned arenas: definition, representation, resolution, and remembrance. Each section serves dual purposes. First, the chapter will outline the range of voices and perspectives on genocide definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances that will provide the backdrop for the assessments of popular cultural forms of genocide cessation discourse. Many of the popular culture texts

in this study reflect variances on scholarly responses to each of these four questions. Second, this chapter will survey the debates in Holocaust and genocide studies on matters of agency and authority in particular as a means to advance the examination of those arguments related to the constructions of the nation-state and the public in genocide research. In the conclusion, I address the relationship between academic and popular forms of genocide cessation discourse.

Questions of Definition: Applicability and Causality

In the seventy years since the term "genocide" entered the public vernacular, the concept, as well as the atrocities the concept represents, has incited considerable academic debate. As the contestations over the UN Convention suggest, the symbolic and juridical power of the term contributes to the potency of the debates over the term's meaning and usage. Chorbajian asserts that, "[o]ne of the most controversial issues concerning genocide is its very definition because the role of the state, [and] intentionality…are implicated."[20] These controversies manifest in a variety of ways, from disputes over the application of the definition to calls that the use of the word "genocide" be abandoned altogether. Perhaps the most heated contestations question whether indigenous atrocities warrant the appellation "genocide." As Moses's work reveals, the intensity of these application debates emerges from competing causal philosophies. A closer examination of the range of causal hypotheses in Holocaust and genocide studies illuminates wildly divergent understandings of the influence of state authority and popular agency in causing genocidal violence.

Debates over Application and Definitional Utility

The aforementioned complications surrounding the UN Convention represent only one dimension of the definitional debates; applying the term to actual atrocities has proven to be an equally daunting task.[21] Examples of "genocide" have included (or excluded) a wide variety of mass atrocities. Although the Holocaust is commonly recognized as a genocide,[22] numerous other catastrophes have been denied that designation by key international bodies or nation-states, accentuating the politicized nature of the term's application. For example, the Armenian genocide still vies for recognition from the government of Turkey, which continues to deny that the 1915 massacre was a genocide.[23] The barbarities in Darfur in 2003-2004 were recognized by the US government as "genocide" but not by other bodies including the UN and Amnesty International.[24] Others have charged that the term should also be applied to a host of additional violent actions, including, for example, the US slaughter of its Native American population,[25] the US bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,[26] the Soviet Union's "man-made famine" in the Ukraine, Britain's bombing of Dresden, the US conflict in Vietnam, and Germany's extermination of the Herero in Namibia.[27] Such disputes over the term's application contribute to conceptual confusion, which ultimately inhibits preventive or intervening acts given that the UN Convention only requires nations to take action if the crime receives a classification of "genocide."[28]

Variance in application has fueled a cynicism over a perceived "weightlessness" or "meaninglessness" of the term, culminating in calls to abandon the use of the word entirely. Makino builds on his earlier criticism of the UN Convention's definition of genocide to suggest that "the UN Genocide Convention has 'prevented' as many genocides as the Briand–Kellogg Treaty (1928) prevented wars."[29] In its preventative

capacity, the UN definition may be better at stopping the use of the word "genocide" than stopping the act itself. Due to the aforementioned expectations linking word usage and action, state actors tend to be particularly cautious about employing the term "genocide." As occurred most famously during the Clinton administration's mishandling of the Rwandan genocide, state officials avoid use of the "g-word" by finding other ways to decry barbarities without obligating themselves to act.[30] The State Department was criticized by many for their reluctance to call the situation in Rwanda genocide. Brunk argues that the memory of this incident contributed to "the pressure to deploy the term in reference to Darfur."[31] However, the use of the term to describe the political situation in Darfur was perceived by Smith and Pipa as satiating a domestic desire for the recognition of the Darfurian atrocities without signaling a US commitment to action. Although the term was employed, the label alone took the place of additional action.[32] Such historical incidents surrounding the genocides in Rwanda and Darfur suggest that the definition plays a meager (if any) role in genocide prevention. Instead of aiding in genocide cessation, Chomsky and Herman and Peterson argue that the word "genocide" assumes its symbolic currency as a political tool serving Western interests. Regardless of the material circumstances, the use of the term becomes a means of vilifying some political actors and legitimating intervention into a targeted nation-state's affairs.[33] This perceived abuse of the term leads Chomsky to recommend abandoning the term "genocide" until it is used with "honesty and integrity."[34]

Perhaps the most heated definitional debates surround questions of indigenous atrocities.[35] Such debates correspond with what Rothberg terms the "colonial turn in Holocaust studies."[36] Although genocide studies may be beginning to account for the

relationship between genocide and colonialism, perceptive thinkers and writers have long noted these connections, particularly in the early post-World War II period.[37] The authors of *Colonialism and Genocide* charge that Lemkin conceptualized "genocide as an intrinsically colonial phenomena."[38] Although the two terms are not synonymous, Moses and Stone argue that they are nevertheless "profoundly connected;"[39] numerous scholars have attempted to puzzle through the nature of those connections.[40] These analyses function as particularly rich sites for the examination of definitional controversies as they reflect divergent assumptions about the links between state authority and violence.[41]

Moses attributes the ideological "stalemate" over whether or not indigenous atrocities should be termed "genocide" to competing causal philosophies.[42] As Moses explains, at issue in these contestations is "the definition of 'genocide' itself," with differences resulting from "how one defines the term, conceptualizes exterminatory intention and locates the agent that can possess it."[43] Moses contends that existing work on the relationships among the Holocaust, genocide, and colonialism can be discussed as falling under two broad headings: the "liberal" interpretation and the "post-liberal" interpretation. The liberal approach features a prominent role for agency, in particular the agency of the nation-state.[44] It provides a framework that underscores the importance of determining a "genocidal intention" and emphasizes "the agency of the perpetrator and its exterminatory *mens rea*."[45] Furthermore, liberal theories tend to support proponents of the uniqueness thesis (discussed in the Introduction). Accordingly, a correspondence exists between individuals who hold that the Holocaust is unique and individuals who are also inclined to deny that indigenous atrocities constitute genocidal slaughter; both camps find support in liberal approaches to causality.[46]

The "post-liberal" perspective, by contrast, shifts its focus from state actors to look at the influence exerted by socio-political and economic structures. In Moses's words, "it emphasizes the structural determinants of policy development as well as the social forces in civil society that precipitate mass death."[47] Concomitantly, this structural orientation to the study of genocide tends to leave underdeveloped the operation of human agency, "dispers[ing] [the] centralized exterminatory intention and agency" central to the liberal approach.[48] The post-liberal perspective tends to undergird arguments advancing claims about the genocidal nature of colonial or imperialistic behavior.[49]

Moses's description of the "liberal" and "post-liberal" orientations to genocide provides a useful schemata for making sense of the diverse and highly interdisciplinary work that has been done under the auspices of Holocaust and genocide studies.[50] His argument connects definitional debates to substantive differences in causal philosophies and charts them in accordance with their divergent emphases on state authority and agency. Thusly, Moses's work encourages the interrogation of the epistemological assumptions about authority and agency, which inevitably shape definitional debates as they manifest in both scholarly literature and in the popular culture texts assessed in the chapters that follow.

Understanding Definitional Discrepancies through Causal Debates

Implicitly or explicitly, definitional disputes invariably bear the traces of competing causal philosophies. To be sure, questions as broad as "what causes genocide" and "why did the Holocaust happen?" do not have clear and concise answers.[51] As Staub explains, "Group violence rarely if ever has a single, specific cause. It is the outcome of a

combination of influences that leads to an unfolding, an evolution that involves changes in individuals, groups of people, and whole societies."[52] Nonetheless, a variety of scholarly and professional voices have attempted to provide answers to these causal questions, naming and interrogating a plethora of factors that may be "genocidal warning" signs.[53] The myriad of historical and theoretical analyses grappling with causality reflects substantial variance in the relative importance of public and state actors. In what follows, I showcase the multiplicity of treatments of state authority and popular agency by highlighting ends of a causal spectrum.[54] On one hand, Holocaust and genocide studies informed by work in psychology often offer clear assessments of the significance of individual agents in the instigation of violence. On the other, structural analyses tend to have a more diffuse understanding of human agency and centralize the state's contributions to the problem of genocide.[55]

Psychological approaches to genocide feature the largest role for individual agents. As is to be expected, these approaches treat "genocidal behavior [as] ha[ving] its cause in the human psyche."[56] Such studies vary dramatically in their foci. Famous studies like Milgram's work on authority and the Stanford prison experiment are common citations in psychological approaches to genocidal action.[57] Oliner's work on prosocial behavior and altruism adds to knowledge about intervention and the bystander effect.[58] Waller's work, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*, develops a more comprehensive theory of the variety of factors that facilitate the conduct of evil acts,[59] as does Staub's *Overcoming Evil*: *Genocide, Violent Conflict, and Terrorism*, with his balanced approach to the origins of violence.[60] Baum's scholarship attempts to distinguish the differences in the psychology of perpetrators, rescuers, or

bystanders by focusing on questions of maturity in relation to one's reaction to violence.[61] Newman and Erber's edited collection, *Understanding Genocide: The Social Psychology of the Holocaust*, engages topics ranging from authoritarianism to prejudice and scapegoating to zoomorphism all under the auspices of a social psychological approach to genocide.[62] Even as these diverse works blend an appreciation for "[d]ifficult life conditions" with culture and psychological motivations,[63] Staub underscores that the emphasis is "on people, the psychology of the individuals that make up groups, and of their leaders: their needs, worldviews, attitudes toward other people, feelings of threat, fear, hostility, caring and empathy for others or lack of these emotions, their woundedness as a result of past history, and other psychological conditions."[64]

Amid the contributions yielded through psychological approaches, psychological studies provide rich theoretical frameworks for conceptualizations of "evil." Waller's study is guided by a singular thesis: "Extraordinary Evil" such as genocide is committed by ordinary individuals. His work challenges the simplistic idea that evil acts are committed by "sadists, psychopaths, and monsters."[65] The belief that "Extraordinary Evil" is committed by "extra-human[s]" affords a comfortable distance and means of disassociation from the human capacity for violence.[66] However, Waller, asserts that this "purely evil person is" a caricaturization and is "just as much an artificial construct as a person who is purely good."[67] As a corrective to this tendency, some psychological works suggest that all humans have the potential to become genocidal killers. Yet, in some ways, this is as problematic as positing evil as "extraordinary." As Kuper notes, early works operating from this perspective on evil positioned the seeds of genocide as instinctual, the desire to kill woven into human beings' animalistic inheritance.[68] In

practice, these sentiments reinforce a Hobbesian worldview and a less-than-charitable conception of human nature in which individuals, left to their own devices, would "naturally" kill one another save for the fear of intervention by the state or civic order.[69] Resultantly, the challenge becomes finding an approach to evil that moves beyond caricature to account for the complexity of individual agency.

Despite such contributions, other scholars have noted the shortcomings of psychological approaches, arguing that these perspectives on genocidal causes are insufficient and incomplete. More specifically, such approaches to causality fail to explain why genocides occur in certain locations or historical contexts and not others. In his early assessment of the field, Jonassohn claims, "Psychological and psychiatric theories dealing with hostility and aggression are unlikely to be relevant because such drives surely occur among all peoples and because large-scale phenomena such as genocides are not likely to find their explanation in the attributes of individuals."[70] From a more charitable perspective, this research may illuminate some components of our understanding of the conduct of genocide, but it loses the forest for the trees.[71] In other words, the unique dimensions of genocide as a collective act are lost when solely looking at the processes that govern individual behavior. According to Fein, "inferring psychological motives is basically a complementary level of explanation to a macrosociological perspective. What is needed is a theory of how structural, situational and cultural forces lead potential perpetrators of genocide to define the situation so as to mandate and justify the killing of the victims."[72] Such criticisms invert the causal question to cast doubt upon whether the individual mind represents the origin of the

genocidal impulse or merely capitalizes on an existing structural opportunity for genocidal action.

In contrast to the propensity of psychological approaches to focus on the individual agent, structural approaches locate the origins of genocide in macro-social phenomenon. Levene's corpus is indicative of such a structural orientation. From Levene's perspective, "[g]enocide *is* the mainstream"[73] and is far from "be[ing] a product of mad, bad or sad polities, societies, structures or predispositions outside and entirely beyond the universe of the ordered, civilized legally constituted, democratically elected West."[74] The assumption is that genocide is built into the socio-, political and economic systems that govern international relations.[75] In short, Levene contends that "genocide is not so much a series of isolated, aberrant and essentially unconnected events but is at the very heart of modern historical development."[76] In his multi-volume treatment of genocide, Levene identifies three structural-level "causal factors" that contribute to the rise of genocide: modernity, the nation-state, and the dominance of Western civilization.[77] These dimensions – far from unique to Levene's work – have been linked to genocide by multiple scholars.[78] Importantly, these three structural issues are interdependent, not distinct causal attributes. Accordingly, the interrelations among such constructs bolster each in turn and solidify genocide as a constituent component of the global order.[79]

Modernity has long been a part of causal conversations, pinpointed as an explanation for late twentieth-century violence.[80] Bauman's oft-cited *Modernity and the Holocaust* typifies such logics. Bauman challenges the idea that the "Holocaust" was an aberration or deviation from the norms of the twentieth century; instead, he argues that

the Holocaust is a consequence of modernity.[81] Modernity's byproducts – rationality,

social engineering, bureaucracy[82] – establish the conditions for genocides such as the

Holocaust.[83] Bauman contends that the modern "civilizing process failed to erect a single

foolproof barrier against the genocide [the Holocaust]."[84] Rather, modernity's emphasis

on "'progress'" and "'civilization'" abet genocide, often providing the rationale for the

elimination of indigenous peoples.[85] Of course, as Hinton and other scholars have

stressed, "modernity does not lead to genocide in any direct causal sense,"[86] but rather

"modernity inflects genocide."[87] Further, modernity contributes to genocide by

facilitating the rise of the nation-state, another element of the social structure heavily

critiqued for contributing to the propagation of genocide.

The nation-state has been linked to genocide in a number of ways.[88] In his book,

Levene enumerates three aspects of the nation-state that may promote genocidal

behaviors: the state's sublimation of other interpersonal human relationships to the

relationship between the individual and the nation-state, the work of the polity to advance

or "better" the state, and the latent desire for homogeneity.[89] Hayden posits that

genocides (or ethnic cleansing) are part of state building, a means of attaining a unified

state. These practices are condoned when the development of a new state serves the needs

of the powerful and only critiqued when the state in formation is undesirable. In these

latter cases, the label of "genocide" is applied.[90] Corroborating Hayden, Levene and

Moses have argued that, "states which are new, or are heavily engaged in the process of

state and nation building" are often the culprits of genocide.[91] For Moses, this is part of

the dynamic which marks the "racial century," a period from 1850-1950 that laid the

roots for mass violence.[92] From a slightly different perspective, Ray indicts nationalism

as a cause of genocide, holding that nation-states have a tendency to use the memories of atrocities for national unification purposes, rallying populations through identification with victimhood.[93] Entrenching memories of animosity fuels antagonisms against "Others" and potentially plants the seeds for future genocidal conflict.[94]

Finally, "the rise of the West" to a position of global predominance has been widely discussed as a source of genocidal violence. From such vantage points, colonialism is linked to the practice of genocide in both direct and indirect ways.[95] According to some, the West's rise occurred largely at the expense of indigenous or non-Western "Others;" whether through colonial or imperial slaughters or though the reification of other forms of structural inequality which sustain the conditions for continued violence.[96] Surely, as has occurred countless times throughout world history, the "acquisition" of territory often occurs at the expense of indigenous peoples and cultures. Some have argued that such devastation should be seen as genocidal.[97] These arguments about the "rise of the West" and its connections to genocide represent the clearest approximation of a post-liberal perspective.

Yet the links between Western dominance and genocide need not only be conceptualized in terms of the violence associated with colonialism and imperialism. Other forces include the restructuring of the global order and the disruption of other economic systems and patterns of (inter)dependency that occurred while centering the West as a hegemon. These acts led to destabilization, bred resentment, and reinscribed inequalities that would provide additional impetuses for violence.[98] As Levene puts it, "While the rise of the West was accompanied by no overarching political agenda for the

annihilation of foreign peoples, it did create a broader cultural discourse in which such annihilation was perfectly conceivable."[99]

In much the same way that psychological approaches have their critics, so too are structural perspectives subject to critique. Levene is aware of the potential critiques of his work and structuralist perspectives on genocide more broadly. Levene is self-reflexive about the fact that his work "carries with it an almost imponderable moral dilemma." From his perspective, "It is human beings who suffer (as well as commit) genocide. Surely to treat them as abstractised items in some grand narrative is to be as guilty of the same clinical mindset with which we have already been at pains to charge a complicit modernity."[100] Worse, Semelin holds that such moves strip individuals of agency, treating them as "always 'acted upon' by external factors."[101] Chiefly, these are problems of determinacy and agency. Moreover, if the macro-social order is to blame, then genocide is seemingly intractable, woven into the fabric of global politics.[102] From such perspectives, genocide is enmeshed in the current structure of the international community; thus, genocide cessation can seem little more than a pipe dream unless the entire system can be overhauled,[103] a Herculean task that can work to diminish a sense of human agency. Although structural orientations offer what Andreopoulos identifies as "a constructive reminder of the role of impersonal forces in shaping group and individual choices,"[104] their predilection toward these "impersonal forces" has significant implications for the ways agency and the plausibility of genocide cessation work are conceptualized.

This examination of the divergent approaches to causality within the field illuminates the extent to which Holocaust and genocide studies are rife with

inconsistencies regarding the relative importance of popular agency and state authority. They simultaneously suggest why discussions of genocide might be considered threatening as they potentially implicate individuals and states as causal agents. Individual agents are indicted through discomforting arguments about the human capacity to commit "evil" acts. And states – and in particular Western states – are impugned for establishing an international order that breeds violence. The anxiety created by such claims seeps into definitional debates and is met by a similar form of anxiety regarding Holocaust and genocide representations.

Questions of Representation: Trauma and Ineffability

Given that genocide is difficult to define, it is an equally challenging subject to access, represent, and consume. As Kuper reinforces, "the enormity of … genocide seems to defy understanding."[105] Representational hurdles are compounded by the deficiencies of certain popular culture mediums that tend to reduce complex social issues to narrative plots or forms of individual or interpersonal conflict.[106] Numerous scholars have attempted to puzzle through some of these complications associated with the mediation of genocide memory, whether in analyses of specific genocide-related texts or a particular medium's treatment of genocide.[107] At the heart of these representational contestations, Shandler argues, are matters of "propriety (that is, what constitutes 'appropriate' or 'just' use of the Holocaust [or other genocides])" as well as "property rights (that is, who are the 'rightful' arbiters of 'proper' Holocaust [and genocide] memory)."[108] These matters of propriety and property are complicated by the association of genocide with "trauma," a controversial appropriation of psychiatric vocabulary often found within some scholastic treatments of genocide memory. The connotations of "trauma" influence the ways

genocides are (or are not) represented as well as subsequent concerns over the authority

of authorship and the appropriateness of various representational choices.

"Trauma" is a complicated and problematic term; therefore, any scholastic

framing of genocide as a form of trauma contributes to arguments about how and if

genocide memories should be represented. Genocide memories are subsumed

occasionally under a larger category of "traumatic memories," with the designation of

"trauma" recalling psychiatric and therapeutic rhetorics. Although "trauma" is a clinical

condition, used in the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical

Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM),[109] the term has been adopted and utilized in a

number of disciplines such as literature, history, film studies, and sociology.[110] This

expanse in the term's application creates tension between those who argue "trauma" is a

specific psychological diagnosis (i.e., used to describe the very real psychological

consequences of duress) and others who are less convinced that traumas objectively exist

and thus use the term more loosely.[111] From the latter perspective, traumas are social

constructions rather than material experiences.[112] In other words, events are understood to

be traumatic *not* because of their inherent characteristics but because of a perceived sense

of "disruption" imparted by such events, either to identity or understandings of

temporality (e.g., traumatic events are commonly depicted as dividing time into "pre" and

"post" periods as in "pre-9/11" or "post-Holocaust").[113] As Gray and Oliver claim, this

perceived sense of disruption is critical in explaining why some events (like genocide, for

example) are understood as "catastrophic" or "traumatic" whereas consistent concerns

(like poverty) are less likely to be understood as such.[114]

Although understanding genocide memory through the concept of trauma may

yield some useful insights,[115] criticisms of therapeutic and traumatic discourses abound,

highlighting a few of the troubling implications of using the term "trauma" in discussions

of genocide representations. Recalling Farrell's work on "post-traumatic culture,"[116] Gray

and Oliver posit that society has become obsessed with the trauma framework so much so

that "there may be few individuals who could not now lay claim to the status of trauma

victim."[117] This obsession with trauma and other therapeutic concepts has troubling

implications for conceptualizing human agency.[118] Therapy rhetorics, Furedi argues,

condition individuals to believe that they are psychologically and emotionally flawed or

vulnerable.[119] When the world is constructed as a series of potential "threats" to

individuals' "fragile" and susceptible mental states, messages of powerlessness and

passivity are also imparted.[120] An abundance of such public discourses, Cloud contends,

teaches individuals to relinquish their agency, encouraging them to accommodate social

ills rather than challenging social systems and agitating for social or political change.[121]

In addition to decreasing perceptions of agency, traumas, according to some

definitions of the term, "defy" representation; thus, to label genocide memories

"traumatic memories" is to suggest that they are somehow beyond the realm of mediation

and representation. According to such logic, trauma should not be represented because

any attempts to do so pale in comparison to the atrociousness of the inflicted harm. As

Roth and Salas explain, "The horror of trauma is such that it is often seen as a black hole

of sense and meaning that consumes even the principles of its interpretation: no

meaningful relationships between what came before and after a traumatic event can be

created; every attempt to apply concepts of development fails."[122] Paradoxically, they

underscore that "[t]he modern concept of trauma emphasizes the demand for

representation and the refusal to be represented."[123]

Thus, to classify genocide as a trauma is to suggest that its memory can never be adequately represented or mediated, a position that aligns with some of the arguments and anxieties that have long circulated in Holocaust and genocide studies about "the limits of representation."[124] Such arguments often date back to Adorno's frequently invoked condemnation of artistic expression after the Holocaust.[125] The crux of the controversy "center[s] on intangible but nonetheless perceived boundaries" to representation.[126] Friedlander, for example, charges "that there are limits to representation *which should not be but can easily be transgressed.*"[127] These arguments over representational strategies are complex and have been fueled by a number of contextual factors influencing the evolution of Holocaust and genocide studies. The 1989 Historians' Debate in Germany and the rise of postmodernism and cultural studies, for example, offered challenges to predominant ways of thinking about representation.[128]

As the debates over the appropriate ways of representing such atrocious events continue, a wide range of perspectives emerges. At one end, some viewpoints suggest that even language – the spoken or written word – is incapable of capturing the horror of these events, as the essence of these harrowing experiences simply can never be represented.[129] In marked contrast, others believe this kind of "rhetoric of the unspeakable"[130] perpetuates an "ideology of silence" that severely impairs knowledge, comprehension, and societal growth.[131] In trying to navigate the nebulous terrain between these viewpoints, scholars often engage in a kind of "moral connoisseurship," according to Shandler, heralding or decrying various forms of Holocaust and genocide memory as inadequate.[132] Such arguments are based upon a variety of factors, including who

produced the representation, which medium was utilized, and whether the text adheres to or deviates from a realist aesthetic.[133]

In terms of the author or producer of such texts, the trauma framework suggests, some maintain, that only certain individuals are capable of interpreting or mediating such memories.[134] By and large, this dynamic results in giving privileged status to genocide or Holocaust survivors over other voices that attempt to enter these conversations.[135] Holocaust survivor Eli Wiesel offers the following remarks during the *Remembering for the Future* conference to substantiate this experiential perspective:

> If in the beginning few critics and commentators paid attention to our work, now there seem to be too many. My friend and companion Primo Levi, with whom I shared the barracks in Auschwitz, called them "thieves of time, they look and sneak through keyholes, take our memories and leave without a trace."[136]

Mocking the "entitlement" or the authority of these non-survivor "thieves," Wiesel's indictment is most vehement: "They know better than I do what I endured where, with whom, under what circumstances?"[137] Wiesel is not alone in articulating this critique regarding the ownership of Holocaust memory. Grappling with the role of art and the artist in the representation of the Holocaust, Feinstein notes, "Not only Wiesel, but others such as Theodor Adorno, Jean Amery, and Primo Levi have emphasized that there is a wall the nonsurvivor can never surmount, and art, in any form, can never conceptualize."[138] Illustrating the strength of the survivor's authority in meaning making, Feinstein cites the backlash to an exhibition titled "Mirroring Evil," which featured not only non-survivors, but non-Jews as artists as well. At issue, Feinstein posits, are these

very questions over the authority to intercede in meaning making: "Can the artist, especially one who was not 'there,' stumble upon some essential truth that even the survivor may have missed?"[139] Beyond the survivor's power, claim is often laid to the authority to represent these traumatic events by the children of survivors, or in the case of the Holocaust, the Jewish community at large, setting the stage for skirmishes over which voices should be heard in debates about the mediation of genocide memory.[140]

These mediation debates over traumatic memories also extend to debates over which mediums and styles may or may not be appropriate for traumatic representation. As the title of Norfolk's photo essay (*For Most of It I Have No Words*) implies, because "words" are seen as insufficient representations, images are often privileged.[141] From other perspectives, electronic forms of mediation, chiefly television, are critiqued as inadequate as the ephemerality of these mediums contrasts with the concreteness of artifact or object-driven forms of representation.[142]

Even more problematic than these medium choices are the debates pertaining to the destabilizing influences of postmodernism and the use of creative or poetic license.[143] Rothberg argues these debates over representations are the byproduct of conflicting epistemological perspectives: realism, modernism, and postmodernism.[144] The latter is particularly troubling for certain scholars in Holocaust and genocide studies. On the one hand, postmodernism's tolerance of incompleteness and its awareness of the limitations of texts align with viewpoints that believe "that even the most precise historical renditions of the Shoah contain an opaqueness at the core."[145] On the other hand, postmodernism's skepticism toward claims about "Truth" and "Reality" is distressing to Holocaust and genocide scholars reticent to introduce grounds for historical relativism.

In Friedlander's words, "postmodern thought's rejection of the possibility of identifying some stable reality or truth beyond the constant polysemy and self-referentiality of linguistic constructs challenges the need to establish the realities and the truths of the Holocaust."[146] Although Rothberg attempts to offer a theory of "traumatic realism" to bridge these perspectives,[147] he implies that these epistemological rifts inform debates over realism and give rise to the conflicts that ensue as representational strategies move away from realist aesthetics to include fictive elements and less literal styles.[148]

To elaborate further, the introduction of creative license, in particular, incites considerable controversy. Walker and Lowenstein acknowledge the constraints placed on traumatic representations and the fear created by deviating from realistic portrayals of traumatic events.[149] Regarding the Shoah, Brenner argues that "numerous critics qualify the majority of fiction, dramatization, and figurative speech about the Holocaust as misrepresentation;" thus, "the singularity of the Shoah is viewed as being in danger of violation whenever it is not read literally."[150] As Zelizer highlights, a tendency exists in visualizing the Holocaust "to valorize visual forms like filmed testimony, archival photograph, or documentary film more than representations that track reality in a less manifest fashion."[151] Walker and Lowenstein defend non-literal or fictionalized representations of traumatic pasts. As Walker stresses, all representations – even the most "realistic" or "authentic" – involve acts of invention and bear the imprint of their production.[152] For such scholars and political actors, the potential to produce a richer understanding through the embrace of creative forms of representation outweighs any need to protect the sanctity of traumatic memories.[153]

Haunting these discussions over traumatic representation are concerns about

genocide denial. As forms of representation abandon "the real" in creating awareness of their own *inventive* or *imaginative* capacity, they invite questions about reality versus representation that provoke discourses of denial and threaten the inviolability of genocide memory.[154] Not surprisingly, then, the invention used in "false" genocide memoirs, like *Fragments: Memories of a Wartime Childhood* and *I, Rigoberta Menchu*, has incited turmoil.[155]

While all of these quandaries regarding the various modes, styles, and sources of genocide mediation complicate acts of representation, others debate the fundamental ethics of mediating genocide memory in the first place.[156] Some of these ethical concerns center on the implications of (re)producing the horrors of genocide. As White and others have illuminated, even with progressive or idealistic ends, media producers must be accountable for their role in propagating images of violence and oppression.[157] Such arguments hold that reproduction, representation, and mediation may do more harm than good. As Crane questions, "How, then, do we responsibly face the possibility that viewing atrocity images revivifies the perpetrator's gaze, re-enacting the dehumanization and terrorizing of the victim?"[158] Arguing that what viewers of such images want is largely "safe titillation, and redemption," Crane calls for the removal of Holocaust images from the public sphere.[159] She concludes that "[s]eeing atrocity images in ignorance only shocks the senses; it does not teach meaning-making or historical truthfulness, and it risks kitsch."[160] The fears over trivializing genocide, fostering prurient interest, and reproducing its horrors precipitate the interrogation of mediation strategies as well as the motives for representing memories of atrocity. Skeptical of the ethics of mediating genocidal violence, these voices urge an examination of the politics of

mnemonic invocation, inviting a critical analysis of the links forged between genocide

representation and cessation.

Questions of Resolution: Antagonistic Relations among Cessation Agents

Just as no single "cause" exists for genocide, so too no single "solution" exists to

the problems posed by atrocity. As Heidenrich puts it, "If the problem of genocide had an

easy solution, we would have conquered it a long time ago."[161] Instead, the literature is

flooded with competing propositions, challenged not by a lack of ideas, but a seeming

confusion over where to target one's intervention. This confusion is exacerbated by

inconsistent assessments of state and public involvement in genocide prevention and

intervention efforts. The state is both positioned as a hindrance to genocide cessation and

an agent of genocide cessation. Similarly, the public is at once empowered and excluded

from proposals to end genocide. As Jones highlights, the divergences in resolution

rhetorics reify a split between popular and scholarly forms of genocide cessation

discourse. At the same time, changes to the media environment create additional avenues

for exercising popular agency.

Obstacles to Genocide Cessation

Before interrogating proposed solutions to end genocide, discussions of genocide

cessation often identify common obstacles to prevention or intervention politics. These

obstacles further the ambivalence about state authority as they indict the nation-state as a

possible obstacle to cessation. National sovereignty and the absence of political will pose

substantive problems to resolution proposals.[162] The hindrances created by these

constructs speak to the complexity of the relationship between state authority and

genocidal violence.

State sovereignty is commonly cited as a barrier to genocide cessation politics.[163] Sovereignty, or the idea that each state is entitled to govern its own affairs inside its territorial boundaries without the undue intervention of foreign actors, has functioned as a cornerstone of international politics since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia.[164] Yet, Voth and Noland emphasize that such efforts to defend the autonomy of states too often translate into a roadblock to human rights work, resulting in "a pre-eminence of sovereignty for states over and against the sovereignty of human individuals."[165] The state's rights take precedence over "human rights," and the defense of sovereignty is used to safeguard the state from outside intervention, creating a protected space where abuses against its own people and its acts of atrocities are overlooked.[166] Although Kuper notes, "no state *explicitly* claims the right to commit genocide…[nevertheless] the right is exercised under more acceptable rubrics, notably the duty to maintain law and order, or the seemingly sacred mission to preserve the territorial integrity of the state."[167] The principle of sovereignty is thus exploited to shield offending states from interventionist or preventionist politics while genocidal action is condoned, at least implicitly, in practice.[168] Despite the complications to cessation posed by sovereignty, numerous scholars have articulated hopeful arguments about the erosion of sovereignty in an increasingly globalized world. For example, Totten credits "the relatively new international human rights regime (e.g., the UN Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, as well as others), the end of the Cold War, the onset of the Information Age," and the creation of the International Criminal Court and two international criminal tribunals with

diminishing the perceived inviolability of "sovereignty" and enhancing genocide cessation efforts.[169]

In addition to hindrances posed by sovereignty, a lack of political will at the level of the nation-state can cripple genocide cessation work.[170] As Kuper explains, although moral arguments about genocide cessation are not to be discounted, prevention and intervention decisions are also strategic exercises in political influence.[171] From his perspective, intervention is more likely when a powerful state is interceding into the affairs of a weaker state as the stronger state need not fear retaliation; however, this power dynamic creates "a situation all too reminiscent of colonial interventions."[172] By utilizing realism as a lens through which to analyze US responses to genocide, Ronayne's work elucidates the role "of other geostrategic priorities and domestic political concerns" in inhibiting cessation.[173] Roth refers to this logic as a "deadly calculus of passivity" and contends that such a calculus has guided political responses to atrocity in multiple contexts.[174] By way of example, Roth includes the international community's lack of investment in Saddam Hussein's persecution of the Kurds as well as the Guatemalan government's persecution of indigenous populations. He argues that Hussein's behavior was ignored because of larger oil politics whereas the decision to discount the violence in Guatemala reflected Cold War dynamics.[175] As these instances and numerous others highlight,[176] genocide cessation politics are fundamentally enmeshed in boarder considerations about "national interest" and political will. As Totten puts it, "[w]ithout the willingness of an international body, a group of nations, or, at the very least, a single nation to act to prevent a genocide or intervene early on, not even the most sophisticated and most efficiently operated genocide early warning system will be of much, if any,

use."[177] Totten accordingly subtitles his exploration of genocide prevention and intervention as: "Where There *Is* the Political Way, There Is A Way."[178]

Perhaps not surprisingly given these obstacles, genocide scholars and writers have offered less-than-optimistic assessments of existing approaches to intervention and prevention. Noted genocide scholar and activist Power charges that the United States has an abysmal track record when it comes to genocide cessation. According to Power's 2003 Pulitzer Prize winning study, "[t]he United States had never in its history intervened to stop genocide and had in fact rarely even made a point of condemning it as it occurred."[179] She continues, "the forward-looking, consoling refrain of 'never again,' a testament to America's can-do spirit, never grappled with the fact that the country had done nothing, practically or politically, to prepare itself to respond to genocide. The commitment proved hollow in the face of actual slaughter."[180] Other scholarly voices balance these critiques and retain a more optimistic perspective on the politics of intervention or prevention.[181] Some stress the perceived agency of the United States[182] and others highlight cases in which possible genocides were averted or stemmed (e.g., the curtailment of Iran's persecution of its Bahá'í population).[183] Nevertheless, difficulty in ending such atrocities might suggest why genocide is referred to in Power's book as "'A Problem from Hell.'"[184]

Ending Genocide: Perspectives on Prevention & Intervention

Despite the problems posed by sovereignty and political will, Chirot and McCauley stress that "[t]here is a large and rapidly growing literature on conflict resolution and prevention;" however, they believe there is "little consensus about what works and what does not."[185] Like scholarly assessments of causality, the flourishing

body of genocide cessation literature tends to be diverse, replete with "solutions" ranging from truth and reconciliation committees in the wake of such atrocities to the promotion of genocide education programs as preventative measures.[186] Amid these proposals, Jones notes a curious disconnect between popular and scholarly cessation discourses.[187] The former he states "adopt a highly individualistic perspective," which he argues is out of sync with "the structural, historical, social science perspective of genocide researchers."[188] In other words, Jones suggests that the fault lines in the discussion of popular and scholarly forms of genocide cessation discourse hinge upon matters of agency and the actors authorized by each body of literature to participate in genocide cessation work. In what follows, I highlight only a few examples of cessation proposals to demonstrate the ways agency and authority anxieties manifest in the literature on cessation. I focus specifically on proposals that affirm the centrality of individual and individual-based conceptions of agency as well as proposals that are more structural in orientation.

Resolution discourses focused on moral development and genocide education centralize popular agency. Moral development approaches stress the transformative power of the individual's moral character and benevolent actions. Rhetorics of "care" or "empathy" are common within such discourses, retaining hope that if individuals were only made to care more about one another or identified more closely with "others," genocide would be harder to sustain. Embodying this perspective in placing stock in the power of care, Heidenrich asks, "Most of us do care. *But do we care enough?*"[189] Similarly, Charny reveals the links between care, concern, and identification, noting how concern for others tends to decrease based upon perceptions of "foreignness." Thus, he

calls on audiences to recognize a shared investment in the politics of genocide cessation. He encourages a fostering of "kinship with all other peoples… and a notion of a common humanity [that] begins to transcend identifications with any specific sector of that humanity."[190] From that perspective, "there develops a value-commitment to opposing the mass destruction of *any* people, religion, ethnicity or nation," inhibiting our ability to commit or tolerate genocide anywhere in the world, of any victim group.[191] According to such logic, the more we connect and identify with foreign "others," the less likely we are to tolerate genocide and inaction.

Closely related to the cultivation of individual morality, other genocide cessation approaches suggest that genocide education can function as a preventative force.[192] Such thinking is undergirded by the belief that teaching students about genocide may condition them to want to eradicate it.[193] For such reasons, Hamburg treats education as one of the central features of genocide prevention politics.[194] Echoing the perspectives that treat "caring" and "empathy" as critical to genocide cessation, many approaches to genocide education adopt what Jones labels "Moral Exemplars Perspectives."[195] According to Jones, Moral Exemplars Perspectives implicate the "weakness and flaws of individual moral character, especially the lack of altruism, sympathy, and compassion," as deficiencies which can enable genocide.[196] Resultantly, Moral Exemplars Perspectives hold that "the best way to prevent genocide is to ensure that there are enough people who are individually of strong moral character in these respects."[197] As Jones's works elucidates, both moral development approaches and genocide cessation efforts create space for the exercise of public agency.

By contrast, other propositions for genocide cessation emphasize the importance of structural solutions, examining changes that could be made within the international community and diminishing a sense of the role individuals play in ending genocide. In elevating solutions at the national and international level, individual agents are supplanted by nation-states as the primary actors in genocide cessation. Often these proposals call for changes to the structure of the international community. Hamburg's book, *Preventing Genocide: Practical Steps toward Early Detection and Effective Action,* is primarily located on this structural level as he punctuates the need for "preventative diplomacy," "international cooperation for preventing mass violence," the development of democracies,[198] and the creation of two "international centers for prevention of genocide," one to be located within the UN and the other inside the EU.[199] Although there is some sense that individuals could play a meaningful role in such genocide cessation politics, most of these suggestions tend to accentuate legal and diplomatic action.[200]

Much of the resolution discourse focused on the international level contains calls for the creation of a standing international body, tasked with monitoring and intervening in conflicts that seem to be going through the stages of "*genocidal priming.*"[201] Although the details vary depending upon each individual proposal, most advocates call for a special body, able to act quickly and concerned exclusively with genocide cessation. Totten argues that this body must possess "a strong mandate with a well-trained, well-equipped, and adequately sized contingent of personnel working in a timely manner" in light of the propensity to underfund, understaff, and retard the action of peace-keeping forces.[202] Heidenrich contends that proposals for such a standing body have been part of

US political discourse for decades. His book, *How to Prevent Genocide: A Guide for Policymakers, Scholars, and the Concerned Citizen,* calls for the use of an "international legion of volunteers," "combined into a single standing unit, available to the Security Council for relatively small scale but still risky missions of importance."[203] He devotes an entire chapter in his text to explaining how this body would be financed and structured.[204] As discussed in greater detail in Chapter Two, Goldhagen, too, advocates for an "international watchdog organization" with selective membership tasked with rapidly responding to crises.[205] Congruent with more structural perspectives on genocide's causes, these policies look toward structural resolutions.

Media Producers as Agents of Genocide Cessation

In a move which links representation to cessation, one strand of resolution discourse links media production to genocide cessation, opening additional space for popular agency given the power of new media tools. "The media" has long been part of conversations about genocide cessation.[206] Media producers are clearly implicated in proposals regarding the creation of a "watchdog" organization and tasked with surveillance. Such approaches treat news organizations in particular as the eyes and ears of genocide cessation work, responsible for monitoring global affairs and bringing the public's attention to atrocities. Their failure to do so becomes cause for concern and subjects media outlets to criticism for their coverage choices.[207] These arguments about the role of media in genocide cessation are based on the assumption that "ignorance" or a lack of awareness about global conflict enables the continuation of atrocity.[208] According to such logic, if publics are only informed about genocides as they happen, appropriate action will be taken to stop such atrocities.[209] The implication here is that a more active

media could have contributed to a successful genocide cessation politics. For a number of reasons, other scholars have asserted, this assumption is misguided. To begin, Charny writes, "simply knowing the historical facts of the past does not in itself free humankind to change the future."[210] Further, several facets of the way mainstream media outlets are structured (e.g., the news media's short attention spans, the provision of coverage only after events occur) preclude them from being effective surveillance aides.[211]

As genocide studies scholars address the power of new media, additional opportunities arise for non-state actors to participate in genocide cessation. New work in Holocaust and genocide studies has turned attention from traditional forms of media (i.e., television broadcasts, newspapers, etc.) to herald the power of "new media." Kreps highlights the power of mobile phones, satellite imagery, and social networks in raising awareness and circulating information about current genocides. Her arguments rest on the logic that "If pictures say a thousand words, and millions of people have access to those pictures, then the mobilizing effects are potentially enormous."[212] The networked power of these new media technologies usefully contribute to breaking down national barriers and encouraging the kind of identification with others Charny advocates above. From Kreps's perspective, new media can aid in "bring[ing] events that are far away from us close to home, which substantially influences the way people perceive their locality" in a fashion consistent with Levy and Sznaider's hopes for a globalized human rights culture.[213] Ideally, these changes to the structure of mediated communication help circumvent the problems Totten and others ascribe to mainstream media and may enable the (new) media to aid in genocide cessation.[214] Importantly, this emphasis on new media reaffirms arguments about popular power and genocide cessation.

New media open additional avenues for engagement in contrast to earlier work on network journalism or newspaper coverage which can serve to replicate the faults of structural approaches in giving the means of expression to a few.[215] Even though Torchin is critical of the way new media has been used for popular genocide cessation efforts, she nevertheless notes that "[t]he reach and convenience of the new technology has helped to draw new people into the political process while arming active groups with resources for increased action."[216] Of course, new media is unlikely to be a panacea for global violence; yet, at minimum, work on the links between new media and genocide cessation has the potential to illuminate ways of navigating the anxiety surrounding state authority and popular agency reflected in some genocide cessation proposals. The conversations surrounding new media certainly create new space to envision the public as engaged in genocide cessation in ways that go beyond the reductiveness Jones ascribes to popular forms of genocide cessation discourse.

Questions of Memory: The Changing Relationship between Memory and the State

Like questions of definition, representation, and resolution, questions of Holocaust and genocide memory are beset by controversy. The Introduction's explanation of the uniqueness thesis showcases some of the heated contestations over the use or perceived abuse of Holocaust memory. The uniqueness thesis, however, is but a subset of a larger category of political arguments concerning the rhetorical potency of genocide memory. Genocide memories commonly function as rhetorical resources for interpreting other political events or atrocities as memories from one political context are applied to another, a process Akcan discusses as "memory transference."[217] One of the most prevalent hopes surrounding such "memory transference" is that such analogies

might contribute to genocide cessation and the propagation of a stronger international commitment to human rights. Evaluations of these arguments rest upon distinct understandings of state authority and public agency. In short, as Edkins explains, questions of political power are at issue. Edkins's work aptly links the contestations over genocide memory to anxieties regarding the changing nature of state power. She charges, "[t]he way in which events such as wars, genocides and famines are remembered is fundamental to the production and reproduction of centralized political power…[A]t stake [in debates over atrocity memory] is the continuing existence of a particular form of power relation: sovereign political authority."[218]Against this backdrop of unstable or jeopardized state power, memory becomes a battleground upon which state authority and popular agency meet.

Holocaust and Genocide Studies Memory as a Rhetorical Resource

Scholarly discussions of Holocaust and genocide memory often locate its utility in the provision of rhetorical resources for understanding moral and political behavior.[219] In line with the presumption underlying the promotion of moral education as form of genocide resolution, some scholars highlight the moral purposes of genocide memory, stressing its capacity to enhance understandings of righteousness and evil. MacDonald, for example, treats "the Holocaust as a generator of norms."[220] He explains: "Morality and ethics in the late twentieth century and after have been strongly influenced by the legacies of the Holocaust. Through its Americanization, nativization, or cosmopolitanization, the Holocaust is seen to provide a universalized standard of good and evil, designed to highlight the roles of victims, perpetrators, and bystanders."[221]

Viewed from this perspective, the Holocaust, in particular, helps shape moral codes,

functioning as "a moral touchstone" and creating "a master moral paradigm."[222]

Others argue that Holocaust and genocide memory provide a resource for

understanding political affairs and other domestic and global atrocities. The Holocaust, in

particular, functions as a rhetorical resource for mobilizing awareness of other

international conflicts.[223] In articulating what he refers to "the Auschwitz analogy,"

Steinweis argues,

> One might go so far as to say that analogies to the Holocaust have become
>
> part of the normal language in which American foreign policy is debated
>
> in the public sphere…an "Auschwitz analogy" has now become a
>
> recurrent theme in American discussions about how best to confront
>
> genocide and other systematic atrocities.[224]

These political situations need not only involve foreign affairs. Hartman highlights

activists' proclivities to "proclaim an 'Animal Auschwitz'" or "a 'holocaust of

babies.'"[225] Independent of the cause, Assmann affirms that Holocaust memory "is

increasingly invoked as a model to articulate, analyse and legitimate other traumatic

memories around the globe."[226] To be sure, these metaphorical comparisons inspire

controversy, particularly amongst proponents of the uniqueness thesis to whom such

analogies violate the memory of the Holocaust.[227]

In contrast to the critics of these comparative practices, others suggest such forms

of analogizing may function as a resource for building a global commitment to human

rights. MacDonald claims that "Holocaust imagery has also become a means for substate

actors to draw attention to their historical or current predicaments, while helping group

members focus on specific agendas."[228] Resultantly, Assmann asserts that "the Holocaust had indeed gone global," functioning as "a free-floating signifier that is readily associated with all kinds of manifestations of moral evil."[229] Levy and Snzaider link this phenomenon to the rise of "cosmopolitan memory." According to Levy and Snzaider, cosmopolitan memory is a conception of memory that more adequately reflects an increasingly globalized landscape, or rather, a "glolocalization," which involves the merger of both globalizing and localizing forces.[230] Spurred by developments in media culture that interconnect localities,[231] the cosmopolitanization of memory works productively to provide a platform for shared advocacy around genocide and human rights issues.[232] Assmann and Concard link the globalization of memory to a widening sense of "global accountability."[233] From these authors' perspectives, the progressive potential for Holocaust and genocide memory expands substantially once such memory is unshackled from the service of the nation-state.[234]

Memory as a Component of Genocide Cessation

One of the most hopeful arguments about the Holocaust and genocide memory links the circulation of atrocity memory to genocide cessation. This kind of "redemptive logic" often manifests in discourses on Holocaust and genocide memory;[235] adherents to this position believe that such memory can contribute to ending genocide.[236] As Wollaston writes, "[t]here seemed to be a consensus that the world would be a more humane and safer place if only there was more Holocaust education, more children visited Holocaust museums, saw films such as *Schindler's List* and so on."[237] This logic suggests that remembering the Holocaust or other genocides keeps the public vigilant and prepared to stop future atrocities, furthering a strong sense of human agency. Traces of

this logic can be found in the introductory remarks to the conference proceedings, *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide*. In these remarks, Lucas implies, "If we do not learn from our historical experience, we will not be guarded against revisiting such appalling horror."[238] Put simply, cessation becomes the rationale for engaging Holocaust memory.

Consequently, a palpable fear of forgetting pulses through some attempts to study and preserve Holocaust memory.[239] Forgetting typically engenders anxiety.[240] Yet, in the case of Holocaust or genocides studies, "forgetting" the memory of past genocides becomes an egregious affront to the victims of past tragedies because the stakes of remembering are elevated. To demonstrate, the obliteration of genocide memory is compared to a crime or a sin by some scholars. "Entropy is a moral scandal," Ignatieff writes, "For if everything is forgotten, if all headstones decay, what is the point of grieving?"[241] Thus, he concludes, "Entropy makes remembering an obligation. In remembering we make our stand against the indifference of nature."[242] Similar sentiments appear in Wiesel's works where he treats remembrance as integral to the perpetuation of the community.[243] Of memory's centrality, Wiesel argues: "if the truth of our past is to be distorted, diminished and repudiated, our memory will have no future. Protect that future."[244] Such works position memorialization and remembrance as critical to genocide cessation, holding out hope that memory will prevent the duplication of future genocidal acts.[245]

Of course, despite a seeming abundance of Holocaust memory in particular, genocides have not ceased to occur, creating doubt over the proposition that memory necessarily promotes the cessation of genocide and leading to numerous critiques of the

"redemptive" perspective.[246] Critics of redemption need only point to examples like that included in Fowler's work; Fowler reminds his readers that shortly after the USHMM held its annual Holocaust remembrance ceremony in April 1994, the Rwandan genocide began. While that genocide was decimating the Tutsi population in Rwanda, the USHMM welcomed its two millionth visitor.[247] "The cliché that 'we must learn the lessons of the past,'" Crane contends, "has never been revealed to be more useless in motivating ethical action: learning the lessons of the past only teaches that the past relates to the present by being over or 'dead' today."[248] Stone too notes the disconnect between a commitment to atrocity memory and a lack of commitment to the action steps that could alleviate such atrocities:

> [W]e live in a culture of memory, one that is obsessed with the past, at
> least certain easily packaged versions of it that do not challenge
> contemporary behaviour, and, on the other hand, we live in an age that has
> not only failed to prevent genocide in Bosnia, Rwanda, and Darfur **...** but
> has even failed to notice that there may be an awkward contradiction in
> commemorating genocide one day and detaining asylum seekers or
> seeking to withdraw from the 1951 UN Convention Relating to the Status
> of Refugees **...** the next.[249]

From Stone's perspective, not only has a commitment to memory historically failed to stop genocide, he suggests genocide memory is completely disassociated from genocide prevention action.

Others hold that discussing the Holocaust as the "prototypical genocide" diminishes our capacity to recognize other genocides and take action. Stone, for example,

posits the possibility that "the focus on the Holocaust … somehow prevents people from investigating or taking equally seriously cases which do not appear to be exactly like it."[250] He also underscores the importance of reinforcing, "that there are many ways in which genocide can be committed, and only rarely does it involve the use of gas chambers."[251] Similarly, Lentin sees these comparative acts, such as the use of Steinweis's "Auschwitz analogy,"[252] as a sign of "the further impoverishment of our Western imaginations,"[253] undermining our ability to see and think beyond this simplistic frame for understanding conflict in the stark good/evil, moral/immoral terminology typically used in popular discussions of the Holocaust.[254] Treating the Holocaust as the "textbook" example of genocide creates unrealistic expectations for the magnitude of the situation that would require intervention.[255] As Power explains, the problem with this logic is that, "the Holocaust sets a grossly 'high' bar for attention or action."[256] This "high bar," she believes, allows us "to tell ourselves that contemporary genocides were not measuring up;" hence, we are not obliged to act.[257] Far from being largely theoretical exercises, as Power and others make clear, these debates over Holocaust and genocide memory influence our perceptions of genocide cessation.

In addition to setting a "high bar," others suggest that excesses of Holocaust memory change our perceptions of contemporary atrocities by altering their temporality. This argument undergirds the conclusion to Zelizer's study of atrocity photos: "This recycling of photos from the past not only dulls our response to them but potentially undermines the immediacy and depth of our response to contemporary instances of brutality, discounting them as somehow already known to us."[258] The problem here is not too little memory but too much,[259] with the omnipresence of such memory

contributing to its devaluation.[260] As counterintuitive as it may seem to make a case for "forgetting genocide,"[261] such studies challenge the contention that memorial practices contribute to genocide prevention and call on readers to be skeptical of the ways in which mediated representations of genocide memory are linked to the termination or prevention of genocide.

Screen Memory, Multidirectional Memory, and the Role of the Nation-State in a Global Age

Returning to Edkins's remarks, recent work in Holocaust and genocide studies suggests that these debates over the politics of genocide memory reflect varying assessments of the relationship between memory and the state. Edkins contends that the state asserts its authority through attempts to circumscribe the potency of trauma into narratives which serve state power. Consequentially, the progressive potential inherent in moments of trauma is squandered.[262] By unhinging memory from the state, Rothberg's work opens new space for reconciling mnemonic tensions, moving memory discourses from competitive models to a multidirectional one.

Rothberg argues that discussions of Holocaust and genocide memory are confined by dualistic, either/or kinds of thinking. In *Multidirectional Memory*, Rothberg contends that much of the discourse about memory is hampered by what he refers to as "collective memory as *competitive* memory – as a zero-sum struggle over scarce resources."[263] From a competitive memory viewpoint, the advancement of the memory of one event comes at the expense of the remembrance of another. Rothberg implies that this "zero-sum" view of memory is what undergirds uniqueness debates and contributes to their ferocity because memory of X or Y atrocity is thusly seen as jeopardizing Holocaust memory.

Competitive conceptions of memory are also inherent in and signaled by the language of "screens" or "blinders" in Holocaust and genocide studies work. For example, Worthington's dissertation on the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum uses the Burkean concept of the "terministic screen."[264] Zelizer's analysis of journalistic coverage of the Holocaust suggests that Holocaust memory "blocks out" the memory of contemporary violence.[265] Freud's concept of "screen memory" is also employed in Holocaust and genocide studies arguments to make similar points.[266]

Instead of using the limiting competitive model, Rothberg encourages a view of "memory as *multidirectional*: as subject to ongoing negotiation, cross-referencing, and borrowing; as productive and not privative."[267] A multidirectional approach avoids the creation of the aforementioned "hierarchy of suffering" associated with uniqueness theses as memories do not "compete" with one another from this perspective.[268] Freed from competition, Rothberg's approach to multidirectional memory "makes visible a countertradition that not only foregrounds unexpected resonance between the Holocaust and colonialism but also can provide resources for rethinking justice."[269]

The progressive potential inherent in multidirectional memory adheres in the adoption of transnational perspectives. Collective memory studies traditionally situate memory as a resource serving national politics.[270] Yet, editors of a recent collection of work on *Memory in a Global Age* argue that "the globalization process has placed a question mark over the nation state as the seemingly natural container of memory debates."[271] Accordingly, today's "memory debates not only unfold within national communities of pride or attrition but are connected across borders."[272] Rothberg builds off Fraser's work on "justice in a globalizing world" to consider the possibilities

contained within texts that "have persistently broken the frame of the nation-state."[273]

Herein the interdisciplinary threads found in discussions of genocide causality and

cessation merge with critiques of atrocity memory in their criticism of state authority.

Rothberg and others suggest that more productive approaches to atrocity are available

once scholars and advocates think beyond the confines of the nation state.

Of course, such optimistic assessments of the power of transnational memory

meet with some resistance in textual practice. The examples of US popular culture

discourses examined in this study confront rhetorical challenges posed either by their

financial ties to the US nation-state (the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum) or

the conservative influence created through indirect pressures for commercial viability

(the Museum of Tolerance, *Worse Than War*).[274] Thus, the transnational calls to "eclipse"

the nation-state are considerably more complicated. As such, the texts in this study

cannot so easily remove the residue of state power; instead, they work within and around

it, grappling with the anxieties produced by the now familiar tensions associated with the

state, the public, and genocidal violence.

The Intersections between Scholarly and Popular Genocide Discourses

Debates continue in Holocaust and genocide studies over the definitions,

representations, resolutions and remembrances of genocidal atrocity. In deliberating over

these issues, scholarly literature reflects substantial anxieties over the place of popular

agency and state authority in the politics of genocide and genocide cessation. Some of the

most sophisticated studies in this area acknowledge this complexity and find ways of

overcoming reductive and binary thinking.[275] These studies provide models for

recognizing the productive tensions circulating *within* Holocaust and genocide studies.

Yet, additional challenges manifest in finding creative ways to translate that complexity to non-scholarly audiences.

The rich terrain produced by the interdisciplinary nature of the conversations in Holocaust and genocide studies has yielded different understandings of the nature of state authority and public agency; however, as various rhetors offer arguments engaging the anxieties over these concepts, they must still find ways of making their genocide cessation discourse comprehensible to popular audiences. Put differently, the scholarly conversations in this chapter invite questions about the relationship between academic knowledge and popular epistemologies. Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's work provides a platform for interrogating the relationship between popular and scholarly ways of knowing. Goldhagen is a scholar by training but is often regarded as a contemporary media celebrity; thus, he sits on the cusp of academic and popular discourses. Chapter Two turns attention toward the questions of genocide definition, representation, resolution, and remembrance as addressed in Goldhagen's *Worse Than War*.

<div align="center">Notes</div>

---

[1] Makino discusses the process as the debate over "the small print of the genocide convention." Uwe Makino, "Final Solutions, Crimes against Mankind: On the Genesis and Criticism of the Concept of Genocide," *Journal of Genocide Research* 3, no. 1 (2001): 56.

For a review and analysis of the drafting of the document, see Jeffrey S. Bachman, "The Genocide Convention and the Politics of Genocide Non-Prevention" (PhD diss., Northeastern University, 2013), http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20003116. See

also Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 19-39.

[2] Makino, "Final Solutions," 56.

[3] See also Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 10; Kuper, *Genocide*, 24-30.

[4] Kuper, *Genocide*, 29.

[5] Foreshadowing an argument I will explicate later in this chapter, the obstacle here is connected to the notion of sovereignty. Hinton writes, "International legal mechanisms, in turn, falter because the international community fears 'violating' the sovereignty of one of its members. After all, it might set a dangerous precedent." Alexander Laban Hinton, "The Dark Side of Modernity: Toward an Anthropology of Genocide," in *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 27.

[6] UN General Assembly, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Resolution 260 (III), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session*, Part I (A/810), 174, http://www.un.org/documents/instruments/docs_en.asp?year=1969.

[7] Samantha Power, *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Perennial, 2003), 58. John G. Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide: A Guide for Policymakers, Scholars, and the Concerned Citizen* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001), 19.

[8] See Andreopoulos on the importance of the definition and its ties to prevention. George J. Andreopoulos, "Introduction: The Calculus of Genocide," in *Genocide: Conceptual and Historical Dimensions*, ed. George J. Andreopoulos (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 3-4.

[9] In this paragraph, I highlight just a few of the critiques of the UN definition, but the criticisms of the definition contained in the 1948 Convention (and the problems with crafting a suitable definition of genocide in general) have preoccupied numerous scholars working on issues of Holocaust and genocide studies. Hayden, for example, considers the ways our understandings of "genocide" and "ethnic cleansing" are linked to problems of memory. Straus compiles multiple circulating definitions of genocide and compares the implications of various authors' conceptions of genocide. Others, including Chorbajian, Harff, Jonassohn, Semelin, Totten, Roth, and Totten & Parson, either offer specific critiques of problematic facets of extant definitions or provide a litany of criticisms of the UN (and other) definition(s). See Robert M. Hayden, "Schindler's Fate: Genocide, Ethnic Cleansing and Population Transfers," *Slavic Review* 55, no. 4 (1996): 727-748; Scott Straus, "Contested Meanings and Conflicting Imperatives: A Conceptual Analysis of Genocide," *Journal of Genocide Research* 3, no. 3 (2001): 349-375; Levon Chorbajian, "Introduction," in *Studies in Comparative Genocide*, ed. Levon Chorbajian and George Shirinian (Hampshire: MacMillan Press, LTD, 1999), xv-xxxv; Barbara Harff, "Recognizing Genocides and Politicides," in *Genocide Watch*, ed. Helen Fein (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 27-41; Kurt Jonassohn, "What is Genocide?" in *Genocide Watch*, ed. Helen Fein (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 17-26; Jacques Semelin, "What is 'Genocide'?" *European Review of History* 12, no. 1

(2005): 81-89; Samuel Totten, "To Deem or Not to Deem 'It' Genocide: A Double-Edged Sword," in *The Genocidal Temptation: Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Rwanda, and Beyond*, ed. Robert S. Frey (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), 41-55; John K. Roth, "Epilogue: 'After?...Meaning What?'" in *Genocide and Human Rights: A Philosophical Guide*, ed. John K. Roth (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 330; Samuel Totten and William S. Parsons, "Introduction," in *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, ed. Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1997), 1-13. Notably, Totten and Parsons's "Introduction" provides extensive citations chaining out further the various manifestations of these definitional debates.

Andreopoulos's edited collection includes multiple chapters centralizing definitional concerns. Andreopoulos, ed. *Genocide.*

[10] Roth, "Epilogue," 330; Totten, "To Deem," 43-44; Kuper, *Genocide*, 31-35.

[11] The USSR's advocacy combined with the consent of other UN member states, including the US. See Kuper, *Genocide*, 24-30.

[12] Kevin Lewis O'Neill and Alexander Laban Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory, and Representation: An Introduction," in *Genocide: Truth, Memory, and Representation*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton and Kevin Lewis O'Neill (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 2. In contrast, Totten and Parsons begin their introduction by highlighting their choice to include political groups and noting other scholars in this field who consider political groups amongst the victims of genocide. Totten and Parsons, "Introduction," 4; see also Kuper, *Genocide*, 39.

[13] Lemkin's early work on genocide sought to capture two facets of the crime: what Lemkin termed "barbarity" and "vandalism." The latter notion of vandalism included what we understand to be cultural genocide today. See Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 21-22; O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 2-3; Kuper, *Genocide*, 30-31; Amy Hungerford, *The Holocaust of Texts: Genocide, Literature, and Personification* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 7-8.

[14] O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 3; Kuper, *Genocide*, 30-31.

[15] Hungerford, *The Holocaust of Texts*, 7.

[16] Makino, "Final Solutions," 58. [emphasis mine]

[17] Wendy Hesford, "Human Rights Rhetoric of Recognition," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2011): 286.

[18] Hinton, "The Dark Side," 27.

[19] Mark Levene, "Why Is the Twentieth Century the Century of Genocide?" *Journal of World History* 11, no. 2 (2000): 317.

[20] Chorbajian, "Introduction," xv.

For an extended discussion of the complications surrounding "genocidal intent" see Akio Kimura, "Genocide and the Modern Mind: Intention and Structure," *Journal of Genocide Research* 5, no. 3 (2003): 405-420. See also Andreopoulos's discussion of intentionality vis-à-vis structural perspectives. Andreopoulos, "Introduction," 7-9.

[21] O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 3. As Power notes, despite genocide's inclusion in the 1948 UN Convention, drafting a definition proved only to be part of the battle: "Nearly four decades would pass before the United States would ratify

the treaty, and fifty years would elapse before the international community would convict anyone for genocide." Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 60.

[22] Of course, the relationship between the constructs "the Holocaust" and "genocide" is fraught in ways explained in the Introduction's discussion of the "uniqueness thesis." See pages 15-18.

[23] More than ninety years after the 1915 massacre, this issue remains a political landmine. In March 2010, a U.S. decision to recognize the slaughter as genocide infuriated Turkey. See Giles Whittell, "Turkey recalls Ambassador after US vote on Armenia 'genocide,'" *The Times (UK)*, March 5, 2010, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article7050439.ece.

[24] Nicholas D. Kristof, "A Wimp on Genocide," *New York Times*, September 18, 2005, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/18/opinion/18kristof.html; Darren Brunk, "Dissecting Darfur: Anatomy of a Genocide Debate," *International Relations* 22, no. 1 (2008): 36. See also Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Worse than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2009), 237.

[25] As featured later in this chapter's notes, this argument is often associated with the work of Ward Churchill. For a brief presentation of some of his arguments, see Catherine Helen Palczewski, "When Times Collide: Ward Churchill's Use of an Epideictic Moment to Ground Forensic Argument," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 41, no. 3 (2005): 123-138. See also page 133n40.

[26] The example of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is used to open Goldhagen's book. To be fair, Goldhagen's subject is eliminationism, not just the narrow

category (within the typology he develops) of genocide. Under this broadened conception of eliminationism, he places Truman's decision to use the atomic bomb. Goldhagen, *Worse than War*, 3-8.

Other scholars treat these bombings as a form of genocide. Kuper also discusses this incident as genocidal. Kuper, *Genocide*, 17. Further linkages between such forms of warfare and genocide are developed in Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Markusen, *The Genocide Mentality: Nazi Holocaust and Nuclear Threat* (New York: Basic Books, 1990). See also Kimura, "Genocide," 407-408, 418n5

[27] These last four examples are all part of Norfolk's book. See Simon Norfolk, *For Most of It I Have No Words: Genocide Memory Landscape*, with an essay by Michael Ignatieff (Stockport: Dewi Lewis press, 1998).

[28] Totten, "To Deem."

[29] Makino, "Final Solutions," 49.

[30] Power reproduces the careful phrasing used by US State Department spokesperson Christine Shelly to avoid issuing a designation of genocide. Using descriptors such as "acts of genocide," the Clinton administration went to extreme lengths to avoid the word "genocide." This rhetorical maneuvering ultimately raised questions from the news media, including the oft-quoted retort, "'How many acts of genocide does it take to make genocide?'" See See Arthur Jay Klinghoffer, "American Reticence," in *The International Dimension of Genocide in Rwanda* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 99-100; Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 358-364; Brunk, "Dissecting Darfur," 35-36; Peter V. Ronayne, "The United States and the 'G-Word': Genocide and Denial Before and Beyond Rwanda," in *The Genocidal Temptation:*

Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Rwanda, and Beyond, ed. Robert S. Frey (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), 101-114.

[31] Brunk, "Dissecting Darfur," 35.

[32] Cynthia E. Smith and Tony Pipa, "The Politics of Genocide: U.S. Rhetoric vs. Inaction in Darfur, 7 April – 26 September 2004," *Kennedy School Review* 6 (2005): 131-140; see also Brunk, "Dissecting Darfur."

[33] Herman and Peterson write, "During the past several decades, the word 'genocide' has increased in frequency of use and reckless application, so much so that the crime of the twentieth century for which the word originally was coined often appears debased." Edward S. Herman and David Peterson, *The Politics of Genocide* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010), 103. Noam Chomsky, foreword to *The Politics of Genocide*, by Edward S. Herman and David Peterson (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010), 12.

[34] Chomsky, foreword to *The Politics of Genocide*, 12. For more on the political usage of the term, see Aleksandar Jokic, "Genocidalism," *The Journal of Ethics* 8, no. 3 (2004): 251-297.

[35] As Moses and Stone explain, "The relationship between genocide and colonialism is clearly a vexed question that admits of no easy answers and even stumps seasoned analysts." A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone, "Introduction," in *Colonialism and Genocide*, ed. A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone (London: Routledge, 2007), vii.

[36] Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009), 101.

[37] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*.

[38] The text contends that Lemkin "wrote chapters on the European settlement of the Americas, Africa, and Australia," as part of his scholarship on genocide although these works were not published. A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone, ed. *Colonialism and Genocide*, (London: Routledge, 2007), i.

[39] Moses and Stone write, "Thus, although colonialism does not necessarily issue in genocide, the two phenomena are profoundly connected." Moses and Stone, "Introduction," vii-viii.

[40] Kuper credits Sartre's 1968 work with the development of a theory that links colonialism and genocide through practices of capitalism. Kuper, *Genocide,* 44. Jean-Paul Sartre, *On Genocide* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).

Kuper is somewhat skeptical of Sartre's theses, but he holds, "Nevertheless, given the many genocidal massacres in colonial history, I think the argument of an affinity between colonialism and genocide can be accepted, though with much qualification, and we can extract from Sartre's arguments some of the significant elements in this relationship." Kuper, *Genocide*, 45.

In a less direct correspondence, Stone advances an argument about the influence of British imperialism on Germany's Third Reich, discussing the Nazi fascination with the British Empire and teasing out shared concerns regarding space or *Lebensraum* in both the British Empire and 1930s Germany. Dan Stone, *History, Memory and Mass Atrocity: Essays on the Holocaust and Genocide* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2006), 174-195. Stone's work includes a review of the litany of research on European powers, colonialism, and genocide.

Churchill, too, crafts an argument about colonial practices and Nazi influence, moving toward the suggestion that the United States' policy with regard to Native American removal could have influenced Nazi Germany. See Ward Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1997), 52.

[41] Chorbajian, "Introduction," xviii.

[42] A. Dirk Moses, "Conceptual Blockages and Definitional Dilemmas in the 'Racial Century': Genocides of Indigenous Peoples and the Holocaust," in *Colonialism and Genocide*, ed. A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone (London: Routledge, 2007), 151, 160-161.

[43] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[44] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[45] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 163.

[46] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[47] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[48] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[49] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[50] Although I find Moses's schemata useful for thinking through the broader literature on causality, I want to acknowledge Moses's work in proper context. It is worth bearing in mind that Moses's work emerges from a specific context: the study of the relationships among genocide, the Holocaust, and colonialism. Nevertheless, I think Moses's perspective enhances the ensuing analysis of the tensions underlying approaches to genocidal causality.

[51] Indeed, each question has historically inspired a variety of responses and fueled contentious scholarly debates. These include the structural-functionalist versus ideological-intentionalist interpretations of the Holocaust, the controversies around the 1989 Historians' Debate, and the 1990s Goldhagen-Browning debates. The structural-functionalist versus ideological-intentionalist split reflects differing interpretations of what caused the Holocaust. The varying "camps" reflect a difference in emphasis (the psychology of agents versus the attributes of the social structure), which in some ways parallels the tensions to be teased out in the first section of this literature review. I discuss the ideological-intentionalist and structural-functionalist debates using Moses's work in Chapter Two. A.D. Moses, "Structure and Agency in the Holocaust: Daniel J. Goldhagen and His Critics," *History and Theory* 37, no. 2 (1998): 194-219.

Updating the conversation, Bauer contends that these competing interpretations no longer constitute much of a causal debate as a number of historians have sought ways to draw on both intentionalist and functionalist positions. See Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 28-30.

For an overview of the Historians' Debate, see Dominick LaCapra, "Representing the Holocaust: Reflections on the Historians' Debate," in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution,"* ed. Saul Friedlander (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 108 - 127.

For a discussion of the Goldhagen-Browning debates, see Chapter Two, pages 185-186.

The answers that are posited tend to reflect disciplinary fault lines in genocide studies, with humanists honing in on different causal attributes than social scientists,

anthropologists spotlighting different aspects of genocide than historians, and political scientists examining different phenomenon than sociologists. Again, such divergent disciplinary foci are not surprising given the different epistemological beliefs that scholars bring to bear under the auspices of the disciplinary umbrella of genocide studies. See Michael Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 5-10.

[52] Ervin Staub, *Overcoming Evil: Genocide, Violent Conflict, and Terrorism* (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2011), 15. Phrased differently in his earlier work, "Genocide arises from a pattern, or gestalt, rather than from any single source." Ervin Staub, *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 23.

[53] Countless scholars have attempted to identify these warning signs. For examples, see the "warning signs," articulated in Hinton, "The Dark Side," 29; Barbara Harff, "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing the Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003): 57-73; David A. Hamburg, *Preventing Genocide: Practical Steps Toward Early Detection and Effective Action* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2008), 10; Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, 85-86.

See also note 201 on genocidal priming

[54] As Levene makes clear, "No key analyst offers an entirely monocausal explanation" for genocide. Mark Levene, "A Dissenting Voice: Or How Current Assumptions of Deterring and Preventing Genocide May Be Looking at the Problem

Through the Wrong End of the Telescope, Part I," *Journal of Genocide Research* 6, no. 2 (2004): 163n4.

[55] Although I underscore this in the text, I wish to stress again that this is but a sketch of *select* conversations in Holocaust and genocide studies on the problem of causality. As outlined in note 51, numerous significant debates occur over questions of causality. In what follows, I highlight literature that should be treated as ends of a spectrum rather than diametrically opposed camps with an understanding that few, if any, scholars would be so reductivist as to hold genocide's causes lie only in the "mind" or the "social structure." These particular perspectives on causality are highlighted so as to serve as examples of the differential conceptualizations of agency that circulate in these causal conversations.

[56] Although Heidenrich expends a considerable amount of space in his book talking about aspects of genocide at a more macroscopic level, in his conclusion, he casts genocide as more of a psychological phenomenon. I quote from Heidenrich at length to demonstrate: "Rather than being compelled by our genes, genocidal behavior has its cause in the human psyche, a cause rooted in a fear so deep that this driving fear has twisted and corrupted the perpetrator's intellect, a fear arisen from his own lack of unconditional love for himself. Many of us, perhaps most of us, would rather not face our innermost feelings about ourselves, a feeling of personal self-doubt or even of self-hatred – but that is where the eventual impetus for genocidal behavior originates." Later, he writes, "The ultimate cause and cure of genocide is more psychological than biological, more spiritual than material." Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, 258, 262.

[57] James Waller, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford, 2007), 10. Waller, it should be noted, is critical of work that only "follow[s] the shopworn procedure of" citing these two studies while ignoring other work in psychology.

Although I am skeptical of Goldhagen's work and will critique his scholarship in Chapter Two, he, too, is critical of the use of Milgram's work to explain the Holocaust/genocide, concerned that such studies reinforce arguments that remove agency from human actors. Goldhagen, *Worse Than War*, 151-154.

Staub is not advancing the same criticism of Milgram as Goldhagen; however, his description of the Milgram study clearly highlights the complications its poses for understandings of agency: "Milgram suggested that people can enter an 'agentic' mode in which they relinquish individual responsibility and act as agents of authority." Staub, *The Roots of Evil*, 29. See Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1974).

[58] Samuel P. Oliner and Pearl M. Oliner, *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe* (New York: The Free Press, 1988).

[59] Waller, *Becoming Evil*.

[60] Staub, *Overcoming Evil*. Staub's earlier work, although less comprehensive, similarly retains a balanced approach to the interaction between the mind and the social environment. Staub, *The Roots of Evil*.

[61] Steven K. Baum, *The Psychology of Genocide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

[62] Leonard S. Newman and Ralph Erber, ed., *Understanding Genocide: The Social Psychology of the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

[63] Staub, *The Roots of Evil*, 13. Staub's work, overall, is an excellent model and works against any inclination to caricature psychological approaches to genocide as only concerned with the mindsets of individual agents. Though Staub's interests primarily lie in the study of the psychology of genocide, in both of the texts cited here, Staub balances his appreciation of the potency of psychology with an awareness of the ways psychological behaviors are influenced by social structures and cultures. See Staub, *The Roots of Evil*, 13-34; Staub, *Overcoming Evil*, 12-14.

[64] Staub, *Overcoming Evil*, 14.

[65] Waller, *Becoming Evil*, 20.

[66] Waller, *Becoming Evil*, 20.

[67] Waller, *Becoming Evil*, 20.

[68] Kuper summarizes some of this research in Kuper, *Genocide*, 51-52. For the original arguments and conversations about aggression, instinct, and the Holocaust, see Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression*, trans. Marjorie Kerr Wilson (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1966); Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973); Eugen Kogon, *The Theory and Practice of Hell: The German Concentration Camps and the Systems Behind Them*, trans. Heinz Norden, 2nd. ed. (New York: Octagon Books, 1976). Although these works are dated, the problematic aspects of this perspective (which remove agency and ascribe genocidal violence to human nature) have not entirely disappeared as I demonstrate in the note below.

[69] Staub, in his discussion of evil, notes the ways Hobbes and other theorists' conceptions of human nature correlate with certain beliefs about evil and violence. Staub, *The Roots of Evil*, 26. Although these authors approach their work on genocide with more nuance, I would argue that such a conception of human nature animates, in part, Chirot and McCauley's work. Though the authors' stress the importance of situations as well as human proclivities toward peace, their talk of "impulses" and framing of the introduction to their text contains elements which arguably seem to reinforce a Hobbesian view of humanity, emphasizing the importance of intervention and the need to reroute human behavior (through channels that include social and political organization) from the propensity to do violent harm. See Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley, *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 1-10.

It is worth noting that the "human nature" argument can also work in the exact opposite fashion, by which scholars and authors assume that mass violence violates human nature as it defies human beings' "natural" propensity *not* to kill one's species. Kuper refers to this as "a liberal assumption as to the nature of human nature or of man in society." He continues, noting that a liberal assumption is "[t]he assumption … that massive slaughter of members of one's own species is repugnant to [hu]man[ity]." Kuper, *Genocide*, 84. See also Fromm *The Anatomy of Human*; Chirot and McCauley, *Why Not Kill Them*, 7.

[70] Jonassohn, "What is Genocide?" 24.

[71] Although Levene is not specifically talking about psychological approaches, this is the idea that underlies his charge that "current assumptions of deterring and

preventing genocide may be looking at the problem through the wrong end of the telescope." Levene argues that extant studies of genocide (far beyond psychological approaches alone!) may be suffering from "myopic vision." Overall, Levene contends that a much more "macro-context" oriented approach is necessary. The problem, in short, is one of sight, and scholars need to broaden their lenses. Levene, "A Dissenting Voice," 154, 162, 163.

[72] Helen Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective* (London: Sage Publications, 1993), 44.

[73] Mark Levene, "A Moving Target, the Usual Suspects and (Maybe) a Smoking Gun: The Problem of Pinning Blame in Modern Genocide," *Patterns of Prejudice* 33, no. 4 (1999): 20, 24.

[74] Levene, "A Dissenting Voice," 155. Levene charges that this is an assumption that tends to underlie many of the works of note in genocide studies. See Levene, "A Dissenting Voice," 163-164n4.

[75] As Levene expands upon this idea elsewhere: "To return to our basic proposition: genocide, instead of being treated as a series of unrelated aberrations, afflicting only god-forsaken peoples whose cultural idiosyncracies or ideological borrowings predispose them in this direction but who otherwise have no relationship to a normative modernity rather needs to be viewed as one critical by-product—though, I should emphasize very far from the an exclusive one—of what is actually a very seriously dysfunctional modern international system. Or to put it another way, the micro-level of radicalized state violence cannot in the twentieth century be isolated from the macro-context in which it occurs anymore than a perpetrator society's possibly historic

hatred against a particular group or groups can be disentangled from hegemonic, globalizing pressures which may finally and fatally push it over the genocidal precipice." Levene, "A Dissenting Voice," 162.

[76] Mark Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation-State*, vol. 1, *The Meaning of Genocide* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 32.

[77] Levene, *Genocide.*

[78] As an aside, Levene notes that these causal factors are not only implicated in the causal politics surrounding mass atrocity, "together they represent, on the one hand, the most profound shift in human development since the Iron Age and, on the other, key fundaments upon which contemporary (or at least Western) society's peace, security and well-being have become largely assured." Levene, *Genocide*, 11.

Additional scholarship on these causal factors is identified in the paragraphs to follow, spanning pages 94-97.

[79] As Hinton reminds readers, these concepts are also linked in paradoxical ways. Hinton explains, "Paradoxically, however, modernity is also associated with the centralization of political control and the predominance of state sovereignty, creating a situation in which modern subjects are regulated by state disciplines that may necessitate the very type of bodily suffering their 'rights' are supposed to protect against."

He continues, "Moreover, since modern states, like modern subjects, are supposed to have 'rights' over their body politic, other states cannot violate their sovereignty, leading to another paradox in which international inaction about genocide is legitimated by metanarratives of modernity." Hinton, "The Dark Side," 25-27.

[80] Levene, *Genocide*, 12-14.

[81] Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000).

[82] Bureaucracy is an especially prominent part of the conversation about causality as it manifests well-known scholarship on Holocaust causality. See Staub's review of these theses and reflections on the role of bureaucracy, Staub, *Overcoming Evil*, 9-10; Staub, *The Roots of Evil*, 28-29.

[83] Bartov adds industrial killing to this list as well. Omer Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[84] Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, 110.

[85] Hinton, "The Dark Side," 1, 7-12.

[86] Hinton, "The Dark Side," 27.

[87] As alluded to by this remark, the relationship between modernity and genocide is complex as modernity both creates the conditions for genocide even as genocide unravels the foundations of "modern" life. Quoting Hinton, "If modernity inflicts genocide, then genocide, in turn, inverts modernity, as it creates diasporic communities that threaten to undermine its culminating political incarnation, the nation-state." Hinton, "The Dark Side," 26.

[88] Levene, *Genocide*, 14-18. In addition to the works cited below, the nation-state or nationalism is also linked to genocide in Jonassohn, "What is Genocide," 24-25; Staub, *Roots*, 19.

[89] Levene, *Genocide*, 15-17.

[90] Hayden, "Schindler's Fate." Hayden regards the designation of "genocide" or "ethnic cleansing" as politically motivated. The usage of the term is thus contingent upon the perception of the state asserting control over its territory.

[91] Levene, "Why Is the Twentieth," 317. Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 177-180.

[92] Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 177-180.

[93] Larry Ray, "Memory, Trauma and Genocidal Nationalism," *Sociological Research Online* 4, no. 2 (1999): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/4/2/ray.html. See also Jie-Hyun Lim, "Victimhood Nationalism in Contested Memories: National Mourning and Global Accountability," in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 138-162.

[94] Numerous scholars treat genocide as triggered by the memories of other events in the nation's past. Kosicki, coining the term "victim-aggressor memory," argues that genocides result from the memory of previous abuse or mistreatment of the current aggressors at the hands of the current victims, a cycle he contends the world witnessed during the Rwandan genocide. Similarly, Buckley-Zistel describes the muting of memory in post-genocide Rwanda to avoid inciting additional violence. Piotr H. Kosicki, "Sites of Aggressor-Victim Memory: The Rwandan Genocide, Theory and Practice," *International Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 1 (2007): 10-29; Susanne Buckley-Zistel, "Remembering to Forget: Chosen Amnesia as a Strategy for Local Coexistence in Post-Genocide Rwanda," *Africa* 76, no. 2 (2006): 131-150.

[95] Kuper, *Genocide,* 44-48, 57-83; Vinay Lal, "Genocide, Barbaric Others, and the Violence of Categories: A Response to Omer Bartov," *American Historical Review* 103, no. 4 (1998): 1188-1190. Sartre, *On Genocide.*

[96] Levene, *Genocide*, 11-12.

[97] See John H. Bodley, *Victims of Progress*, 2nd ed. (Menlo Park, CA: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc., 1982); Churchill, *A Little Matter*; David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

For other perspectives on the relationship between the state, indigenous populations, and genocide, see Helen Fein, "Scenarios of Genocide: Models of Genocide and Critical Response," in *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide*, ed. Israel W. Charny (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984, 8-9; Leo Kuper, *The Prevention of Genocide* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 151.

[98] Levene, *Genocide*, 11-12.

[99] Levene, *Genocide,* 12. For additional backing for this assertion, Levene turns to Todorov and Finzsch. Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984); Norbert Finzsch, "'The Aborigines…Were Never Annihilated, and Still They Are Becoming Extinct': Settler Imperialism and Genocide in Nineteenth-Century American and Australia," in *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, ed. A. Dirk Moses (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 253-270.

[100] Levene, *Genocide*, 22.

[101] Jacques Semelin, *Purify and Destroy: The Political Uses of Massacre and Genocide*, trans. Cynthia Schoch (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 2-3. Notably, Semelin is not talking specifically about post-liberal approaches here. His larger concern in this passage is any causal theory that strips accountability.

[102] Levene in his book responds to this by noting that genocide is "possible" not "inevitable." Levene, *Genocide*, 18. Although working from a different theoretical vantage point (psychology), Staub, too, works around the problem of inevitability by instead discussing probability. Staub, *The Roots of Evil,* 23; Staub, *Overcoming Evil*, 35.

[103] Such positions' "claim that genocide is coextensive with the reproductive needs of a certain system suggests the normalization of the genocidal process and the concomitant impossibility of devising preventive measures against a process that is part of everyday life." Andreopoulos, "Introduction," 9.

[104] Andreopoulos, "Introduction," 9.

[105] Although Kuper is not talking about television, he captures the problem of accessing and understanding genocide well. He holds, "Yet even in the particular case, the enormity of the genocide seems to defy understanding. It is individual suffering which speaks to us most directly and meaningfully – the account of a survivor; the anguish of a mutilated baby; an Italian Consul's despair as witness to an episode in the Turkish genocide against Armenians; a young boy's first view of Auschwitz at the time of the German annihilation of Hungarian Jews; the narrative of a husband and wife moving from a Polish ghetto through the death camps to a heartbreaking reunion with their son." Kuper, *Genocide,* 9. See also O'Neill and Hinton, "Genocide, Truth, Memory," 1.

[106] On television being ill-suited for the representation of collective issues see Roderick P. Hart, *Seducing America: How Television Charms the Modern Voter* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Darrell Y. Hamamoto, *Nervous Laughter: Television Situation Comedy and Liberal Democratic Ideology* (New York, Praeger, 1989); Bonnie J. Dow, *Prime-Time Feminism: Television, Media Culture, and the Women's Movement Since 1970* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996); Margaret J. Heide, *Television Culture and Women's Lives:* thirtysomething *and the Contradictions of Gender* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).

[107] See the Introduction, page 46n25.

[108] Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 212-213.

[109] American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th ed., Text Rev. (Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

[110] On the expanding the definition of "trauma," see Cathy Caruth, "Introduction" in *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, ed. Cathy Caruth (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press, 1995), 3-4; Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver, "Introduction" in *The Memory of Catastrophe*, ed. Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 9-10. For examples of the application of the traumatic framework, see Adam Lowenstein, "Introduction: The Allegorical Moment," in *Shocking Representation: Historical Trauma, National Cinema, and the Modern Horror Film* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 1-16; Dominick LaCapra, *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).

[111] Gray and Oliver, "Introduction," 9-12; Duncan Bell, "Introduction: Memory, Trauma, and World Politics," in *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*, ed. Duncan Bell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 7 -9.

[112] Jeffrey C. Alexander, "Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma" in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, ed. Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernhard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser and Piotr Sztompka (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 8.

[113] Alexander, "Toward a Theory," 9-10; Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), xiv. Although Gray and Oliver use the term "catastrophe" to talk through this temporal break, their conception of a disruption of temporality is useful. See Gray and Oliver, "Introduction," 7-8; Bell, "Introduction," 7.

[114] Gray and Oliver, "Introduction," 8.

[115] Both Kosicki and Gray and Oliver suggest the ways in which trauma studies may be of use to memory studies. Kosicki highlights a lacuna in Halbwachs' original work on collective memory: Halbwachs's failure to theorize about collective memory in times of trauma. Kosicki attempts to begin to fill this void. See Kosicki, "Sites of Aggressor-Victim," 10-29.

Gray and Oliver's conception of catastrophe as contingent upon a sense of temporal "break" or cleavage, "place[s] the processes of memory at the very core of catastrophe studies," a productive intervention for my own study's purposes. As they explain, for a "catastrophe" to have occurred there is often a break between memory of

life before the disaster and after that disaster; thus, "catastrophes are structured by the presence of memory." See Gray and Oliver, "Introduction," 8.

[116] Kirby Farrell, "Introduction: Trauma as Interpretation of Injury," in *Post-traumatic Culture: Injury and Interpretation in the Nineties* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 1-33.

[117] Gray and Oliver, "Introduction," 11. For an example of this extensive application of "trauma," see Gina Ross' book on trauma and the media. In her book, she holds, "[e]ven seemingly small events can be devastating and trigger traumatic symptoms." Amongst these events, she includes "mercilessly tickling." Gina Ross, "What Everyone Should Know About Trauma," in *Beyond the Trauma Vortex: The Media's Role in Healing Fear, Terror, & Violence* (Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books, 2003), 4.

[118] Bell, "Introduction" 9-10. Bell advances this argument by drawing heavily on Bourke. See Joanna Bourke, "When the Torture Becomes Humdrum," *Times Higher Education*, February 10, 2006, http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=201299&sectioncode=26.

[119] Frank Furedi, "Introduction," in *Therapy Culture: Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 21.

[120] Furedi, "Introduction," 6-8.

[121] Dana L. Cloud, *Control and Consolation in American Culture and Politics: Rhetorics of Therapy* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1998). See also Mari Boor Tonn, "Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 3 (2005): 405-430.

[122] Michael S. Roth and Charles G. Salas, "Introduction," in *Disturbing Remains: Memory, History, and Crisis in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Michael S. Roth and Charles G. Salas (Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Research Institute, 2001), 3.

[123] Roth and Salas, "Introduction," 2.

[124] Saul Friedlander, "Introduction," in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution,"* ed. Saul Friedlander (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 1-21. David Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust Blockbuster: *Schindler's List* and *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, Globally and Locally," *The Germanic Review* 75, no. 4 (2000): 296-297. It is important to pause to note here that most of these debates are about the representation of *Holocaust memory* specifically. The contestations discussed in the Introduction regarding the uniqueness thesis complicate the applicability of Brenner's and Friedlander's arguments to other genocides.

[125] Kyriakides's work probes the meaning of Adorno's remarks on representation, arguing that his famed line about post-Holocaust art is often misunderstood. Yvonne Kyriakides, "Commentary: 'Art After Auschwitz is Barbaric': Cultural Ideology of Silence through the Politics of Representation," *Media, Culture & Society* 27, no. 3 (2005): 441-450.

[126] Friedlander, "Introduction," 3.

[127] Friedlander, "Introduction," 3. [italics in the original]

[128] Friedlander, "Introduction," 1-5. As Friedlander explains, some of the viewpoints that surfaced during the Historians' Debate (mentioned above) created the exigencies for responses such as his edited collection.

[129] Of course, this recalls the powerful assertion made by Primo Levi on the need for a new "language" in order to capture the horror of the Holocaust: "Just as our hunger is not that feeling of missing a meal, so our way of being cold has need of a new word. We say 'hunger', we say 'tiredness', 'fear', 'pain', we say 'winter' and they are different things. They are free words, created and used by free men who lived in comfort and suffering in their homes. If the Lagers had lasted longer a new, harsh language would have been born; and only this language could express what it means to toil the whole day in the wind, with the temperature below freezing, wearing only a shirt, underpants, cloth jacket and trousers, and in one's body nothing but weakness, hunger and knowledge of the end drawing nearer." See Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz: The Nazi Assault on Humanity,* trans. Stuart Woolf (1958; New York: Touchstone, 1996), 123.

This insufficiency also recalls one of Kurasawa's major concerns, building off the writing of Paul Celan, about the difficult labor of "bearing witness" to atrocity. See Fuyuki Kurasawa, "A Message in a Bottle: Bearing Witness as a Mode of Transnational Practice," *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, no. 1 (2009): 95. Again, see too Friedlander, "Introduction," 5.

[130] Naomi Mandel, "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz': Against a Rhetoric of the Unspeakable in Holocaust Writing," *boundary 2* 28, no. 2 (2001): 203-228.

[131] Kyriakides, "'Art After Auschwitz.'"

The argument that limiting the modes of representation has a crippling effect on Holocaust and genocide knowledge also appears in Lentin's work. Ronit Lentin, "Introduction: Postmemory, Unsayability and the Return of the Auschwitz Code," in *Re-*

Presenting the Shoah for the Twenty-First Century, ed. Ronit Lentin (New York:

Berghahn Books, 2004), 1-24.

[132] Shandler, "Introduction," xvii.

As a case study, see Hansen's review of the debates around representation in

Schindler's List. Miriam Bratu Hansen, "*Schindler's List* Is Not *Shoah*: The Second

Commandment, Popular Modernism, and Public Memory," *Critical Inquiry* 22, no. 2

(1996): 292-312.

[133] This list of factors for consideration in assessing Holocaust or genocide

representations is by no means exhaustive. Other debates concern the question of

"closure." See James E. Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in

Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

Hesford also explores the problem of identification between the witness/victim

and audiences and the power dynamics involved in such acts of identification. See

Wendy S. Hesford, "Documenting Violations: Rhetorical Witnessing and the Spectacle of

Distant Suffering," *Biography* 27, no. 1 (2004): 104-144; Wendy S. Hesford, "Media

Review: Rhetorical Memory, Political Theater, and the Traumatic Present,"

Transformations XVI, no 2 (2005): 104-117.

[134] Shandler, *While America Watches,* 212-213.

[135] This rise of the survivor as the authority in meaning making can be located

within a shift during the second half of the nineteenth century. As Holocaust memory

transitioned to become a larger part of public memorial culture so too did the survivor

move from the background (seeking to blend in and assimilate) to the foreground, and the

valorization of the survivor as a vaulted witness began. See Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture*

and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America (Seattle: University of Washington

Press, 2001), 22-23; Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston: Houghton

Mifflin Company, 1999), 8-9. For more on "survivors," see Pamela Ballinger, "The

Culture of Survivors: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Memory," *History*

& Memory 10, no. 1 (1998): 99-132.

[136] Eli Wiesel, "Opening Address," in *Remembering for the Future: The*

Holocaust in an Age of Genocide, ed. John K. Roth and Elisabeth Maxwell, *vol. 1:*

History (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 9.

[137] Wiesel, "Opening Address," 11.

[138] Stephen C. Feinstein, "Introduction: *A Scream/A Repetition/A*

Transformation," in *Absence/Presence: Critical Essays on the Artistic Memory of the*

Holocaust, ed. Stephen C. Feinstein (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2005),

xxiii.

[139] Feinstein, "Introduction," xxiii.

[140] Bauman, Mintz, and Hungerford all offer variants on this theme. Bauman is

worried about the consequences of an intergenerational transmission of the "privileged

status" (of victimhood) from Holocaust survivors to their offspring. Mintz argues against

ceding privileged status in meaning making by using Fish's notion of the "interpretative

community" to discuss claims to Holocaust memory. Hungerford is weary of what these

privileges in meaning making might mean for/to academics. She writes, "And the

emerging discipline we are calling Holocaust Studies has become beholden to statements

of personal connection, to the need to explain one's connection to one's subject in a way

that is not required by other kinds of scholarly work." In general, these are byproducts of

the use of trauma as an interpretative framework that limit rather than expand the production of knowledge in Holocaust and genocide studies. See Mintz, *Popular Culture*, 170-178; Zygmunt Bauman, "The Holocaust's Life as a Ghost," *Tikkun* 13, no. 4 (1998): 33-38; Hungerford, *The Holocaust of Texts*, 155.

[141] Norfolk, *For Most of It*; Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 85. In contrast, Hughes advances a competing argument about the decay and the impermanence of the image. See Rachel Hughes, "The Abject Artefacts of Memory: Photographs from Cambodia's Genocide," *Media, Culture & Society* 25 (2003): 23-44.

[142] Shandler argues, "Public memory is conventionally thought of as being best served by phenomena with purportive powers of endurance, such as stone monuments, official public celebrations, or texts that are widely circulated and regularly read. Television, inherently ephemeral and elusive, might well seem inimical to remembrance." Shandler, *While America Watches,* 259-260. See also Andrew Hoskins, "Signs of the Holocaust: Exhibiting Memory in a Mediated Age," *Media, Culture, Society* 25 (2003): 7-22.

On a related note, in his discussion of postmodernism, Hartman argues that "[i]n the light of media over-exposure the evil of the Holocaust becomes strangely weightless." See Geoffrey H. Hartman, "Introduction: Darkness Visible," in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory*, ed. Geoffrey H. Hartman (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 11.

[143] Markovitz highlights the ways these issues around creative license are foregrounded in *Ararat.* Jonathan Markovitz, "*Ararat* and Collective Memories of the Armenian Genocide," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 2 (2006): 241-242.

[144] Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism*, 7-10.

[145] Friedlander, "Introduction," 5.

[146] Friedlander, "Introduction," 4-5.

[147] Rothberg suggests that these differences in epistemological perspectives can be observed within and contribute to the disciplinary divisions that appear within Holocaust and genocide studies. Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism*, 5-6.

[148] Lentin, too, identifies the contours of these contrasting perspectives. In her words, "Beyond the sayability versus unsayability crisis, a further crisis in representation is the tension between historical 'facts' and interpretation, or the dilemma of historical relativism versus aesthetic experimentation in the face of the need for 'truth', on the one hand, and the problems raised by the opaqueness of the events and the opaqueness of language, on the other." Lentin, "Introduction," 3.

[149] Janet Walker, "Catastrophe, Representation, and the Vicissitudes of Memory," in *Trauma Cinema: Documenting Incest and the Holocaust* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 25; Lowenstein, "Introduction," 3-6.

[150] Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 297.

[151] Zelizer, "Introduction," 2.

[152] Walker, "Catastrophe, Representation," 24-25. Notably, Walker draws on a few other scholars to advance this point. See also Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 171-175; Stone, *History, Memory*, 125.

Markovitz charges that a similar position is advanced in *Ararat*: "Egoyan's film, on the other hand, refutes the notion that the past can be depicted in a transparent manner, insisting that it is important to come to terms with the processes by which collective

memories of genocide are constructed and – equally importantly – erased." Markovitz, "*Ararat* and Collective Memories," 236.

For an interesting case study on the centrality of invention, in the production of an "authentic" tourist experience at Auschwitz, see Chris Keil, "Sightseeing in the Mansions of the Dead," *Social & Cultural Geography* 6, no. 4 (2005): 479-94.

[153] Walker, "Catastrophe, Representation," 25-27; Feinstein, "Introduction," xxxi-xxxii; Lowenstein, "Introduction," 1-6.

[154] Stone, *History, Memory*, 125. Hartman charges, "The influence of the media, the penetration of their simulacra into daily life, prompts a deep anxiety about forgery, or counterfeit evidence." Hartman, "Introduction," 17. See also Walker, "Catastrophe, Representation," 25; Markovitz, "*Ararat* and Collective Memories."

[155] Numerous works have been written about these controversies, and it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide an exhaustive account of such work. For an introduction to these controversies and their connections to rhetoric and public memory, see Stone, *History, Memory*, 143-145; Hal Cohen, "The Unmaking of Rigoberta Menchú," in *Genocide, Collective Violence, and Popular Memory: The Politics of Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, ed. David E. Lorey and William H. Beezley (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002), 53-64; Roberto Avant-Mier and Marouf A. Hasian, Jr., "Communicating 'Truth': *Testimonio*, Vernacular Voices, and the Rigoberta Menchú Controversy," *The Communication Review* 11 (2008): 323-345; Marouf Hasian, Jr., "Authenticity, Public Memories, and the Problematics of Post-Holocaust Remembrances: A Rhetorical Analysis of the *Wilkomirski* Affair," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 3 (2005): 231-263.

[156] Although not specifically about genocide, Sontag's work on photographic images of war and violence provides an excellent introduction to some of the ethical quandaries facing the mediation of horrific content. See Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Picador, 2003).

[157] White's work engages a very different context. She is talking about the genre of historical fiction (as represented through "nostalgic" television shows) and the problems that arise from (re)mediating racism and sexism. Nonetheless, her point resonates with Crane's argument. Not only do these representations continually disseminate images of violence, in both cases, the lesson imparted through such mediation is that this violent past is "over" (with the attendant and implied belief that the present must be more progressive). See Mimi White, "'Reliving the Past Over and Over Again': Race, Gender, and Popular Memory in *Homefront* and *I'll Fly Away*," in *Living Color: Race and Television in the United States*, ed. Sasha Torres (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 122. See also Hesford, "Documenting Violations," 107-108; Susan A. Crane, "Choosing Not to Look: Representation, Repatriation, and Holocaust Atrocity Photography," *History and Theory* 47 (October 2008): 309-330.

[158] Crane, "Choosing Not to Look," 311. This problem of privileging the gaze of the perpetrator is taken up in Hesford's essays as well as in Keil's work. Hesford, "Rhetorical Memory," 104; Hesford, "Documenting Violations," 119; Keil, "Sightseeing in the Mansions," 488.

The replication of the perpetrator's gazes raises other problems associated with witnessing, which Hesford refers to as the "crisis of witnessing" (106-107). As Hesford explains, the perpetuation of images of "victimhood" grants little agency to the depicted

individual(s); they are stripped of power and seen only as victims. This also complicates

the relationships between the abused and the witness by creating a power imbalance.

Hesford elaborates upon the problems challenging these relationships in both of her

essays cited in this note.

[159] Crane, "Choosing Not to Look," 315.

[160] Crane, "Choosing Not to Look," 316.

Although I do not engage these issues here, Dean interrogates similar lines of

argument regarding the representation of the Holocaust as a reflection of larger tensions

pertaining to understandings of empathy in the wake of the Holocaust. Carolyn J. Dean,

The Fragility of Empathy after the Holocaust (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press,

2004).

[161] Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, 258.

[162] Samuel Totten, "The Intervention and Prevention of Genocide: Where There *Is*

the Political Will, There Is a Way," in *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and

Critical Views*, ed. Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed.

(New York: Routledge, 1997), 477-481.

[163] Totten "The Intervention," 477. Thomas G. Weiss and Don Hubert, *The

Responsibility to Protect: Research, Bibliography, Background*, Supplemental Report of

the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (Ottawa, ON:

International Development Research Centre, 2001), 5-14.

[164] Totten "The Intervention," 477. Totten draws on the work of Weiss and Hubert

in advancing claim. See also Weiss and Hubert, *The Responsibility to Protect*, 5.

According to Kranser, upon the conclusion of the Thirty Years War, the Treaty of Westphalia established "the modern international system as a universe composed of sovereign states, each with exclusive authority within its own geographic boundaries." Stephen D. Krasner, "Compromising Westphalia," *International Security* 20, no. 3 (1995/96): 115.

[165] Ben Voth and Aaron Noland, "Argumentation and the International Problem of Genocide," *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 28 (2007): 40.

[166] Kuper, *Genocide*, 161-185; Voth and Noland, "Argumentation."

[167] Kuper, *Genocide*, 161.

[168] Robert I. Rotberg, "Deterring Mass Atrocity Crimes: The Cause of Our Era," in *Mass Atrocity Crimes: Preventing Future Outrages*, ed. Robert I. Rotberg (Cambridge, MA: World Peace Foundation / Harvard Kennedy School Program on Intrastate Conflict / Washington, D.C., Brookings Institute Press, 2010), 7-8; Hinton, "The Dark Side," 25, 27.

[169] Totten, "The Intervention," 477-479. See also Helen Fein, *Human Rights and Wrongs: Slavery, Terror, Genocide* (Boulder CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2007), 228; Weiss and Hubert, *The Responsibility to Protect*, 8-14.

The scholarship on transnational memory discussed later in this chapter similarly expounds upon this theme. See pages 117-118, 123-124, 167-168n228-234; 174n271-273.

[170] Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 508-510; Semelin, *Purify and Destroy*, 366.

[171] Leo Kuper, "Reflections on the Prevention of Genocide," in *Genocide Watch*, ed. Helen Fein (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 138-139.

Ronayne demonstrates this contention in practice through his analysis of the United States' responses to genocide. Peter Ronayne, *Never Again? The United States and the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide since the Holocaust* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001).

[172] Kuper, "Reflections," 141.

[173] Ronayne, *Never Again?* 4.

[174] Kenneth Roth, foreword to *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), x.

[175] Roth, foreword, x.

[176] See the discussion of Somalia as an illustrative example later in this study. Pages 418-419, 473n213-474n214.

[177] Totten, "The Intervention," 479.

[178] Totten, "The Intervention."

[179] Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* xv.

[180] Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* xxi.

[181] Many scholars in the field attempt to nuance their assessment of the state of genocide prevention work, seeking to provide a sense of hope or reasons for optimism. Fowler, Totten & Parsons, and Roth all highlight some advances and signs of progress in the scholarship and practice of genocide prevention. Totten and Parsons, "Introduction;" Roth, "Epilogue;" Jerry Fowler, "Out of that Darkness: Responding to Genocide in the 21st Century," in *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, ed.

Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed. (New York:

Routledge, 1997), 465-467.

[182] In a 1992 publication, Kuper offered a chapter that concludes with a sense of

hopefulness that the end of the Cold War could create an international climate better

adapted to human rights work. He suggests the U.S. ratification of 1948 UN Convention

could potentially signify an increased US role in genocide prevention work. Kuper

argues that this historical moment could "provide an opportunity to activate the United

States to use its aid policies, trade relations, and diplomatic and other resources to resume

the leading role in the prevention of genocide that it took in the Nuremberg trials and in

the framing of the Genocide Convention." See Kuper, "Reflections," 161.

[183] Katharine R. Bigelow, "A Campaign to Deter Genocide: The Bahá'í

Experience," in *Genocide Watch*, ed. Helen Fein (New Haven, CT: Yale University

Press, 1992), 189-196; Totten, "The Intervention," 486-488; Kuper, "Reflections," 139.

Totten also suggests the Bahá'í example be studied in conjunction with the intervention

efforts in East Timor in 1999.

[184] Power takes the title of her book from a statement made by former US

Secretary of State Warren Christopher about Bosnia. Reproducing the quote as it appears

in her text, Power quotes Christopher as saying, "'It's really a tragic problem…The

hatred between all three groups – the Bosnians and the Serbs and the Croatians – is

almost unbelievable. It's almost terrifying, and it's centuries old. That really is a problem

from hell.'" As Power aptly notes, this kind of assertion aligns with the position that

genocide is "inevitable" and works against intervention/prevention. See Power, *"A

Problem from Hell,"* xii. This idea that genocide is simply "inevitable" or "endemic" to

certain parts of the world or certain peoples is also developed in Voth and Noland, "Argumentation," 38-46.

[185] Chirot and McCauley, *Why Not Kill,* 5.

[186] Chirot and McCauley, *Why Not Kill,* 5.

[187] David H. Jones, "On the Prevention of Genocide: The Gap between Research and Education," *War Crimes, Genocide, & Crimes against Humanity* 1, no. 1 (2005): 5-46.

[188] Jones, "On the Prevention," 8

[189] Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide,* 261.

[190] Israel W. Charny, "Preface: Which Genocide Matters More? Learning to Care about Humanity," in *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, ed. Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1997), xv.

[191] Charny, "Preface," xv.

[192] Martha Minow, *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 3.

[193] Totten and Parsons, "Introduction," 10-11.

[194] Hamburg, *Preventing Genocide,* 13.

[195] Jones, "On the Prevention."

[196] Jones, "On the Prevention," 11.

[197] Jones, "On the Prevention," 11.

[198] Fein, *Human Rights and Wrongs*, 222-224. Fein's suggestions here seem to echo Rummel's contention regarding the inverse correlation between democracy and

genocide. See R. J. Rummel, "Democracy, Power, Genocide, and Mass Murder," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39, no. 1 (1995): 3-26.

[199] Hamburg, *Preventing Genocide*, 12-18, 267-273.

[200] Although the International Criminal Court and the threat of legal action have been linked by some as a critical part of genocide cessation, Mennecke questions the premise underlying such promotions of legal action as a form of deterrence. Martin Mennecke, "Punishing Genocidaires: A Deterrent Effect or Not?" *Human Rights Review* 8, no. 4 (2007): 319-339.

For more discussion of the role of the International Criminal Court and genocide cessation, see Levene, "A Dissenting Voice;" Rotberg, "Deterring Mass Atrocity Crimes," 8-11.

[201] Hinton describes "*genocidal priming*" as a precondition for genocide. Alexander Laban Hinton, "Introduction: Genocide and Anthropology," in *Genocide: An Anthropological Reader*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002), 14; Hinton, "The Dark Side," 29. See also Kuper, *The Prevention of Genocide*, 281.

[202] Totten, "The Intervention," 481.

[203] Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, 233-234.

[204] Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, 233-250.

[205] Goldhagen, *Worse Than War*, 570-571.

[206] Torchin's book provides a rich history tracing what she discusses as forms of media witnessing from Armenia through the conflict in Darfur. Leshu Torchin, *Creating the Witness: Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the Internet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).

[207] See pages 45-46n23.

[208] See Power's concluding remarks about ignorance as a thin excuse for not taking cessation-related action. Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 504-506.

[209] This is the framework that Torchin describes as undergirding faith in the media's role in genocide cessation. See Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 1.

[210] Israel W. Charny, "Editor's Preface," in *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide*, ed. Israel W. Charny (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984), xvii.

[211] Totten, "The Intervention," 470-472.

[212] Sarah E. Kreps, "Social Networks and Technology in the Prevention of Crimes Against Humanity," in *Mass Atrocity Crimes: Preventing Future Outrages*, edited by Robert I. Rotberg (Cambridge, MA: World Peace Foundation / Harvard Kennedy School Program on Intrastate Conflict / Washington, D.C., Brookings Institute Press, 2010), 181.

[213] Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "Revised Introduction to the English Edition," in *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, trans. Assenka Oksiloff (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2006), 10.

[214] Heidenrich, *How to Prevent Genocide*, 76-77; Roth, "Epilogue," 332; Totten "The Intervention," 470-472.

[215] See Hartley and Jenkins on the shifting role of audience in meaning making. John Hartley, *Television Truths* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008); Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide,* updated with a new afterword (New York: New York University Press, 2008).

[216] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 175. For more on the shortcomings of this form of activism, see her discussion of "iWitnesses and CitizenTube." Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 172-215.

From a more optimistic perspective, Ben Voth's work also explores the possibilities created through empowering audiences to participate in genocide cessation through new media. Ben Voth, "The Cell Phone vs. the AK-47: The Internet's Role in Stopping Ethnoviolence," (lecture, February 6, 2012), http://web.me.com/benvoth/Ben_Voths_World_of_Rhetoric/Ethnoviolence_Class/Entries /2012/2/6_cell_phone_vs_ak_47_ethnoviolence.html.

[217] Esra Akcan, "Apology and Triumph: Memory Transference, Erasure, and a Rereading of the Berlin Jewish Museum," *New German Critique* 110 vol. 37, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 153-179.

[218] Jenny Edkins, "Remembering Relationality: Trauma Time and Politics," in *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*, ed. Duncan Bell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 101.

[219] In this capacity, genocide memory demonstrates its usability. "Collective Memory is Usable," Zelizer reminds us. She writes, "collective memory is always a means to something else…*collective memory is evaluated for the ways in which it helps us make connections*." Barbie Zelizer, "Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12, no. 2 (1995): 226. [emphasis mine]

See also Bradford Vivian, "Times of Violence," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, no. 2 (2013): 209-217.

[220] David B. MacDonald, *Identity Politics in the Age of Genocide: The Holocaust and Historical Representation* (Abdington: Routledge, 2008), 1.

[221] MacDonald, *Identity Politics*, 2.

[222] The discussion of the Holocaust as "a moral touchstone" comes from Levy and Sznaider's work: "The need for a moral touchstone in an age of uncertainty and the absence of master ideological narratives have pushed the Holocaust to prominence in public thinking. The Holocaust has become a moral certainty that now stretches across national borders and unites Europe and other parts of the world." See Levy and Sznaider, "Revised Introduction," 18. Shandler contends, "More than a metaphor, the Holocaust has become a master moral paradigm, peerless both as a measure of enormity and in the catholicity of its application." Shandler, *While America Watches*, xii.

[223] Assmann writes, "In the global media age where attention has become the currency of a new economy, the prestigious symbol of the Holocaust is used as a universal lever to draw attention to other marginalized collective memories." Aleida Assmann, "The Holocaust – a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community," in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 111-112, 114.

[224] Alan E. Steinweis, "The Auschwitz Analogy: Holocaust Memory and American Debates over Intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 19, no. 2 (2005): 277.

[225] Hartman remarks on such overextension: "Such false integration is again a form of anti-memory." Hartman, "Introduction," 15.

[226] Assmann, "The Holocaust," 111.

[227] The broader discussion of the uniqueness thesis occurs in the Introduction. See pages 15-18.

[228] MacDonald, *Identity Politics,* 2. See also Assmann, "The Holocaust," 111.

[229] Assmann, "The Holocaust," 114.

[230] Levy and Sznaider, "Revised Introduction," 10. Levy and Sznaider ground their work in Robertson's work on globalization and glocalization. Roland Robertson, "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity," in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995), 25-44.

[231] Levy and Sznaider, "Revised Introduction," 10.

[232] The authors suggest that "memories of the Holocaust facilitate the formation of transnational memory cultures, which in turn have the potential to become the cultural foundation for global human-rights politics." Levy and Sznaider, "Revised Introduction," 4. See also Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "The Institutionalization of Cosmopolitan Morality: The Holocaust and Human Rights," *Journal of Human Rights* 3, no. 2 (2004): 143-157.

Given Levy and Snzaider's optimistic assessments of the power of cosmopolitan memory, the authors have their critics and have been rebuffed by scholars such as Assmann and Conrad as well as Alexander for shortcomings in their arguments. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, "Introduction," in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastion Conrad (Hampshire/New York: Palgrave MacMillan 2010), 8-9; Jeffrey C. Alexander, *Remembering the Holocaust: A Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 187n10.

[233] Assmann and Conrad, "Introduction," 7.

[234] Assmann, and Conrad, "Introduction," 1-16.

[235] Fowler links redemptive beliefs to the discourse on prevention. Fowler, "Out of that Darkness," 457. Fowler draws on the explanation of the problem of "redemption" found in Cynthia Ozick, "Roundtable Discussion: Raul Hilberg, Cynthia Ozick, Aharon Appelfeld, Saul Friedländer," in *Writing and the Holocaust*, ed. Berel Lang (New York: Holmes & Meir, 1988), 277-284. For more on this perspective between remembrance and progress, see also Roger I. Simon, Sharon Rosenberg, and Claudia Eppert, "Introduction: Between Hope and Despair: The Pedagogical Encounter of Historical Remembrance," in *Between Hope and Despair: Pedagogy and the Remembrance of Historical Trauma*, ed. Roger I. Simon, Sharon Rosenberg, and Claudia Eppert (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 1-8. By contrast, Young positions the artists at the center of his study in opposition to the redemptive approach. See Young, *At Memory's Edge*, 2.

[236] The foundational report establishing the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum serves as an example of such reasoning. Its authors argue that, "A memorial unresponsive to the future would also violate the memory of the past," bridging their present engagement with the memories of the past for the benefit of the future. President's Commission on the Holocaust, "Report to the President," September 27, 1979, accessed May 24, 2011, http://www.ushmm.org/research/library/faq/languages/en/06/01/commission/. For more on the creation of the USHMM's Committee on Conscience, see again Fowler, "Out of that Darkness," 457-458.

[237] Isabel Wollaston, "Negotiating the Marketplace: The Role(s) of Holocaust Museums Today," *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 4, no. 1 (2005): 74.

[238] Colin Lucas, "Opening Address," in *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide*, ed. John K. Roth and Elisabeth Maxwell, *vol. 1: History* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 3.

[239] See Simon on the trepidation that underlies a perceived "loss" of Holocaust memory related to beliefs about genocide cessation: "An unsettling consequence of the last two decades of Holocaust cultural memory is a prevalent dominant discourse that reduces the significance of this history to the warning 'we must not let the past be repeated.' This has resulted in a symptomatic repetition in which the imperative to remember is acted out in the anxious replay of images and narratives justified as a preventive, necessary reiteration given the persisting evils of racism and intolerance." Roger I. Simon, "Museums, Civic Life, and the Educative Force of Remembrance," *The Journal of Museum Education* 31, no. 2 (2006): 118.

He expands on this assertion in his notes: "While space limitations here preclude a discussion of the range of practices initiated over the last fifty years, the single most prevalent shared justification for Holocaust remembrance in North America (across a diverse range of schools, museums, public programs, and in relation to built memorials and internet websites) is that cultural memory might function as a spur to action that would prevent the repetition of genocide." Simon, "Museums, Civic Life," 120n6.

Smith's arguments here seem to suggest a liturgical performance of memory akin to conception functioning with Maier's work on memory. Maier writes, "In its impulse to be retrieved and not to be explained, collective memory must claim some liturgical

impulse, like the Catholic mass which carries out Jesus's injunction: 'Do this in memory of me.'" Charles S. Maier, "A Surfeit of Memory? Reflections on History, Melancholy and Denial," *History and Memory* 5, no. 2 (1993): 144.

[240] Bradford Vivian, "On the Language of Forgetting," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 1 (2009): 89-104; Paul Connerton, "Seven Types of Forgetting," *Memory Studies* 1, no. 1 (2008): 59-71.

[241] Ignatief essay in Simon Norfolk, *For Most of It I Have No Words: Genocide Memory Landscape*, with an essay by Michael Ignatieff (Stockport: Dewi Lewis press, 1998).

[242] Ignatief essay in Norfolk, *For Most of It*, n.pag.

[243] Wiesel, "Opening Address," 8.

[244] Wiesel, "Opening Address," 11.

[245] Although Roth's treatment of genocide is more nuanced than the belief that remembrance alone holds the keys to redemption, even his book includes a line suggesting "[s]uch remembering could help to bring genocide to an end." John K. Roth, "Will Genocide Ever End? Genocide's Challenge to Philosophy," in *Genocide and Human Rights: A Philosophical Guide*, ed. John K. Roth (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 151.

[246] The contrast between the optimistic belief that memory of the past would safeguard the present from further atrocity and the continued occurrence of genocide in the face of memorial efforts has led to responses from mild disappointment to cynicism. In the words of Israel Charny, "It also has to be clear to all of us by now that, notwithstanding the hopes of many earlier philosophers, simply knowing the historical

facts of the past does not in itself free humankind to change the future." Charny, "Editor's Preface," xvii.

Totten and Parsons's remarks on this subject are also appropriate: "At times it is difficult not to be disheartened, especially when governments deny and distort the historical record of genocide or do too little or nothing at all when new genocides erupt somewhere across the globe. Indeed, at times it is difficult not to wonder whether all the scholarship, all the words, and all the pledges to 'Never Forget' are simply some type of anodyne to ease the pain of the survivors or soothe the conscience of those who deeply care about such tragedies but feel impotent to staunch genocide early on. And at times it is difficult not to wonder whether those of us who hold out hope that genocide can, at a minimum, be halted early on are doing so more out of desperation than any sense of objectivity or reality." Totten and Parsons, "Introduction," 2.

Finally, Fowler's chapter contains the cynical remarks of journalist David Rieff. Rieff writes, "For if there was to be no intervention to stop a genocide that was taking place, then the phrase 'never again' meant nothing more than: Never again would Germans kill Jews in Europe in the 1940s." David Rieff, *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West* (New York: Touchstone, 1995), 27. Fowler, "Out of that Darkness," 457.

[247] Fowler, "Out of that Darkness," 457. Fowler's chapter, overall, provides excellent examples of the contrast between a belief in memory and the repetition of genocidal action. As Fowler also notes, Linenthal's conclusion expounds upon the complicated nature of the USHMM's popularization of Holocaust memory and the mobilization of such memory. Edward T. Linenthal, *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to*

Create America's Holocaust Museum (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001),

260-272.

[248] Crane, "Choosing Not to Look," 324.

[249] Stone, *History, Memory,* ix.

[250] Stone, *History, Memory,* ix.

[251] Stone, *History, Memory,* x.

[252] Steinweis, "The Auschwitz Analogy."

[253] Lentin, "Introduction," 7.

[254] Lentin, "Introduction;" Steinweis, "The Auschwitz Analogy."

[255] Samantha Power, "To Suffer by Comparison?" *Daedalus* 128, no. 2 (1999):

56.

[256] Power, "To Suffer," 57. See also James Young, "America's Holocaust:

Memory and the Politics of Identity," in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed.

Hilene Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press, 1999), 74.

[257] Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 503.

[258] Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 15.

[259] Bauman, "The Holocaust's Life;" Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 200-201;

Oren Baruch Stier, *Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust*

(Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 210-217. Zelizer draws on

Huyssen's work to advance this point. See Andreas Huyssen, *Twilight Memories:*

Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia (New York: Routledge, 1995), 250. This notion of

"too much" of a certain kind of memory (referred to as part of an "Auschwitz code")

underlies the way Lentin structures her research questions. See Lentin, "Introduction," 6.

A similar argument is advanced in Mandel regarding the masking function of the "rhetoric of the unspeakable." Mandel, "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz.'" See Hungerford on privileging memory over learning. Hungerford, *The Holocaust of Texts*, 155.

Making the case from a different perspective, Rosenfeld articulates anxiety over the dilution of Holocaust memory through its excessive usage in popular culture. Alvin H. Rosenfeld, *The End of the Holocaust* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011).

Of course, debates over excessive prevelance of genocide memory also undergird arguments about the role of memory in inciting violence. See again Kosicki, "Sites of Aggressor-Victim;" Buckley-Zistel, "Remembering to Forget;" Ray, "Memory, Trauma."

[260] Young builds on Nora (and others) to advance this claim. See James E. Young, "Introduction: The Texture of Memory," in *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 5. See also Keil, "Sightseeing in the Mansions," 485-6; Pierre Nora, "General Introduction: Between Memory and History," in *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past,* vol. 1, *Conflicts and Divisions*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (1992; New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 1-20.

[261] Shandler draws an excellent contrast between the Jewish approach to Holocaust remembrance and the approach of the Gypsy/Roma community. Building on the work of Isabel Fonseca, he contrasts remembrances with the Gypsy community's forgetting. Shandler, *While America Watches*, 258; Isabel Fonseca, *Bury Me Standing: The Gypsies and Their Journey* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995), 276. See also Bradford Vivian, "'A Timeless Now': Memory and Repetition," in *Framing Public*

Memory, ed. Kendall R. Phillips (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 187-211.

[262] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory.*

[263] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 3.

[264] David L. Worthington, "American Exceptionalism and the Shoah: The Case of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2007), 5-6, ProQuest document ID 304856056.

[265] Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget.*

[266] See Rothberg's discussion of "screen memory" vis-à-vis "multidirectional memory" in debates over the Holocaust. Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory,* 12-16.

[267] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory,* 3.

[268] See Levene on the "hierarchy of suffering." Levene, *Genocide*, 6.

[269] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory,* 21.

[270] See Gillis on the emergence of national memory cultures. John R. Gillis, "Introduction: Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship," in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 7-9.

[271] Assmann and Conrad, "Introduction," 6.

[272] Assmann and Conrad, "Introduction," 6.

[273] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 20. Nancy Fraser, "Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World," *New Left Review* 36 (November-December 2005): 69-88.

[274] To clarify, there is a substantial difference between the texts used to evidence Rothberg's thesis about multidirectional memory and the texts that constitute the core of

this study. Rothberg's piece examines the work of leading thinkers; thus, his work reveals little about how general publics (very much ensconced within particular nation-states) grapple with tensions surrounding genocide memory. The texts in this study must work within the limitations on their discourse created by either (a) financial ties to the US government or (b) the conservative influence of economic pressures. In the latter cases, these texts must find means of attracting audiences. As numerous media studies scholars argue, this stymies the potential for social change or radical messaging lending such texts a conservative tint (See Introduction, pages 72-73n156). Within these rhetorical contexts, challenging the authority of the nation-state becomes considerably more difficult. By studying popular representations of genocide cessation discourse for general audiences, my study seeks to nuance the assumptions about atrocity memory in light of the rhetorical complexities reflected in public texts targeting popular audiences.

[275] In particular, I elevate Moses's work and Rothberg's work as examples. Both Moses and Rothberg seek to reroute contemporary thought on the problems posed by causality and memory in genocide studies away from binary thinking. Both scholars make important contributions to the literature (and to this study) by transcending overly simplistic binaries. Moses and Rothberg assume a central place in this study because they offer resolutions which ameliorate some of the tensions that can be associated with the relationships among public agency, state authority, and genocide. Moses's racial century transcends approaches to the colonialism and genocide that would either underappreciate structural forces in favor of ceding space for agency or eradicate agency to emphasize structure. Rothberg's multidirectional memory creates space to counter the reductiveness

of competitive memory models. Both of these studies offer models for grappling with the

complexity of the tensions that run through Holocaust and genocide studies.

CHAPTER TWO
Proximity, Distance, and Authority in Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's Worse Than War

"Genocides happen in every corner of the world to every type of people. The numbers in the past one hundred years are staggering…All told, in our time there have been more than a hundred million innocent victims of genocide—more than all the combat deaths in all the wars fought during that time everywhere in the world. Based on the human toll alone, genocide and mass slaughter are worse problems plaguing humanity than war.

We need to understand why."

-- Daniel Jonah Goldhagen
Worse Than War[1]

In April 2010, PBS drew the ire of some of its viewers for its decision to collaborate with Daniel Jonah Goldhagen in the production and broadcast of a documentary titled *Worse Than War* (WTW). Commentary on the film's website reflects frustration and disappointment with the network. In the words of one respondent, "Goldhagen is a proven fraud…. PBS demeans itself by allowing this charlatan a platform."[2] Another charges that "PBS should be ashamed" for "broadcasting Worse Than War" because "Goldhagen is too full of himself to be a true scholar and not manipulate stories for his personal gain."[3] Of course the comments are not uniformly negative. Another post suggests that WTW is "[a] captivating film that is chilling, horrifying and fascinating all at once" and a documentary "that EVERYONE should see as members of this global community."[4] Another fan offers further praise, concluding that, "this is the most powerful view of genocide I have ever watched…. He [Goldhagen] has done the research, he has talked with mass murderers to hear their side, he is the more thorough [sic] historian and activist I have seen so far."[5] Although the comments on PBS's website reflect a wide range of opinions about WTW's strengths and weaknesses, these posts reveal competing conceptions of Goldhagen's *ethos*.

At their core, the comments above centralize longstanding controversies over Goldhagen's authority. Since the publication of his first book, *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (HWE), Goldhagen has polarized audiences. He is revered by some as a courageous young scholar able to explain the dynamics of historical atrocities. Others, as the comments suggest, view Goldhagen as a fraud, a poor scholar lacking the integrity to be an expert on matters of genocide and genocide cessation.[6]

These authority anxieties percolate throughout WTW. WTW is the cinematic adaptation of Goldhagen's book by the same name. The film and the book introduce Goldhagen's concept of *eliminationism*.[7] Eliminationism is a broad category that includes genocide among other forms of violence. By way of elucidating the concept in the film, Goldhagen addresses questions surrounding genocide causality and provides an introduction to historic atrocities in such places as Armenia, Cambodia, Rwanda, Bosnia, and Guatemala. He interviews perpetrators, survivors, and governmental officials in an attempt to develop arguments about eliminationism. He concludes the film by positing possible resolutions to eliminationist violence.

Alongside Goldhagen's analysis of eliminationism, the film includes an extended narrative focused on Goldhagen's relationship with his father, Erich. Together, father and son explore their family's Holocaust past. Goldhagen frequently interviews his father, who is also a former professor and Holocaust scholar. Simultaneously, the film slowly unpacks Erich Goldhagen's boyhood experiences during the Holocaust. As the documentary progresses, the father and son pair visits a family gravesite as well as Erich Goldhagen's childhood home. Thus, as the film constructs a macro-narrative about the broader phenomenon of eliminationism, the film features a micro-narrative about the

Goldhagen family's direct experience with one example of eliminationist violence: the Holocaust.

To promote the film PBS developed a website with a host of additional resources for viewers. Visitors can stream the film at their convenience through the website and learn more about its production.[8] The accompanying webpages include resources for further reading on the subject,[9] including multiple passages from Goldhagen's book. The website polls visitors about the most appropriate methods for genocide cessation and includes a tab titled "Get Involved," which leads visitors to a handful of genocide cessation organizations.[10] On almost all of the pages, PBS includes comment fields, creating space for visitors to register their opinions about the film, Goldhagen's work, or the concept of eliminationism.

The promotional materials surrounding the film centralize two of the text's attributes: Goldhagen's (questionable) authority as a genocide cessation expert and WTW's overtures to popular audiences. These two threads provide the foundation for the tensions that circulate throughout WTW as its efforts to enhance Goldhagen's authority undermine a sense of public agency. As the comments on PBS's website imply, Goldhagen is a complicated figure in Holocaust and genocide studies, and WTW is laced with arguments fortifying Goldhagen's embattled ethos. Throughout the film's attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember the problems posed by genocidal violence, WTW bolsters Goldhagen's authority on the politics of genocide and the public's role in genocide cessation. Such messages about authority hinder WTW's inclusiveness. In other words, even though Goldhagen is ostensibly attempting to engage a broader audience in genocide cessation, his film rests upon assumptions which exclude numerous individuals

from participating in anti-atrocity measures. The constraints imposed upon genocide cessation activity emerge through the ways Goldhagen tethers authority to spatial and experiential proximity. Put differently, authority is only bestowed upon individuals with direct experiences with atrocity or who inherit the "postmemories" of trauma.[11] Consequently, those without such access to genocide are excluded from participation in genocide cessation work. Ultimately, the film glorifies a model for anti-genocide action that places all power and responsibility in the hands of a select few, leading to the ironic endorsement of passive consumption as the primary avenue through which most audiences are positioned to engage with genocide cessation discourses.[12]

By way of establishing the context for this reading of Goldhagen's film, this chapter begins by reviewing the controversies over Goldhagen's debut publication, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*. The publication of this book thrust Goldhagen into the public eye and ignited considerable debate over his credibility while simultaneously raising larger questions about the relationship between academic and non-academic engagement with the Holocaust. Lingering questions about authority and the relationship between scholarly and popular forms of Holocaust and genocide studies inform WTW. In the process of building Goldhagen's ethos and navigating this fraught academic/popular terrain, the film melds incompatible arguments about genocide definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances. The inconsistencies in each arena are reflective of the paradoxical relationship WTW builds between authority and access in discussions about genocide. In the conclusion, I complicate the lynchpin in the film's case for Goldhagen's authority by examining more closely the film's constructions of proximity and distance.

Goldhagen's Contentious Relationship with the Academy

Goldhagen inhabits a liminal position in Holocaust and genocide studies. He possesses an elite academic pedigree; yet, his work has been excoriated by respected Holocaust historians. At the same time, Goldhagen has had tremendous success as a public personality. Multiple critics situate Goldhagen at the nexus of popular and academic thought with success in the former arena pitted against rejections from the latter. With regard to Goldhagen's HWE, Lorenz writes that the book "may have made its author into a millionaire, but at the same time it has wrecked his academic career."[13] Jones similarly asserts that "Goldhagen himself has greater celebrity than scholarly status these days."[14] Such remarks construct tensions between popular appeal and scholarly credibility. The commentary and controversy surrounding Goldhagen's work raises larger questions about the value of the knowledge produced by the media, the academy, and the general public. The debates over HWE provide an apt prelude to the interpretations of atrocity contained in WTW.

Goldhagen attained his fame/notoriety in the mid-to-late 1990s for his book, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*. Trained as a political scientist at Harvard, Goldhagen's doctoral dissertation provided the basis for HWE. Upon its publication, Goldhagen rose to a position of international prominence due, in part, to the controversy surrounding the book. Goldhagen describes the book as a "radical revision" of existing work on the Holocaust.[15] Goldhagen situates his book in what he claims is a lacunae in Holocaust and genocide studies scholarship, arguing that existing work on the Holocaust has paid insufficient attention to the perpetrators.[16] Goldhagen contends that the scholarship on the perpetrators is limited by its assumptions about human behavior. He challenges extant

tendencies in the scholarship to view perpetrator behavior as a byproduct of situational constraints, such as coercion by superiors, obedience to authority, peer pressure, self-interest, and "bureaucratic myopia."[17] Instead, Goldhagen centralizes perpetrator choice as well as what he terms "eliminationist antisemitism" as crucial to explanations of the Holocaust. As Goldhagen explicitly states,

> The conclusion of this book is that antisemitism moved many thousands of "ordinary" Germans – and would have moved millions more, had they been appropriately positioned – to slaughter Jews. Not economic hardship, not the coercive means of a totalitarian state, not social psychological pressure, not invariable psychological propensities, but ideas about Jews that were pervasive in Germany, and had been for decades, induced ordinary Germans to kill unarmed, defenseless Jewish men, women, and children by the thousands, systematically and without pity.[18]

In sum, Goldhagen positions his work to restore perpetrator agency and elevate the importance of antisemitism in discussions of the Holocaust. He argues, "Simply put, the perpetrators … consulted their own convictions and morality and … judged the mass annihilation of Jews to be right."[19]

The publication of the book elicited praise and hostility. Many in the academy rejected Goldhagen at the same time the public embraced him.[20] Critics perceived the book as suffering from substantial flaws in its research, methodology, and tone.[21] Nevertheless, HWE was wildly popular with US and international audiences. The book was a *New York Times* best-seller,[22] and when the book was translated into German, the 40,000 copies in its first printing sold out in five days.[23] The book was awarded

Germany's Democracy Prize.[24] Moses contends, "[n]o academic book received greater international scholarly and public attention in 1996 and 1997 than Daniel J. Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*."[25]

The polarized reactions to Goldhagen's work quickly became an object of scholarly inquiry. This disparity between the academic and non-academic responses to HWE has raised broader questions about the relationship between scholarly and popular understandings of the Holocaust and genocide studies.[26] Multiple theses have emerged to explain Goldhagen's public appeal.[27] Amongst these theses, scholars have argued that the divergent assessments of Goldhagen's work reflect: (1) critiques of intellectualism or "expert" models of knowledge production,[28] (2) dissatisfaction with existing genocide studies work, and (3) the political demands on US identity construction in the 1990s.

One explanation for the public's embrace of the text holds that Goldhagen's HWE capitalized on a kind of anti-intellectual and "anti-establishment" fervor. From one perspective, Goldhagen's story could be read as the narrative of a young, brave man, capable of seeing the obvious "truth" elder scholars have missed.[29] As Bytwerk explains, such interpretations see the book and its reception through the lens of a David and Goliath narrative, whereby Goldhagen plays the David to Holocaust studies' Goliath.[30] Bytwerk's interpretation is lent support by the audience's reaction to Goldhagen's appearance on a United States Holocaust Memorial Museum panel. Describing the panel, Caplan writes that Goldhagen "was greeted by enthusiastic applause from the audience, but when the other historians criticized him, the audience was silent or emitted murmurs of dissent."[31] She attributes part of this response to the idea that "junior knuckles being rapped by elder statements was…patently offensive to" those in attendance, encouraging

visible support for the younger scholar.[32] More than a hint of anti-intellectualism can be found in such a narrative as "experts" are attacked for their failure to provide the kind of answers contained in HWE.[33] Put differently, the book offers grounds for the advancement of *ad populum* reasoning over elitist forms of scholarship.[34]

From a less pessimistic perspective, the divergent reactions to HWE highlight differences in expectations for different modes of knowledge production. Hasian and Frank suggest that the reception of HWE presents an opportunity to study the dialectic between "expert" and "public" ways of knowing.[35] The authors argue that the book's reception reflects whether or not it is treated as history or collective memory.[36] Moses charges that HWE challenges historians to confront questions pertaining to their obligations to the public and the relationship between culturally-produced knowledge and universal standards for rationality.[37] If not a dismissal of academic ways of knowing, then at minimum the wildly divergent responses to HWE contain calls for reconsidering the implications of various epistemologies.

Others have argued that the public's response to the book does not signify a rejection of scholarship writ large, but rather a response to a specific intellectual trend in Holocaust and genocide studies. More precisely, Moses reads the book as an index of the popularity of structural-functionalism and ideological-intentionalism as competing explanatory frameworks for the Holocaust.[38] According to Moses, the hallmarks of ideological-intentionalism include: (1) an emphasis on ideology, and more specifically, anti-Semitism as a cause for the Holocaust, (2) a pronounced focus on perpetrator agency, (3) a view of Nazi Germany as an aberration from Western development, (4) the "use [of] explicitly moralistic rhetoric," (5) the elevation of "Jews as the primary victims of Nazi

persecution," and (6) defense of the uniqueness thesis.[39] By contrast, structural-functionalism posits that "abstract and impersonal structures are to blame for the Holocaust."[40] Correspondingly, "the bureaucrat, rather than the ideologue" of ideological-intentionalism constitutes the framework's image of a genocidal perpetrator.[41] Furthermore, unlike the moralism of ideological-intentionalist writing, structural-functionalists adopt "a detached, sober style."[42]

In Moses's historiography, structural-functionalist interpretations of the Holocaust began to gain ground throughout the 1960s and 1980s amid leftist movements willing to critique "the unquestioned health and 'normality' of Western societies."[43] Significant ideological-intentionalists, such as Saul Friendlander, began to soften their earlier arguments about intent,[44] and structural-functionalist books such as Bauman's *Modernity and the Holocaust* were published. In 1992, Christopher Browning published *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, which drew on the foundation set by Raul Hilberg to offer a structural-functionalist explanation of perpetrator behavior.[45] Given that Browning and Goldhagen investigate the same phenomenon (i.e., the behavior of "ordinary" Germans), the two books are commonly read as representations of the structural-functionalist school and the ideological-intentionalist school.[46]

Moses and others argue that the reception of Goldhagen's book symbolizes frustration with structural-functionalist approaches.[47] Moses suggests that the structural-functionalist approaches provide an unsatisfying answer to the question "why did the Holocaust happen" because they centralize abstract concepts such as "modernity" and "bureaucracy" as causal forces.[48] Ash explains that "[n]on-scholars do not identify easily

with seemingly anonymous 'structures' and 'forces' of history."[49] Thus, Moses reads the public's reaction to Goldhagen's book as a signal of their "dissatisf[action] with a scholarly consensus that makes it very difficult to talk of intention, agency, and responsibility in relation to the Holocaust."[50] For all of its faults, Goldhagen's book featured an easily consumable understanding of agency and a simple answer to question of the Holocaust's causality, offering a response to the perceived shortcomings of structural-functionalism.[51]

Finally, others theses hold that HWE resonated with audiences because it spoke to larger political and intellectual currents circulating among US publics in the late 1990s. Most obviously, Goldhagen's text was published during the height of "Holocaust consciousness" as Holocaust memory seemed to preoccupy parts of US popular culture.[52] Thus, HWE was poised to capitalize on an interested audience and offered an argument that resonated with their existing knowledge base. As Bartov explains, Goldhagen's position aligned with "what the general public had intuitively known all along [about the Holocaust], that it was 'the Germans' who had done it, that they had always wanted to do it, that they did it because they hated Jews, and that once called upon to do it, they did it with great enthusiasm and much pleasure."[53] Such an interpretation pins blame for the Holocaust squarely on foreign others,[54] which also conveniently halts a broader interrogation into genocidal causality.

In other words, HWE resonates with the view of the Holocaust as the antithesis of US political culture.[55] In the book's introduction, Goldhagen clearly casts Germany as a strange and foreign culture,[56] one which must be observed "with the critical eye of an anthropologist disembarking on unknown shores."[57] This framing allows Germany to be

the "alien" foil to "'normal' society,"[58] which Caplan reads as the US *polis*. In contrast to

structural-functionalist explanations which view genocidal violence as endemic,[59]

Goldhagen's framing serves to "absolve" American audiences by reassuring them that

they had nothing to do with the barbarity that was the Holocaust. Ergo, the book

establishes a contrast which allows US audiences to craft their identity in contrast to

German barbarism. Caplan argues that this space for identity construction vis-à-vis a

German foil was especially important when HWE was released in the late 1990s as the

US struggled to make sense of its national identity after the Cold War. HWE provided a

platform that US audiences could use to build an image of the United States in the post-

Cold War that contrasted sharply with Nazi Germany.[60]

WTW has proven to be less controversial than HWE;[61] nevertheless, it has been

critiqued by many as suffering from shortcomings similar to the ones ascribed to HWE.

Such criticisms tend to castigate Goldhagen as a poor researcher. Echoing some of the

response to HWE, Goldhagen's research was attacked as overly reductive.[62] Gray

charges Goldhagen with carelessly "lumping together" a variety of different forms of

political violence.[63] Cieplak maintains that the book relies on generalization and

stereotypes,[64] and other reviewers have suggested Goldhagen lacks a familiarity with the

larger body of literature in Holocaust and genocide studies.[65] Others have argued that his

tone deviates from expectations for scholarship. According to Üngör, "[t]he film

compensates for …[a] lack of intellectual sophistication with an overdose of moralistic

indignation about the phenomenon rather than dispassionate reflection."[66] Others describe

Goldhagen as overly emotional,[67] sensational,[68] arrogant, and strident.[69] Due to his choice

of tone, Romaniuk notes that "[s]ome may find this scholarly inquiry more akin to a tedious moralizing lecture or admonition."[70]

In sum, the contestation over Goldhagen's reputation pits scholarly research against popular thought in Holocaust and genocide studies. Ash aptly captures the extent to which Goldhagen positions himself as an academic insider-outsider. On the one hand, Ash stresses that the book has the hallmarks of "academic respectability" due to "Goldhagen's Harvard affiliation and the fact that the dissertation version of the book received a prize from the American Political Science Association."[71] However, Goldhagen "did not follow the academics usual path to public success via scholarly approval;" instead Goldhagen "presented himself to a large public and the media directly."[72] As a quasi-public/quasi-academic figure, Goldhagen's work stands to reveal much about the ways US genocide cessation discourse constructs popular understandings of the politics of genocide and genocide cessation. Like the texts analyzed in Chapters Three and Four, WTW's genocide cessation discourse is fraught with contradictions and offers inconsistent messages about genocide definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances. While these incompatible frameworks often serve to enhance Goldhagen's authority, they contribute to the disenfranchisement of the audiences WTW is ostensibly trying to reach.

Definitional Debates: Conflicting Frameworks for Understanding Eliminationism

At the heart of WTW is what Goldhagen calls "the problem of definition."[73] One of the project's guiding theses concerns the shortcomings of the language used to describe atrocities. As Goldhagen explains in the film, "we've been missing a critical point in understanding these horrors."[74] The problem, he argues, relates to language

limitations: "[t]erms like 'genocide' or even 'mass murder' are inadequate to describe the phenomenon we have repeatedly witnessed."[75] The inadequacy to which Goldhagen refers is a byproduct of the conceptual blindness old terms induce. Rather than focusing on specific actions (murder, sterilization, etc.), Goldhagen argues that the field demands a name to refer to the broader genus from which all of these individual actions emerge. As a corrective, Goldhagen directs the attention of scholars to the problem of *eliminationism*. In his book, he writes, "[e]ven if eliminationism's many forms are better known by their particular and spectacularly horrible consequences and names, such as genocide, the desire to *eliminate* peoples or groups should be understood to be the overarching category and the core act, and should therefore be the focus of our study."[76] Although all genocides are forms of elimination, not all acts of elimination manifest as genocide.[77]

Goldhagen explains the concept of eliminationism through numerous examples both in the book and the film. Primarily the concept takes shape through two conceptual frameworks. The first is best understood through the metaphor cluster GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY.[78] The second can be discussed concisely through Goldhagen's emphasis on "overkill." These frameworks are not inherently compatible and result in conflicting understandings of perpetrator agency. However, they converge in the production of readily identifiable agents to blame.[79] This establishment of clear "wrongdoers" is critical to Goldhagen's proposed resolutions. As Edelman notes, "problems are created so that particular reasons can be offered for public acceptance, and … so that particular remedies can be proposed."[80] Ergo, despite the incongruence between aspects of these definitional discourses, both frameworks are critical to building

the foundation for WTW's overall arguments about the politics of genocide cessation by shaping perceptions of perpetrator behavior.

GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY

This metaphorical understanding of genocide as a strategic game punctuates the fundamentally "rational" nature of such atrocities. Near the conclusion of WTW, Goldhagen interviews Tharcisse Karugarama, Rwanda's Minister of Justice. Karugarama draws on the notion of genocide as a strategic game when he claims that, "genocide is a political game. It's a power play….If people … knew, at the end of the day they'd be the losers, they would not play the game."[81] The game players are critical to this understanding of genocide. Karugarama's remarks imply an intelligent and rational actor, able to make assessments concerning the likelihood of success or failure. This view of the perpetrators is punctuated by Goldhagen elsewhere in the film. Goldhagen asserts that genocidaires "are rational calculators of costs and benefits."[82] The rationalism of perpetrator action is a central component of this framework: It is not a game of chance, but a game of strategy.

As a strategic game, this metaphor cluster suggests that the perpetuation of atrocity requires both a clear intent and advance preparation. Like chess players, genocidaires have identifiable objectives. Early in the film, Goldhagen identifies the intentions underlying some twentieth-century genocide: "Pol Pot wanted to radically transform Cambodian society," "Adolf Hitler wanted to create a vast political empire ruled by the German master race," and "Slobodan Milosevic wanted to permanently redraw the political map of the region."[83] Genocide, Goldhagen implies, becomes the means by which these goals are achieved.[84] Haris Silajdzic, the former President of

Bosnia, affirms this understanding of genocide. In an interview sequence, Silajdzic

stresses, "political goals can be reached in different ways," and "Some people think that

exterminating a group would help their goals so that's why they do it [commit acts of

genocide]."[85] Such an understanding of genocide centralizes the importance of

perpetrator intent. Although other scholars underscore the difficulty of ascertaining

genocidal intent,[86] intention is a critical component of the GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF

STRATEGY metaphor cluster.

In addition to identifiable intent, GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY encourages a

conception of genocide as *planned* action. Multiple scenes in WTW showcase the

planning process, the documentation, and the preparation that go into the coordination of

genocide. In one scene, Goldhagen skims Nazi documentation enumerating the Jews they

intended to kill.[87] Elsewhere in the film, WTW spotlights footage of military training in

Rwanda.[88] Beyond such footage, Silajdzic explains the advance planning that is a

necessary part of genocide. He tells Goldhagen,

> These things are done in cold blood. This is a design. This is a plan. This
>
> is a calculation...This is not a reaction to something…This, unfortunately,
>
> here is a planned genocide. As is any other genocide, because it's not
>
> possible to kill a big number of people without prior preparation. Mental
>
> preparation. Intellectual preparation. Military preparation.[89]

By casting genocide as an act that is well thought out, "done in cold blood" and

"planned," [90] Silajdzic's remarks refute what Goldhagen discusses as "a misconception

that genocides erupt spontaneously out of deep-seated passions or ethnic conflicts." [91]

Instead, as Goldhagen states blatantly, "there is nothing spontaneous about genocide."[92]

In short, genocide is a form of planned action, committed with a strategic intent designed to help some political leaders achieve their broader goals and objectives.

GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY bolsters ideological-intentionalist approaches to genocidal causality by accentuating perpetrator agency and choice.[93] In the film, Goldhagen stresses *ad nausea* that genocide is "a series of choices."[94] "Leaders choose to initiate the killing," and "Ordinary people make a conscious choice to participate."[95] By underlining choice and agency, Goldhagen extends portions of the explanatory framework used in HWE.[96] According to Moses's read of HWE, a central component of Goldhagen's understanding of the Holocaust is rational choice theory. Moses asserts, "Rational choice reinvests the individual with the agency and autonomy that the concern with bureaucratic structures and social psychology plays down."[97] This elevation of "choice" and "agency" over "bureaucracy" and "structures" clearly signals an affinity with ideological-intentionalism over structural-functionalism.

GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY also sets the conditions for involving international institutions in genocide cessation work. The discussion of intent in WTW bears a striking resemblance to the language used in the 1948 UN Convention. The convention text features the "intent to destroy" as part of the legal definition of genocide.[98] In accentuating intent as a definitive aspect of eliminationism, WTW establishes part of the foundation for mounting a legal case against genocidaires. The GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY metaphor cluster enhances the grounds for a legal response to genocide by establishing culpable subjects. As explored earlier, mental competency is presumed by this metaphor cluster. In conjunction with the emphasis on rational action, WTW stresses perpetrators' sanity. In explaining perpetrator behavior to

his editor during an interview sequence in the film, Goldhagen explains, "these people have risen to the pinnacle of power in their countries;" thus, "they are not crazy."[99] Elsewhere, Goldhagen contends that eliminationist acts "are not the acts of crazed individuals."[100] By removing *insanity* as an explanation for perpetrator behavior, the GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY cluster casts genocidaires as fully culpable and responsible for their actions. Such a focus on "accountability" resonates with Goldhagen's past investment in "emphasiz[ing] the responsibility of all killers as individuals for their deeds" in HWE.[101] In other words, such preemptive refutations position the perpetrators as fit to answer for their crimes. Foreshadowing elements of WTW's resolutions to eliminationism, the arguments associated with GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY make it plausible to envision the perpetrator as subject to legal proceedings.

The Symbolic Potency of the Notion of "Overkill"

GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY exists alongside a competing narrative best captured through the construct of "overkill." WTW introduces the term during a scene at the Fundación de Antropología Forsense in Guatemala. At the Fundación de Antropología Forsense, Goldhagen meets with Fredy Peccerelli, a forensic anthropologist, introduced as an authority on the remains of the victims in Guatemala. Peccerelli uses the skull of a deceased individual to explain how the person was killed. Peccerelli argues the body suffered from "repeated blows to the head." He calls this traumatic act of death "'overkill,'" which he associates with "crimes of passion."[102] Goldhagen repeats the term, stating "'[o]verkill.' There's a word I don't think I'll ever hear the same way again. If the killers were simply doing their duty…they would execute

their victims quickly and be done with it. You have to wonder why we see so much evidence of such murderous passion."[103] This brief exchange sketches some of the prominent attributes of the term. When violence is interpreted through the "overkill" framework, it is treated as an affective phenomenon marked by the experience of perpetrator pleasure and gratuitous violence.

Overkill consequentially represents an expression of affect. From time to time, WTW highlights the joy perpetrators derive from their violent acts. Goldhagen describes some perpetrators as experiencing "euphoria,"[104] which is shown through a series of interviews with perpetrators from Rwanda. Some perpetrators mention thinking of themselves as "strong" and "on top." One, for example, describes the emotional high derived from participating in eliminationist violence as akin to the feeling that "Nothing would touch you."[105] He continues, "You almost felt immortal. You hear people dying, cries of agony. And you are thinking you are powerful."[106] Given the thrill and sense of self-worth tied to such brutal acts, this conception of eliminationist violence deviates substantially from the cool detachment or "cold blood" presumed to be part of the GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY cluster.[107] If the chess player is a dispassionate and calculating actor, then "overkill" encourages a view of eliminationism as an expression of passion, emotion, and pleasure.

Furthermore, overkill connotes excessive brutality. Following from Goldhagen's assertion that "If the killers were simply doing their duty…they would execute their victims quickly and be done with it,"[108] the notion of "overkill" helps to explain the gratuitous nature of certain murderous acts. In Rwanda, Goldhagen ask perpetrators to offer detailed descriptions of the slaughters in which they participated, highlighting the

extent to which some perpetrators sought to torture their victims.[109] Goldhagen argues

that the "victims" in Rwanda "were not just killed in . . . the least painful way, but were

hacked to death, were tortured."[110] This excessive violence borders on irrational at times.

Through a narrative sequence featuring one Holocaust survivor's memories of the close

of the war, Goldhagen suggests that the desire to inflict suffering and pain on the death

marches was absurd. It superseded the most logical course of action. The survivor, Lilli

Silbiger, explains, "We knew the Russians were closing in;"[111] yet, Goldhagen

emphasizes that the Nazis "continued to deny them food" and "continued to beat them,

they continued to kill them, they continued to do it to the very end."[112] Not only was such

violence superfluous, it was counterintuitive as the Nazis could have used such time for

self-preservation efforts.[113] Goldhagen remarks, "One of the astonishing things is that

they were marching the Jewish prisoners literally to the last day of the war. Instead of

running away to avoid capture, they stayed with the prisoners."[114] Through the prism of

overkill, eliminationism is construed by Goldhagen as an excessive, emotive, and even

irrational series of violent acts.

To the extent that the overkill framework suggests that perpetrator behavior is

irrational, it undermines critical components of the GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY

metaphor cluster that is founded on notions of rationality. As mentioned earlier,

Goldhagen claims, "There's a misconception that genocides erupt spontaneously out of

deep-seated passions or ethnic conflicts."[115] However, Peccerelli asserts that these

atrocities are "crimes of passion."[116] Even as Goldhagen casts perpetrators as rational and

logical actors, the film also contains footage of a Rwandan perpetrator claiming that his

participation in the Rwandan genocide felt "like being in a fog, something like a

darkness."[117] The contrasts hinge on the extent to which perpetrators are cast as agents in command of their actions or as individuals driven by uncontrollable passion and emotion. The dual perspectives on perpetrator agency reflected in the "overkill" framework and the GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY metaphor cluster establish a tension that the film never resolves.

In spite of such tensions, the frameworks work together to support WTW's resolutions. Through the overkill framework, wrongdoers are readily identifiable because they exist in a world of distinct good/evil demarcations. Regardless of whether the perpetrators are in full control of their actions, they are vilified figures in WTW. This vilification is enacted in the special feature section at the end of the DVD. Goldhagen describes his discomfort over the prospect of having to shake hands with the killers he interviewed:

> Shaking the hand of a killer … is a strange thing. It's an act of politeness, it's a time of human sharing, and yet that same hand… I think the same hand actually was wielding a machete and striking and killing and hacking to death other people, and you can't flinch, and you can't say "I don't want to do it," and you have to do it because it's part of what you need to do when you interview somebody.[118]

Goldhagen depicts the perpetrators as so repugnant as to be almost untouchable.

Through a focus on the perverse joy perpetrators take in excessive violence, WTW perpetuates a "they" (the spotlighted murderers) as not like "us" (WTW's audiences). Drawing on Waller's discussion of "extraordinary" evil featured in Chapter One, the overkill framework revives a view of genocide as committed by evil Others.[119] It

is a presentation of "evil" that separates perpetrators' actions from the realm of "normal" human behavior.[120] These acts of disassociation are facilitated by the emphasis on the gratuitous nature of such violence. In this capacity, the concept of overkill functions in much the same way as the lurid and graphic textual descriptions of violence in HWE.[121] As Ash notes, the gruesome detail contained in HWE helps to maintain a chasm between the perpetrators and the audience at the same time that such detail indulges readers' morbid curiosity.[122] He argues that such graphic descriptions are "distancing because they allow readers to imagine the murderers as people quite different from themselves while simultaneously experiencing the thrill—and disgust—resulting from imagined direct contact with violence."[123] Ash's assessment foreshadows an important component of WTW's representational strategies: the use of melodrama to construct "good guys" and "bad guys" binaries.[124]

At its core, WTW foregrounds the importance of precise definitions as the film devotes considerable attention to Goldhagen's efforts to define and promote the term "eliminationism." As Goldhagen develops the construct through examples, the film presents two contrasting approaches to eliminationist violence. The first posits that GENOCIDE IS A GAME OF STRATEGY, an understanding of genocide that centralizes perpetrator accountability and rationality. The second promotes the notion of "overkill," an affective framework that accentuates excessive brutality and unbridled irrationality, aiding in the establishment of clear good/evil demarcations. Both understandings will prove crucial to WTW discourse on atrocity resolutions, and both shape the film's approach to representation.

Proximity and Authority in WTW's Genocide Representations

WTW navigates the tensions surrounding the representation of genocide in two distinct capacities. The film blends generic elements from travel documentaries (travelogues), melodrama, and academic discourse as it develops its argument in WTW. These generic elements extend WTW's definitional discourse by giving shape to the concept of eliminationism at the same time they contribute to the construction of Goldhagen's ethos. The use of these genres gestures toward the importance of proximity in building one's authority to participate in genocide cessation work. This emphasis on "closeness" also informs the ways WTW treats various vehicles for representation, chiefly written discourse, images, and direct experiences. Ultimately, the culmination of the film's strategies for representation privileges a constricted form of access to atrocity prevention work dependent upon spatial and experiential proximity. Although redefining authority through proximity enhances Goldhagen's credibility, it excludes numerous others from participation in genocide cessation work.

Generic Conventions and Genocide Representation

WTW blends generic conventions drawn from travelogues, melodrama, and academic discourse in its representations of genocide. The merger of melodrama and academic discourses enhances the film's claims to veracity while the travelogue narrative provides support for the exclusive type of authority Goldhagen relies upon in constructing his ethos. Nevertheless, this medley of genres creates apparent moments of tension in the film which provides Goldhagen an opportunity to reflect on the intersections among these representational techniques. The combination of these genres helps to extend aspects of WTW's definitional discourse while bolstering WTW's conception of authority.

On one obvious level, the film is a travelogue;[125] it is the story of Goldhagen's travels around the world to investigate the phenomenon of eliminationism. Early in the film Goldhagen explains, "over the past year, I traveled to these 'somewhere elses.' The sites of some of the worst mass murders of our time."[126] Goldhagen's commitment to traveling to these places is reinforced through multiple shots of Goldhagen in transit: whether he is on a plane, in a car, or walking through a city street. He picks up his bags in an airport in Berlin;[127] he navigates airport security.[128] The film shows Goldhagen sitting on a plane, looking out the window at a pastoral scene below.[129] He walks through the streets of New York City and Guatemala City. The film spotlights Goldhagen doing his work while traveling, writing on the plane or from a café. These scenes help establish Goldhagen as well traveled at the same time they begin to visualize the work of a scholar.

Part of the travelogue includes Goldhagen's efforts to retrace his family's Holocaust history. Early in the film, father and son are shown planning for their upcoming journey. They discuss Goldhagen's efforts to enlist his mother in cajoling his father to join him in revisiting the city of his father's birth. Along the way, father and son stop to see a grave filled with massacred members of the Goldhagen family, ride through the city of Erich Goldhagen's birth, and visit the elder Goldhagen's childhood home.

As the culmination of the pilgrimage,[130] the scene outside Erich Goldhagen's former home provides the emotional climax for the film as well as a point of suture between the film's private familial quest and its larger arguments about the nature of genocide. As he stands next to his boyhood home, Erich Goldhagen recounts the memory of the day he was almost killed. The elder Goldhagen recalls seeing his father being beaten with a rifle and discusses the thoughts he had as a child contemplating his own

demise. In a poignant scene, Erich Goldhagen states, "when I remember that moment as I walked…I did reflect upon how I would lie dead. What does it mean to be dead and to lie in your blood? I remembered vividly this imagery..."[131] This revelation provides the opening for a montage featuring the faces of many of the victims of eliminationist violence featured in the film. The younger Goldhagen asks,

> What must it feel like for a 10-year-old boy to contemplate his own imminent, violent death? Or a 16-year-old girl? Or a 19-year-old man? What must it feel like to be imprisoned in a rape camp? Or to watch helplessly as members of your family are killed? Or as your people are decimated?[132]

Each of the questions in this scene refers to a story of victimization described earlier in WTW. As Goldhagen ponders aloud, the face of the victim to which each question refers fills the screen. With these questions hanging in the air, the film moves to its penultimate scene: a video of "the men of Srebrenica" about to be executed in a field.[133] Goldhagen's family narrative is thus reinserted into the emotionally charged closing sequence of the film. In these final moments of the documentary, the film fuses Goldhagen's macro-level investigation of eliminationism with the micro-narrative of his family's Holocaust experience.

The poignancy of the aforementioned scene is enhanced by the film's use of melodramatic conventions alongside the travelogue narratives as components of WTW's representation of atrocity. Brooks defines melodrama as "an intense emotional and ethical drama based on the manichaeistic struggle of good and evil."[134] The previously explored construct of "overkill" lends itself to melodramatic framing. In addition to the vilification

of the perpetrators as depraved, WTW reflects elements of the melodramatic by utilizing

children to underscore the blamelessness and innocence of the victims. Children are

described as victims of eliminationist violence on multiple occasions. In Guatemala, the

film features testimonials from individuals who had watched as children were raped and

killed. According to a man identified as Placido Jeronimo Grave, "They grabbed the

children and beat them against the ground."[135] Similarly, Juan Manuel Jeronimo

continues, "The soldiers took the girls away to another house to rape them, after killing

all who remained."[136] While standing in the forensics laboratory with Peccerelli,

Goldhagen holds a tiny jaw bone. The bone is described as belonging to a murdered

child. Goldhagen punctuates the innocence of these victims by emphasizing that they

"did not pose a threat to anyone." Peccerelli echoes the point, arguing that "these are not

combat deaths."[137] Their blamelessness makes their deaths all the more tragic. As

Goldhagen notes, "[e]verywhere I go, the faces of children haunt me the most."[138]

Melodramatic representations aid the film in delineating its characters into

innocent victims and perverse perpetrators thusly contributing to WTW's unambiguous

moral order. As explored above, extant critiques of WTW often highlight its moralism

and reduction.[139] As Üngör notes, WTW presents a world that offers "static binaries of

bad guys versus good guys."[140] Goldhagen's proclivity toward melodramatic

representations is not unique to WTW; similar good/bad dichotomies structured

Goldhagen's representations of Germans and Jews in HWE.[141] Criticisms of HWE

stressed that the book perpetuates binaristic "representation[s] of 'Germans' and 'Jews'

as two absolutely distinct, essentially opposed, and ultimately abstract principles that

have been locked in an eternal struggle whose outcome can only be total victory or total

defeat."[142] Such binaries have clear utility insofar as they remove anxiety about genocidal causality. Ash argues that melodramatic dualities like the ones contained in HWE and WTW respond to American desires "for simple binary images of good and evil with which to structure a moral-conceptual grid of easy certainties, and to locate the murderous potential of modernity itself somewhere far away from the good old USA."[143] As such, the film's melodramatic portrayals of good and evil enable the film to construct a clear moral order at the same time that it distances its audiences from the origins of evil. Accordingly, the reliance on melodrama also strengthens the film's ties to ideological-intentionalism given the importance of moralism to that school of thought.[144]

Finally, WTW strengthens its arguments about genocide by drawing on the conventions of academic discourse to enhance its authority and claims to veracity. Although Goldhagen has a complicated relationship with the academy, he nevertheless frames WTW as a scholarly endeavor. The film is established early on as part of a well-articulated and long-standing research agenda. One of the opening scenes in WTW depicts Goldhagen at work in his study. The camera zooms in on Goldhagen sitting in a dark room illuminated by the light of his computer screen. As Goldhagen works at his desk, mounds of books and papers are on display. Goldhagen remains tightly focused on the computer screen as the camera focuses in on Goldhagen's face, intently trained on his writing. Through the voiceover, Goldhagen contextualizes this footage by explaining that he has "been thinking and writing about genocide for nearly 30 years." In the background, the film builds Goldhagen's credentials by using news footage in multiple languages to reference the controversy surrounding HWE. With the camera trained on Goldhagen, multiple voices can be heard discussing "a highly controversial account of

the Holocaust" and "a controversial book about the Holocaust raising a troubling new question." Through footage of an interview sequence with Charlie Rose, Goldhagen is able to review his thesis in HWE.[145]

This opening sequence has obvious functions: It renders visible the academic "performance" and facilitates a reading of WTW as an academic text. From a dramaturgical perspective, these scenes are part of the "dramatic realization" of the academic role.[146] As Goffman explains, "if the individual's activity is to become significant to others, he must mobilize his activity so that it will express *during the interaction* what he wishes to convey."[147] Thus, Goldhagen uses such scenes as a means visualizing the work of a scholar to the documentary's audiences. Before Goldhagen begins to speak, the setting in these sequences cues audiences to recognize him as an academic. The use of news media clips to articulate HWE's thesis for Goldhagen similarly establishes the impact of his past work and thus presumed importance to the field. This sequence in WTW is the visual equivalent of what some critics have charged enabled HWE to strengthen its claims to authority: the *performance* of academic discourse.[148] As Bartov notes of HWE, the "jargon-ridden text, the hundreds of footnotes, the sheer size of the book, all seemed to prove that this was indeed a most serious scholarly undertaking."[149] In other words, the book had the trappings of an academic text, and these academic trappings are likewise employed in WTW to cast it as an academic project. Beyond the documentary itself, the film's marketing accentuates Goldhagen's ties to the academy, noting his position at Harvard and his success with HWE.[150]

Goldhagen's claims to academic authority are also enhanced by his father's academic credentials. Goldhagen defines his own work as the continuation of his father's

research agenda. While the screen is filled with an image of Goldhagen on a departing plane, Goldhagen explains that his father "journeyed into the darkest chapters of the human experience seeking to understand not only what happened but why. Now I am continuing the journey he began. A journey that in a sense, I have been on my entire life."[151] Growing up with a professor as his father, Goldhagen recalls that "As early as I can remember . . . .my father and I have been talking about these things"[152] and our "home" was filled "with this material."[153] Such remarks tether Goldhagen's ethos to his father's academic authority and cast this film as part of a research program that preceded his own work.

By positioning WTW as a scholarly endeavor, Goldhagen builds an argument for his authority and expertise. The film contains a clear association of scholarship with "truth." Immediately following the news footage of HWE's reception, Goldhagen describes his work thusly: "I spend my professional life trying to dispel myths." This line can be read in two ways. Because he makes this assertion immediately after the news footage covering the controversy around HWE, the line is a potential response to critics of HWE. In HWE, Goldhagen positions his work as responding to the ill-conceived scholarship of others.[154] The remark about "dispel[ling] myths" furthers the notion that his work corrects other scholars' erroneous arguments about the Holocaust and genocide.

More importantly, such a response positions Goldhagen as the voice of "truth."[155] These claims to truth are reinforced by Goldhagen's chosen vehicle for WTW: documentary. The film's marketing as a documentary also imparts a sense of realism and objectivity.[156] As Torchin writes of genocide documentaries, "[t]he indexicality of the photographic medium imparts ontological status and a suggestion of evidentiary value"

despite the fact that "documentary remains a representation of lived reality and its claims to truth are made manifest through a vast array of cinematic strategies."[157] Nonetheless, the academic patina and documentary format aid in the construction of Goldhagen's authority and consequently lend credibility to the arguments about genocide contained in WTW.

Although the authoritative connotations of both academic and documentary discourses enhance Goldhagen's ethos, they sit uneasily with the moralism of melodrama and Goldhagen's personal investment in the subject matter as established through the travelogue narratives. Shugart argues that professional academic discourse "serves to foster distance between a critic and her or his text; the illusion of objectivity; and an aura of specialized expertise that is above reproach."[158] Both the sense of scholarly distance and objectivity are complicated by the affective ties that bind Goldhagen's family to the history of the Holocaust. The emotional intensity of some of the moments in the film, such as his father's recollection of his childhood brush with death, threatens to invalidate the film's claim to documentary neutrality and academic distance.[159] Goldhagen's close ties to his father compromise Goldhagen's past projects for some by suggesting that his work is a means of "acting out the senior Goldhagen's supposed revenge fantasy against Germany."[160]

Goldhagen seemingly anticipates such threats to his ethos as he attempts to foreclose these challenges in two ways. First, Goldhagen sublimates his familial connection to the Holocaust at multiple points in the film. Early in the film Goldhagen introduces his father as "a valued mentor, a scholar of genocide, and survivor of the Holocaust." After a brief pause, he adds, "he also happens to be my father."[161] By

introducing the elder Goldhagen in this fashion, Goldhagen centralizes his professional

connections to his father as a mentor or scholarly advisor over his familial ties. In the

special feature at the end of the DVD, Goldhagen again emphasizes his academic

connection to the Holocaust over a more personal provenance for his studies. In

Goldhagen's words, "There's no doubt that my father influenced my initial direction of

working on the Holocaust, but it's less because he was a survivor than he was a professor

who studied this."[162] These arguments suggest Erich Goldhagen's significance to WTW

is his scholarly pedigree and not his personal exposure to atrocity.

Second, both Goldhagens suggest that they are able to preserve their objectivity

through their unique ability to divest themselves from their personal connection to the

Holocaust. Goldhagen explains that, "Like my father, I have always endeavored to

separate my emotions from my scholarly work on genocide."[163] Other moments in the

film suggest that the Goldhagens are remarkably good at such detachment. Standing by

the grave of his relatives, Erich Goldhagen recollects, "Sometimes – as you may

remember when I gave the course on the Holocaust at Harvard – I experience sometimes

a sense of guilt at the fact that I speak so coolly and analytically over their death."[164] The

elder Goldhagen's self-reflexive comments showcase an awareness at how emotionally

"detached" he must seem to others. Anticipating that his students would notice his lack of

emotion, Goldhagen's reaction represents a sense of "guilt" over the disconnect between

the emotional weight of the subject and the lack of emotion in his academic

performance.[165] Of course, this "guilt" is evidence of his success in circumscribing his

emotional engagement with the subject matter as a Holocaust survivor in order to

perform the work of the scholar. Echoing his father's admission, Daniel Goldhagen notes,

"I'm your son in many ways, and your dispassion is my own."[166] Standing by the gravesite in the same scene, Goldhagen comes to puzzle over "how detached I am, too, from this," calling it "shocking" that he did not put the connections together between the kind of scholarly work he was doing and his own emotional connection to these atrocities as the son of a Holocaust survivor.[167] This scene reinforces an interpretation of the film as a neutral intellectual pursuit even as the father-son pair delve into the emotional territory surrounding their own personal connections to this subject matter.

While their personal ties to the subject matter have the potential to threaten their credibility as objective documentarians and academics, the elder Goldhagen's survivor status also serves to enhance the Goldhagens' claims to authority by providing a rare form of access. The Goldhagens' familial ties to the Holocaust provide Daniel Goldhagen with a form of authority few can claim. As explored in Chapter One, genocide survivors commonly are seen as possessing special authority in the interpretation of atrocity.[168] A similar authority extends to family members as the families of the victims are often ceded privileged positions from which to make meaning.[169] As I have argued elsewhere, the claims to authority that emerge from familial connections to those who have endured or perished in atrocities "become unassailable in many respects" because "the ethos of their argument[s] is bound up in their personal experience[s]."[170] "To challenge the argument of the sufferer is to border on declaring their feelings illegitimate;" those operating from "subjectivities of suffering" are therefore able to lay claim to a form of authority granted to few others.[171] As Lipstadt affirms, "The general public tends to accord victims of genocide a certain moral authority,"[172] and Bartov suggests that Goldhagen is able to capitalize on "the moral authority of being the son of a survivor."[173] Arguably, the ethos

Goldhagen "inherits" as a son of a Holocaust survivor is more potent than the academic credibility he works to construct in WTW. Whereas numerous individuals can ground their ethos in academic authority, fewer can access the authority of the survivor. This proximity to atrocity is critical to WTW given the suspicion the film evinces toward various forms of mediation.

Access to the "Real": WTW's Treatment of Words, Images, and Experiences

In the same way that Goldhagen relies upon seemingly incongruent genres in WTW, the film's positions on the relative strengths and drawbacks of words, images, and direct experiences produce inconsistent messages about genocide representation. Although the film recognizes the value of words and images, crucial components of the travelogue narrative celebrate the authority produced from being on location. The glorification of the direct experience acquired through travel perpetuates a representation/reality split wherein "being there" is cast as providing unmediated access to the "real." The travel narratives accentuate the importance of proximity, which acquires a dual meaning within WTW. Proximity is both spatial and experiential. By leveraging both meanings of the term, Goldhagen constructs an elite and privileged form of authority that supersedes purely academic modes of knowledge production and constrains who is able to engage in genocide cessation advocacy work.

The Word

Written discourse is important in WTW to the extent that it contributes to Goldhagen's academic performance. The scholar's work is chiefly portrayed through the act of writing, with a pronounced focus on the importance of rhetorical invention. Outside of this role, written texts seemingly have little utility. Their primary value is to

enhance Goldhagen's dramaturgical performance. They function primarily as props or artifacts, a form of evidence observed at a glance and not engaged with in any depth.

From one perspective, WTW is predicated on the importance of words given its central contention that the discourse used to discuss mass atrocities is insufficient. By punctuating the importance of precise terminology, Goldhagen charges, "Reframing the way we think about these deeds is not just an intellectual exercise." He refers to the invention of the term eliminationism as "a critical component of understanding."[174] In short, Goldhagen's concise remarks underscore that words matter. Elsewhere in both the book and the film, Goldhagen affirms the significance of discourse to genocide and genocide cessation by attending to the persuasive influence of genocidaires and the dehumanizing language used in perpetrators' speech.[175]

Put differently, invention or discourse production is valued within WTW as it enhances the project's claims to scholarly authority through Goldhagen's academic performances. Writing is elevated as an important part of performing the academic role. WTW spotlights the act of invention through multiple scenes of Goldhagen writing. Many of these shots feature Goldhagen working in his study.[176] Often the camera is situated behind Goldhagen, positioning the audience to watch him work over his shoulder. On other occasions, the scene remains tightly cropped on either the screen or the keyboard as Goldhagen's hands strike the keys. Mimicking the arc of a film from beginning to end, the writing process transitions to the editing process near the film's conclusion. Shots of Goldhagen working at his computer are supplemented by a scene of Goldhagen editing.[177] In these scenes, the written word has value insofar as it helps construct Goldhagen's academic ethos.

Although rhetorical invention and discourse production are important parts of scholarly work, written texts seemingly have little significance once complete in WTW. Notably Goldhagen's means of performing the academic role is through writing texts, not reading them. To the extent that the research process is shown in WTW, it is a qualitative process. Goldhagen is seen conducting interviews and engaging in field work. He is rarely seen reading others' work. The lack of scenes featuring Goldhagen reading resonates with critiques that he is under read in his field;[178] such omissions further diminish the power of the written word.

On other occasions when written texts are featured, they appear as "sign-equipment." Goffman treats sign-equipment as a part of the setting, "the scenery and stage props for the spate of human action played out before, within, or upon it."[179] Written texts function as "props" within the dramaturgical performance, establishing relevant context in WTW. These props include things such as a wanted sign hanging in an office in Guatemala, which Goldhagen pauses to look at,[180] or the signs worn by protesters in California.[181] They include a pile of documents sitting on a table next to Kate Doyle of the National Security Archive's Guatemala Documentation Project.[182]

Representations of written "props" foreshadow a diminished role for rhetoric in genocide cessation work. This attenuation of rhetoric's potency is evidenced by a brief scene early in the film wherein Goldhagen examines Nazi planning documentation.[183] The document is sealed away in a glass case. The fact that the document exists and can be seen suffices as evidence in the scene; the text does not demand, nor does the film imply the need for, further engagement with it. It is the literal representation of written discourse as an artifact, glass-cased and cut off from the rest of the action in the film.

Although the idea of rhetoric as a "prop" does give rhetoric a certain authority as a means of establishing the setting and corroborating the resultant performance of Goldhagen's academic role, the notion of rhetoric as a prop implies that rhetoric is static, frozen, and divorced from the rest of the action in the film. Like the painted door on a stage set that cannot be opened, written discourse here is something to be seen and appreciated, not engaged with beyond a glance. This mode of representation undersells the potency of rhetoric to construct, build, and shape lived experiences as well as to contribute to the contexts which give rise to genocidal violence. In sum, the value of the word lies in enhancing Goldhagen's academic performance, a role that limits and weakens the extent to which rhetoric is important to genocide cessation.

The Image

Whereas WTW appears ambivalent about the power of written texts, it includes multiple scenes affirming the value of images. WTW's existence as a book *and documentary* offers an inherent endorsement of the power of visuality. Chiefly, the film capitalizes on the image's affective potency, concision, and indexicality.[184] Though celebrated by Goldhagen, WTW's editorial interventions compromise the film's ability to sustain a view of documentary as a transparent representation of the real.

In a special feature included on DVD, Goldhagen reflects on the process of making WTW and the affective potency visuality lends to the film. Contrasting the film with the written text, Goldhagen explains that if he were left to his own devices in producing the film, "I probably would have produced a nice two- hour lecture of some kind with visuals instead of a film that is visually arresting and emotionally evocative and, as powerful as the book is, in some ways obviously more powerful."[185] Such

remarks suggest that images have an emotional weight that words lack.[186] Like his father

and the other victims of genocide interviewed in the film, Goldhagen describes powerful

visions of faces. He states, "the faces of the people I spoke with and their words are with

me in a way that the testimony and documents and court testimony and so on never are

with me." Through such remarks Goldhagen elevates the power of the word while

simultaneously marking the written texts as less powerful. While the images "resonate

with" him,[187] the written texts fail to make a similar impact.

Goldhagen elevates the power of images and deflates the forces of writing a book

and working on a film. When writing books, Goldhagen remarks, "if I decide something

needs 20 pages of elaboration, then I do it."[188] However, a premium is placed upon

brevity in film. Such brevity is possible in part because the image "is more than worth a

thousand words. It's worth endless, endless volumes of words," according to

Goldhagen.[189] Thus, images benefit from their concision.[190]

WTW's appreciation for the concision of the image is evidenced through the

employment of montages throughout the film. The film uses a montage of WWII planes

releasing bombs and tanks rumbling across the land during the interview with Holocaust

survivor Lilli Silbiger as she talks about the end of the war.[191] In Rwanda, the film moves

between different images of men running along the road while the narration describes the

force of hate speech propagated through Rwanda's RTLM radio. Despite the film's

gestures toward the limited utility of the word, this scene functions as an

acknowledgement of the dehumanizing rhetoric of the perpetrators.[192] As Goldhagen

narrates the history of the Jews in the Ukrainian town where his father had once lived, the

images jump between various scenes of Jews being rounded up and forced into trucks.[193]

The film's introductory sequence transitions between images from the Holocaust and genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, and Darfur to convey the scope of the problem of eliminationism.[194]

The problem with these montage sequences is that their inclusion of decontextualized and recontextualized images exposes the process of editorial intervention and compromises the documentary's claims to "truth."[195] The images and videos used in these sequences risk becoming "free-floating signifier[s]" because they have an unclear provenance.[196] WTW includes numerous decontextualized images of bodies in pain, bodies laboring, and dead bodies, identified only by the names of the countries where these images ostensibly were taken.[197] Elsewhere in the film, Goldhagen describes the work of the "Hutu leaders" while video footage of unidentified black bodies fills the screen. The images showcase men running with guns, rolling down hills, and chanting. The spoken words help control the interpretation of this footage, suggesting that perhaps these images are from some sort of martial training program; however, such a determination cannot be conclusively drawn from the decontextualized images alone.[198] These brief examples are representative of trends toward more rampant decontextualization of unidentified footage throughout the film.

Similarly, other visual practices in WTW betray the notion of documentary as a "window on the world."[199] Multiple scenes in WTW suggest a clear manipulation of the image. For example, WTW animates still photos of violence by superimposing the sound of gun shots or adding ominous or foreboding music. These editorial impositions thwart the film's ability to suggest that documentary provides "unmediated" access to the real and instead reveal documentary's "realism" as a textual construction.[200]

The film's treatment of images raises larger questions about WTW's ethics of representation. With his previous work, Goldhagen has been accused of being sloppy with his evidence, misrepresenting primary source material, marshaling and misusing source material to sustain claims that cannot and should not be advanced.[201] Crane argues that these irresponsible practices are all the more likely when working with photographs. In her analysis of Holocaust images, she disparages atrocity photography that is displayed "in promiscuous ways we would never tolerate in the use of textual sources—we print them sans captions, sans credits, sans textual reference to figure, and sometimes all of the above."[202] Because the film often fails to provide any identifying information for its images, WTW asks for the viewer's trust. Trust, in turn, rests upon the film's attempts to restore Goldhagen's (fraught) credibility.[203] Perhaps most ironically, this haphazard treatment of visual content plays into the fears of some Holocaust and genocide studies scholars regarding the use of creative license and genocide denial.[204] With little care put into citing images, WTW creates an opening for challenges to the film's veracity. In spite of Goldhagen's praise of images, WTW's engagement with this form of representation also complicates its claims to authority.

Direct Experience

With visual and written texts compromised in the ways explained above, WTW ultimately valorizes the knowledge produced through direct or "unmediated" experiences. These discussions of "direct experience" reify a representation/reality divide while simultaneously redefining authority through a sense of proximity to atrocity.[205] Proximity acquires a dual meaning. On one hand, it refers to the geographic closeness afforded through the film's travel narrative. This closeness provides Goldhagen with a means of

overcoming critiques of academics as distant. On the other hand, proximity refers to the knowledge of the Holocaust Goldhagen "inherits" through his relationship with his Holocaust survivor father. By capitalizing on these dual forms of proximity, Goldhagen creates the space to weave together incompatible genres and inconsistent positions on genocide representation.

In drawing on the generic features of a travel documentary, Goldhagen not only visits important locations in his family's history, he also visits a variety of mass killings sites. WTW includes footage of Goldhagen squatting in a mass grave being excavated in Guatemala. In another morose sequence, Goldhagen walks down a street in Srebrenica as a companion suggests that victims were shot as they walked through such streets during the genocide.[206] Early in the film, Goldhagen marvels at the experience of standing inside a gas chamber.[207] Many of Goldhagen's interviews take place at the site of the interviewee's victimization: Holocaust survivor Lilli Silbiger recounts her experiences near the route of a Nazi death march.[208] Emmanuel Gatari stands in a field where he sought refuge during the Rwandan genocide.[209] Sabaheta Fejzíc discusses the moment she was separated from her son during the Bosnian genocide from the site of the UN base where she was last with her child.[210]

Goldhagen supplements these scenes with other place markers. WTW establishes Goldhagen as "on location" through the use of visual landmarks. Scenes in Washington, DC and Berlin feature the Washington monument and the Berlin Holocaust memorial respectively. Shots of a busy, urban street work in conjunction with textual labels to place Goldhagen in New York City. Shots of the outside of office buildings, focusing in on their address, establish Goldhagen on location at Otilia Lux Diputada congressional

office in Guatemala or at former SS member Otto-Ernst Duscheleit's house in Berlin. On

other occasions, Goldhagen highlights that he is in a particularly significant place by

using phrases such as "*these* hills" or "here." In Guatemala, the camera focuses on the

hills visible from Goldhagen's car window as he explains that "In these hills, the

Guatemalan military conducted a scorched-earth campaign against Maya and leftist

insurgents."[211] The marker "here" serves the same purposes. Goldhagen punctuates his

comments with a reminder of the importance of his spatial location: "A recent episode

here in Kenya,"[212] "*Here* in Guatemala, a genocidal mastermind walks freely,"[213] or "all

the people *here* murdered other people?"[214] Such scenes very clearly locate Goldhagen

within particular geographies.

The pointed emphasis on place in these sequences is significant as it ties

Goldhagen to emotionally charged landscapes and displaces temporal distance with

spatial proximity. This focus on "being there" grounds Goldhagen's authority in

geographic access. Such claims to authority are reminiscent of the strategies that Zelizer

contends some journalists employed in the wake of the Kennedy assassination. Framed as

"investigators," these journalists sought to construct a case for their journalistic authority

by offering "tales of the *same place* but a *different time*."[215] Like the journalists in

Zelizer's study, Goldhagen strengthens his authority by emphasizing his ties to

significant spaces. Furthermore, the geographies Goldhagen inhabits in these films are

sites that are viewed by many critics as rhetorically significant. Sites of atrocious

violence are potent resources for meaning-making.[216] As WTW constructs connections

between Goldhagen and these locations, the film suggests his access to these violent

landscapes imparts additional authority to Goldhagen's genocide cessation arguments.

The film minimizes the importance of lapsed time by suggesting that a sense of enduring authority inheres in the land itself. This logic is made visible through a sequence included in Goldhagen's interview with Holocaust survivor Lilli Silbiger. As Goldhagen and Silbiger walk through the countryside near the site of a Nazi death march, the color footage of the current landscape is overlaid with a WWII era image of Silbiger.[217] The documentary seamlessly fades the contemporary countryside into the image of Silbiger's face.[218] The sequence collapses time into space, closing a sense of temporal distance at the same time that it reifies an understanding of the landscape as rhetorically significant.

Goldhagen's claims to authority through access to these geographies centralize the importance of proximity. Proximity has a dual meaning in WTW. On the one hand, proximity is acquired through direct access to a presumably "unmediated" real. In elevating direct experience of travel as the gold standard for knowledge production, WTW evinces a representation/reality divide wherein words and images are cast as shallow substitutes for the "real," reviving longstanding iconophobic approaches to representation.[219] As Hartley explains, such an approach is ultimately unproductive: "Instead of dismissing media images or discourses as unreal 'shadows in the cave', it is necessary to recognize that images, discourses, texts, media and so on are themselves quite real."[220] Nevertheless, WTW positions direct experience as a means of eclipsing problems of representation.

Because scholarly work is predicated on the value of written texts, this denigration of the written forms of representation translates into a critique of the scholar's authority. These critiques are explicitly voiced by Erich Goldhagen who tells

his son: "Because you have been sort of an academic, very secluded….you have studied this phenomenon from a distance through document."[221] Notably the language of "seclusion" used to describe academics resonates with critiques of the academy as an "ivory tower" and activates stereotypes of scholars as removed from the "real world."[222] Other remarks in WTW suggest that the Goldhagens' travels are all the more significant because they rectify the confinement of the "ivory tower." By way of introducing the importance of his travels, Goldhagen states, "As a scholar, I spend most of my time in archives and libraries."[223] This introductory clause attains meaning through the juxtapositions the film constructs between the academy and the "real world." Goldhagen's travels attain significance because they take him out of the archive and "to these 'somewhere elses'" where genocides occur.[224] This sense of contrast is heightened again as Goldhagen notes that he has spent "decades studying Nazis and the Holocaust, genocide, but I've never been in a gas chamber before."[225] The aggregation of these remarks constructs a multi-tied critique of academia as both a place that is quite literally *spatially distant* from the subjects of interest in WTW and *limited in the knowledge that it can produce because it relies upon written representations* which pale in comparison to the direct experience Goldhagen acquires through his travels.

WTW's elevation of "direct experience" over words and images as forms of representation complicates its claims to authority in two ways. First, Goldhagen casts WTW as an academic project at the same time that he critiques academics as "removed" and beholden to insufficient textual forms of knowledge production. Throughout much of WTW, Goldhagen performs an academic role while his travelogue narrative problematizes academic ways of knowing in its celebration of proximity. Goldhagen's

academic insider-outsider subjectivity aids him in navigating this tension as he tethers his

authority to his proximity. In simple ways, Goldhagen responds to such criticism through

the act of acquiring supplemental experience during his travels. His spatial proximity

removes the distance and detachment otherwise hampering academic work. Yet, by doing

so, he opens himself up to critiques from the academic community for his privileging of

subjective experience over academic objectivity and rigor.

Yet, Goldhagen is also able to capitalize upon a second sense of "proximity" – the

proximity to the subject he "inherits" through his status as the son of a Holocaust

survivor. This sense of proximity corresponds with an approach to epistemology Caplan

discusses as "knowledge-by-identification, in which true knowledge is supposed to be

authenticated by its closeness to the subjective experience of the knower."[226] Absent the

direct experience of a Holocaust survivor, Goldhagen's claims to proximity reflect the

larger ways in which children of survivors position themselves to become the proprietors

of atrocity memory and assert authority over meaning-making.[227] Such attempts to

ground authority in exclusionary access or rights to interpretation underlie some of the

longstanding debates in Holocaust and genocide studies.[228] Nevertheless, Goldhagen

invokes this sense of proximity as he builds his authority within WTW.

By levering both meanings of the term "proximity," Goldhagen is able to make

space for seemingly incompatible representational strategies as he simultaneously

positions his claims as irrefutable. Many of the tensions produced by the film's medley of

genres and inconsistent evaluations of words, images, and experiences hinge upon

questions of proximity and distance. Goldhagen's case for authority through proximity

subsumes these tensions as the varying representational strategies converge to convey

Goldhagen's "closeness" to the film's subject matter. Furthermore, Goldhagen's

construction of authority through proximity preempts challenges from his critics. As

previously mentioned, many of the critiques in the wake of the publication of HWE

attacked Goldhagen on the grounds that his book did not meet standards for good

scholarship, which presume distance and "objectivity."[229] By shifting the basis of

authority to proximity and the inheritance of memory, Goldhagen invalidates criticisms

that privilege knowledge that is produced in the academy. Accordingly, Goldhagen builds

his ethos on grounds that *supersede* the academic forms of knowledge production relied

upon by his detractors.[230]

However, WTW's elevation of "proximity" through direct experience creates a

second complication for the film. At the same time WTW exalts "being there" over more

shallow textual substitutes, Goldhagen imparts his arguments about genocide cessation

through a book and documentary. Thus, whereas Goldhagen touts his ability to access an

unmediated "reality," WTW offers its audiences mediated forms of engaging with

genocide cessation through the consumption of these written and visual texts. This latter

tension complicates the forms of genocide cessation work the film is able to promote as a

part of its resolution discourse.

Genocide Cessation and Political Power: The Disenfranchisement of Popular

Audiences

Goldhagen proposes multiple resolutions to the problems posed by

eliminationism. Chiefly, these resolutions take the form of legal action, martial invention,

or policy change. Notably, each of these forms of resolution privileges empowered and

elite political actors with the resources to engage in legal work, direct military operations,

or recommend policy. The options for broader public participation in genocide cessation are limited to a form of indirect influence on people in positions of powers. Even this restricted role is challenged as WTW extends earlier critiques of representation into pessimism surrounding the utility of genocide cessation discourse. These constrained modes of engagement offered to WTW's viewing audiences reflect the film's earlier efforts to cast authority as contingent upon privileged modes of access. As a result, those without such access are disenfranchised from the film's proposed resolutions.

Over the course of the nearly two-hour long documentary, Goldhagen expends roughly six minutes authoring solutions to the problem of genocide. In this condensed sequence, Goldhagen essentially outlines proposals for genocide cessation that involve legal, martial, and policy resolutions. Exploring legal resolutions, Goldhagen raises the possibility of prosecuting genocidaires. In advocating this form of genocide resolution, Goldhagen draws upon crucial components of WTW's definitional discourse. Because genocidaires are "rational calculators of costs and benefits," he calls for viewers to "think about their cost-benefit calculus."[231] Currently, Goldhagen posits that there are too few "costs." Goldhagen argues that genocide is facilitated by genocidaires' perceptions of impunity. He charges, "because they [potential perpetrators] know they have basically impunity, and there has been very little calling to account, and they get away with it time and time again."[232] Fear of retribution has the potential to change their "cost-benefit calculations."[233] Furthermore, because WTW's definitional discourse has laid the foundation for viewing genocidaires as culpable legal subjects, such retribution could be enacted through the appropriate court channels. However, legal resolutions alone are insufficient. Goldhagen argues, although "[w]e have international courts, and they do

some good … they are unbearably slow and ineffective…And the killing continues."[234]

Thus, according to Goldhagen's logic, legal procedures have a limited role in genocide

prevention.

Martial solutions are also briefly explored. Goldhagen references the success of

NATO's bombing during the Bosnian genocide.[235] He cites this example to demonstrate

that "as was the case in Bosnia, relatively little force can achieve extraordinary

results."[236] Though only briefly mentioned in the film, martial forms of genocide

cessation received the strong endorsement on PBS's WTW website through the

discussion of the aforementioned poll of website visitors:

> If the government of a developing country is about to begin, or has begun,
>
> a genocide of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children --
>
> similar to what happened in Rwanda -- which of the following should the
>
> United States and the international community be willing to do, if
>
> necessary, to prevent or stop the mass murder?[237]

Respondents are given the option of selecting from among the following preset answers:

"Take diplomatic initiatives," "Impose sanctions," "Threaten to place bounties on the

country's leaders," "Bomb military forces and installations," or "Send ground forces."[238]

Responses to the poll overwhelming favor martial resolutions; "Send ground forces" and

"Bomb military forces and installations" collectively received 67 percent of the responses

as of May 2013.[239]

Although martial resolutions may have received the strongest endorsement from

WTW's audiences, the film overwhelmingly centralizes policy changes at the

international level as critical to genocide cessation. These policy changes are two-fold.

First, Goldhagen champions the creation of a new response force. Goldhagen argues: "instead of the U.N. we need an international watchdog organization made up of democratic nations that will enforce a zero tolerance policy on genocide and eliminationism."[240] Speed is of the utmost import, Goldhagen claims. Because deliberation takes time, he argues, "Each of the members must have the right to intervene individually or collectively to stop campaigns of elimination."[241] Yet, even this policy change is insufficient. Goldhagen laments, "But intervention, even forceful intervention, is not enough. By the time we intervene, tens of thousands can be dead or homeless. We need an effective system of prevention."[242]

Thusly, Goldhagen argues for the implementation of "a bounty program" for genocidal leaders modeled off the bounty program the US has instituted "to hunt down terrorists."[243] By way of building a case for the success of such a solution, Goldhagen queries former president Silajdzic, "Let's say for example, the international community declared the leaders of countries that commit genocide to be outlaws. They can be hunted down until they either give themselves up or until they're killed. Would Milosevic under these circumstances have ever initiated the slaughter of Bosnians?"[244] As expected, Silajdzic answers, "I don't think he would."[245] With this hypothetical scenario offered as grounds, the bounty program is promoted as part of WTW's resolution to the problem of eliminationist violence.

Goldhagen advocates a similar resolution in his book and his suggestions in both texts have been critiqued by others as imperialistic. According to Üngör, "[i]n the film, Goldhagen ignores the thorny issue of state sovereignty and travels across the world to preach American military invasion as the most effective form of genocide prevention."[246]

Rieff and Üngör both suggest that Goldhagen's call for an international "rapid response" task force for genocide intervention is essentially a form of US imperialism.[247]

Yet, the imperialistic bent of the resolutions Goldhagen promotes is occluded through the film's reliance on melodrama. Earlier definitional and representation discourses situate the problem with eliminationism within WTW's world of stark moral dualism. Thus, the power dynamics that engender the charge of imperialism are lost within a world order shaped by a discernible right from wrong scenario. Because melodrama allows for these delineations, the decisions surrounding the use of force or intervention become decidedly less complicated. Within this context, the poll results on WTW's website are not surprising. Indeed, the phrasing of the poll further reduces any sense of moral ambiguity in suggesting that visitors consider this hypothetical genocide as "similar to what happened in Rwanda." The poll question capitalizes on the memory of Rwanda to lend legibility to the construct of genocide and promote apparent right and wrong distinctions.[248] By capitalizing on twenty years of hindsight which have ensconced Rwanda into popular memory as a blatant example of genocidal slaughter, the poll encourages dualistic thinking, making the choice to intervene by force perfunctory. In other words, the prism of melodrama encourages a kind of reductionist logic that oversimplifies genocide cessation into matters of saving innocents by targeting the guilty. In such a world, charges of imperialism are a distant concern in the face of seemingly unambiguous evil.

Beyond critiques of imperialism and reduction, Goldhagen's genocide cessation discourse makes scant reference to the public's efficacy. Notably, WTW's resolutions feature state, military, and international governmental actors. The film's proffered

resolutions are contingent upon access to governmental platforms: military units, international governmental bodies, international courts, etc. Genocide and genocide cessation happen through political elites. Popular power is only engaged to the extent that people can put pressure on their elected officials. Goldhagen makes this argument explicit in the last line in his film:

> We can't stand by anymore. People are dying every day. A few political leaders start genocides. A few political leaders can stop them. The presidents and prime ministers we elect have the power to end impunity and change the choices potential mass killers make. We must hold our leaders accountable and demand that they bring an end to genocide and eliminationism.[249]

A certain irony exists here: Although Goldhagen is regarded as a popular Holocaust and genocide studies figure, he fails to offer his audiences any substantive ways of envisioning themselves as part of his genocide cessation efforts. Instead, the resolutions in WTW transfer power away from the people.[250] The transfer is apparent in the promotional materials surrounding the film. PBS's website asserts, "the film not will only leave viewers changed, it should have a galvanizing effect on the public and, most importantly on, our political leaders."[251] Although marketed to the general public, members of the public have a circumscribed role in the film's resolution discourse. They are situated as removed from the arenas in which key decisions are made, which are visualized in the film as the seats of political power: the US Department of State or the chambers of the Guatemalan legislature. By and large, they asked to transfer their power

to people in positions of privilege.[252] They primarily engage in genocide cessation efforts by exerting a form of indirect pressure through their elected officials.

Even this relatively weak form of engagement is undermined at other junctures in WTW given the little faith that film places in genocide cessation discourse. The film's earlier critiques of the limitations of words and lack of trust in the value of texts translate into diminished faith in rhetoric as a component of genocide cessation efforts. In an interview with a radio DJ, Goldhagen forthrightly states that the discourse of "'Never Again'" is "well-meant, but … a hollow phrase."[253] Goldhagen suggests that it is "a mockery of itself," contributing to the sense that words have little impact on atrocity prevention.[254] Although WTW's definition discourse bears traces of the 1948 UN Convention's definition of genocide, even legal discourse is disparaged. Goldhagen excoriates the UN's 1948 convention stating that "[t]he document is noble-sounding but totally ineffective. It has never once been invoked to prevent the death of a single person."[255] An even more pointed critique of discourse is conveyed through the notion of "screaming." Genocide cessation discourse is presented as so ineffective advocates need to "scream," and even once one is screaming the desired results are seldom achieved. Playing "devil's advocate," Goldhagen's publisher argues in one interview sequence, "[w]e've been screaming about these issues for a long time, and the leaders of the world haven't listened."[256] Spoken, written, or "screamed," discourse is cast as futile in the hands of the general public. In contrast to other texts which celebrate the efforts of discourse creators (see Chapter Four), WTW suggests words matter little in the face of such violent atrocity.

This enfeebled and passive position for viewers reflects the restricted constructions of authority Goldhagen relies on elsewhere in WTW. In bolstering his ethos Goldhagen constructs his authority to participate in genocide cessation work as contingent upon spatial and experiential proximity. These arguments value a form of unmediated access to the "real" depicted primarily through travel as well as familial ties to atrocity. Notably, both of these avenues for authoritatively engaging the subject disenfranchise numerous others from participating in genocide cessation efforts. Few can claim such proximity to atrocity through familial channels. Shy of expending the financial resources necessary to travel to these "somewhere elses," similar spatial proximity cannot be accessed. Ergo, the primary avenues for engaging in anti-genocide work have been foreclosed to many. Resultantly, viewers are left with the experience of consuming the documentary text as their primary recourse of action. As Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles suggest, documentaries like WTW may "have limited force" because the primary means of participating in the film's advocacy work is through the "'experience'" of watching the documentary.[257] In this way, the film's construction of authority constrains the resolutions it can proffer. Whereas constructions of authority shape future possibilities for action, they are also underwritten by a particularized understanding of the past and an exclusionary form of genocide memory.

(Post)Memory and Authority

WTW's attempts to define, represent, and resolve genocide are bolstered by arguments about the transmission of Holocaust memory. The arguments about Goldhagen's familial connection to the Holocaust are predicated less upon access to the event itself and more upon access to the *memory* of the event. As Young notes, "our

contemporary actual reality of the Holocaust…is not the event itself but [the] *memory* of the event."[258] More specifically, the framework for WTW centralizes Daniel Goldhagen's attempts to harness the potency of what Hirsch terms "postmemories" of the Shoah. In other words, Goldhagen's authority is contingent upon the legitimacy of mnemonic inheritance, a dubious construct in the eyes of some who question the idea that the survivor's authority over meaning-making is inherently transmitted to their children.

The concept of postmemory introduces a set of questions surrounding the transference of memories from Holocaust survivors to their progeny. Postmemory is Hirsch's term for the form of Holocaust memory that resides with members of the second generation, the children of survivors. Postmemory is a nebulous construct because it refers to the possession of a memory of an event one has never experienced.[259] As such, postmemory is not "recollection but…an imaginative investment and creation."[260] Numerous authors have attempted to puzzle through the complexities of postmemory by attending to its transmission and representation.[261] "At stake," in the study of postmemory, Hirsch argues, "is precisely the 'guardianship' of a traumatic personal and generational past with which some of us have a 'living connection' and that past's passing into history."[262] The use of the word "guardianship" implies both the rights of a possessor and the custodial power over that which is possessed, hinting at the power that comes from being the "owner" of Holocaust memories.

Questions regarding the transference of memory and the power of postmemory ground the film and undergird Goldhagen's exclusionary claims to authority. As I have underscored at multiple junctures throughout this chapter, WTW oscillates between a documentary and family genealogy. Although Goldhagen "grew up" with intimate

knowledge of the Holocaust,[263] numerous scenes in the film focus on the transmission of the elder Goldhagen's Holocaust memories to his son. Goldhagen punctuates the importance of this process by stressing the significance of his trip to his father's childhood home in Czernowtiz, Ukraine.[264] Similarly, the elder Goldhagen underscores the salience of this trip in rectifying his son's academic seclusion and distance from his family's past.[265]

The film's investment in postmemory and memory transference is underscored through the special feature at the end of the DVD. Goldhagen situates his travels to Czernowtiz as a family affair. He explains in the special feature that his wife and his son accompanied him to his father's childhood home. After noting his son's interest in the elder Goldhagen's Holocaust experience, Goldhagen remarks that to have "one of his grandchildren see where my father came from and where he suffered and where his family suffered" enhanced the meaningfulness of the trip.[266] By introducing his son Gideon, Goldhagen reinforces the genealogical elements in his work, and he foregrounds narratives related to the transference of memory. The trip to Czernowtiz not only advances the film's larger narrative about eliminationism, but it also functions as a pedagogical moment for his family as Daniel and Gideon establish intimate connections with Erich Goldhagen's Holocaust memories.

By tethering Goldhagen's authority to his postmemory of the Shoah, the film ensnares itself into larger debates connected to mnemonic transmission. Bauman's exploration of this phenomenon raises two sets of concerns. Bauman is critical of the idea that one can assume "the status of a 'victim by proxy'" or advance claims "of belonging to a *sui generis* 'aristocracy of victimhood' (… a *hereditary* claim to sympathy and to the

ethical indulgence owed to those who suffer)."[267] Put simply, he questions the ethics of

"*in blanco* certificate[s] of moral righteousness" that seemingly accompany just such a

transmission of Holocaust memory.[268] Bauman suggests that second generational

righteousness has the potential to be used to justify "whatever the offspring of the victims

do … [as] morally proper (or at least *ethically correct*) as long as it can be shown that it

was done in order to stave off the repetition of the lot visited on their ancestors."[269] The

problem raised here is that familial memories become the platform for shaping broader

political arguments. As demonstrated through Goldhagen's corpus of works, Goldhagen

is utilizing postmemories to make idiosyncratic meaning of his family's loss; he is

leveraging that loss to construct public arguments about the nature of genocide.[270] In so

doing, his postmemories become the vehicle for authorizing his atrocity definitions,

representations, and resolutions while limiting the broader exercise of public agency.

Alternative Approaches to Proximity

Goldhagen is an intriguing genocide cessation actor because of his unique

position at the nexus of scholarly and popular forms of Holocaust and genocide studies.

WTW reflects the tensions that inhere in such a precarious position as Goldhagen

fortifies his sense of authority while promoting "accessible" genocide cessation texts.

Ultimately, his efforts to construct the former undermine the latter. The film's treatment

of genocide definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances are laced with

arguments that tether authority to privileged forms of spatial and experiential access.

Those without such access are afforded limited roles in genocide cessation.

Consequently, Goldhagen excludes the popular audiences he is so often assumed to be

addressing from his anti-genocide advocacy.

WTW is predicated upon managing relations of proximity and distance. The film's employment of these constructs extends select ideological components introduced in HWE. Reflecting on the debates surrounding the representation of violence in Goldhagen's first book, Ash suggests that the text contains "ambivalent markers of immediacy and distance."[271] Likewise, Brenner observes Goldhagen's predilection for "oscillation between extremes of identification (for example, repetition-compulsion) and distanciation (for example, denial)."[272] Ultimately, Ash accentuates the potential afforded through the management of these spatial relations, charging that "both identification and its opposite, moral distancing, are useful means of teaching about the past."[273] Whereas the bulk of this chapter has examined the paradoxical implications of Goldhagen's claims of spatial and experiential proximity, these claims to authority also rely on troubling presumptions of distance, which preserve notions of US innocence while maintaining the conditions which allow for Western nation-states' disassociation from the politics of genocide.

First, the film's treatment of questions of proximity and distance contributes to the representation of genocide as a "foreign" phenomenon. In much the same way that Caplan notes that HWE positions Germany as foreign,[274] the sites of eliminationist violence are spatially located beyond the territorial boundaries of the United States. Quite literally, Goldhagen refers to these locales in the film as "somewhere elses," implying that genocidal violence is not something that happens "here." The film's travelogue elements reify this sense of distance as scenes of Goldhagen on a plane or in an airport suggest that places of genocidal violence are *places that are a plane ride away*. Moreover, these are locations that are an *international* flight away. After one flight

sequence, Goldhagen is shown retrieving his bags from the baggage claim while background signage reads "Welcome to Berlin." When such clear place-markers are absent, the film superimposes Goldhagen's location onto the screen. These practices help mark the sites of such violence as located outside of the US. The creation of this chasm between sites of eliminationist violence and Goldhagen's home country effaces the history of atrocities on US soil, including debates around the decimation of US indigenous populations. While Goldhagen may impugn the United States in the film for not taking action to prevent or intervene in genocides, the United States is nevertheless safeguarded from charges of inciting genocidal violence through such effacements and distancing. As such, WTW's construction of spatial relations bolsters perceptions of US innocence.

Second, the film's treatment of proximity/distance presumes that the US has no inherent relationship to the politics of genocides as they occur in these "distant" locales. In other words, the construction of distance in WTW erases the links post-liberal approaches to genocide cessation attempt to reveal between Western nation-states and sites of genocidal violence. To return to the discussion of causality contained in Chapter One, scholars such as Levene treat the historic ascendency of Western nation-states as one of the structuring conditions for genocidal violence. Beyond the violence such states directly orchestrated (indigenous slaughter, slavery, etc.) in certain locales, Western advancement results in asymmetric power relations and relations of dependency with wide reaching implications. Levene charges, "[n]owhere was entirely untouched by these trajectories" of Western development.[275] Yet, the rhetoric of *distance* contained in WTW disavows any causal relationship between the United States and sites of eliminationist

violence. Just as the sites of violence are positioned as *spatially* removed from the territorial boundaries of the United States, so too does the film's construction of distance imply that the United States is *politically* removed from the violence unfolding in these locales. From a post-liberal perspective, no distance exists between the affairs of Western nation-states and the politics of genocide.[276] According to such a causal philosophy, these states are already implicated in Goldhagen's eliminationist violence regardless of where such violence occurs, an implication that must remain exnominated in WTW.

The film's constructions of proximity and distance reflect one of the many ways WTW attempts to navigate its position on the cusp of academic and popular genocide cessation discourses. The incompatible arguments and inconsistences in genocide definitions, representations, and resolutions reflect the challenges of navigating this scholarly/popular terrain. Whereas WTW has an aura of sobriety due to its ties to the academy and use of the documentary form,[277] such gravitas is compromised by the blatant use of entertainment genres employed to attract visitors to the Los Angeles-based Museum of Tolerance (MOT) and draw their attention to its genocide cessation discourse.

<div align="center">Notes</div>

[1] "Introduction," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

Given that the book project and the DVD share a title, to avoid confusion in the citations, abbreviated citations will not be used in referencing the DVD. The citation information for the DVD will be given in full each time it is cited. Textual authentication of quoted evidence occurred through two avenues. Quotations were transcribed from the

DVD and then verified against a transcript PBS made available through their YouTube channel. "Genocide: Worse Than War | Full-length documentary | PBS," YouTube video plus transcript, 1:54:17, posted by PBS, June 4, 2010, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w7cZuhqSzzc.

[2] "Gaius Baltar," April 16, 2010, comment on "About Daniel Jonah Goldhagen," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/the-film/about-daniel-jonah-goldhagen/18/comment-page-1/.

[3] "Dan," July 7, 2011, comment on "About Daniel Jonah Goldhagen," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/the-film/about-daniel-jonah-goldhagen/18/comment-page-1/.

[4] "Molly," April 14, 2010, comment on "Watch *Worse Than War*," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/the-film/watch-worse-than-war/24/comment-page-1/.

[5] "Sky," April 14, 2010, comment on "Watch *Worse Than War*," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/the-film/watch-worse-than-war/24/comment-page-1/.

[6] These critiques of Goldhagen are explicated in the literature review to follow. See 236n21.

[7] Eliminationism is defined somewhat circuitously by "the desire to *eliminate* peoples or groups." Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Worse than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2009), 14.

[8] This content is also available on the DVD as a special feature: "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[9] One of these resources is the "Smallest Witnesses" program, a program I analyze in Chapter Four, see pages 402-404.

[10] "Get Involved," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/category/get-involved/.

[11] Postmemory, the memories that children of victims of trauma possess of the traumatic event, is a concept that emerges from the work of Marianne Hirsch. See Marianne Hirsch, "The Generation of Postmemory," *Poetics Today* 29, no. 1 (2008): 103-128; Marianne Hirsch, "Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile," *Poetics Today* 17, no. 4 (1996): 659-686.

[12] In articulating this argument, the connections between WTW and the political documentary, *Fahrenheit 9/11*, analyzed in Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles's work becomes most apparent. Both films ostensibly attempt to stimulate political activism, yet WTW ultimately leaves viewers resigned to the consumption of the film, which Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles argue, happens with Moore's film as well. See Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles, "*Fahrenheit 9/11*—Virtual Realism and the Limits of Commodified Dissent," in *The Rhetoric of the New Political Documentary*, ed. Thomas W. Benson and Brian J. Snee (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 24-53.

[13] Chris Lorenz, "Model Murderers: Afterthoughts on the Goldhagen Method and History," *Rethinking History* 6, no. 2 (2002): 146, 148n28. Lorenz credits this insight to Jeffery Herf and Manfred Hettlings.

[14] Adam Jones, "Review: Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity," *Journal of Genocide Research* 12, no. 3-4 (2010): 271.

[15] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 9.

[16] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners,* 9-14.

[17] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 11-12.

[18] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 9.

[19] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 14.

[20] As Moses writes, "the enthusiastic welcome of journalists and the public was as warm as the impatient dismissal of most historians was cool." A.D. Moses, "Structure and Agency in the Holocaust: Daniel J. Goldhagen and His Critics," *History and Theory* 37, no. 2 (1998): 194.

[21] Shandley's book offers a compilation of responses to Goldhagen's text. See Robert R. Shandley, *Unwilling Germans? The Goldhagen Debate*, trans. Jeremiah Riemer (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

Finkelstein and Birn's book contains their two essays challenging HWE's academic merits. Norman G. Finkelstein and Ruth Bettina Birn, *A Nation on Trial: The Goldhagen Thesis and Historical Truth* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1998).

See also Marouf Hasian Jr., and Robert E. Frank, "Rhetoric, History, and Collective Memory: Decoding the Goldhagen Debates," *Western Journal of Communication* 63, no. 1 (1999): 102-106. Carolyn J. Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy after the Holocaust* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 47-48.

[22] Raul Hilberg, "The Goldhagen Phenomenon," *Critical Inquiry* 23, no. 4 (1997): 725. See also Hasian and Frank, "Rhetoric, History," 102.

[23] Geoff Eley, "Ordinary Germans, Nazism, and Judeocide," in *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism – Facing the German Past*, ed. Geoff Eley (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000), 4. See also Hasian and Frank, "Rhetoric, History," 103.

[24] Omer Bartov, "Reception and Perception: Goldhagen's Holocaust and the World," in *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism – Facing the German Past*, ed. Geoff Eley (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000), 48.

[25] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 194.

[26] Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 33; Dirk Moses, "Book Review: Robert A. Shandley, ed., *Unwilling Germans? The Goldhagen Debate;* Geoff Eley, ed., *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism Facing the German Past;* D. D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust on Trial*," *The Journal of Modern History* 75, no. 4 (2003): 994.

[27] Lorenz, "Model Murderers;" Ulrich Herbert, "Academic and Public Discourses on the Holocaust: The Goldhagen Debate in Germany," *German Politics and Society* 17, no. 3 (1999): 35-54; Richard Kramer, "The Logic of the Goldhagen Debate," *Res Publica* 6, no. 2 (2000): 155-177.

[28] In offering their assessment of the controversy surrounding Goldhagen's work at the conclusion of their analysis Hasian and Frank suggest viewing the HWE contestations through the prism offered by the "recognition that elite and public forms of rhetoric stand in dialectical tension." Hasian and Frank, "Rhetoric, History," 106.

Newman and Bytwerk likewise elevate the tensions associated with expert ways of knowing in their exchange. Randall L. Bytwerk, "Is It Really That Simple? A Response to Goldhagen (and Newman)," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 425. Bytwerk argues that this is the reading of Goldhagen operating within Newman's work. See Robert P. Newman, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry Goldhagen: A Narrative of Guilt and Redemption," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 407-424.

[29] Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40-41.

[30] Bytwerk, "Is It Really," 425. Again, Bytwerk is responding to Newman's work. See Newman, "Sinners in the Hands."

[31] Jane Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception of Goldhagen in the United States," in *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism – Facing the German Past*, ed. Geoff Eley (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000), 154.

[32] Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception," 154.

[33] Such hints of anti-intellectualism are conveyed clearly by Newman's skeptical question: "A 'consensus' of certified, credentialed historians is going to tell those Germans who lived under Hitler, and tell their children and grandchildren, how those Germans should feel about what their countrymen did in 1933-45?" Newman, "Sinners in the Hands," 421.

By way of mocking Newman's logic, Bytwerk writes, "Is he really making the claim that the less people know about the subject, the better qualified they are to evaluate Goldhagen's argument? Is he also prepared to argue that we ought to doubt the wisdom of astronomers and physicists, given the fact that 45 percent of the American public purportedly believe in flying saucers and 25 percent in astrology?" Bytwerk, "Is It Really," 431.

See also Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40.

[34] Bytwerk, "Is It Really," 431. Again, Bytwerk is engaging Newman, "Sinners in the Hands."

Traces of this logic also come through in Brenner's work. In Brenner's words, Goldhagen "renders the American and German publics who have bought his book 'smarter' than the critics." David Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust Blockbuster: 'Schindler's List' and 'Hitler's Willing Executioners,' Globally and Locally," *Germanic Review* 75 (2000): 306.

[35] Hasian and Frank, "Rhetoric, History," 106-107.

[36] Hasian and Frank, "Rhetoric, History." See also Eley, "Ordinary Germans, Nazism," 24-25.

[37] Moses, "Book Review."

[38] This framework is not unique to Moses's work. As Moses notes, "This is a well-known division in the literature on Nazi Germany and the Holocaust." Moses, "Structure and Agency," 199.

[39] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 200.

[40] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 208.

[41] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 202.

[42] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 206.

[43] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 201. For a slightly different interpretation of this intellectual shift, see also Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 38-40.

[44] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 208.

[45] This intellectual history is explicated in Newman's work. Newman, "Sinners in the Hands."

[46] Such a reading of the two books is present in all of the following works: Bartov, "Reception and Perception;" Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception," 155-156; Eley, "Ordinary Germans, Nazism;" Moses, "Structure and Agency;" Newman, "Sinners in the Hands."

Although not using the ideological-intentionalist or structural-functionalist lens in this section, this Browning "versus" Goldhagen framework structures explanations of HWE in Jones's introductory genocide studies primer. See Adam Jones, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Routledge, 2011), 251-252.

[47] Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40; Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception;" "Moses, "Structure and Agency."

[48] Moses, "Structure and Agency."

[49] Mitchell G. Ash, "Review Essay: American and German Perspectives on the Goldhagen Debate: History, Identity, and the Media," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 11, no. 3 (1997): 400.

[50] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 217.

[51] Moses, "Structure and Agency." Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy*, 46.

[52] See the discussion of Novick's "Holocaust consciousness" contained in the Introduction on pages 7, 49n37.

[53] Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40.

[54] Bytwerk, "Is It Really," 426; Caplan, "Reflections on Reception," 159-160.

[55] This point is taken up more fully in Chapter Four. See pages 383, 440-442n43-45.

[56] Bytwerk, "Is It Really," 426; Caplan, "Reflections on Reception," 159-160.

[57] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 15. See also Caplan, "Reflections on Reception," 159.

[58] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 15. See also Caplan, "Reflections on Reception," 159.

[59] See also the discussion of what Moses terms the "post-liberal" approach featured in Chapter One, page 90.

[60] Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception," 159-160.

[61] Cieplak argues that the same level of controversy is unlikely because "it is simply not a good enough book to warrant such attention." Piotr A. Cieplak, "Mass Murder: A Matter of Choice?" *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, May 18, 2010, 56.

[62] David Rieff, "The Willing Misinterpreter," *National Interest*, November/December 2009, 88, 90.

[63] John Gray, "Killing in the Name," *New Statesman*, February 8, 2010, 44.

[64] Cieplak, "Mass Murder," 56.

[65] Jones, "Review," 272-273; Rieff, "The Willing Misinterpreter," 88, 91; James Traub**,** "Patterns of Genocide," review of *Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity*, by Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *New York Times Book Review*, October 15 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/18/books/review/Traub-t.html?_r=0.

[66] Uğur Ümit Üngör, "Team America: Genocide Prevention?" *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (2011): 37.

[67] Rieff, "The Willing Misinterpreter," 89-90.

[68] Cieplak, "Mass Murder," 56.

[69] Jones, "Review," 277; Rieff, "The Willing Misinterpreter," 87-88.

[70] Scott Nicholas Romaniuk, "Book Review: Worse Than War," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (2011): 109.

[71] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 400.

[72] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 400.

[73] Goldhagen, *Worse Than War*, 6.

[74] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[75] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[76] Goldhagen, *Worse Than War*, 14.

[77] In the film, Goldhagen does not expend much time or energy parsing out which of the featured acts are instances of eliminationism or the narrower concept of genocide. Most of his discussions of eliminationism are acts of genocide. While acknowledging his attempt at redefinition, I will continue to use the term genocide instead of eliminationism when appropriate.

[78] To the best of my knowledge, no one else is using this idea to describe genocide at the time of this writing; however, there are genocide-themed strategy games that literally envision genocide as a strategic game (i.e., Orc Genocide).

In this chapter, I adopt the stylistic markers used by Lakoff. Metaphor clusters are identified in small caps with the understanding that a variety of related metaphors inhere in the cluster. See George Lakoff, "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 209.

[79] Moses centralizes the importance of just such an agent in his review of the literature adopting ideological-intentionalist positions. See Moses, "Structure and Agency," 200.

Again, Bartov argues that part of HWE's appeal was that Goldhagen's framework allowed him to point out "who was guilty." Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40.

[80] Murray Edelman, *Constructing the Political Spectacle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 18.

[81] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

Notably, these remarks also literalize this metaphor cluster. See Rikka Kuusisto, "Heroic Tale, Game, and Business Deal? Western Metaphors in Action in Kosovo," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 1 (2002): 50-68.

[82] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[83] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[84] To borrow Goldhagen's remarks about Efraín Ríos Montt (an accused genocidaire in Guatemala), with these goals in mind, these leaders "considered [their] goals, [and] weighed [their] options." "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[85] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[86] See, for example, the discussions of intent in Totten and Kuper. Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 31-35; Samuel Totten, "To Deem or Not to Deem 'It' Genocide: A Double-Edged Sword," in *The Genocidal Temptation: Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Rwanda, and Beyond*, ed. Robert S. Frey (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), 43-44.

[87] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[88] See pages 213 for a longer discussion of this complicated sequence. "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[89] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[90] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[91] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[92] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

Affirming this view of genocidal atrocity, Alisa Muratćauš, "President, Association of Concentration Camp Survivors," holds that the perpetrators in Bosnia "knew everything. They prepare everything. It was really actually planned and systematic. Actually systematically planned." "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*,

directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[93] As Moses explains, ideological-intentionalism accentuates Nazi agency. Moses, "Structure and Agency," 200.

[94] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[95] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[96] As Moses writes, "*Hitler's Willing Executioners* is suffused with the language of preferences, choices, and constraints." Moses, "Structure and Agency," 210. See also Cieplak, "Mass Murder."

[97] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 210.

[98] UN General Assembly, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Resolution 260 (III), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session*, Part I (A/810), 174, http://www.un.org/documents/instruments/docs_en.asp?year=1969.

[99] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[100] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[101] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 400. Ash suggests that this helps in part explain the HWE's success: "This insistence on personal responsibility is surely laudable from a moral standpoint, and it is a central factor in the tremendous public success of this book."

[102] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[103] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[104] Goldhagen asserts, "When those harboring powerful hatreds finally are given the chance to kill, their euphoria is unmistakable." "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[105] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[106] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[107] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[108] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[109] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD. Goldhagen asks, "When people killed the victims did they try to kill them as painlessly as possible or did they try to make them suffer?"

[110] Quoting Goldhagen, "Here we're speaking now as two people trying to understand a very difficult set of circumstances: the ways in which victims were not just killed in, if we can call it, the least painful way, but were hacked to death, were tortured." "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[111] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[112] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[113] Lilli argues, "They managed for such a long time to keep ahead of the allies…Just to drag us…Just go in circles, actually. That's what was happening. They didn't know themselves what they were doing. They could have easily left us wherever we were and just disappear, and they didn't." Her remarks suggest that the Nazis continued to abuse the Jews through the death march at the expense of their own ability to elude the Allies, a fairly *irrational* course of action. "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[114] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[115] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[116] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[117] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[118] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[119] James Waller, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford, 2007), 20.

[120] Picart and Frank link the frameworks for understanding the Holocaust with competing frameworks for understanding the horror genre. Roughly, the classic horror frame corresponds with ideological-intentionalism; whereas, a conflicted horror frame corresponds with structural-functionalist approaches. With regard to the classic horror framework and the views of ideological-intentionalists, Picart and Frank argue such worldviews depend upon an "evil that is transgressive, beyond the ordinary." "[T]he monsters are portrayed as radically different;…they are essentially and irreducibly other."

Caroline Joan (Kay) S. Picart and David A. Frank, *Frames of Evil: The Holocaust as Horror in American Film* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006), 7.

[121] The graphic language in HWE has been a source of contestation. Dean aptly captures how the use of the term "pornography" to describe HWE masks a much larger debate over the role of empathy and morality in history. At issue, she suggests is "how to fashion a language at least capable of conveying the difficulty of disentangling moral numbness…and moral integrity." Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy*, 54. See also Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 304-305.

[122] Such critiques raise larger questions about the reader's relationship to violence, echoing concerns about the visual consumption of graphic material. See Tait and Taylor for an exploration of these subjectivities. Sue Tait, "Pornographies of Violence? Internet Spectatorship on Body Horror," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 1 (2008): 91-111; John Taylor, *Body Horror: Photojournalism, Catastrophe and War* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

[123] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 406, 410n24. See also Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 305, 309; Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy,* 47-56.

[124] Üngör, "Team America," 37.

[125] The travelogue as a genre for genocide representation has been treated elsewhere by Norridge as she argues that many Rwanda representations are travelogues in form. See Zoë Norridge, "Writing against Genocide: Genres of Opposition in Narratives from and about Rwanda," in *Postcolonial Poetics: Genre and Form*, ed. Patrick Crowley and Jane Hiddleston (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011), 240-261.

[126] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[127] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[128] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[129] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[130] See Keil on the complexities of treating visits to sites of Holocaust violence as pilgrimages. Chris Keil, "Sightseeing in the Mansions of the Dead," *Social & Cultural Geography* 6, no. 4 (2005): 479-94.

[131] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[132] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[133] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[134] Peter Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976), 12.

[135] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[136] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[137] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[138] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[139] Rieff, "The Willing Misinterpreter," 88, 90. Üngör, "Team America," 37. See also Romaniuk's remarks cited above. Romaniuk, "Book Review," 109.

[140] Üngör, "Team America," 37.

[141] Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 309; Josef Joffe, "'The Killers Were Ordinary Germans, ergo the Ordinary Germans Were Killers': The Logic, the Language, and the Meaning of a Book that Conquered Germany," in *Unwilling Germans? The Goldhagen Debate*, ed. Robert R. Shandley, trans. Jeremiah Riemer (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 225.

See Eley's discussion of the challenge this creates to the idea of complicity. Eley, "Ordinary Germans, Nazism," 11-12.

[142] Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception," 158.

[143] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 405.

[144] Moses, "Structure and Agency," 200, 206.

[145] "Introduction," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[146] Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press, 1973), 30-31.

[147] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self*, 30. [emphasis in the original]

[148] For more on the performance of academic discourse, see Alyssa A. Samek and Theresa A. Donofrio, "'Academic Drag' and the Performance of the Critical Personae: An Exchange on Sexuality, Politics, and Identity in the Academy," *Women's Studies in Communication* 36, no. 1 (2013): 28-55.

[149] Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 41; David Schoenbaum, "Ordinary People?" *National Review*, July 1, 1996, 54. See also Caplan, "Reflections on Reception," 158.

Similarly, Bytwerk writes, "To the ordinary reader, those 474 pages of text and 130 pages of endnotes look persuasive." Bytwerk, "Is It Really," 432.

[150] "About the Film," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/the-film/about-the-film/17/.

[151] Notably this footage melds with a literal travel sequence. His journey is metaphorical and literal. "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[152] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[153] To quote Goldhagen in full: "There's no doubt that my father influenced my initial direction of working on the Holocaust, but it's less because he was a survivor than he was a professor who studied this, and I grew up with this material in my home always with the purpose not of telling a tale of woe, which it is, but of understanding and explaining. This was always my orientation from the time I can remember knowing or thinking about it or discussing it." "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[154] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 13, 375-401.

[155] Cieplak writes that Goldhagen positions "his subjective and often ideologically problematic opinions…as universal historical truths." Cieplak, "Mass Murder." See also Bartov on Goldhagen as the voice of "'simple truth.'" Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40-41.

[156] For more on the documentary form's historical associations with notions of realism and objectivity see Cara A. Finnegan, "Documentary as Art in *U.S. Camera*," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (2001): 43-44. Finnegan grounds her work in larger shifts in cultural values, which set the conditions for the documentary form's popularity. See Miles Orvell, *The Real Thing: Imitation and Authenticity in American Culture, 1880-1940* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989); William Stott,

Documentary Expression and Thirties America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

[157] Leshu Torchin, *Creating the Witness: Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the Internet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 73.

[158] Helene A. Shugart, "An Appropriating Aesthetic: Reproducing Power in the Discourse of Critical Scholarship," *Communication Theory* 13, no. 3 (2003): 281. Shugart's critique is targeted at the work of communication academics; nevertheless, her remarks about the form of writing seem apt here.

[159] Here again Goldhagen's conduct exists in marked contrast with the presumed neutrality or distance of the historian or scholar. See again, Dean's analysis of Goldhagen's emotionalism, identification, and tone. Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy*, 47, 53.

[160] Moses, "Book Review," 995. Moses is developing a possible interpretation gestured to in Markovits's writing. Andrei S. Markovits, "Discomposure in History's Final Resting Place," in *Unwilling Germans? The Goldhagen Debate*, ed. Robert R. Shandley, trans. Jeremiah Riemer (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 122. See also Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy*, 55.

[161] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[162] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[163] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[164] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[165] For a contrasting opinion on the emotional weight of these studies, see Jones, *Genocide*, xxvi-xxvii, xxxn4.

[166] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[167] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[168] See pages 102-103. Of course, other critics have raised questions about Holocaust and genocide victims' authority. Moses, "Book Review," 999; A. Dirk Moses, "Conceptual Blockages and Definitional Dilemmas in the 'Racial Century': Genocides of Indigenous Peoples and the Holocaust," in *Colonialism and Genocide,* edited by A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone (London: Routledge, 2007), 151. See also Zygmunt Bauman, "The Holocaust Life's as a Ghost," *Tikkun* 13, no. 4 (1998): 33-38.

[169] Theresa A. Donofrio, "Ground Zero and Place-Making Authority: The Conservative Metaphors in 9/11 Families' 'Take Back the Memorial' Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 2 (2010):150-169. See also John W. Jordan,

"Transcending Hollywood: The Referendum on United 93 as Cinematic Memorial,"

Critical Studies in Media Communication 25, no. 2 (2008): 196-223.

[170] Donofrio, "Ground Zero," 164.

[171] Donofrio, "Ground Zero," 164.

[172] Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (New York: Plume, 1994), 7. See also Stein's study of the usage of that authority. Arlene Stein, "Whose Memories? Whose Victimhood? Contests for the Holocaust Frame in Recent Social Movement Discourse," *Sociological Perspectives* 41, no. 3 (1998): 527-528.

[173] Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40. Bartov suggests that the combination of his Harvard pedigree and status as a member of the second generation endowed his claims in HWE with additional authority.

[174] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[175] The power of genocidaires' speech is showcased most powerfully through crowd sequences. The crowd functions enthymematically to suggest the persuasive potency of the genocidaire. Hitler is shown addressing the assembled crowds. An extended sequence in Bosnia trains the camera on the throngs of people assembled to see Milosevic. Quite in contrast to the individualization of the genocidal leaders, the crowd appears as a pulsing, undifferentiated mass. They flood the rally site, taxing the guards assembled to keep them back. They chant and clap and fill balconies to find space to watch the event. Images of crowds are images of audiences seamlessly imbibing the

words of their leaders, which implies in turn the power of the genocidal leader's speech. See for example, "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

The power of perpetrator speech is also taken up explicitly in the book version of *Worse Than War*. See Goldhagen, *Worse Than War*, 309-359.

[176] "Learning from History," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[177] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[178] See 242n65.

[179] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self*, 22.

[180] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[181] "Learning from History," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[182] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[183] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[184] Mitchell Stephens, *The Rise of the Image the Fall of the Word* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 61-62. On indexicality, see Paul Messaris, *Visual Persuasion: The Role of Images in Advertising* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 129-142.

[185] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[186] Stephens, *The Rise*, 62. For more on the affective power of photography (and specifically iconic images), see Robert Hariman and John Louis Lucaites, *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 35-36.

[187] To be fair to Goldhagen, he also notes that their words and testimony made a similar impact. Quoting Goldhagen: "Well, the faces of the people I spoke with and their words are with me in the way that the testimony in documents and court testimony and so on never are with me." Nevertheless, such a remark corroborates Goldhagen's derision of academic ways of knowing.

"Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[188] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[189] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[190] Stephens, *The Rise*, 61-62.

[191] "A Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[192] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[193] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[194] "Introduction," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[195] For more on mediated practices of decontextualization and recontextualization, see Shawn J. Parry-Giles, "Mediating Hillary Rodham Clinton: Television News Practices and Image-Making in the Postmodern Age," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 2 (2000): 205-226.

[196] The quotation here harkens back to my use of Assmann's work in Chapter One to discuss the ways Holocaust memories, specifically, have become disconnected from their historical contexts and "readily associated with all kinds of manifestations of moral evil." Aleida Assmann, "The Holocaust – a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community," in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 114.

[197] Moreover, the ethics of the film are open to critique not only on the basis of the potentially irresponsible use of images, but because such decontextualized imagery works to strip the represented victims of their agency. The shot of the crying (presumed) rape victims seems especially poised to corroborate Hesford's arguments about the ways such representation invites reads of the depicted individual as powerless, as victims lacking any agency. Wendy S. Hesford, "Documenting Violations: Rhetorical Witnessing and the Spectacle of Distant Suffering," *Biography* 27, no. 1 (2004): 104-144; Wendy S. Hesford, "Media Review: Rhetorical Memory, Political Theater, and the Traumatic Present," *Transformations* XVI, no 2 (2005): 104-117.

[198] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[199] In Chapter Four, I discuss documentary in more depth. Eric S. Jenkins, "Seeing Katrina: Perspectives of Judgment in a Cultural/Natural Disaster," *Visual Communication Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (2007): 94; John Taylor, "Iraqi Torture Photographs

and Documentary Realism in the Press," *Journalism Studies* 6, no. 1 (2005): 39-49. See pages 396-397, 453n94-99.

[200] Indeed, realism is always a textual construction, as Hall argues, "Naturalism and 'realism' – the apparent fidelity of the representation to the thing or concept represented – is the result, the effect, of a certain specific articulation of language on the 'real.' It is the result of discursive practice." Stuart Hall, "Encoding/Decoding" in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed. (1980; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2006), 167.

[201] Finkelstein and Birn issue critiques of Goldhagen's academic integrity in their text. Finkelstein and Birn, *A Nation on Trial*. See also Michael Brennan, "Some Sociological Contemplations on Daniel J. Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*," *Theory, Culture & Society* 18, no. 4 (2001): 98, 100, 106n17.

[202] Susan A. Crane, "Choosing Not to Look: Representation, Repatriation, and Holocaust Atrocity Photography," *History and Theory* 47 (October 2008): 324.

[203] To return to the above discussion of HWE, this credibility or the perception of Goldhagen's ethos is of the upmost import given that scholars such as Bartov have argued that Goldhagen capitalizes on that ethos (his Harvard background, his second generation status, etc.) to promote his work. See Bartov, "Reception and Perception," 40.

[204] Regarding Holocaust photography, Zelizer writes, "[D]eniers' apparent interest in photographic documentation generates questions about the original loosening of the photograph's referentiality. It may be that the thrust to use the photograph as symbol, set in place at the time of liberation, over time deprived the atrocity photos of too much of their referential data, facilitating the deniers' claims." Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to*

Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 200.

Given Crane's concerns about the abuse of Holocaust images, Crane highlights and applauds Zelizer's analysis as well as the work done by Janina Struk on the same subject. Crane, "Choosing Not to Look," 325n46. See Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*; Janina Struk, *Photographing the Holocaust: Interpretations of the Evidence* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004).

For more on fears linked to creative license, see Chapter One pages 103-104.

[205] In this way, the film capitalizes on the power and credence lent to those who can claim "experience" without recognizing that the understanding of "experience" is constructed through discourse. See Joan W. Scott, "'Experience,'" in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (New York: Routledge, 1992), 22-40.

[206] "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[207] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[208] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[209] "Learning from History," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[210] "A Lack of Will," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[211] "Cruelty," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[212] "A Lack of Will," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD. [emphasis mine]

[213] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD. [emphasis mine]

[214] "Introduction," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD. [emphasis mine]

[215] Barbie Zelizer, *Covering the Body: The Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 135.

[216] See Kenneth E. Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*, 2nd ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003).

[217] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[218] "Failure to See Humanity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[219] For more on the history of iconophobia, see Jean Baudrillard, "The Precession of Simulacra," in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed. (1994; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 453-481; Cara A. Finnegan and Jiyeon Kang, "'Sighting' the Public: Iconoclasm and Public Sphere Theory," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 4 (2004): 377-402; Maria Elizabeth Grabe and Erik Page Bucy, *Image Bite Politics: News and the Visual Framing of Elections* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Stephens, *The Rise*.

[220] John Hartley, *The Politics of Pictures: The Creation of the Public in the Age of Popular Media* (London: Routledge, 1992), 2.

[221] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[222] Intriguingly, these stereotypical roles for academics also inform the Museum of Tolerance, the text to be explored in Chapter Three. Luke discusses the ways the MOT's representation practices capitalize on "scholastic authenticity" while simultaneously, "mock[ing] the pursuits of intellect and imagination as the dronelike labor of gray people in dowdy clothes and crummy offices." Timothy W. Luke, *Museum*

Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002), 52.

[223] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[224] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[225] "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[226] Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception," 161.

[227] These claims to authority are rooted in a particular understanding of memory, a claim I take up more thoroughly on pages 227-230 in this chapter.

[228] More specifically here I am referring to the debates surrounding the uniqueness thesis. See discussion of the uniqueness thesis on pages 15-18 in the Introduction. See also Rothberg on exclusion and memory. Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009).

[229] Shugart, "An Appropriating Aesthetic."

[230] Though employed in a different context (Goldhagen's responses to the controversies surrounding HWE), Brenner describes Goldhagen as a "privileged interpreter." Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 305.

[231] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[232] "Learning from History," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[233] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[234] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[235] "A Lack of Will," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[236] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[237] Poll featured on "Worse Than War" homepage, PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/.

[238] Poll featured on "Worse Than War" homepage, PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/.

[239] Screen shots of these poll results are on file with the author.

[240] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[241] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[242] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[243] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[244] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[245] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[246] Üngör, "Team America," 37.

[247] Rieff, "The Willing Misinterpreter," 96; Üngör, "Team America," 37.

[248] Of course, the *illegibility* of the situation in Rwanda was largely cited as a reason to justify the lack of intervention while the atrocities were taking place. Alan J. Kuperman, "Rwanda in Retrospect," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000, 101-103; David Rieff, "An Age of Genocide: The Far Reaching Lessons of Rwanda," *The New Republic*, January 29, 1996, 32-33.

[249] "Back to the Drawing Board," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[250] Herein, WTW adopts a similar strategy toward popular power as the Museum of Tolerance, the subject of Chapter Three. Both texts evince distrust of their viewers or visitors. See Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 142; Susan Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation: The Role of the Body in Holocaust Pedagogy," in *Impossible Images: Contemporary Art after the Holocaust*, ed. Shelley Hornstein, Laura Levitt, and Laurence J. Silberstein (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 245-259.

[251] "About the Film," PBS, accessed July 9, 2013, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/worse-than-war/the-film/about-the-film/17/.

[252] There is a rare moment in the film where Goldhagen recognizes a role for individual agency by emphasizing the need for "ordinary people" alongside "political leaders" "to make different choices." "Genocide: A Choice," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[253] "Learning from History," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[254] "Learning from History," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[255] "A Lack of Will," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[256] "Impunity," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[257] Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles, "*Fahrenheit 9/11*," 27.

[258] James E. Young, "America's Holocaust: Memory and the Politics of Identity," in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed. Hilenen Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 77.

[259] In this way postmemory bears some familiarity to Landsberg's concept of prosthetic memories. See Alison Landsberg, "America, the Holocaust, and the Mass Culture of Memory: Toward a Radical Politics of Empathy," *New German Critique* 71 (1997): 63-86. Hirsch is cognizant of these similarities. Hirsch, "The Generation of Postmemory," 105.

[260] Hirsch, "Past Lives," 659. Explaining the construct, Hirsch writes, "Postmemory describes the relationship that the generation after those who witnessed cultural or collective trauma bears to the experiences of those who came before, experiences that they 'remember' only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew up. But these experiences were transmitted to them so deeply and affectively as to *seem* to constitute memories in their own right." See Hirsch, "The Generation of Postmemory," 106-107.

[261] Hirsch elevates questions of the invention needed to construct such memories and the threat of such memories occluding the memories of the members of the second

generation. Hoffman's work, *After Such Knowledge*, explores the process of such transfer and the memories that the second generation acquire from their parents. Young's *At Memory's Edge* grapples with the complex of second generation artists as they attempt to visualize Holocaust memories. Hirsch, "The Generation of Postmemory;" Eva Hoffman, *After Such Knowledge: Memory, History, and the Legacy of the Holocaust* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2004); James E. Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

[262] Hirsch, "The Generation of Postmemory," 104. By raising questions of guardianship, Hirsch is referencing Hoffman's work. See Hoffman, *After Such Knowledge*.

[263] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[264] WTW includes a scene of the Goldhagens discussing their plans to return to Czernowtiz. Daniel Goldhagen suggests that he has worked with this mother to help convince his father to go, in spite of his father's "natural reluctance." In this sequence, Erich Goldhagen remarks that his wife "believes that the past has to be preserved and remembered." The exchange in this scene further reinforces the importance of the trip to Daniel Goldhagen and the importance of postmemory more broadly. "A Leader's Decision," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[265] "Eliminationism," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[266] "Daniel Johan Goldhagen on the Making of *Worse than War*," *Worse Than War*, directed by Mike Dewitt (Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: JTN productions and WNET.ORG Properties L.L.C., 2009), DVD.

[267] Bauman, "The Holocaust Life's," 35-36.

[268] Bauman, "The Holocaust Life's," 36.

[269] Bauman, "The Holocaust Life's," 36.

[270] Herein Goldhagen's strategies resemble the problematic implications of the authority claims made by family members of 9/11 victims. Donofrio, "Ground Zero," 164.

[271] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 406, 410n24. See also Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 305.

[272] Brenner, "Working Through the Holocaust," 305.

[273] Ash, "American and German Perspectives," 400. Ash suggests that the utility of the dual employment of intimacy/distance can be observed through the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, a text given fuller treatment in Chapter Four. Again, issues of intimacy/distance also lie at the heart of Dean's work. Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy*.

[274] Caplan, "Reflections on the Reception."

[275] Mark Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation-State*, vol. 1, *The Meaning of Genocide* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 11.

[276] See the discussion of the "post-liberal" approach in Chapter One, page 90. Moses, "Conceptual Blockages," 162.

[277] Nichols writes, "Documentary film has a kinship with…other nonfictional systems," within which we can include the academy, "that together make up what we may call the discourses of sobriety." He claims, "Discourses of sobriety are sobering because they regard their relation to the real as direct, immediate, transparent." Bill Nichols, *Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 3-4. See also Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 73.

CHAPTER THREE:
The Glorification of State Authority and the Problematic Politics of Security within
the Museum of Tolerance

In 2002, the popular television show *South Park* aired an episode titled "The

Death Camp of Tolerance." In this episode, famous *South Park* residents Cartman, Stan,

Kyle, and Butters are sent to visit the Los Angeles-based Museum of Tolerance (MOT)

after being accused of discriminating against their openly gay teacher. At the start of the

episode, viewers are introduced to a caricatured representation of the MOT as the

students and their parents tour the institution. A chipper guide wearing a Star of David

greets the group at the museum and explains the institution's mission: "Here we try to

educate you on the dynamics of racism and prejudice in America." The students enter

their first exhibit, the "tunnel of prejudice," a darkened chamber simulating "what it can

feel like to be discriminated against." Ethnic slurs are shouted at the students as they

pass through the tunnel. The students then enter the "hall of stereotypes [where]… wax

figures represent how some intolerant people have labeled minorities." Among the

figures featured in the hall, the group encounters an African-American man shown eating

watermelon and fried chicken with a pistol tucked into his pants, a representation of an

Arab man brandishing a weapon, "an Asian man with a calculator," "a covetous Jew"

shown with a bag of money, and a "sleepy Mexican," who turns out not to be a wax

figure at all but a janitor that had paused for a nap.[1]

Upon exiting the hall of stereotypes, the students learn more about the nature of

tolerance. In essence the guide's definition of tolerance is constructed as withholding

criticism. Cartman's weight is highlighted as an example; his obesity is equated with

making "a different life choice" while the guide condones his decision to eat as many

"cookies and cakes and pies" as he likes. At the conclusion of their tour the guide

reminds the students that "we have to accept people for who they are and what they like

to do." Yet, seconds later, the guide spots a smoker near the front the museum and

becomes outraged over his behavior. As the group yells at the man to move, they hurl

derogatory epithets, condemning him as a "filthy smoker" with "dirty lungs" and "stupid

tar breath." In little time, the limits of tolerance discourse become readily apparent.[2]

As the object of satire, *South Park*'s representation of the MOT punctuates

problematic aspects of the institution's work to define, represent, and resolve social

problems. At the definitional level, the episode highlights the institution's sophomoric

conceptions of the origins of public problems. The tour guide's lessons and questions

(i.e., "Now, did you know that words we use can show intolerance?"[3]) are so rudimentary

as to barely warrant discussion let alone museum exhibitions. At the representational

level, the episode suggests that the institution propagates rather than eliminates

stereotypes and violent forms of discourse. As Cartman goes through the "tunnel of

prejudice," he visibly enjoys the experience of hearing these offensive phrases and asks

to "ride again" after he emerges on the other side. The students glean new insults to use

on each other and commit to remembering some of the phrases they have heard for later

usage.[4] Finally, the incident with the smoker at the end of segment demonstrates the

contradictions in museum messaging. Tolerance discourse clearly has its boundaries as

there are individuals and issues excluded from that which society must tolerate.[5]

Although the episode offers a caricaturized version of the MOT, it highlights contentious

aspects of the institution long decried by its critics.

The ambitious scope and structure of an institution devoted to "tolerance" make the MOT a unique example of US genocide cessation discourse. Unlike the other two texts examined in this study, the MOT does not foreground ending genocide as a major part of its vision statement. Under the auspices of eradicating the roots of public problems ranging in severity from high school bullying to the Holocaust, genocide is just one of many social ills the institution addresses. Whereas both the Tolerancenter and the Holocaust portion of the MOT have been studied extensively, the MOT's configurations of genocide tend to be overlooked.[6] Despite the limited space expressly devoted to imparting messages about genocide and genocide cessation within the MOT, analysis of the institution provides an opportunity to study the interconnections among various forms of atrocity. By situating genocide amid a host of public problems, the MOT invites a comparative assessment of violent acts, which raises broad questions about the links among state authority, the public agency, and the execution or cessation of genocidal atrocities.

Although the institution's breadth creates the opportunity to probe the complexities of the relationships among power, violence, and the nation-state, such breadth also intensifies the anxieties at the core of this study, manifesting in inconsistencies across the institution's attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide. Rather than sublimate such anxieties as demonstrated in Chapter Two, the institution cultivates an anxious affect, capitalizing on a sense of fear introduced through the use of the horror genre. In lieu of a more robust definitional discourse, the construct of genocide takes shape through the use of multiple generic frameworks, chiefly horror, melodrama, and motivational discourses. The sense of uneasiness

introduced through horror conventions extends into a sense of suspicion as the MOT

marks the discursive environment its visitors inhabit as dangerous. In turn, these subtle

messages about lurking dangers feed the institution's resolution discourses by

undergirding calls for state-based security solutions.[7] Remembrance discourses reify this

elevation of the nation-state. They do so by constructing a "temporal folding" that

accentuates a sense of past, present, and future threat even as such messages create

unease over state power and the politics of genocide and genocide cessation.[8]

After exploring existing criticisms of the museum, this chapter examines the

strategies utilized by the MOT to supplement its abstract definitional discourses through

the use of horror, melodrama, and self-help or motivational generic conventions. Genres,

of course, contribute to both the definition of genocide as well as its representation; thus,

the ensuing section examines the MOT's focused engagement with representation issues

through its emphasis on the importance of communication processes and technologies.

The third section probes the interconnections between the MOT's approach to

communication and communication technologies and their proffered resolutions to

genocide, revealing inherent contradictions in their stance on atrocity prevention. The

final section on genocide memory suggests that the institution's constructions of

temporality reify the importance of state authority in spite of the complications the

validation of the security state creates.

A Critical Chorus: Extant Criticisms of the MOT

As its own promotional materials stress, the MOT "'is no Ordinary Museum.'"[9] In

marked contrast to what museum organizers term "ordinary museum[s] of artifacts and

documents,"[10] the MOT punctuates the extent to which it constructs a multi-media,

interactive experience for visitors.[11] In the MOT's words, the institution "is a human rights laboratory and educational center."[12] And its stated pedagogical aims are ambitious, particularly in its aim to encourage Holocaust understanding and "confront all forms of prejudice and discrimination in our world today."[13] Offering a pronounced message of empowerment, the MOT seeks to "challenge people of all backgrounds to confront their most closely-held assumptions and assume responsibility for change."[14]

The institution attracts a diverse audience. In addition to its appeals to Los Angeles tourists, the MOT makes a special effort to reach out to youth.[15] The MOT casts itself as responding to "a new generation of young people … beginning to question whether or not the Holocaust ever happened."[16] Indeed, the MOT is given ample opportunity to address youths, claiming that 130,000 students pass through its doors annually.[17] To facilitate and encourage youth attendance, the MOT offers grant funding to offset travel expenses for educators planning school trips from the Los Angeles and San Diego school systems.[18]

Beyond its targeting of youths, the MOT also markets itself to professional communities. Through programming related to its "Tools for Tolerance,[®]" for example, the MOT engages in professional development and training, advertising itself as "hav[ing] served over 160,000 professionals including judges, lawyers, managers, scientists, nurses, librarians, teachers, police officers, doctors, human resources specialists, corporate executives, and many more."[19] Among its clients, the MOT lists the Boston Police Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, Sony Pictures Entertainment, the United States Attorney's Office, and Wells Fargo.[20] In other words, far from "merely" a children's learning center, the MOT casts itself as an important voice

in educating professionals about values of justice, tolerance, and diversity, [21] In the institution's words, the MOT "challenge[s] participants to redefine professional roles in an increasingly complex and diverse world."[22]

The museum works toward fulfilling these lofty objectives through its use of a variety of mixed media, interactive exhibitions. The ground floor of the institution hosts the bulk of the MOT's promoted content. It is typically discussed as organized into a "Tolerancenter" and Holocaust exhibition. The Holocaust portion of the MOT consists of a seventy minute "sound-and-light guided" narrative that spatially moves visitors through selected moments in Holocaust history,[23] including a recreated street scene in 1930s Germany, a "mock" Warsaw ghetto, and even a simulated "selection" at the gates of Auschwitz. Nearby, the Tolerancenter addresses a wide range of topics through interactive media consoles. Its contents include a constructed "Point of View" diner where visitors have the opportunity to watch videos about issues ranging from drunk driving to hate speech. The consoles in front of each visitor at the diner enable them to interview the central characters in the video as well as to respond to polls about their lived experiences with the topic under discussion. In addition to the Point of View diner, the Tolerancenter features videos on contemporary genocide and the civil rights movement, an interactive timeline spotlighting US human rights struggles, and computer stations which call visitors' attention to the prevalence of hate speech on the Internet.

In the twenty years the institution has been open to the public, much has been said about the Museum of Tolerance and its exhibitions, and much of the academic critique of the institution is fairly negative.[24] Although the MOT has been studied from a variety of different angles, these critiques tend to center on three lines of argument. These

arguments are not mutually exclusive nor are they distinct forms of critiques; rather, they tend to inform one another, often culminating in a multi-tiered declamation of the MOT's inadequacies. These lines of argument accentuate: (1) the limitations of the MOT's substantial use of multi-media and simulation, (2) the MOT's reductive explanations of social problems, and (3) the MOT's heavy-hand in meaning-making.[25]

1) MOT as Hyperreal Spectacle

MOT exists in Hollywood's backyard and distinguishes itself from other museums in large part based upon its embrace of television and other forms of interactive media;[26] many critics of the MOT consequently interrogate the implications of its hyper-mediated exhibition displays, expressing concerns about "truth," "reality," and affective manipulation.[27] Contextually, the MOT is linked both to Los Angeles tourism and the "aura" of Hollywood productions. Located near Rodeo Drive and Beverly Hills, the MOT is marketed as a tourist destination.[28] With promotional materials encouraging potential visitors to "take a vacation from your vacation,"[29] the MOT in part pitches itself as yet another tourist attraction, worthy of visitors' time, energy, and money. To quote its brochure:

> In the hyper-competitive world of Los Angeles tourist sights and
> attractions, the Museum of Tolerance is something of a miracle. Without
> the easy lure of thrill rides or blockbuster art, the MOT has been garnering
> rave reviews and record attendance for powerful interactive exhibits on the
> Holocaust and highly charged subjects such as Human Rights, Diversity,
> Intolerance, and Immigration and Family….Explore, discover and

experience. We promise you, it will be one of the most meaningful and, yes, entertaining days of your life.[30]

Acknowledging its competition (which includes popular destinations like Disneyland, the Hollywood Walk of Fame, and the Chinese Theatre), the MOT does not try to work against the entertainment-oriented tourist logics; rather, it uses such logics to usher visitors through its doors. Regardless of whether or not visitors to the MOT frequent these other sites, such famed L.A. destinations and the mindset of "entertainmentality" constitute the "experiential landscape" within which visitors approach and understand the MOT.[31]

In addition to its geographical proximity to major Hollywood studios, the institution bears traces of Hollywood's influence. Norden describes Rabbi Hier, the founder of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, as "enlist[ing] the friends, Jewish and non-Jewish, whom he made in the entertainment business" to support the construction of the current MOT.[32] As a result, "[c]oncern was therefore expressed that … [the MOT] would be too show-biz…"[33] Such concerns were likely not allayed by having Hollywood superstar Arnold Schwarzenegger offer his remarks at the museum's opening nor by the homage paid to Hollywood inside the MOT.[34] The "Finding Our Families, Finding Ourselves" exhibition, for example, capitalizes on the MOT's access to celebrity stories by featuring narratives spotlighting "poet, best-selling author, historian and educator Dr. Maya Angelou; award-winning actor, comedian and director Billy Crystal; multiple Grammy winner and Rock and Roll Hall of Famer Carlos Santana; and National League MVP and former Manager of the four-time World Series Champions, the New York Yankees, Joe Torre."[35] Elsewhere, the "Millennium Machine" exhibit borrows from an

entertainment genre using a quiz show format to ask questions of visitors about social issues such as child labor or refugee issues.[36]

The associative links between "Hollywood," "spectacle," and the MOT give many critics pause. Among the many problems of embracing Hollywood's aura, the MOT risks exploiting the suffering of others as entertainment fare, thusly corroborating critiques advanced by Rothe and others about contemporary media culture's willingness to "sell" trauma, pain, and anguish.[37] Further, others argue that the demand to attract visitors or viewers severely constrains these Holocaust or genocide studies representations.[38] Tasked with showing brutal atrocities and violence on a terrifying scale while also attempting to draw audiences, the texts invariably offer sanitized narratives that gloss over the most disturbing aspects of atrocities.[39]

In addition to the questionable ethics of casting the MOT's content through the prism of "entertainment," critiques of the MOT as spectacle draw attention to the concerns around the MOT's use of "simulation." Because of the MOT's representation choices, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett suggests the MOT "is already walking a fine line by using dramatic recreations to tell the story of the Holocaust,"[40] tapping into longstanding fears about the use of fiction and creative license in the depiction of the Shoah.[41] Developing this critique, Lisus and Ericson discuss the MOT's mediated exhibitions as hyperreal, where "the real – or rather those things that define the real, namely memory and history – collapses, in degrees into the fantastic, the fictional, the unreal" within the MOT's doors.[42]

Finally, the MOT's connections to "entertainmentality" lead to critiques of the institution as capitalizing on affect. Given the institution's staged recreations, the MOT

sells visitors on an *experience*,[43] and in particular, an affective experience.[44] Critical of such an approach, Witcomb and others argue that the institution works to prioritize sentiment over historical contextualization and political action,[45] "making for an unreflective emotionality rather than understanding."[46] Lisus and Ericson discuss the MOT as a multi-media "emotion factory,"[47] and Bartov goes so far as to assert that the MOT ironically embraces the same form of emotional manipulation that it lambastes the Nazis for using.[48] "[B]y privileging pathos over knowledge,"[49] Bartov charges that the institution reduces the space for visitors to create and advance resistant or alternative readings. As a result, Lisus and Ericson argue that "[t]he aesthetics of emotion [deployed within the context of the MOT] become the aesthetics of control,"[50] foreshadowing an argument which feeds prominently into subsequent critiques offered by Brown, Patraka, and others.[51]

2) Violence as an Interpersonal Problem

　　Some have noted that the emphasis on Hollywood-style production values produced an exhibit where "history" and "politics" are lost within the MOT's reduction of violence to an interpersonal problem.[52] Lisus and Ericson suggest that this may be a problem of the MOT's overuse of television, which has long been critiqued for its inability to capture the complexity of systemic political problems.[53] Others have argued that the institution is thoroughly presentist in its temporal orientation.[54] As a result, its displays are bereft of the historical context needed to add sufficient depth to its narratives.[55] Articulating a biting criticism of the MOT's ahistoricism and superficiality, Stier contends that "tradition and memory are largely ignored [within the institution],

pushed to the sidelines in favor of a multimedia spectacle that ultimately fails to mediate much of anything."[56]

In addition to critiques of the MOT's ahistoricism, others argue that the institution offers overly simplistic explanations of political problems. Complex social issues are reduced to interpersonal issues and treated as having their genesis in prejudicial thoughts and behaviors. As Rabinbach asserts, "the Tolerance Museum promiscuously regards intolerance as the single root from which any manifest social evil, from human rights abuses, inequality and AIDS to racism and, ultimately, ethnic genocide could sprout."[57] By casting prejudice and intolerance as the origins of serious social problems, the institution elides the "present political and socio-economic conditions" that Bartov asserts generate the kinds of violence featured in the institution.[58] These reductive narratives have significant implications for the MOT's resolution discourses. Because the MOT locates "[p]rejudice…at the root of genocide," Bartov contends the solution then becomes to "eliminate prejudice [and] (not its causes)."[59] He goes on to argue that the paths toward the rectification of said ills lie "[n]ot [in] a change of material realities, but a change of heart, not a transformation of the conditions that perpetuate frustration and violence, but a transformation of our perception of these conditions."[60] In short, these critiques suggest that without a broader historical or political context, the problems contained in the MOT appear primarily as interpersonal failures.[61]

This framing contributes to the MOT's *apolitical* veneer. In her read of the institution, Brown argues that the MOT's reductive understanding of context contributes to the propagation "of tolerance as a contemporary discourse of depoliticization in which power and history make little or no appearance in representations or accounts of

ethnicized hostility or conflict"[62] Of course, no institution is apolitical, and Brown illuminates the extent to which the MOT's apolitical discourses of tolerance mask the museum's conservative political interests. Although the institution's emphasis on the interpersonal dimensions of social harms occludes a more substantive discussion of politics, the MOT's ideological bent is perhaps best signaled through its attempts to exert control over its messaging.

3) Hegemony and Message Control

Finally, one of the MOT's more remarked upon attributes is its heavy-handed attempts to guide visitors' experiences. As other critics have noted during their visits to the institution, maps are not made available to visitors; thus, visitors are dependent upon the orientation to the institution provided by docents.[63] Within the Holocaust exhibition, there is remarkably little to read; thus, to consume the narrative, visitors must keep pace with the order of the audio-visual displays, moving on when the displays move on, resulting in little time for contemplation.[64]

Brown and others articulating this critique highlight a certain irony: the institution pays lip service to audience interactivity while limiting the opportunities for visitors to interact. Lisus and Ericson, Witcomb, and Brown all contend that the MOT offers only the most superficial modes for visitor engagement (i.e., instructions to press X or Y button or select one of the following four options, etc.).[65] Lisus and Ericson charge, "While the visitor is provided with the sensation of being in a 'free-flicker' environment, the individual is not as free as she seems" due to "pre-programmed and repetitively run" video options.[66] Such limited modes for engagement, Brown argues, render the MOT's appeals to visitors' intellect and its stated commitment to their opinions hollow. In sum,

the implications are the same for these critics: The MOT repeatedly encourages visitors to engage in forms of critical thought all-the-while undermining visitors' ability to demonstrate their critical capacity.[67]

In sum, criticisms of the institution's reliance on Hollywood-esque spectacles, reductive approaches to violence, and hegemonic museum messaging provide insights which enrich their readers' understanding of the museum.[68] Underlying much of the expressed criticism is a palpable lamentation over the superficiality the MOT's treatment of complex political and social issues. There is also a visible dissatisfaction with the extent of institutional control exerted over visitors' experiences. This interplay between superficiality and control shapes the MOT's constructions of state and public authority as the institution attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide.

Constructing Genocide as a Public Problem: Definitional Struggles within the MOT

Within the context of the institution's vast scope and ambitious mission statement, the concept of genocide plays an important role in lending coherence to museum messaging. More specifically, the MOT's conception of genocide bridges the perceived division between the Holocaust portion of the institution and the Tolerancenter. In order to establish connections between diverse exhibition content, the MOT employs an abstract and thus flexible conceptualization of genocide. The institution's definitional discourse retains a considerable amount of plasticity by under contextualizing the atrocities it features.[69] In lieu of a more robust definitional discourse, the definition of genocide takes shape in relation to other atrocities featured in the MOT. By conceptualizing genocide through associations and comparisons with other forms of violence discussed within the institution, the MOT creates a general impression of

genocidal atrocity while avoiding the political quagmires that would mark more sophisticated attempts to define and apply the term.

At first blush, the concept of genocide is only marginally featured within the institution. The MOT contains its discussion of genocide to two adjacent areas. In the first area, visitors stand in front of a large map of the world flanked by a mounted display case on one side and a series of screens featuring a countdown timer on the other. The display case to the left includes an image of President Ronald Reagan signing a document and a pen. This display marks the moment in 1988 when the US became party to the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. As visitors turn away from that display case, they face the map highlighting genocides and crimes against humanity during the twentieth century. The map spotlights the atrocities that have occurred in countries such as the Congo, Namibia, Armenia, Cambodia, Iraq, Sudan, Rwanda, Bosnia, and Kosovo. As each area is discussed, the map shows the affected country and includes a sentence or two about the identities of the victims targeted and the number killed. The display moves quickly through these locations, interspersing bits of information about the Holocaust, Lemkin, and the creation of the term "genocide" as well as the introduction of the phrase "crimes against humanity."

Next to the map, a timer lets visitors know when they can move into the second exhibition area, a small theater featuring a short video on twentieth-century atrocities. The film, titled "In Our Time," addresses the problems posed by "genocide," "human rights abuses," and "terrorism." Although never expressly differentiated, these three ideas are constituted through a few prominent definitional attributes, chiefly blood, carnage, death, and mass destruction. One gets the sense from the film that "genocide" is a

concept that refers to physical violence that culminates in the death of a large number of people.

These two exhibition areas leave the concept of genocide fairly abstract. On one hand, the display case featuring Reagan's decision to sign the 1948 UN Convention as well as the repeated references to the Lemkin and his effort to coin the term elevates the legal understanding of genocide as contained in the UN Convention text. On the other, so little contextual information is provided about the featured genocides that the relationship between the atrocities and the definition remains mystified.

Further, the mechanics of the displays themselves contribute to the MOT's definitional ambiguity. Extending the aforementioned critiques of the institution's control of the visitor's experience, the superimposed lines of texts about each atrocity on the map flicker across the wall at a clipped pace. A few lines of text are displayed for a moment before the exhibition narrative moves on, leaving the visitor little time to digest any of the information before the display changes. Additionally, the exhibition scrolls through so many countries and addresses so many different topics, definitional distinctions blur. The map alternatively discusses the Holocaust, genocide, and crimes against humanity. The map identifies 5 instances of genocide spotlighting the atrocities in Armenia, Congo, Rwanda, and Cambodia in addition to an extended focus on the Holocaust. It then profiles a number of diverse abuses in countries such as Guatemala, Brazil, Nigeria, and Pakistan. The exhibition references the Great Leap Forward and the Rape of Nanking. The brevity of the remarks about each event and the display's fast pacing inhibit a clear understanding of the connections between these historical occurrences. The exhibition insinuates that not all of the featured nation-sates were involved in genocides however

maintaining a sense of distinction between "genocide" and "crimes against humanity" is next to impossible given the display's rapid transitions. The inability to slow the script down combined with the limited information given about each historic atrocity result only in fostering general impressions of the pervasiveness and longevity of mass forms of violence. Otherwise, the correlations between Lemkin's definition, the UN definition, and historical examples featured in this display area are muddled.

Given the limited information imparted by these exhibition areas, the MOT's definition of genocide primarily emerges through a series of contrasts with the institution's other exhibitions. The relationship between the MOT's components has been discussed by Brown as verging on "incoherence in themes and content."[70] Others see a clear narrative unifying the Tolerancenter and the Holocaust exhibition. The MOT's featured genocide exhibitions sit at the nexus of these two segments of the institution and come to be defined vis-à-vis contrasts with these segments.

The construct of genocide helps resolve an organizational problem. Numerous critics have noted that the MOT's diverse exhibitions create problems in terms of institutional coherence.[71] As a *New York Times* feature describes the exhibitions, the institution "strains to tie together slavery, genocides, prejudice, discrimination and hate crimes."[72] With displays addressing content ranging from the Warsaw Ghetto uprising to hate speech on the Internet, some existing criticisms of the MOT see it as composed of two separate segments: the "Tolerancenter" and the Holocaust exhibition. Stier charges that MOT "is actually split in two parts and that the doubled name of the museum [Beit HasShoah-Museum of Tolerance] refers to its two distinct sections," lending the institution a "split and ambiguous personality."[73]

Others see the organization as building a coherent narrative about violence across the MOT's numerous and diverse exhibitions. Prosise, for example, draws on social ritual scholarship to read the MOT's exhibitions as creating a sequential narrative of transformation, moving visitors through multiple "ritual" stages: separating the individual from society (Tolerancenter), providing liminal spaces (the Holocaust exhibition), and reintegrating the changed individual back into society (the exit to the Holocaust exhibition).[74] Operating from a similar perspective, other critics argue that the MOT constructs a continuum of violence.[75] In Patraka's words, the institution adopts "a teleological narrative of escalating violence," moving from small scale injustices like a sexist comment, for example, to the Holocaust.[76] Reading the institution in fashion consistent with Patraka, Williams writes, "[t]he question of the scale of behavior – from an offensive ethnic joke to mass murder – is one that is little acknowledged. Or rather, the sliding scale is exactly the museum's point – Nazis and other demagogues are there to show that if we do not check ourselves for private thoughts, then terrible actions can easily follow."[77] Beyond his assessment of the spectrum connecting the exhibitions, Williams's remarks about policing "private thoughts" foreshadow critical aspects of the MOT's resolution discourse.

Read as part of a continuum, the concept of genocide helps unify exhibition content; at the same time, such content provides the concept of genocide with broad contours. Viewed from Patraka's and William's perspectives, the concept of genocide plays an important role on the MOT's continuum of violence. The construct adds gravitas to the "microaggressions" in the Tolerancenter and functions as a contemporary exigency to complement the Holocaust exhibition.[78] Simultaneously, the concept of genocide takes

shape relationally through contrasts with the other segments of the museum. Unlike the Tolerancenter's discussion of hate speech, genocidal violence is not only symbolic, it is also material. Unlike the discussion of the deaths of individuals such as James Byrd, Dr. Barnett Slepion, or Matthew Shepard featured in the Tolerancenter, the poignancy of the loss is multiplied here because genocide is the death of many. Unlike the Holocaust exhibition, the violence depicted in this segment is not "over," it is ongoing.

Still, such an understanding of genocide as a point on a spectrum of atrocities paints the construct only in broad brushstrokes. The exhibition content expressly concerned with genocide offers a vague and underdeveloped definition of the term. On one obvious level, this abstract definition frees the institution from the contentious political debates that accompany attempts to draw discernments between genocidal and nongenocidal atrocities. The MOT's plasticity in this regard aids the institution in cultivating a seemingly apolitical definition of genocidal atrocity. Rather than enhance the precision of the definition, the construct of genocide comes into focus through its relationship with other MOT exhibitions. The construct is further shaped through MOT's representational choices. More specifically, the MOT's use of generic conventions drawn from horror, melodrama, and self-help lend additional insight into the institution's characterization of the problem of genocide and foreshadow important components of its resolution discourse.

Generic Conventions and Representation Trepidation

Representation is a complicated issue within the MOT. Museums are rhetorical artifacts, and their exhibitions, displays, and architecture reflect representational choices.[79] At the same time, the MOT is self-reflexive about the potency of

representations and leery of the power of communication and communication technologies. Nevertheless, the MOT's representational choices shape visitors' understandings of genocide and other forms of violence. The institution relies on generic threads drawn from horror, melodrama, and self-help to give meaning to the concept of genocide. These generic conventions also influence how genocide and other atrocities are represented within the institution. At the same, the exhibition is cognizant of the extent to which communication and communication technologies contribute to violence. This awareness has the potential to be profoundly destabilizing as the MOT both relies on the persuasive potency of its displays while simultaneously expressing concerns about the power of persuasion. This trepidation or representational anxiety is managed within the institution by making recourse to horror conventions to build a case for the importance of security and control over the contemporary "mediascape."[80]

Casting Genocide through a Generic Patchwork[81]

Though the MOT may provide limited explicit information about genocide, the concept is lent definitional attributes through the utilization of three distinct generic frameworks: horror, melodrama, and self-help. Genres, as Devitt explains, influence and are influenced by understandings of situations. Devitt contends, "people construct genre through situation and situation through genre."[82] Thus, the genres within the MOT contribute to the MOT's conceptualization of genocide and atrocity. Attention to the genres utilized to describe the atrocities featured in the MOT stands to reveal textual understandings of these situations. In other words, these genres speak to the kind of problem of which genocide is a part. Through the use of three generic conventions,

genocide is established as unabashedly horrible, unquestionably evil, but encouragingly

mutable in the confines of the MOT.[83]

Genocide as Horror Story

Horror is a critical component of the MOT's representation of genocide. Defining

"horror" as a genre, as Hantke explains, is a challenge because "horror is one of the rare

genres that are defined not primarily by period or formal idiosyncrasies, but by the effect

they produce in the audience."[84] For horror, the genre "carries the response it tries to

evoke proudly in its name."[85] Horror, alongside melodrama, is one of Williams's "body

genres."[86] These genres traffic in the production of affective or sensory experiences.[87]

The horror genre and Holocaust and genocide representations have a complicated

history. Undoubtedly, some of the reason for this tension comes from the perceived low-

culture status of the horror genre and the strict policing of forms of representation

associated with the Holocaust.[88] Kerner argues that horror is not a major genre within

which one finds treatments of the Holocaust.[89] Yet, as Picart and Frank demonstrate,

elements of horror frameworks often inform and structure Holocaust representations,

including highly-praised representations such as *Schindler's List*.[90] The contrasts between

the configurations of horror contained in Kerner's work and Picart and Frank's work

reflect an uneasiness regarding the appropriateness of the horror genre, especially in

connection with the Holocaust. Whereas horror may be an appropriate response to the

Shoah,[91] fears regarding the conflation of historical horror with entertainment culture's

representations of horror create ethical concerns about the genre's usage in Holocaust

representations.[92]

Placing these ethical concerns aside, the horror genre enhances the MOT's ambiguous conception of genocide in two ways. First, it creates space for an affective encounter with atrocity. In Kerner's words, the horror framework provides a "license, if not an expectation, to explore 'the blood and guts' of" the Holocaust and genocides.[93] Second, horror genres signify aberrations in the social order, shaping perspectives of "evil."[94] In discussing the utility of the horror genre in connection to Holocaust and genocide studies, Kerner stresses that the utility of horror comes from its treatment of "the existence of evil in the world, and the darker side of humanity."[95]

The MOT draws upon the horror genre though the use of graphic imagery and the cultivation of a sense foreboding. "In Our Time" makes liberal use of an aesthetic of carnage. Mangled bodies pepper the film. As the narration offers examples of "genocide," "human rights abuses," and "terrorism" in the twentieth century, the film includes footage of dead or emaciated babies, naked bodies being pushed with bulldozers, and an injured victim of a terrorist attack, his face bruised, distorted and covered in blood. The scenes are captured in a tight shot, locating the viewer proximate to these horrors.[96] The MOT does not hesitate to show footage of harm befalling people. Among the content animating the video, "In Our Time" contains video footage of a man being struck by a machete.[97] As terrifying images fill the screen, tense music and the sound of sirens amplify the sense of terror and aid in the cultivation of a state of anxiety. Indeed, the first two-thirds of the film are replete with images of bloody violence and the sound effects of destruction, creating strong parallels between "In Our Time" and the aesthetic conventions of a horror film.[98]

Though "In Our Time" may showcase the most graphic carnage in the MOT, it is hardly the only exhibition to borrow from the horror aesthetic. For instance, if the visitor enters "In Our Time" via the Tolerancenter, then the visitor has already been subjected to images of the Napalm girl, a blurred image of a half-nude victim of child pornography, and a bloodied image of a woman representing the destruction from the Oklahoma City Bombing, to name but a few of the images in the Tolerancenter.[99] Some of these images are plastered on wall-sized displays. Others flicker across the numerous video screens in this section of the MOT.[100]

Beyond this graphic imagery, parts of the Tolerancenter promote an affective experience of foreboding. "Confronting Hate in America" – the second exhibit the visitor encounters in the Tolerancenter – showcases a giant map of the United States flanked by large images of violence and atrocity. The exhibition focuses on contemporary examples of hate, violence, and intolerance in the United States, including the 9/11 attacks, the murder of James Byrd in Jasper, Texas, and an attack on migrant workers in an empty warehouse on Long Island, New York. The center piece of the exhibition is a screen in the shape of the United States that displays recent news stories concerned with hate or violence.[101] By superimposing news stories detailing hate crimes or instances of discrimination directly onto a screen in the shape of the US nation-state, this exhibition most clearly enacts Patraka's contention that the MOT casts the US "as a potential place of genocide."[102] "Confronting Hate in America" depicts the United States as a site of danger, where terror, hate, and evil lurk, spawning the steady stream of news stories. In other words, it sets the stage for the US to be seen as a place of "horror" and contributes to what Glassner has discussed as "the culture of fear."[103]

A similar affective experience is created in the Holocaust portion of the MOT.

Although critics of the museum have read the institution as borrowing from

"Disneyesque" or Nintendo-esque aesthetics,[104] perhaps the more apt referent for the

Holocaust exhibition is that of a haunted house. As visitors enter the Holocaust

exhibition, they move into a darkened room. The automatic doors close behind the

visitor, prompting the visitor to move forward. Barely visible in the dimly lit first

chamber are the contours of a recreated street scene populated by life-sized manikins.

Such displays in the first chamber establish the Holocaust exhibition's *mise-en-scène*

aesthetic whereby the visitor spatially moves through various "sets" depicting moments

in Holocaust history. For any visitor with most basic knowledge of the Holocaust, the

horrific end to this narrative can be anticipated in advance. Thus, a haunting premonition

of the death and destruction awaiting the visitor at the end of the exhibition is enough to

encourage the first-time visitor to seek the "safety" that comes from sticking with the

group, the guided narrative, and lighted parts of the display. Noting this sense of

foreboding, Weiner, too, comments on the way the affective of experience of horror

shapes the visit as he stresses that the first room, "shrouded in a darkness … must make

almost everyone feel the same way: Will this be too terrible for me? Can I turn back

now?"[105] Although the intensity of that sense of terror likely varies by visitor, the

experience ends where one might expect it to: in Auschwitz, in a gas chamber, with faux

"barred doors."[106]

The sensory experience of anxiety combined with the prevalence of graphic

imagery punctuates the sense of harm or danger posed by genocide. At the MOT's

opening ceremony, famed Hollywood actor and then-future California governor Arnold

Schwarzenegger informed audiences in order to be instructive "'you have to first grab their attention.'"[107] To be sure, the use of horror helps the MOT "grab attention" through shocking, disturbing, and graphic material. By making liberal use of horror aesthetics, the MOT invites visitors to engage on a sensory level with the evidence of brutality.[108] Despite the utility of horror in creating that space, counter arguments question whether such a framework simply grants permission for the indulgence of morbid curiosity.[109]

While signifying a breakdown in the social order, the MOT's use of horror as a framework for genocide offers little insight into the nature of the problem. Put differently, the horror genre may help establish genocide as an atrocious public problem, but it offers little insight as to the genesis of the problems and the solutions needed to forestall future atrocities. Thusly, the MOT blends aspects of the horror genre with melodrama to provide a structure for making sense of atrocities. The combination of these two generic frameworks ultimately helps cast genocide as unabashedly horrifying and unquestionably "evil."

Genocide as Melodrama

The MOT draws on aspects of melodrama to continue to lend shape to the definition of genocide. As explained in Chapter Two, definitions of melodrama vary; however, Brooks treats the genre as characterized by emotionally charged representations of "good and evil."[110] Historically, he argues the genre has been concerned with imposing a sense of order on a complex political landscape.[111] Drawing on Brooks, Rothe argues that contemporary "popular trauma culture" employs melodrama in a similar fashion as a response to current political exigencies. "[M]elodrama," she suggests, "echoes the trepidations and angst brought about by a world in which mundane life is increasingly

experienced as not only disembedded but as insidiously traumatic."[112] Similar to the way

the genre was used in *Worse than War*, melodrama enables the MOT to cast atrocities

through the language of moral absolutes; genocide thus becomes a problem of

"innocents" felled by "evil."[113] Using children and gendered representations of grief, the

MOT sketches a portrait of the blameless victim. In stressing the innocence of the

victims, the melodramatic framework inherently accentuates the culpability of the

perpetrators of violence. Yet, the construction of culpability in the MOT is complicated.

Working in conjunction with Christian narratives connected to the notion of original sin,

the MOT communicates a fairly radical message about the capacity for violence by

positioning its visitors in "guilty" or culpable subjectivities.[114]

As a means of highlighting the distance between the concepts of good and evil,

the MOT plays on stereotypical conceptions of "innocence" as embodied by children.

Dead children are a prominent motif. "In Our Time," for example, opens with a narrative

about woman whose baby was violently taken away from her. By means of establishing

the severity of the situation in Darfur, the video contains a narrative about children

slaughtered in school houses. As the narrative unfolds, the three screens in the exhibition

showcase dead children's bodies, framed in a tight shot, including the bodies of very

young children.[115] Quite in contrast to the graphic carnage attributed to the horror

aesthetic, the images are not gory or bloody; rather, the dead children appear almost

peaceful. If it were not for the context, the children could be read as sleeping. Given the

perceived innocence of sleeping babes, such visual resemblance increases the pathos of

these tragic depictions.

"In Our Time" is not the only exhibition to feature the bodies of dead babies; the Holocaust exhibition ends with an extended narrative about massacred infants. In the mock gas chamber at the end of the Holocaust exhibition, the visitor encounters a variety of Holocaust narratives. In one of these narratives, the female speaker describes the evacuation of a hospital during the Holocaust. Once the adults were removed from the facility, the woman mentions an empty truck left behind at the scene. This truck was later filled with infants as babies were thrown from a hospital window into the truck below. While the woman describes the scene, the screens in the room fill with still images of infants. Much like the infants in the "In Our Time" story, the tight shots could be children at rest had they not been situated as images representing the dead babies in the narrative.[116] Oddly, between these scenes of sleeping/dead children, the screen fills with images of dolls, other markers of childhood and perhaps poignant reminders of the loss of the children who would otherwise use these toys. Though dolls also connote youth, the juxtaposition of dead babies and baby dolls is troubling on many levels, not the least of which because such images raise the issue of the artificial and "real." The mix of images of baby dolls and the still images of deceased children recalls the mix of varying modes of representation blended by the MOT: the dolls as symbols of the artificial and the images of the dead children signaling a documentary-style representation of the "real." Such a juxtaposition serves as a potent reminder of the complicated status of the role of artifice within Holocaust aesthetics.

The pathos of the violence in the MOT is further communicated through gendered representations of grief.[117] In a second segment in the same faux gas chamber in the Holocaust exhibition, a female narrator describes the death of her child. The victim of a

mass shooting, the woman escaped a fatal injury; however, she describes awaking in a pile of bodies to find her daughter shot in the head. The description of this tragic occurrence is visually represented through the black and white image of a girl, eyes closed, lying amid a pile of bodies. A moving camera begins by focusing on the face of the child and pans out to show that she lies a top a pile of limbs.[118] Again, the image lacks the graphic nature of the violence elsewhere displayed in the MOT; its poignancy instead is a byproduct of the symbolic power of the young "sleeping" girl as a marker of innocence. This image is reused as something of a stock image; it appears again in the "Ordinary People" vignette as a means of capturing the horrors – at the broadest level – of Nazi Germany. The actual context for the image thus seems irrelevant; its symbolic power instead lies in its gendered representation of childhood innocence.[119]

This deployment of melodramatic motifs to accentuate notions of innocence heightens the contrast between "innocent" victims and "evil" perpetrators. As Brown argues, a kind of "Manicheanism … courses through the MOT," which enables a clear division of the world into good/bad binaries.[120] In this case, the focus on the purity and innocence of the victims simultaneously enhances perceptions of the guilt and culpability of the perpetrators that have killed them. Through the prism of melodrama, genocide is a problem of "bad people" slaughtering innocents. Both evil and innocence are caricatures.[121] In melodrama, Brooks states, "evil is villainy; it is a swarthy, cape-enveloped man with a deep voice."[122] "We," the consumers of these melodramatic texts, are nothing like "them"—the evil individuals depicted. These components of the genre further a reductive understanding of evil that helps to keep evil safely contained.[123] Thus, melodrama provides comfort insofar as it encourages what Smith describes as "the

euphoric illusion that we are innocent victims of a hostile world."[124] The MOT

complicates this narrative by making recourse to a Christian theological framework to

trouble the idea that its visitors are purely innocent. Through this Christian theological

framework, the visitor is situated within a subjectivity of culpability, cast as bearing some

responsibility for the depicted atrocities.[125]

Christianity and Original Sin

Although the MOT is connected to a Yeshiva and read by others as a primarily

Jewish institution,[126] the melodrama framework is bolstered by repeated recourse to a

Christian iconographical and theological framework.[127] The stark duality of heaven/hell

or salvation/damnation reifies the moral clarity afforded to social problems through the

use of melodrama. Images of "hellfire" and references to "hell" help to demarcate the

boundaries between good and evil. While drawing on hellfire imagery to maintain these

boundaries, Christian theological narratives about original sin imbricate the visitor into a

subjectivity of accountability. By stressing that the potential for evil lurks within us all,[128]

the institution is able to plant the seeds to support the MOT's construction of resolutions.

The Christianization of Holocaust and genocide representation is not a novel

development.[129] Studying the rise of US interest in the Shoah, Novick notes the ways one

of the central figures in Holocaust memory, Eli Wiesel, is read by some "as [a] Christ

figure."[130] Wiesel's story of suffering, Novick charges, "resonates with Christian

doctrines" and in particular, Catholic theology, with its "close link between suffering and

redemption."[131] Rothe argues that this infusion of Christian motifs goes beyond Wiesel as

the Eichmann trial "recycle[d] the Christian suffering-and-redemption trope of spiritual

purification through physical mortification."[132] This trope – along with the idea of the

survivor as a saint-like figure[133] – becomes a constitutive part of Holocaust memory as well as Rothe's "popular trauma culture" more broadly.[134]

Furthering the connections to Christianity,[135] the MOT deploys the concept of "hell" to connote "evil," functioning as shorthand for facilitating moral judgment. References to "hell" and images of hellfire pepper the exhibitions and in particular a film for the "Power of Words" display. Visitors hear a man tacitly encouraging violence toward abortion providers, a child vowing to kill all of the Jews, and of course, the words of Hitler, Stalin, and Osama Bin Laden. They also hear from "hate mongers," including a woman who describes the death of Matthew Shepard thusly: "There is only one important thing that happened today. Matthew Shepard was beat to death. He entered hell for all eternity."[136] The aural invocation of "hell" provides a framework for making sense of the images that accompany the vignettes. By way of transition, the center screen fills with images of flames. Although these flames can be interpreted in a variety of ways (such as references to Kristallnacht),[137] the video also contains an image of a cross set ablaze. The cross imagery and spoken invocation of "hell" cast the flames within a Christian iconography, which helps demarcate and signal the presence of "evil." In such a way, the image of "hell" bolsters the melodrama framework by helping to establish or reinforce a sense of moral order.

Although there are multiple ways of making sense of evil, the "evil" in the MOT is not an external evil;[138] rather, the MOT's arguments about humanity's flaws resonate with Christian narratives about "original sin."[139] One of the more "radical" messages contained within the MOT, according to Weiner, is the idea that all visitors are potential perpetrators. [140] Prosise argues that this message is punctuated by the Tolerancenter,

which "encourage[s visitors] to confront themselves, their prejudices, their potential for bigotry and violence, and also their apathy in the face of bigotry and violence."[141] Going a step further, I suggest the messages reinforced by the Tolerancenter echo arguments about original sin. Many critics of the MOT comment on the peculiar entrance to the Tolerancenter.[142] The entrance is marked by two doors: One labeled "prejudiced" and the other "unprejudiced." The "unprejudiced" door is locked, forcing all visitors to walk through the prejudiced door. As Derwin and Brown note, such a bodily and spatial experience reinforces visitors' status as "fallen."[143] To use Goldhagen's words in a slightly different context, the exhibition's spatial construction demands that visitors accept "the Caligula that is everyman" as condition of entry.[144] The "threat" communicated by the Tolerancenter exists because the seeds of evil lurk within each visitor. Fortuitously, just as the institution hints at the pervasiveness of the problem of evil, it draws upon a third generic framework to offer reasons for hope.

A MOTivational Story:[145] The "Self-Help" Narrative & Messages of Empowerment

Motivational discourses are a crucial component of the MOT's representation of genocide because they contribute to conceptions of genocidal mutability thus laying the groundwork for the MOT's resolution discourses. Self-help discourses and motivational discourses reinforce an understanding of genocide as a problem created by and potentially solved by individuals. Self-help frameworks temper the gravitas afforded by horror and melodrama by reinforcing messages about the viability of change and stimulating visitor action. The motivational refrain repeated within the MOT is simple: The narrative reinforces the theme that every person matters; we all have the power to make a difference. Whereas such messages emphasize individuals' potential in the

Tolerancenter, the Holocaust portion of the exhibition highlights the consequences of individuals' failure to act. These pronounced messages of audience agency function ironically within the context of the MOT as the exhibition elsewhere undercuts visitors' power.[146]

Self-help or motivational discourses accentuate the individual over the social system as the locus for responsibility and action furthering criticism of the institution's reductive understanding of public problems. This self-help generic framework reinforces aspects of the MOT's definitional discourses drawn from horror and melodrama. As suggested by narratives about original sin, the "horror" in the MOT is a "horror" that is embedded in individuals and not social systems. This figuration of social ills as problems of and for individuals enables melodramatic discourse to exist alongside self-help discourses.[147] As the aforementioned critiques of the institution have noted, the flaw of such a framework is that the social system is granted a kind of de facto impunity, spared any form of critical assessment. Without the resources or ability to challenge the social system, the only kind of "change" that gets encouraged by such a framework is an alteration of visitors' *feelings* about contemporary political situations.[148]

Messages of empowerment and reminders of audience agency are voiced fairly explicitly in the Tolerancenter and especially in the "In Our Time" exhibition. After detailing the ways "genocide," "human rights abuses," and "terrorism" "threaten us all," the tenor of the narrative shifts as the film underscores the idea that "even one person can make a difference."[149] By way of illustrating the extent to which one person can enact change, "In Our Time" offers the example of Raphael Lemkin. Lemkin's courageous efforts to the draw attention to the problem of mass murder by coining the term genocide

showcase the kind of work the individual can undertake to participate in genocide cessation. Yet, the film notes that Lemkin's work is incomplete as "words alone have yet to stop" the kinds of atrocities featured in the film. The film implores, "You have the power to turn words into action" and cuts quickly to an image of George Clooney telling an assembled crowd, "you make the policy" while student activists begin to talk about the movement to end atrocities in Darfur. The nature of the quick transition seems to construct an argument that Clooney and modern day participants in the Save Darfur movement are the inheritors of Lemkin's legacy. As uplifting music begins to swell, the film repeats a common refrain about the audience's power to enact change: "Every person has opportunities and inner resources" to participate in atrocity prevention work, exclaims Daniel Pearl's father. By way of visually corroborating this message, a variety of images of groups protesting and advocating for human rights fill the screen, including the image of a young child holding a protest sign as a student advocate charges that "Nobody is too young to take action." The film reminds viewers, "In our time, old tragedies don't have to be repeated," stressing "YOU can fight hatred" and "YOU can make a difference."[150] While these words appear in the theater, a young girl wanders toward the camera. Her face fills the screen, gazing directly at viewers. The innocence and fragility of this child extend the melodrama framework at the same time that her direct address offers a prompt to action.[151]

As with the horror and melodrama frameworks, "In Our Time's" self-help or motivational discourse extends threads that appear elsewhere in the MOT. The entrance to "Point of View" diner contains a reminder to visitors about the power of their opinion: "A single voice can save a life or change the world."[152] Elsewhere in the Tolerancenter,

visitors are presented with models for action, proof of the power individuals have to enact change. In one of the more uplifting videos on the ground floor, the MOT features the work of advocates from the civil rights movement, their commitment, courage, and conviction embodying the power of individuals and collectives. In a display titled "Assuming Responsibility," the MOT features the actions of selected groups or individuals, including the "Freedom Writers," "Seeds of Peace," "Project Lemonade," and "Take Back the Night." The exhibition applauds the actions of the individuals who joined the National Guard after September 11th and the legislative efforts that resulted in Cesar Chavez receiving a governmental holiday and the passage of ADA legislation. As Brown notes seemingly little unites the politics behind these actions.[153] However, the one commonality remains: Each panel proffers a vision of an empowered agent, supporting and furthering the use of the self-help genre.

The Holocaust exhibition counters these optimistic motivational discourses while reinforcing messages about agency and accountability through an emphasis on individual failings during the Shoah. In this segment of the museum titled "Ordinary People, Ordinary Lives," visitors enter a darkened chamber where a short film raises the question: Why did German citizens chose to participate in the Holocaust? The film begins with a series of still photos of children while the narrator argues that Hitler's plans for Nazi Germany could not have been carried out without the participation of the German people. Dismissing coercion as the rationale for their actions, the film spotlights people watching the denigration of Jews as they forcibly scrub the street, casting spectatorship as a reprehensible act. The film escalates the violence from here, concluding with World War II and the mobile shooting squads that preceded the Holocaust. Employing a circular

compositional structure, the film starts where it ends, returning to the photographs of German children. Yet, at the film's end, the camera pulls out to reveal that these angelic faces belong to children standing near a Nazi flag or located amidst others giving the "Heil Hitler" salute.[154] The "innocence" of these children is perverted by their tacit complicity. By reminding viewers that the German people could have made different choices, the self-help or motivational message takes on a darker tone in this segment of the museum.

The Holocaust exhibition returns to the messages contained in the "Ordinary People, Ordinary Lives" segment at the conclusion of its narrative. As visitors exit the faux gas chamber at the end of the Holocaust exhibition, they are told that the liberators were also "ordinary people." These two portions of the Holocaust exhibition establish a contrast that fits into the highly polarized worldview (supported and reinforced by earlier melodramatic threads) by highlighting individuals that stood by and those that worked to end the Shoah. As expressed in the "Ordinary People" exhibition, these messages about empowerment have a familiar to ring to them; they echo the titular contention of Goldhagen's famed text, *Hitler's **Willing** Executioners*, as an explanatory ideology for the Holocaust and, more broadly, genocidal atrocity.[155] Whether spotlighting bystanders or liberators, both depictions of "ordinary people" reinforce messages about the individual as the locus for genocidal violence or genocide cessation.

These motivational discourses complement the other generic frameworks (i.e., horror and melodrama) in developing the contours of the MOT's conception of genocide. These three genres become part of what Torchin references as the "interpretive gird" through which public notions of genocide take shape.[156] Through these generic

frameworks, numerous exhibitions in the Tolerancenter and Holocaust exhibition paint the following picture: The world is a violent place. Multitudes of people die or suffer other horrific abuses. Such atrocities exist within an unambiguous world of moral dualities. Yet, encouragingly, such atrocious violence is within the scope of human power to stop—one human at a time.

Reflections on Representations: Plasticity as Problematic

At the same time the MOT relies upon these generic conventions in their representation of atrocity, the MOT is self-reflexive about the power of representations. A considerable amount of museum exhibition space is committed to exploring the power of discursive or mediated representations. These reflections on the representation process extend the plasticity associated with the MOT's definitional discourses. On multiple occasions, the institution articulates the argument that texts lack inherent moral valences. The impression conveyed is that texts are open, polysemous, and potent. However, such messaging about the hermeneutic openness of communication processes and technologies potentially taxes the institution's genocide cessation discourse as it contains within it the seeds to unravel the institution's authority as a rhetor. As such, the MOT counters its message about the openness of communication processes with attempts to constrain meaning and reinforce hegemonic or singular interpretations of exhibition content. Extending the aforementioned critiques of the MOT's heavy-hand in meaning-making, the institution curtails polysemic potential through structured modes for visitors' engagement with its exhibitions, pedantic lessons about the meaning of texts, and the cultivation of an affect of suspicion associated with the contemporary mediascape. Resultantly, the institution's treatment of communication process and technologies

exposes limitations on visitors' agency and primes audiences for arguments about the importance of state authority.

The MOT exhibits an institutional preoccupation with the power of communication and communication technologies, hosting special events and programming revolving around the special links between communication, communication technologies, and violence. One such event held early in the MOT's history was a conference session for 200 "communicators." Described in a *Communication World* review article, one of "the defining moments for many people in the group [at the conference] was an exhibit exploring the significant contribution that communication makes in the power of demagogues like Adolph Hitler."[157] Quoting one attendee, "'As a communicator, it makes us realize just how dangerous irresponsible communication can be…it is our responsibility to make sure that all our communication is to generate harmony and goodwill among all people.'"[158] Setting aside the vagueness of a conference for "communicators" and their descriptions of communication, the message conveyed by both the act of hosting such a conference and the remarks generated by attendees capture the extent to which the MOT situates itself as important voice in conversations about the power of communication. In addition to hosting this conference, the MOT was the location for an address by Raymond W. Smith, Chairman of Bell Atlantic Corporation, on free speech, hate speech, and the Internet.[159] Through the staging of these special events, the MOT spotlights the extent to which it sees itself as engaged in conversations about the potency of communication and communication technologies.

This preoccupation with communication extends into the MOT's exhibitions. The aptly titled "The Power of Words" exhibit underscores the potency of discourse. Composed of a looping video and wall text, the "The Power of Words" juxtaposes remarks from famous or infamous political figures. The installation contrasts Susan B. Anthony with Jean-Marie Le Pen and President Franklin D. Roosevelt with William Pierce. The former are featured as means of showcasing how "[w]ords can inspire" whereas the latter represent the idea that "[w]ords can incite," and "[w]ords can be hateful."[160] These juxtapositions extend throughout the MOT, reinforcing the embedded potentiality and explicitly referenced power of discourse.

Further, two of the five spotlighted narratives in the recreated Berlin café in the Holocaust exhibition revolve around communication professionals. In one exchange, two men are discussing how their professional plans will change if the Nazis assume power. Articulating a sentiment along the lines of "if you can't beat them, join them," visitors learn that one of the two men assumes the role of a propagandist for the Nazi party. The narrator explains that he will help burn books and author anti-Semitic texts, furthering the Nazi party's objectives. In a different exchange, a second figure, identified as a journalist, is cast as working for a "left-wing," anti-Nazi publication. As the narration jumps in time to foreshadow the journalist's fate, visitors learn that this man was the first of the people in the faux cafe to perish. Established as foils, both of these narratives highlight the significance of communication: In one instance, the publisher uses his trade to contribute to genocide; in the other narrative, the journalist loses his life, presumably using his craft to challenge the emergence of a violent regime.[161] Showcasing a prominent institutional

refrain, these juxtapositions convey the idea that words can have tremendous social value and can cause tremendous harm.

The messages imparted by the museum's discussions of communication and communication technology are potentially radical and threatening. By calling attention to the dramatically different ways discourse can be employed for public good or public harm, the MOT highlights the polysemous and open nature of texts. In Brown's assessment, she argues that the MOT's meditation on the potency of discourse "suggests an unsettled quality or a hermeneutic difficulty inherent in this form of power." [162] She contends that the institution's messages about the "moral and political ambiguity of the power of words" have the capacity to induce "intellectual vertigo" insofar as they invite sustained reflection on the nature of discourse.[163] As Brown's allusion to "vertigo" infers, such forms of discursive openness or celebrations of polysemy have the capacity to be profoundly destabilizing. If words are infinitely open in this capacity, the installation raises the specter of relativism and potentially creates the grounds for challenges to the institution's authority. Ergo narratives about openness are counted by structural and ideological maneuvers which contain meaning-making by restoring hegemonic and singular frames for interpretation.

The MOT attempts to exert control and contain meaning-making in three different capacities. First, as alluded to in earlier critiques of the MOT, the MOT limits polysemy and undermines visitors' agency through the structure of its exhibitions. Brown demonstrates how such constraints on meaning-making work by analyzing two of the more interactive features in the MOT: the Point of View diner and the Millennium Machine. Both exhibitions ask viewers to interrogate contemporary issues such as

bullying or the status of refugees. The Point of View diner allows visitors to conduct interviews to gain additional perspectives on these topics through a preset number of questions. Not only does the structured nature of the question and answer segment limit choice, Brown notes that the figures being interviewed embody stock characters and stereotypes; thus, "[o]ne doesn't really need to 'interview' any of them to know what they will say."[164] In the Millennium Machine, visitors answer a variety of questions in a multiple choice fashion and then are given one minute to discuss large global issues. The limited number of answers and superficial forms of engagement demonstrated in both of these exhibits, Brown and others charge, undermine the pretense of engagement and interactivity promoted within the MOT.[165] In Brown's words, "These incessant but empty injunctions to think or to offer one's opinion help to obscure the fact that there is very little in the MOT that has not been politically and intellectually premasticated as well as dumbed-down, fictionalized, and fitted into clichés and sound bites."[166] Put differently, the MOT's representational choices in structuring their exhibitions undercut their messages about the importance of communication processes.

Such constraints on visitor engagement are exacerbated within the Holocaust portion of the MOT. As Brown notes, though the Tolerancenter abounds with interactive displays, the Holocaust exhibition lacks such interactivity.[167] For example, the Holocaust exhibition contains little to read and offers little space for reflection. Because the installation is guided by light, sound, videos, and voiceovers, the visitor seldom has the opportunity to reflect on or return to any particular point.[168] Even when texts are featured, such as a 1919 Hitler letter or a 1939 letter between Himmler and Arthur Seyss-Inquot, the MOT limits the means through which audiences can interact with these texts.

The letters are broken down into smaller, easier-to-read passages, with the museum's annotations on the text providing "quick" interpretations for the visitor. As a byproduct of the way the MOT represents these texts, one gets the sense that the letters are not meant to be read, save for the museum's notes on particular passages. As a case in point, the Himmler letter is left in German. Even the short articles about contemporary news events in the "Confronting Hate in America" display are broken into bold headlines that run above the featured articles for those uninterested in reading the rest of the text.[169] As Brown argues, "More than being guided, the visitor's very experience of the museum is orchestrated by the media installations; so, too, almost all thinking about tolerance, bigotry, and prejudice is undertaken by the museum, notwithstanding the frequent injunction to the visitor to 'think.'"[170] As a result, the MOT hems in audiences' opportunities for textual interpretation through the representational and structural elements embedded in its exhibition displays.

The MOT works to contain meaning-making in a second way through a pedantic special exhibition on Hitler's writing. This exhibition reinforces the notion that texts have singular meanings. Adjacent to the entrance of the Holocaust exhibition, visitors encounter a display featuring a September 1919 letter from Hitler. The text of a four-page letter is turned into "an interactive exhibit" by transforming the paper letter into a digital touchscreen.[171] After selecting whether they would like to read the letter in English or in German, visitors can "page" through the letter on the screen. They can also click on selected passages in the text to find the museum's interpretation of the text's meaning. By way of contextualizing the letter, the exhibition is accompanied by a wall-

size mural of an animated man (presumably Hitler) addressing a crowd. The following words are superimposed on top of the mural:

> What began as a private letter – one man's opinion – in September 1919, became the state policy of an entire nation twenty-two years later. This is an important warning for future generations – demagogues need to be taken seriously. They often mean what they say and under the right circumstances, will carry out what they promise.[172]

Through such exhibitions, the MOT is able to advance arguments about the potency of words while casting aspersions upon individuals who fail to recognize the power of communication. The denunciation is clear: Hitler's contemporaries shoulder some blame for his actions because Hitler's intentions were verbalized years before the start of the Shoah.

This special exhibition's arguments rest on highly particularized conceptualizations of intent and effect. The contention underlying the aforementioned wall text (i.e., wherein a "private letter" becomes "state policy") rests upon an approach to discourse as an easily decipherable blueprint. Thus intent is clearly embedded into the document signaling Hitler's plans for future action. Reinforcing the display's messages about culpability, this understanding of intent rests upon meaning "hiding in plain sight." To borrow the theoretical framework offered by Hall's encoding/decoding model,[173] Hitler encodes his intention into the discourse; however, rather than acknowledge the multiplicity of "decoding" possibilities, the MOT only allows for a singularity of meaning: the meaning it unpacks and represents as Hitler's meaning.

Through such a special exhibition, the MOT naturalizes its position as a
privileged reader, extending previous critique of the institution's hegemonic control. In
this exhibit and others, the MOT positions itself as able to access the one "true" meaning
of the text, a meaning that then appears "obvious" with the benefit of over ninety years of
retrospection. Such a representation of the text naturalizes the museum's reading
strategies and counters messages about the polysemy of words by restoring a hegemonic,
singular meaning. The exhibition suggests texts are univocal; thusly, when ill happens
after a vituperative speech or writing, the only explanation for such ill is a failure to take
the discourse seriously and *not* a failure to recognize the inscribed (singular) meaning.
This presumed univocality alongside the MOT's naturalized position as a privileged
reader with access to the "right" meaning seamlessly dovetails with aforementioned
critiques of the institution's role in guiding visitors' experiences.[174]

Finally, the MOT contains meaning by inducing anxiety over the polysemy and
polyvocality of the contemporary media landscape. The MOT subtly extends the
sentiments cultivated through the horror generic framework to cast the current media
environment as one filled with potential dangers. Within the MOT, "the media" is often
cast as a potential tool of the perpetrators,[175] a marked contrast from Torchin's analysis of
popular representations of the media as agents of genocide cessation.[176] The MOT
approaches the contemporary media environment with an air of suspicion,[177] wary of the
power and control media producers are assumed to assert on their viewers.[178] The MOT's
conceptualization of the power of media verges on replicating the philosophy of early
media critics associated with the "strong effects" school.[179] As Luke describes it, MOT
exhibitions operate based upon "the standard injection theory of popular media

reception" as the institution "openly assumes that what is on the airwaves/screen/billboard/printed page/listserv/street picket is what viewers absorb."[180] Without the power of oppositional or negotiated readings,[181] the MOT suggests, audiences have few resources to resist the persuasive pull of the media, which increases the dangers of the contemporary media environment.

The MOT cultivates an affect of suspicion or anxiety over the state of the media before the visitor even enters the Tolerancenter. The pathway to the exhibition is flanked by screens. Some of the screens are televisions displaying news programs from CSPAN, HLN, CNN and Fox News. Other screens feature Internet browsers which display pages from World News, BBC News, Al Jazeera and Press TV. Both the television stations and the websites appear to be streaming live content. During my visits to the MOT at the start of November 2012, these news outlets contained stories on the upcoming US presidential election and the devastation caused by Hurricane Sandy. This fairly small exhibition space represents the polysemic and polyvocal twenty-first century media environment. No text exists to frame the experience for visitors and docents may or may not contextualize the room for the visiting group. Instead, a sense of cacophony is created as newscasters talk over one another, covering different stories, while short commercials play alongside the day's news.

The disordered and disorganized display cultivates a sense of distrust, encouraging skepticism of the media from the start of the visitor's experience. By failing to lend any structure to this hallway, the experience of walking through the screens is disorienting and confusing. How do the stories relate? Why are these stories featured? Which version of the story should the visitor trust? Because no news channel is elevated

over any others and no clues are given as to how the content relates to anything else in the museum, the hallway can be interpreted as serving two purposes. First, because most of the stories feature social ills, the hallway punctuates the sense that the problems featured in the MOT are not "over." Instead, much work needs to be done to fulfill the objectives of the institution given the depicted state of affairs. Second, the hall of screens creates the sense that mediation has a tangential connection to events as they happen in the "real world," a potentially destabilizing impression for visitors uncomfortable with such a social constructionist approach to the media.[182] Because of given differences in news coverage of the same event, the multiple screens side-by-side invite questions of accuracy and bias: Which story is the "right" story? Which is more accurate? The impression is conveyed that both stations are offering different versions of an event, and neither likely capture the event as it "actually" happened. Because the visitor has no way to ascertain "truth" from the screens displayed, the relativism associated with such a display cultivates a suspicion of the contemporary mediascape before the visitor even passes through the Tolerancenter's doors.

Once inside, that suspicion is fed and extended as disorder of the Internet is used to further engender fear over polysemy and discursive openness. As visitors turn from "The Power of Words" exhibition to enter the rest of the Tolerancenter, they are exposed to the following wall text, informing them that, "Many hate mongers have traded in Klan hoods and Nazi arm bands, repackaging age-old hatreds using new language and slogans, video, and digital images to target their 'enemies' and recruit new followers."[183] Casting "digital images" as an accessory to hate crimes in the same way that "Klan hoods" are literal clothing accessories used during hate crimes, such text primes visitors to see the

current media environment as containing numerous threats.[184] These threats are then concretized as visitors approach the "Confronting Hate in America" exhibit. In front of each of the eight panels in the exhibition, computer stations showcase the many ways the Internet can contribute to violence. The computer stations present examples of social media, Internet games, and websites utilized by hate groups.[185] Page upon page of racist video games or hostile social media sites are included for the viewer's consumption, an interactive demonstration of the many dangers of the Internet.

By stressing the perils of the twenty-first century media environment, the MOT builds an implicit argument about the need for order and regulation. As an illustrative case in point, the "Confronting Hate in America" exhibition seems to rest on a metaphoric understanding of the Internet as the "Wild West."[186] Like the lawlessness of the West, the lack of a "sheriff" or other external authority "policing" the Internet enables hateful sites like the ones featured in the exhibition to flourish. The problem of lawlessness is exacerbated by the US government's commitment to free speech and the free press. As the inclusion of a fictional narrative about hate crimes triggered by an incendiary talk radio host in the Point of View diner suggests, this commitment to free speech creates the conditions for the spread of violent discourses.[187] In sum, by drawing attention to the threats contained in the contemporary mediascape, the MOT lays the groundwork for arguments that favor increased authority and regulation, foreshadowing the institution's atrocity resolutions.

Resolutions: Trading Openness for Order

In line with the museum's aforementioned attempts to exert control over visitors' experiences, the MOT's atrocity resolutions undermine earlier messages about fluidity

and openness in favor of a narrative of state control. Capitalizing on arguments about the absence of a sufficient regulatory or policing body, the MOT provides the foundation for the elevation of the nation-state as a critical actor in genocide cessation. More specifically, the MOT implicitly builds an argument for the security state as a "solution" to the problems it spotlights. Yet this solution is imperfect as arguments in favor of increased security sit uneasily with anti-genocide arguments. As such, the MOT must manage the competing implications of promoting "good" forms of US security while disavowing the "bad" forms of surveillance promoted by genocidaires. Ultimately, the MOT's elevation of security culture as a form of resolution intimates the fraught relationships among state authority, public agency, and genocidal violence.

In contrast to the celebration of individual agency promoted through the use of motivational discourses, other MOT texts privilege the role of the nation-state in the resolution of atrocity. The MOT builds this case by underscoring the social ills caused by the absence of a sufficient regulatory body. For example, the MOT highlights the complications created by a lack of external enforcement through a narrative about child labor in the cocoa industry inside its Millennium Machine exhibit. After detailing the exploitative practices involved in chocolate manufacturing, the Millennium Machine mentions an agreement made by chocolate manufacturers to ensure more equitable labor practices for cocoa producers. However, the Millennium Machine also insinuates that such an agreement is doomed to fail because such decisions tend to be dictated by market logics, and without the use of child labor, the chocolate manufacturers will have to raise their prices.[188] As the narrative states, such economically-driven decisions will predominate absent any extra-state or state enforcer. Although the Millennium Machine

represents the most explicit articulation of this argument, its message is congruent with the MOT's discourse on problems posed by new media. In both instances, the problem is the lack of a "sheriff" in the "Wild West" of the Internet. Through its repeated warnings about the absence of regulatory bodies, the MOT creates the conditions for the valorization of the nation-state as critical to atrocity resolution.[189]

Such arguments about disorder and the need for authority join with the fear created through the horror framework to foster a certain affect. Given that the horrors featured in the MOT are located within a political atmosphere that lacks the imposition of order, regulation, or control, the institution creates a yearning for solutions in the form of a strong state or extra-state enforcer. To draw a parallel to Gunn's reading of the post-9/11 film, *War of the Worlds*, the MOT, like Gunn's text, creates a sense of fear and foreboding, which then feeds into a desire for the instantiation of order and control. Gunn describes the process as the "cultivat[ion of] a peculiar affective response," which manifests in "a longing for a strong, paternal figure to restore order, unite the community, and defeat the enemy."[190] In the film, this response is generated by playing upon post-9/11 terrorism anxieties. In the MOT, this response is cued by the aforementioned horror techniques which stress the prevalence of the sources of evil in conjunction with arguments which attribute social ills to the absence of an authoritative policing body. Like Gunn's paternal sovereign in *War of the Worlds*, this "policing body" is never explicitly depicted within the MOT; nevertheless, visitors do learn something about its critical components.

One of the chief components of such a state is its prioritization of security. As Brown notes, messages about the importance of security are communicated from the very

start of the exhibition as "[t]he heavily screened and regulated admission to the museum conveys a sense of potentially violent enmity toward the enterprise and the need for constant vigilance in relationship to this risk."[191] "[W]atchfulness, security, surveillance, and regulation," in Brown's words, are elevated as critical constructs from the start of the visit.[192] Yet, this elevation of security as an important part of the MOT creates a paradox whereby security and policing become an integral component of the institution's imparted messaging about tolerance, freedom, and democracy. Brown aptly captures this dynamic:

> While visitors are incessantly reminded that every individual has the power and responsibility to shape history, we are directed to confer that power to states and NGOs; there is nothing here that affirms – or trusts – popular power. Similarly, while we are constantly importuned to thoughtfulness, we are not actually trusted to think for themselves [sic]. And above all, while tolerance is the ideal or the hope, secure borders and heavily armed checkpoints are the necessary reality, just as freedom may be democracy's *raison d'être* but is ultimately trumped by security.[193]

Herein all of the threads in the exhibition come together: The seeds of fear and suspicion planted in the exhibition instill a sense of *insecurity* that creates a longing for an empowered state actor and a willingness to trade freedom for security.

While Brown aptly notes the disjunction created by the MOT's positioning of security as one of "the passwords of tolerance,"[194] this "solution" becomes all the more fraught because it threatens to expose discomforting connections between state power and genocide. More specifically, the problem for both the MOT and contemporary

genocide cessation discourse is that arguments about order and security must be muted in order to avoid linkages with the emblem of paramount state control: Nazi Germany. In other words, returning to the theoretical vocabulary bequeathed by Barthes, the links between contemporary security culture (which has heretofore been situated as desirable within the MOT) and the empowered and authoritarian state spotlighted in narratives about the Holocaust and other genocides must remain exnominated. Messages about state control and "desirable" forms of security must be safeguarded from blending into arguments that reveal the problems posed by authoritarianism. Put otherwise, state control must be recognized as "bad" when practiced by the Nazis; while "desirable" forms of state power are positioned as wildly divergent from this model of state abuse. The work to maintain the gulf between good state power and bad state power provides the rhetorical constraints that result in incongruences in the MOT's narrative.

Nowhere are the problems of these conflicting arguments about state control more clear than in the Holocaust exhibition. Toward the end of the exhibition, the visitor approaches the reproduced gates of Auschwitz and the moment of staged "selection." As one prepares to walk through these gates, one notes a variety of artifacts presumably associated with the moment of entering the camp: a watchtower, barbed wire, fencing, etc. In perhaps an ill-advised design choice, the observant visitor also notices something else, a technology noticeably out of place and out of sync with the other camp replicas: a security camera. On one side of the famed "Albeit Mach Frei" gate is a security relic from the Nazi camp—the watchtower, which serves as a reminder of the supreme abuse of state power and the perversion of an empowered government destroying its own citizens. On the other side is an emblem of modern state control—the security camera.

This juxtaposition creates the uneasy awareness that the visitor being surveyed just as the visitor's attention is drawn to the role of surveillance in camp life.[195] As Williams notes, security is a sensitive matter in museums like the MOT. Williams argues that memorial museums exhibit a reticence to add additional "guards, to erect a fence, or to add security cameras" to their institutions because "[t]he association of the Holocaust with forms of policing and bodily control makes such symbolically loaded actions thorny"[196] The "thorniness" Williams identifies is part of a broader uneasiness generated through a consideration of the relationships between the political values of the perpetrators of atrocities and the political values of the nation-state housing the MOT.[197]

This odd convergence of "bad" surveillance (Nazi surveillance) and presumably "good" surveillance (the MOT's surveillance) symbolized by this security camera's unfortunate spatial placement reveals what must remain unspoken or "exnominated" within the MOT, thus setting the parameters for the MOT's discourse about atrocity. In order to make meaning of the atrocities contained in the MOT in ways that are congruent with broader narratives about the benevolence of the US nation-state, Nazi Germany must remain its foil.[198] Its abuses must be disassociated from US abuses. If the Nazi state symbolizes control, the United States must stand for freedom. The gap must be enforced between the attributes of Nazi Germany and the attributes of US "liberal" society.[199] In so doing, "[r]eal human complexities" and "fluid shapes," notes Luke, transform into the stock characters and "rigid roles played by Hitler, stormtroopers, Gestapo agents," etc., which makes it all the easier to preserve a gulf between the evils of Nazi Germany and the political climate the visitor inhabits.[200] In other words, the complexities of political

life are flattened into a melodramatic script, creating a clear differentiation of "good" and "bad" nation-states.[201]

The work of maintaining this gap induces a blindness that helps inhibit the ways in which the very "ordered" infrastructure of this institution and others like it bears some resemblance to the genocidal cultures it decries. "Like the death camps themselves," Luke contends, Holocaust museums like the MOT and the USHMM "can seem like an elaborate edifice dedicated to repeating mechanically reproduced processes: arrival, culling, transportation, preparation, dispatch, disposal."[202] The security culture promoted by the MOT along with its "'Disneyfication' of the death camps ignores how deeply and easily the death camp can nest inside the routines of Disneyfication," bureaucracy, order, and control.[203] Luke's argument is all apparent within the MOT given the parallelism between the institution's approach to communication processes and technologies and authoritarian models for controlling speech and media distribution. According to Witcomb, the MOT's "approach to interactivity…has more in common with totalitarian than democratic approaches to cultural production."[204] Despite longstanding arguments about the connections between the modern state, industrial logic, bureaucracy, and genocide,[205] such linkages must remain exnominated in order for the MOT to offer condemnatory narratives about Nazi Germany and other perpetrators of genocide alongside the messages it implicitly and explicitly advances about the need for state control.[206]

Such resolution discourses reveal the limitations of US genocide cessation discourse within the MOT. To return to theoretical orientations introduced in Chapter One, the MOT's definitions, representations, and resolutions to atrocities notably omit

any evidence of "post-liberal" understandings of genocide.[207] Whereas post-liberal approaches to genocide punctuate the connections between the affairs of Western nation-states and the outbreak of genocide, such linkages are absent in the MOT. Rather than noting these connections, the MOT leaves exnominated any sense of the similarities between the violence it represents and politics of security and control it promotes. The state is to be seen as "a provider not a destroyer of security," in Edkins's words, and post-liberal arguments would threaten that image of the state.[208] Developing this critique in relation to US and Israeli Holocaust museums, Bartov highlights an institutional "insistence on ignoring such aspects of the genocide of the Jews that relate it to precisely those present political and socio-economic conditions one would rather maintain."[209] Within the context of the MOT, Bartov's argument translates into an institutional blindness toward the links between the security state and genocidal violence. The work to maintain this gap places limits on the plasticity of the MOT's genocide cessation discourse. Despite this disjuncture within the MOT's resolution discourses, its arguments regarding security are undergird by the institution's treatment of memory and temporality.

Memory & Temporality in the MOT: The Holocaust as Present, Past, and Future

The institution's engagement with memory primarily manifests through the institution's pronounced investment in time. Although the institution urges visitors to "remember," its discussions of memory are subsumed within larger arguments about the links between past, present, and future time. MOT exhibits discuss the significance of past violence, the seriousness of present violence, and the threat of future violence. Certain atrocities, such as the Holocaust, exist within all three temporalities: It is a past,

present, and future event. Insofar as such arguments about temporality intimate a horrific future, they reinforce the MOT's arguments about the necessity of security and an empowered state authority.

In Nora's terms, Holocaust museums are *lieux de mémoire*;[210] however, "memory" plays somewhat of a muted role within the MOT, sublimated within a larger discourse about time. To be sure, the institution includes standard injunctions to remember. Pamphlets available at the end of the Holocaust exhibition declare boldly on their front pages: "We remember…" The pamphlets describe the MOT as "dedicated to preserving the memory of the Holocaust."[211] Elsewhere in the institution, visitors encounter the message to "remember" as they descend the spiral ramp leading to the main exhibition floor. Notably, this plea to "remember" is only one of a list of infinitives inviting visitors to "dialogue," "hope," "create," etc.[212] As one of a multitude of inspirational words, this gateway to the main exhibition floor gestures toward a diminished role for memory.

Beyond these clichéd and simplistic commands to "remember," the MOT signals a broader investment in the past through its treatment of "time." Two Tolerancenter exhibits are expressly concerned with time. The "We the People" exhibition provides visitors with a detailed timeline highlighting US struggles with "diversity," "rights," and "intolerance" from the late sixteenth century to the first decade of the twenty-first century. Like "We the People," the Millennium Machine centralizes the import of time. As its futuristic name implies, the Millennium Machine invokes a sense of future time to highlight the necessity of taking action in the present. After a montage showcasing numerous past instances of atrocity, the exhibit introduces a contemporary issue such as

child exploitation or the status of refugees.[213] At the conclusion of the vignette on the featured topic, the exhibition expresses uncertainty about the future of said issue but reminds visitors: "The time is now."[214]

Institutional refrains such as – "the time is now"[215] – affirm arguments about the institution's presentist nature. As explored above, critics have charged the MOT with ahistoricism. Others have suggested that its heavy use of multi-media contributes to a "presentist" temporal orientation.[216] In many ways, the Tolerancenter supports this focus on the "now." The problems included in its exhibitions are not situated as past problems. Cyberbullying hate speech, and unfair labor practices, for example, are contemporary issues demanding visitors' action in the present.

This temporal orientation is enhanced by the importance of *experience* within the MOT. The prioritization of experience as a path toward knowledge or understanding is such a pronounced part of the institution that it becomes the subject of derision within the aforementioned *South Park* episode. The episode posits as laughable the notion that a few moments inside a simulation could recreate "how it feels" to suffer discrimination.[217] Nevertheless, the emphasis on experience is evident in the structure of the Holocaust exhibition. As visitors move through recreated street scenes and enter the simulated concentration camp, Brown argues the exhibition displays situate visitors so that "we are no longer mere witnesses to the Holocaust but are *inside* the experience."[218] Thusly, Brown notes "it is not surprising to find" remarks in MOT guest books which suggest that the visitors have acquired experiential knowledge: "'I had read some things about the Holocaust, but had never seen it firsthand.'"[219] Such remarks locate the Holocaust as part

of the visitors' present temporal moment. In such an exhibition space, the past is not to be

remembered but *experienced*.[220]

Of course, the Holocaust is also rooted in a particular historical context; thus, the

MOT oscillates between past and present temporalities in framing its Holocaust material.

The slide between these temporalities is facilitated by casting the visitors' walk through

the Holocaust exhibition as a form of time travel. While visitors wait for the automated

doors to open to exhibition, they are invited to sit in an antechamber and watch a short

film titled "The Jewish World That Was." The film describes Jewish life before WWII,

providing a glimpse into Jewish rituals and customs. As a timer above the mechanical

doors winds down and visitors prepare to enter the exhibition space, the film entreats

audiences to "remember" and retain the memory of the "world that was" as a means of

mourning the destruction wrought by the Shoah. As the doors open, the film abruptly

shifts from the language of remembering to one of experiencing. The film invites visitors

to "imagine you are going back in time."[221] Through the device of "time travel," the

Holocaust exists as both a past event as well as a present experience.

This liminal past-present temporality is the focus of one of the first displays

visitors encounter inside the Holocaust exhibition. Before the narrative begins to explain

the political climate in Germany in the 1920s, the narrative cautions visitors, "Remember

it [the Holocaust] could have happened anywhere in the world and to anyone of us."

Although the Holocaust exhibition offers a specific narrative, the display stresses that

"history has a habit of repeating itself unless we recognize the signs before it is too

late."[222] Such phrasing echoes the clichéd adage: "Those who cannot remember the past

are condemned to repeat it."[223] Such prose connects the Holocaust past with visitors'

present. Yet the language used here does not ask visitors to remember what happened but instead what "could have happened," introducing a sense of conditionality. The message articulated is not "Remember the Holocaust;" rather, the message is "Remember the plausibility of atrocity." This conditional message about the plausibility of violence subtly invokes a future temporality.

From this perspective, the Holocaust is not the "past," but a dystopic *future* and knowledge of this "future" then necessitates preventative actions in line with the MOT's promotion of security based-resolutions.[224] Such a conclusion parallels Biesecker's argument about the manipulation of temporality in the wake of the September 11th attacks.[225] Biesecker notes the Bush administration's "discursive transfiguration of a historical and political catastrophe [9/11] into the harbinger of an epochal Act 'to come.'"[226] She describes the Bush administration's rhetoric as marked by "the ubiquitous deployment of the future anterior."[227] In other words, an act that already was becomes the premonition of futuristic action. This future-threat-that-was then necessitates security in the present.[228] In much the same way the Bush administration situated 9/11 as "the future anterior," the MOT locates the Holocaust as part of three temporal moments: It has happened, is happening and will happen.[229] Messages about the future support the MOT's emphasis on security while all three temporalities enhance the MOT's claims to significance.

Flexibility and Rigidity in US Genocide Cessation Discourse

In sum, anxiety percolates throughout the Museum of Tolerance. Its broad scope and wide-ranging exhibition content imbue the MOT with the potential to produce a nuanced assessment of the interrelationships among various forms of atrocity, state

power, and public agency. Yet as the institution attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide, its arguments are fraught with contradictions and incompatible messages. The institution manages the tensions created through these contrasts by exacerbating a sense of anxiety, which ultimately enables the institution to validate state authority over other forms of popular power in spite of the problematic linkages between the nation-state and genocide.

The problematic facets of the MOT's treatment of genocide bespeak broader issues in US genocide cessation discourse associated with constructing genocide as a public problem. At the heart of these tenuous acts of definition, representation, resolution and remembrance is the question of US citizens and the US government's relationship to genocide. On the one hand, the MOT does create the space to acknowledge prevalence of violence that has occurred historically and continues to occur within the United States; the "Confronting Hate in America" exhibition models such acknowledgments. As Patraka explains, in contrast to the USHMM's configuration of the United States as a force of liberation, the MOT envisions the United States as a place where genocide could take place.[230] She goes on to argue, "to the degree that this museum [the MOT] and this ethnicity [Jews] assume the responsibilities of representing oppressions beyond their own, they make a gesture more unparalleled in the United States than the dismissals of this museum as a Disneyesque theme park would acknowledge."[231]

However, Patraka charges that the MOT still safeguards the United States from the harshest critiques. Chief among them, the MOT stops shy of charging the United States with genocide. Patraka draws attention to the little space afforded to the discussion of the US government's treatment of its indigenous populations, charging that the MOT

showcases "a tactful drawing of attention away from the full excess of 'intolerance' in this country."[232] Thus, the MOT attempts to articulate seemingly contradictory narratives. One narrative positions the US as a location where genocide could take place. At the same time, other exhibitions maintain a disconnect between US political ideologies (i.e., security culture) and the political ideologies that contribute to genocide.

The relationships among the US government, US citizens, and genocidal atrocities constitute fraught terrain, and Patraka's reading of the MOT punctuates the ambivalence that resides at the core of the institution. The MOT's exhibitions suggest that the US nation-state is a potential site for violence even as it suggests that additional state authority could stop violence. The US public is invested with a significant amount of agency through motivational messages at the same time that the institution undermines its visitors' ability to take action and participate in genocide cessation work. These tensions are never resolved, and the anxiety created by these incongruences reverberates throughout the MOT. Whereas the MOT capitalizes on an affective experience of anxiety or foreboding, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum manages this anxiety through the interplay of rhetorical intimation and exnomination.

Notes

[1] South Park Studios, "The Death Camp of Intolerance (Season 6, Episode 14)," 21:25, from "Full Episode Player – South Park Studios," air date November 20, 2002, accessed May 17, 2013, http://www.southparkstudios.com/full-episodes/s06e14-the-death-camp-of-tolerance.

[2] South Park Studios, "The Death Camp."

[3] South Park Studios, "The Death Camp."

[4] South Park Studios, "The Death Camp."

[5] In its mockery of the MOT, the episode's engagement with "tolerance" parallels the work on the limitations of tolerance discourses done by Wendy Brown. Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

[6] Brown argues that this is because genocide is not a critical construct. She suggests that the limited attention and space devoted to genocide reflects an institutional prioritization of the Holocaust. In part, she grounds this claim in changes to the exhibition which have removed other content on genocide. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 111-112, 235-236n17.

I do not engage "uniqueness thesis" concerns in this chapter. While not denying the overwhelming focus on the Holocaust, I contend that the institution nonetheless coveys important messages about the construct of genocide.

[7] At the start of her analysis of the MOT, Derwin notes a sense of anxiety percolating throughout the museum, which she treats as a suspicion of the visitor. Whereas as I treat this anxiety as part of a broader pattern within US genocide cessation discourse, she argues that this anxiety over visitor power enables the MOT to promote itself as an authority. See Susan Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation: The Role of the Body in Holocaust Pedagogy," in *Impossible Images: Contemporary Art after the Holocaust*, ed. Shelley Hornstein, Laura Levitt, and Laurence J. Silberstein (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 245, 250, 257-58. Derwin's analysis supports and influences Brown's read of the MOT's distrust of its visitor, explicated more fully later in this chapter. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*.

[8] "Temporal folding" is Vivian's term. See Bradford Vivian, "Times of Violence," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, no. 2 (2013): 211.

[9] The Museum of Tolerance's homepage includes an undated citation attributed to the *New York Times* stating, "This is no Ordinary Museum." Museum of Tolerance homepage, accessed May 21, 2013,

http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4865925/k.CAD7/HomeM OT.htm.

[10] "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 21, 2013,

http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4866027/k.88E8/Our_Histo ry_and_Vision.htm.

[11] On its webpages, the institution promotes its "interactive exhibits" and "creat[ion of] an experience" for visitors For the former quote see, "About Us," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 21, 2013,

http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4866005/k.C7BD/About_U s.htm. For the latter, see "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance. See also the language used to encourage school visits to the institution, "School Field Trips," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 21, 2013,

http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4866003/.

[12] "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance.

[13] "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance.

[14] "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance.

[15] In introducing the institution, Israeli et. al. tout the MOT's "youth outreach programs [for] address[ing] such critical issues as preventing youth violence and hate

crimes." Raphael Israeli et. al., "'The Architecture of Erasure' – Fantasy or Reality?" *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 3 (2010): 565. The MOT also promotes their youth programming on various parts of their website. See "Youth Programs," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 21, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4866091/k.A488/Youth_Programs.htm; "School Field Trips," Museum of Tolerance.

[16] "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance.

[17] "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance; Israeli et. al., "'The Architecture of Erasure,'" 565.

[18] "Grant Funded Field Trips for Los Angeles Area Schools," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 22, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.8383569/k.F3BD/Grant_Funded_Field_Trips_for_Los_Angeles_Area_Schools/apps/ka/ct/contactus.asp?c=tmL6KfNVLtH&b=8383569&en=fkKOK0POJdLSJ6PIIdJOIbPTLbJRIaMVKjKSIfO2JyE; "Grant Funded Field Trips for San Diego Schools," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 22, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.8289631/k.740D/Grant_Funded_Field_Trips_for_San_Diego_Schools.htm.

[19] "For Professionals," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 22, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4970277/k.B7D9/For_Professionals.htm.

[20] "Client Testimonials," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 22, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.5052745/k.703/Client_Testi monials.htm.

[21] Israeli et. al., "'The Architecture of Erasure,'" 565-566. Williams reads the MOT as part of a genre of institutions he calls "peace museums." These institutions are concerned with "future action" and, Williams explains, can be "key site[s] for civic training." Williams specifically refers to the MOT's programming for professionals. Paul Williams, "The Memorial Museum Identity Complex: Victimhood, Culpability, and Responsibility," in *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell, 2nd ed. (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 107-108.

[22] "For Professionals," Museum of Tolerance.

[23] "Holocaust Section," Museum of Tolerance, accessed May 22, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4865935/k.B355/Holocaust _Section.htm.

[24] For a more redeeming reading of the institution, see Theodore O. Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness, and Responsible: Collective Memory and Liminality in the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance," *Communication Quarterly* 51, no. 3 (2003): 351-366. Prosise notes the critical tenor of much of the existing literature and positions his piece as offering an alternative read.

[25] By way of referring to the MOT's role in meaning-making, Brown refers to museum content as "premasticated." Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 127.

[26] Nicola A. Lisus and Richard V. Ericson, "Misplacing Memory: The Effect of Television Format on Holocaust Remembrance," *The British Journal of Sociology*, 46 no.

1 (1995): 1-19. On page 5, Lisus and Ericson provide grounds for the argument that the heavy use of television screens reflects assumptions made about the presumed generational socialization of the MOT's audience. The screens are part of the institution's approach to attracting generations presumably expecting content to be delivered in televised ways. See also Omer Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 185. See also Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation," 247-248.

See again the discourse used to distinguish the MOT from "ordinary museums" on its "Our History and Vision" page. "Our History and Vision," Museum of Tolerance.

[27] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory."

[28] Museum professional Barry Lord discusses the Museum of Tolerance as "a popular example" of an "'idea museum,'" discussing the institution in his report on "Cultural Tourism and Museums." Barry Lord, "Cultural Tourism and Museums" (presentation, Seoul, Korea, September 27, 2002), accessed April 5, 2013, http://sinolord.com/Media/Artcl_CltTourismMSeoulKorea_2002.pdf.

See also Williams on the complexities of memorial museums as tourist destinations. Williams, "The Memorial Museum," 104-107.

[29] Museum of Tolerance, "The Time is NOW" (leaflet distributed at the entrance to the Museum of Tolerance, Los Angeles, CA, November 2012).

[30] Museum of Tolerance, "The Time is NOW."

[31] "Entertainmentality" is Luke's term for the constraints imposed by the adoption of entertainment logics. See Timothy W. Luke, *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the*

Exhibition (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002), 2-4. See also his discussion of the links between the MOT and entertainment culture in Luke, *Museum Politics*, 48-49.

Rather "entertainmentality," Kornblau prefers to conceptualize the MOT as "tak[ing] its cues from infotainment." Gary Kornblau, "The Museum of Tolerance," *Art Issues*, May/June 1993, 48.

Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki coin the concept of the "experiential landscape." See Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2006): 27-47. Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki develop this concept out of the work by Blair and Michel on the Astronauts Memorial. See Carole Blair and Neil Michel, "Commemorating in Theme Park Zone: Reading the Astronauts Memorial," in *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies,* ed. Thomas Rosteck (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999), 29-83. Notably, the influence of entertainment logics due to the MOT's proximity to tourist cites mimics the uneasy relationship between Orlando tourism and the Astronauts Memorial at the heart of Blair and Michel's piece.

See Bartov for his read of the institution vis-à-vis its location in Los Angeles. Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 183-184.

[32] Edward Norden, "Yes and No to the Holocaust Museums," *Commentary* 96, no. 2 (1993): 24. Brown discusses the MOT as the beneficiary of "astonishing sums from Hollywood glitterati." Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 109.

[33] Norden, "Yes and No," 24. The quote in full reads, "Concern was therefore expressed that his new Beit Hashoah – in Hebrew, the House of the Holocaust – would be too show-biz, and at the same time alarmist, parochial, illiberal, chintzy, hawkish, pro-

Likud." Notably, these critiques touch upon the political context Brown builds for

reading the institution. Brown fleshes out some of the reasons for these concerns. See

Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 109-113.

[34] Norden, "Yes and No," 24.

[35] "Finding Our Families, Finding Ourselves," Museum of Tolerance, accessed

May 22, 2013,

http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4865963/k.161D/Finding_O

ur_Families_Finding_Ourselves.htm.

[36] Brown links the format of the Millennium Machine to assumptions the

institution makes about its audiences' need to be entertained and stimulated. Brown,

Regulating Aversion, 125.

[37] Alexander Laban Hinton, "The Dark Side of Modernity: Toward an

Anthropology of Genocide," in *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*,

ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 26; Anne

Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture: Selling the Pain of Others in the Mass Media* (New

Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011); Leshu Torchin, *Creating the Witness:

Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the Internet* (Minneapolis: University of

Minnesota Press, 2012), 112-113, 133, 137-140. Notably Torchin's discussion of this

critique on 112-113 occurs through her analysis of the film *No Man's Land*. She credits

the film for fleshing out the connection to commodification.

[38] In Baron's words, "The commercial demands and genre conventions of motion

pictures as popular entertainment restrain filmmakers from treating the subject as

complexly, depressingly, and graphically as it merits." Lawrence Baron, "Holocaust and

Genocide Cinema: Crossing Disciplinary, Genre, and Geographical Borders: Editor's

Introduction," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 4.

See also Bartov's discussion of *Schindler's List*. Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*,

168-171.

[39] From Holtschneider's perspective, the narratives need to be tempered to protect

audiences. See K. Hannah. Holtschneider, "Victims, Perpetrators, Bystanders?

Witnessing, Remembering and the Ethics of Representation in Museums of the

Holocaust," *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 13, no. 1 (2007): 90.

On Holocaust museums as tourists sites, see Isabel Wollaston, "Negotiating the

Marketplace: The Role(s) of Holocaust Museums Today," *Journal of Modern Jewish

Studies* 4, no. 1 (2005): 65.

[40] Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Folklorists in Public: Reflections on Cultural

Brokerage in the United States and Germany," *Journal of Folklore Research* 37, no. 1

(2000): 13.

[41] See pages 103-104 in Chapter One.

[42] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 13. Witcomb's alternative read of

this quotation is engaged in note 53. Andrea Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums: The

Politics of Narrative Style," in *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, ed. Bettina

Messias Carbonell, 2nd ed. (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 588.

[43] Luke's central argument is that the experience produced at the MOT (and the

USHMM) is akin to the kind of experience that is produced at Disneyland or other such

entertainment sites. Luke writes, "the high-tech experiential spin of the Tolerancenter

permits one a vicarious thrill in violence and fear, like Mr. Toad's Wild Ride at

Disneyland, that can be forgotten or misremembered as soon as the doors fly open to the next section." Luke, *Museum Politics*, 51. Some of his reflections on the implications of the production of such "entertaining" experiences within Holocaust museums are engaged toward the end of this chapter, but his full discussion of these implications merits consideration. Luke, *Museum Politics*, 54-62.

In a very different capacity, Prosise also reads the MOT as producing an experience for its visitors, but an experience that moves visitors through the stages of social rituals. Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness."

For additional context: Although not engaging the MOT directly, Hamber and Hein respectively discuss the role of "experience" in both conflict museums and museums writ large. Brandon Hamber, "Conflict Museums, Nostalgia, and Dreaming of Never Again," *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 18, no. 3 (2012): 268-281; Hilde S. Hein, *The Museum in Transition: A Philosophical Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000).

[44] Williams and Hamber treat the production of affective experiences as characteristic of the form. Hamber, "Conflict Museums;" Williams, "The Memorial Museum," 108-109. The authors engaged in the following seven notes speak more specifically to the affective experience cultivated in the MOT.

[45] Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 587-588. Although not developed as a critique of the MOT, Rothe argues this kind of accentuation of the affective undercuts political action. Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 5.

[46] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 186.

[47] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 17, 18.

[48] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 184-186. See also Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 17.

Williams articulates the counter argument about affect in memorial museums, viewing the use of emotion as part of a means of establishing a contrast with Nazi rationality, "an antidote to the cold intellect associated with Nazism and apartheid that produced decisions about the course of others' lives without regard for emotion." See Williams, "The Memorial Museum," 108-109.

[49] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 186.

[50] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 8.

[51] See the argument as fully developed under the "Hegemony and Message Control" section. Pages 285-286 and notes 63-67.

[52] Edward Rothstein, "Making the Holocaust the Lesson on All Evils," *New York Times*, April 29, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/30/arts/design/museums-make-the-holocaust-a-homily.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

[53] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory,"18. See Chapter One, pages 98, 147n106. See also Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 185.

Notably, Witcomb charges that the ahistoricism of the institution is not necessarily the byproduct of its choice of medium. She attributes the MOT's shortcomings to the ideologies of individualism and faith in technology more so than any perceived deficiencies of the medium. See Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 588.

[54] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 17.

For more on the temporalities of mediation inside Holocaust museums, see Andrew Hoskins, "Signs of the Holocaust: Exhibiting Memory in a Mediated Age," *Media, Culture and Society* 25, no. 1 (2003): 7-23.

[55] Jon Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum," *Tikkun* 10, no. 3 (1995): http://www.tikkun.org/article.php/may1995_wiener.

Wollaston suggests that this is a problem facing Holocaust museums more broadly: "Holocaust museums offer a narrative account of the Holocaust and employ slogans to communicate key 'lessons,' but do not systematically unpack the complexities and significance of the events they represent." She goes on to construct an argument about their partiality. Wollaston, "Negotiating the Marketplace," 73. For more on representations of history in memorial museums, see Williams, "The Memorial Museum," 100-101.

[56] Oren Baruch Stier, *Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 148.

[57] Anson Rabinbach, "From Explosion to Erosion: Holocaust Memorialization in America since Bitburg," *History and Memory* 9, no. 1/2 (1997): 243-244.

[58] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 183. As Kornblau argues, the "MOT carries on a tradition of pandering to social problems, asking why 'we can't all just get along' while ignoring the deep social, economic, and political realities that breed hatred and intolerance." Kornblau, "The Museum of Tolerance," 48.

Again, Wollaston argues that this is part of the genre of Holocaust museums. Wollaston, "Negotiating the Marketplace," 73.

[59] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 184.

[60] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 184. As will be demonstrated below, this view of the Holocaust as rooted in intrapersonal prejudices bolsters the MOT's ability to offer self-help discourses and draw upon the political containment of therapuetic rhetorics. Dana L. Cloud, *Control and Consolation in American Culture and Politics: Rhetorics of Therapy* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.), 1998.

[61] Patraka makes this argument from the opposite perspective. By featuring the MOT's content as rooted in interpersonal inadequacies/intolerances, the systemic dimension is obscured. Vivian M. Patraka, "Situating History and Difference: The Performance of the Term *Holocaust* in Public Discourse," in *Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish Cultural Studies*, ed. Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press: 1997), 71; Vivian Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering: Performing Presence, Absence, and Witness at U.S. Holocaust Museums," in *Memory and Representation: Constructed Truths and Competing Realities*, ed. Dena Elisabeth Eber and Arthur G. Neal (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001), 150.

[62] Extending this quotation, Brown's full characterization of tolerance discourses reads: "of tolerance as a contemporary discourse of depoliticization in which power and history make little or no appearance in representations or accounts of ethnicized hostility or conflict, in which ethnicity, culture, religion, race, and belief are often confused and conflated, and in which historically produced antagonisms are reified as essential, the results of a natural enmity regarded as inherent in 'difference.'" *Brown, Regulating Aversion,* 109.

[63] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 114-115.

[64] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 10; Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 160-162; Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 586-587.

[65] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 7; Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 585-586; Brown, *Regulating Aversion*.

[66] Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 7.

[67] This point is made repeatedly throughout Brown's chapter on the MOT. See, for example, Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 115, 127.

There is a certain irony that rests at the heart of this critique. Patraka, for example, reads the MOT against the USHMM in interrogating the hegemonic and polysemic dimensions of each through a de Certeauian analysis of space/place. She suggests that on first blush the MOT appears to have the most polysemic potential; however, the MOT is a more hegemonic text than the USHMM. She argues that the USHMM does a much better job promoting multiple interpretations. Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 162-163.

[68] I draw here on Dow's insights regarding the goals of criticism. See Bonnie J. Dow, *Prime-Time Feminism: Television, Media Culture, and the Women's Movement Since 1970* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 4.

[69] The inspiration for this chapter's foregrounding of the notion of "plasticity" emerges from Sue Tait's work on body horror, pornography, and violence. In her article, Tait analyzes spectator subjectivities created through the website Ogrish. Ogrish is a platform for the display of graphic violence, including content such as beheadings. Part of Tait's argument highlights the problems of overusing the metaphor of pornography. She argues that the plasticity of the pornography metaphor occludes important element unique to the subjectivities cultivated through the viewing practices Ogrish facilitates.

Sue Tait, "Pornographies of Violence? Internet Spectatorship on Body Horror," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 1 (2008): 91-111. See also Carolyn J. Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy after the Holocaust* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).

[70] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 112.

[71] Rothstein, "Making the Holocaust;" Oren Baruch Stier, "Virtual Memories: Mediating the Holocaust at the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Beit Hashoah-Museum of Tolerance," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 64, no, 4 (1996): 839.

[72] Rothstein, "Making the Holocaust."

[73] Stier, "Virtual Memories," 839.

To some extent, the MOT itself encourages this split reading, demarcating the Holocaust exhibition and Tolerancenter as separate entities in their presentation of the institution. See "Exhibits," Museum of Tolerance, accessed April 6, 2013, http://www.museumoftolerance.com/site/c.tmL6KfNVLtH/b.4865933/k.DFFE/Exhibits.htm.

[74] Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness."

[75] Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 72; Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 150. See also Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 136.

Of course, this question of the relationship between the Tolerancenter and the Museum of Tolerance serves as an impetus for debates about the Holocaust's uniqueness. For more on the uniqueness thesis, see the Introduction. Other critics have read the institution with an eye toward what its organizational choices might imply about the relationship between the Holocaust and other genocides. See Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 111-112; Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum."

[76] Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 72; Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 150.

Indeed, this "sliding scale" logic is visualized in an exhibition at the very start of the Tolerancenter. As part of "The Power of Words" exhibit, visitors find a continuum that moves from yellow to red and lists a number of social problems – in order: "hate language, hate symbols, hate gatherings, disturbing the peace, threats, vandalism, assault, civil rights violations, arson, murder, terrorism." Without offering any clues as to the grounds for this ordering, the continuum exhibits the logic that seems to guide the MOT: small acts of violence lead to larger acts of violence; thus, even seemingly small offenses demand attention. Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[77] Williams, "The Memorial Museum," 108.

Expounding upon a similar theme, Rothstein suggests that the pedagogy embedded in such museums instructs: "We should all get along, become politically active and be very considerate of our neighbors. If not, well, the differences between hate crimes and the Holocaust — between bullying and Buchenwald — are just a matter of degree." Rothstein, "Making the Holocaust."

[78] "Microaggression[s]," a term typically used in discussions of racism, "are the everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights, snubs, or insults, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership." Derald Wing Sue, "Microaggressions, Marginality, and Oppression: An Introduction," in

Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestations, Dynamics, and Impact, ed. Derald Wing Sue (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2010), 3.

One of the major obstacles in conversations about microaggressions is the proclivity to minimalize or trivialize this form of harm. As Sue et. al explain, "microaggressions are believed to have minimal negative impact." Derald Wing Sue, Christina M. Capodilupo, Gina C. Torino, Jennifer M. Bucceri, Aisha M. B. Holder, Kevin L. Nadal, and Marta Esquilin, "Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice," *American Psychologist* 62, no. 4 (2007): 278.

The Tolerancenter is filled with content punctuating the harms of microaggressions. The Tolerancenter warns of the horrors caused by hate speech, stereotypes, gossip, etc. Undoubtedly, such microaggressions have damaging consequences yet they are hampered by perceptions of insignificance, and as such, fail to provide the grounds for the assertion of a *crisis*.

[79] Numerous books and articles have been written on the rhetoricity of museums. As a representative sample, see Greg Dickinson, Brian Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum," *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (2005): 85-108; Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering;" Tamar Katriel, "Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80, no. 1 (1994): 1-20; Gaynor Kavanagh, *Dream Spaces: Memory and the Museum* (London: Leicester University Press, 2000); Luke, *Museum Politics*; Susan MacDonald, ed., *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture* (London: Routledge, 1998).

[80] "Mediascape," as the term is used here, is defined by Appadurai as follows: "Mediascapes refer both to the distribution of the electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information (newspapers, magazines, television stations and film production studios), which are now available to a growing number of private and public interests throughout the world, and to the images of the world created by these media." Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," *Public Culture* 2, no. 2 (1990): 9

[81] I draw here on Kornfeld's inclination to forsake the language of "hybridity" in favor of the metaphoric insights lent by the embrace of sewing metaphors as explanatory devices for the combination of genres. Such language also resonates with the use sewing metaphors in Radway's discussion of ideology. See Sarah J. Kornfield, "Postfeminist Detectives: Television Genres, Genders, and Crimes," (paper presentation, NCA Doctoral Honors Seminar, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, July 11, 2012); Janice A. Radway, "Identifying Ideological Seams: Mass Culture, Analytical Method, and Political Practice," *Communication* 9, no. 1 (1986): 93-123.

[82] Amy J. Devitt, *Writing Genre*s (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004), 21.

For more on the relationship between genre and situation, see Amy J. Devitt, "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept," *College Composition and Communication* 44, no. 4 (1993): 573-586.

[83] A few caveats are necessary to complicate this tripartite delineation of generic frameworks. First, the boundaries between melodrama and horror are contestable. In her oft-cited discussion of "body genres," Williams writes, "Melodrama, however, refers to a

much broader category of films and a much larger system of excess. It would not be

unreasonable, in fact, to con-sider all three of these genres under the extended rubric of

melodrama, considered as a filmic mode of stylistic and/or emotional excess that stands

in contrast to more 'dominant' modes of realistic, goal-oriented narrative. In this

extended sense melodrama can encompass a broad range of films marked by 'lapses' in

realism, by 'excesses' of spectacle and displays of primal, even infantile emotions, and

by narratives that seem circular and repetitive." Williams suggests that "melodrama"

includes horror. Yet she continues in her work to delineate the unique properties of horror

based upon the viewer's reaction. In this chapter, I retain a division between horror and

melodrama in order to create space to focus on the production of a fearful affect. See

Linda Williams, "Film Bodies: Gender, Genre, and Excess," *Film Quarterly* 44, no. 4

(1991): 3-5.

Second, my project overlaps with and diverges from Rothe's *Popular Trauma

Culture*. Her study of "popular trauma culture" relies upon Latour's work "to suggest that

the trauma conception functions as a discursive knot." She argues, "the discursive knot

generated by the trauma concept provides the dominant mode of emplotment – the basic

narrative structure and core set of characters – for representing … diverse experiences."

Rothe contends that part of this narrative structure includes melodrama and self-help

discourses. However, reading the MOT as part of "popular trauma culture" alone would

fail to sufficiently illuminate the punctuated "horror" elements featured prominently

within the museum (but underdeveloped in Rothe's framework). Thus; although I draw

heavily on Rothe's work in the ensuing section, I front the generic frameworks instead of

subsuming each or relating each to Rothe's "popular trauma culture." Rothe, *Popular*

Trauma Culture, 4. Rothe grounds this claim in Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 201.

[84] Steffen Hantke, "Introduction: Horror Film and the Apparatus of Cinema," in *Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear*, ed. Steffen Hantke (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004), viii.

[85] Hantke, "Introduction," viii.

[86] Williams, "Film Bodies." Notably, Williams's conception of "body genres" expands Carol Clover's work on the subject. Clover earlier identified horror as a body genre. See Carol J. Clover, "Her Body, Himself: Gender in the Slasher Film," *Representations* 20 no. 1 (1987): 187-228.

Williams's work is a seminal part of the discussion about the utility of the horror genre. Hantke turns to Williams to define the genre. Hantke, "Introduction," viii.

Others examining horror and Holocaust representation also draw on Williams's work. See Aaron Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust: New Perspectives on Dramas, Documentaries, and Experimental Films* (New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), 10-11, 121-176; Walter C. Metz, "'Show Me the Shoah!': Generic Experience and Spectatorship in Popular Representations of the Holocaust," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 27, no. 1 (2008): 16-35.

[87] Williams, "Film Bodies," 4-5. Indeed, in her analysis of horror, pornography, and melodrama, Williams argues "that the success of these genres is often measured by the degree to which the audience sensation mimics what is seen on the screen."

This focus on the sensory experience is at the core of Derwin's analysis. See Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation."

[88] On the low status of the genre see Williams, "Film Bodies," 3. For more on the representation debates refer back to Chapter One, pages 98-106. See also Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*, 155.

[89] Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*, 10, 155. The division that Kerner is drawing here is subtle. He does not refute Picart and Frank's argument about the use of horror frames. Rather, he is looking at horror films and arguing that few horror films engage the subject of the Holocaust. His claim in this regard rests upon parsing horror from exploitation films, the subject of his previous chapter. Exploitation films, Kerner notes, centralize graphic material both in terms of carnage and sexually explicit materials. Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*, 139-153.

[90] Caroline Joan (Kay) S. Picart and David A. Frank, *Frames of Evil: The Holocaust as Horror in American Film* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006).

[91] As Kerner writes, "the horror genre evokes the sensation of fascination and revulsion. Traditional representations of the Holocaust invite our morbid gaze, but at the same time, owing to their 'serious' form, permit for the disavowal of our own curiosity in the abject. This is done either by cloaking the Holocaust behind the veil of objectivity, as seen in historical narratives and documentaries, or dressing it up in the garb of 'noble genres,' such as dramatic narratives or tragedy. The horror genre, in this respect, is potentially more productive, because within this genre there is license, if not an expectation, to explore 'the blood and guts' of it. But more than this, the horror genre

also deals with the existence of evil in the world, and the darker side of humanity."
Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*, 156-157.

[92] Hantke extrapolates on the questionable ethics of the conflation of historical
and cinematic horror: "Ruzowitzky's horror film in fact occupies a far more problematic
position on the scale of discursive authenticity, gravity, and legitimacy. Making a horror
film that utilizes the Third Reich as a source of cinematic thrills would appear to many a
dubious proposition. This seems paradoxical because horror film is the one cinematic
genre devoted primarily to the sensation with which most regard the Holocaust. **But
horrors on the screen and horrors in history occur on different ontological levels, a
difference that translates into profound ethical differences."** Steffen Hantke, "Horror
Film and the Historical Uncanny: The New Germany in Stefan Ruzowitzky's *Anatomie*,"
College Literature, 31, no. 2 (2004): 121. (emphasis added).

Picart and Frank utilize part of this quotation to interrogate the ethical
implications of the use of horror in Holocaust representations in the introduction and
conclusion of their book. See Picart and Frank, *Frames of Horror*, 6, 127. See also
Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*, 155.

[93] Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*, 157.

[94] See Torchin's arguments about the use of horror in the Nuremberg trial films.
Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 83-86.

Kerner suggests that "the Nazi is figured as an embodiment of absolute evil with
almost superhuman strength, the virtual spawn of Satan." Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*,
155.

[95] Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust,* 157.

[96] Meyrowitz, drawing on Edward T. Hall's work on proxemics, makes the argument that the tightness of a shot can simulate the effect of interpersonal perceptions of distance. Thus the tight framing in these shots locates the viewer proximate to the violence, increasing its emotional impact in line with the principles of proxemics. See Joshua Meyrowitz, "Television and Interpersonal Behavior: Codes of Perception and Response," in *Inter/Media: Interpersonal Communication in a Media World,* ed. Gary Grumpert and Robert Cathcart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 221-241.

[97] Notably, this sequence is not captured in a tight frame; it is shown at a wide angle.

[98] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[99] As Brown explains in her description of the videos in the Point of View diner: "The vignettes are extremely dramatic; the first video contains enough blood, agony, death, and sorrow that it could easily be a high school driver education film, and the second ends with the accidental killing of an innocent bystander by an enraged black security guard." Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 119. Brown's emphasis on the "dramatic" nature of these films lays the groundwork for the following critique concerning the use of melodrama as a genre in the MOT's genocide cessation discourse.

Elsewhere, Brown talks about the use of horror in the Millennium Machine exhibit. In her words, "The film literally terrifies viewers with its account of the ease of making and disseminating anthrax and other massively toxic substances." Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 124.

[100] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[101] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[102] Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 70.

[103] Barry Glassner, *The Culture of Fear: Why Americans are Afraid of the Wrong Things* (New York: Basic Books 1999).

[104] See Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 74; Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 152; Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 185; Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 125; Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 17; Luke, *Museum Politics*, 51, 55. Kornblau describes the MOT as "a sort of It's a Small World for liberals of all ilk." He also reads the Holocaust portion of the MOT as "reminiscent of the Old Carousel of Progress attraction at Disneyland, but here one ends up in a recreated gas chamber." Kornblau, "The Museum of Tolerance," 48.

[105] Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum."

[106] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[107] Remarks attributed to Arnold Schwarzenegger, quoted in Norden, "Yes and No," 24, 25. Brown, too, picks up on the significance of these remarks. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 125, 240-241n32.

[108] Such sensory experiences may not have a profound affective component. As Hantke explains in his analysis of the German film *Anatomie*: "Using the Third Reich as a device that conjures up the uncanny serves not the topic but the demands of the genre. Whenever the Anti-Hyppocratics [in the film] are presented as latter day Nazis, they feel most like movie villains and least like flesh and blood characters. This recourse to the Nazi as Hollywood villain brings with it the risk that the uncanny will be, in fact, just that—a generic device. Audiences who understand the rules of horror films, and most horror audiences are highly competent in this regard, are likely to respond to the

conventionality with which the uncanny is cited. Consequently, they will enter into an interaction with the film that *elides any real emotional involvement. The horror they will experience is bracketed from the very beginning as a response appropriate to the genre of film they are watching, not as a response to the horrors of Nazi medical experimentation.*" Hantke, "Horror Film," 137. [emphasis added]

This returns us to the reasons that Kerner suggests the use of horror is problematic in Holocaust representation. Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*.

[109] Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust,* 156-157. Kerner articulates similar concerns in his discussion of exploitation. Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust,* 141, 154.

Such concerns dovetail with debates over the ethics of the representation of graphic carnage more broadly. See Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Picador, 2003); Tait, "Pornographies of Violence?"; John Taylor, *Body Horror: Photojournalism, Catastrophe and War* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

[110] Peter Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976), 12.

[111] Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination*, 14-15; Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 46.

[112] Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 46.

[113] Rothe argues that this is the storyline of popular trauma culture put into motion by events such as the Eichmann Trial. The popularized story lines from the trial, she argues, "were constructed around a melodramatic conflict between absolute innocence and rank evil, which was embodied in the dichotomized flat characters of victim and perpetrator." Of course, such "flat" narratives are "historically and politically

decontextualized narratives," resonating with critiques of the MOT's reductiveness. Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 2.

[114] Herein such a contention diverges from Rothe's sketch of the components of "popular trauma culture." Using a Christian theological framework, within the MOT, the visitor is both sinner and witness, the judge and the judged. Or, using terms that resonate with Rothe's framework, the visitor to the MOT is both a "survivor" and a perpetrator. As Rothe punctuates repeatedly in her book, the "survivor" is the dominant figure in contemporary popular trauma culture. In asking visitors to accept culpability, the MOT challenges part of the "popular trauma culture" narrative. Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 32-41.

[115] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[116] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[117] Although I do not expressly draw out the gendered element included in such representations, the displays elevate *feminine* representations of grief. This Holocaust narrative resonates with the expressly "feminine" nature of bereavement conveyed elsewhere in the Tolerancenter. Returning to the "Confronting Hate in America" exhibition, women and children are overwhelming used to connote tragedy. Exhibition images capture women at a vigil, a woman holding a child, and children holding hands with a police officer, etc. This visual motif, in other words, connotes "sad" women and children. This becomes the aesthetics used to narrate grief. Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012. Such representations are consistent with Rothe's argument that the "victim figure … remains associated with women and children." Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 46. Such gendered representations within the MOT are

consistent with larger arguments Kitch has made about the gendering of bereavement. Carolyn Kitch, "Mediating Memorial: The Growing Role of Journalism in Local Ritual and National Tribute" (lecture, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, November 3, 2008).

[118] For more on the rhetorical power of animating still photos in this capacity, see Judith Lancioni, "The Rhetoric of the Frame: Revisioning Archival Photographs in *The Civil War*," *Western Journal of Communication* 60, no. 4 (1996): 397-414.

[119] This image's treatment clearly evinces practices of decontextualization and recontextualization. For more on the decontextualization and recontextualization of images, see Shawn J. Parry-Giles, "Mediating Hillary Rodham Clinton: Television News Practices and Image-Making in the Postmodern Age," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 2 (2000): 205-226.

On Holocaust images as symbols, see Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 86, 92-94, 118.

[120] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 118. This divisiveness into good or bad polarities makes sense within the broader context of melodrama. Brooks suggests "the very logic of melodrama" is the "logic of the excluded middle." Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination*, 18.

[121] Melodrama's caricaturization of evil has clear ties to Waller's arguments about "Extraordinary Evil." As Waller explains, these understandings the "purely evil person" and the "purely good" person are "artificial construct[s];" nevertheless, melodrama provides useful backing for these reductive conceptions. James Waller, *Becoming Evil:*

How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford, 2007), 20. See also Chapter One.

[122] Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination*, 17. Rothe, too, utilizes this quotation in her discussion of evil. Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 46.

[123] This understanding of evil both dovetails with Waller's arguments about the "cognitive escape" provided by such caricatured understandings of evil as well as Picart and Frank's arguments about the utility of the classic horror frame in reifying ideological-intentionalist conceptions of "evil as a breach with the ordinary, evil as intentional, the space of the monstrous other as dark and the site of the other." Picart and Frank, *Frames of Evil*, 19. Waller, *Becoming Evil*, 20. See also Chapter One.

[124] Smith discusses at greater length melodrama's "seductive pleasures": "It is comforting to lay the blame for our failure on other shoulders, and shrink from the rigours of self-castigation into the euphoric illusion that we are innocent victims of a hostile world. Again, it is heartening to cast private doubt and reservation aside, and enter wholeheartedly into a struggle against manifest injustice. By attacking villains we can all become heroes." James L. Smith, *Melodrama* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1973), 10.

[125] In Rothstein's words, the lesson is "we are all prejudiced, not just the guards at Auschwitz." Rothstein, "Making the Holocaust."

[126] For more on the MOT's ties to Judaism and the complications this has created for the MOT, see Brown *Regulating Aversion*, 109-111; Norden, "Yes and No," 23-24; Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum." See Stier for an alternative reading of the institution as "Judeo-Christian." Stier, "Virtual Memories," 839, 847.

[127] Rothe affirms the extent to which these two frameworks are compatible. Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*.

Similarly, Stratton notes the ease with which these frameworks meld. Like melodrama, in Stratton's words, "the thematics of the Americanized Holocaust, filtered through American culture's Christian fundamentalist tendency to moral binaries, most obviously callous and sadistic Nazis, and murderous annihilation of those designated as Other, appear across American culture." Jon Stratton, "Thinking Through the Holocaust. A Discussion Inspired by Hilene Flanzbaum (ed.), *The Americanization of the Holocaust*," *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 14, no. 2 (2000): 241.

[128] Prosise argues that this message used to be explicitly conveyed in the physical installation. He writes, "Facing visitors on the wall opposite the entry in large print is this message: 'The potential for violence is within all of us.'" Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness," 359.

[129] For more on the Christianization of the Holocaust, see Tom Lawson, "Constructing a Christian History of Nazism: *Anglicanism and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1945-49*," *History and Memory* 16, no. 1 (2004): 146-176; Tom Lawson, "Shaping the Holocaust: The Influence of Christian Discourse on Perceptions of the European Jewish Tragedy," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 21, no. 3 (2007): 404-420.

On the use of Christian iconography in Holocaust remembrance, see Janet Jacobs, "Memorializing the Sacred: Kristallnacht in German National Memory," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47, no. 3 (2008): 485–498.

Beyond the above discussions of Christian iconography and the Holocaust, Torchin argues that Christian imagery was part of the representation of the Armenian

genocide and continues to be part of the iconography used to make genocide comprehensible. Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 9-11, 44-53. In Torchin's discussion of Christianity as a schemata for understanding genocide, she notes the threat of Manicheanism and depoliticization. Clearly, both the discussion of moral binarism and apoliticism embedded in her critique of the Christian components of such representations resonates with this chapter's analysis of the MOT.

[130] Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999), 274, 351n17.

[131] Novick, *The Holocaust*, 274.

[132] Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 2

[133] Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 24-25. Rothe draws on Novick and Amato's work. See Joseph A. Amato, *Victims and Values: A History and a Theory of Suffering* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990), 48; Novick, *The Holocaust*, 274.

[134] Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture,* 2, 24-25.

[135] Although he takes his critique in a different direction, Bartov identifies the MOT's ties to Christian systems of meaning-making. He argues that the MOT "interprets the past through a Christian prism of infusing matter with spirit, allowing things to remain precisely as they are while simultaneously arguing that they have been transformed in their essence through love (and faith)." Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 184.

[136] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[137] The author would like to thank the attendees at her fall 2012 presentation of this chapter to the University of Southern California's genocide resistance research cluster for this useful insight.

[138] See the larger discussion of evil contained on pages 92-93 in Chapter One.

[139] In this capacity, an understanding of "evil" as contained "within" denies the separatism of a classic horror understanding evil and reflects elements of the conflicted frame insofar as it "weave[s] evil into normality." For more on this understanding of evil and its relation to the classic frame and Holocaust representation, see Picart and Frank, *Frames of Evil*, 8-11.

[140] While this facet of the museum's messaging appears progressive to Wiener, Witcomb, refutes Wiener to reinforce the conservative dimensions of the institution, finding little redemption in what she characterizes as Wiener's praise of the museum's "brave start." Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum;" Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 588-589.

[141] Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness," 359.

[142] The doors are mentioned in all of the following analyses or commentaries: Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 117; Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation," 249-250; Lisus and Ericson, "Misplacing Memory," 3-4; Luke, *Museum Politics*, 49; Prosise, "Prejudiced, Historical Witness," 359; Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 154; Rothstein, "Making the Holocaust;" Stier, *Committed to Memory*, 131-132; Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum;" Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 586.

[143] Drawing on Derwin, "fallen" is Brown's descriptor. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 117. Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation," 249-250.

[144] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Worse than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2009), 9.

[145] The MOT plays on its name in its promotional materials to urge potential visitors to "get MOTivated." Museum of Tolerance, "The Time is NOW."

[146] On page 311, I begin to explicate this argument using Brown's analysis of the MOT.

[147] Indeed, Rothe treats each as constitutive components of "popular trauma culture." For more on her discussion of the links between trauma discourses and self-help discourses, see Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 4.

[148] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 184. Indeed, these are the very implications both Rothe and Cloud contend follow from the embrace of such self-help or therapeutic rheorics. Cloud, *Control and Consolation*; Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*.

[149] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[150] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012. [I have preserved the capitalization from the original]

[151] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[152] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012. Capitalization has been changed here for readability.

[153] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 128-130.

[154] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[155] See again the explication of Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners* in Chapter Two. [emphasis added]

[156] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 2.

[157] "Lessons for Communicators from the Museum of Tolerance," *Communication World,* August/September 1997, http://www.iabc.com/cw/.

[158] Valerie Pethen, quoted in "Lessons for Communicators."

[159] Raymond W. Smith, "Civility without Censorship," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, January 15, 1999, 196-198.

[160] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[161] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[162] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 117. Specifically, Brown argues, this impression is fostered by the "Power of Words" exhibition referenced earlier.

[163] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 117.

[164] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 121.

Herein Brown's critique of this portion of the MOT dovetails with Luke's assertion that the use of these entertainment genres "may make the Holocaust more unreal as its unfathomable evils are recast as stock characters, plot staples, or moral clichés in the diverting simulations of this museum's shows." The museum in this quotation is the USHMM; although Luke's critique stands as applied to the MOT. Luke, *Museum Politics*, 38-39.

[165] See also Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums."

[166] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 127.

[167] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 137.

[168] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 137.

[169] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[170] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 115.

[171] "The Hitler Letter: A Letter that Changed the World" flyer, Museum of Toelrance, accessed June 16, 2013,

http://www.museumoftolerance.com/atf/cf/%7B0418CDF9-65C7-4424-955C-E30218530A20%7D/Hitler_Letter_Exhibit.pdf.

[172] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[173] Stuart Hall, "Encoding/Decoding," in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2006), 163-173.

[174] It also aligns with the generic conventions of melodrama through "the promise of a morally legible universe to those willing to read and interpret properly its signs." Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination*, 201. The emphasis herein on "proper interpretation" is most clearly evidenced in exhibitions such as the 1919 Hitler letter display.

[175] This understanding of the media is easiest to observe in a vignette offered through the Point of View diner about a talk radio host. In the narrative, an offensive talk radio host is linked to outburst of violence. The moral quagmire presented to visitors hinges upon whether or not his offensive speech is the cause of the instance of violence featured in the vignette. This understanding of "the media" as a catalyst for violence is also utilized in the Holocaust portion of the MOT, specifically in its representation of political cartoons. Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012. See 367n187.

[176] Torchin, *Creating the Witness*.

[177] The suspicion with which the MOT approach mediation is reminiscent of the suspicion Biesecker argues (drawing on Derrida) the Bush administration cultivated toward mediation. See Barbara A. Biesecker, "No Time for Mourning: The Rhetorical

Production of the Melancholic Citizen-Subject in the War on Terror," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 40, no. 1 (2007): 147-169.

[178] I would be remiss not to mention that the MOT's trepidation over the power of media (and specifically here we are talking about mass media) can be read as part of the larger anxieties surrounding Holocaust representation referenced earlier in this dissertation project. I am also particularly struck by the way this fear of the media resurrects dated Frankfurtian understandings of mass communication. I take my cue here from Miriam Bratu Hansen's work on *Schindler's List*. In her analysis of intellectuals' reception of *Schindler's List*, Hansen reveals the extent to which the reception of the film showcases representation anxieties, *and more specifically,* encourages the replication of "the old debate of modernism versus mass culture, and thus with binary oppositions of 'high' versus 'low,' 'art' versus 'kitsch,' 'esoteric' versus 'popular.'" Hansen is cognizant of the extent to which the readings of *Schindler's List* replicate "culture industry" concerns. See Miriam Bratu Hansen, "*Schindler's List* Is Not *Shoah*: The Second Commandment, Popular Modernism, and Public Memory," *Critical Inquiry* 22, no. 2 (1996): 292-312.

Frankfurt school understandings of "mass culture" are not just useful in terms of redrawing high/low culture distinction within atrocity representation debates. They seem to also reappear in terms of the way the MOT understand media effects.

[179] For more on this approach to media see Tamar Liebes, "Viewing and Reviewing the Audience: Fashions in Communication Research," in *Mass Media and Society*, ed. James Curran and Michael Gurevitch, 4th ed. (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), 356-374. Notably Liebes makes use of a three part categorization derived from

Ellis's work to organize her analysis. John Ellis, *Seeing Things: Television in the Age of Uncertainty* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000).

[180] Luke, *Museum Politics*, 50. Derwin writes that "from the point of view of the museum planners…the visitors appear to consist of nothing but the media images they mindlessly internalize." Derwin, "Sense and/or Sensation," 249.

[181] Extending the conversation of encoding/decoding and interpretation above, Witcomb expressly notes that the MOT "closes off the negotiation of meaning at the same time as producing high levels of crowd control." Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 585. Hall, "Encoding/Decoding."

[182] By "social constructionist," I mean an approach to the media texts that views them as creating rather than merely transmitting content. My understanding of the media as constructing reality is informed by scholars such as Murray Edelman, *Constructing the Political Spectacle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); James Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (New York: Routledge, 1989); John Hartley, *The Politics of Pictures: The Creation of the Public in the Age of Popular Media* (London: Routledge, 1992); John Hartely, *Television Truths* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008).

[183] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[184] By way of furthering the idea of the Web as a "dangerous" place, Smith states, "Neo-Nazis and extremists of every political stripe who once terrorized people in the dead of night with burning crosses and painted swastikas are now sneaking up on the public – especially our kids – through the World Wide Web." Of the utmost import, however is that Smith's speech argues *against* censorship and in favor of the First

Amendment. Thus, at the same time Smith contributes to this discourse of threat, he resists the implication that the way to counter such threat is through increased governmental control. Smith, "Civility without Censorship," 196.

[185] Notably, Brown creates doubt over the authenticity of these websites. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 240n29.

[186] For more on this metaphor for the Internet, see Jonathan J. Rusch, "Cyberspace and the 'Devil's Hatband,'" *Seattle University Law Review* 24, no. 2 (2000): 577-598.

The number of articles employing this metaphor are too numerous to list. For examples, see Michael Fertik and David Thompson, *Wild West 2.0: How to Protect and Restore Your Online Reputation on the Untamed Social Frontier* (New York: AMACON, 2010); Benjamin Edelman, "Securing Online Advertising: Rustlers and Sheriffs in the New Wild West," in *Beautiful Security: Leading Security Experts Explain How They Think*, ed. Andy Oram and John Viega (Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2009): 89-105; Robin Mackenzie, "'WWW': World Wide Web or Wild Wild West? Fixing the Fenceposts on the Final Frontier: Domain Names, Intellectual Property Paradigms and Current Disputes Over the Governance of the Internet," *Information and Communications Technology Law* 7, no. 2 (1998): 103-116.

[187] Of course, the message imparted by this vignette is not entirely clear, argues Stier. The vignette invites a political debate about the connections among the freedom of speech, hate speech, and violence, but the potential depth of that debate is undermined by the simplistic avenues for audience engagement. See Stier, *Committed to Memory*, 133-134.

[188] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[189] In articulating such an argument, I am positing that "lawlessness" might function in the same capacity that Brown charges the term "security" does within the MOT. Brown cites the work of Mary Louise Pratt and Pratt's argument that "Security is one of those words, like 'celibacy' or 'short' that invokes its opposite." See Mary Louise Pratt, "Security," in *Shock and Awe: War on Words*, ed. Bregje van Eekelen, Jennifer Gonzalez, Anna Tsing, Bettina Stotzer (Santa Cruz, CA: New Pacific Press, 2004), 140; Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 239n22.

[190] Joshua Gunn, "Father Trouble: Staging Sovereignty in Spielberg's *War of the Worlds*," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 1 (2008): 3.

[191] Brown, *Regulating Aversion,* 114.

[192] Brown, *Regulating Aversion,* 114.

[193] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 142.

[194] Brown, *Regulating Aversion,* 114.

[195] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[196] Williams, "The Memorial Museum," 106. Williams articulates this argument in discussing questions surrounding visitor conduct at memorial museums. In particular, this discussion of security arises in response to complaints about visitor behavior at the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin.

[197] See again Bartov's artful discussion of these tensions as they shape Holocaust museums such as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Museum of Tolerance. Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 182-183.

[198] To borrow the words of Rose used in Chapter Four, Nazi Germany must exist "as the anti-city of the American political community." Gillian Rose, *Mourning Becomes*

the Law: Philosophy and Representation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 30. See also Hasian, "Remembering and Forgetting," 69.

[199] This negation argument is also contained in Caplan's work introduced in Chapter Two (see pages 186-187, 241n55-60) and is expounded upon in greater depth on pages 383, 440-442n43-45 in Chapter Four.

[200] Luke articulates this argument in his read of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum; however, his insights are just as valid – if not more valid – as applied to the Museum of Tolerance. Luke, *Museum Politics*, 60 - 61. Brown, too, notes the extent to which the figures in the MOT are caricatures. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 120-121.

Wiener expands upon the consequences of such reductive character sketches. He argues that "since none of us resembles George Wallace [as an example of villainy] very much, the Tolerancenter's premise--that we are all prejudiced--has been forgotten by this point in our journey through the museum." Wiener, "The Other Holocaust Museum."

[201] In this case, the MOT mostly clearly embodies the "flattening" that Rothe discusses as characteristic of the way the Holocaust is cast through the prism of "popular trauma culture" as well as Brooks's contention that melodrama is marked by the "logic of the excluded middle." Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination*, 18; Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture*, 2. See also notes 113, 120.

[202] Luke, *Museum Politics,* 55.

[203] Luke, *Museum Politics*, 55.

In developing this critique, Luke builds on Baudrillard's work on simulations although Bauman and Bartov also deserve credit for developing similar linkages between

the routines of modern life and the impetuses for violence. Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*; Jean Baudrillard, "The Precession of Simulacra," in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed. (1994; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 453-481; Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000).

[204] Witcomb, "Interactivity in Museums," 585.

[205] See again Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*; Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*.

[206] Regarding exnomination, modernity and the Holocaust, Hansen notes in her analysis of the reception of *Schindler's List*: "a need for Americans to externalize and project modernity's catastrophic features onto another nation's failure and defeat-so as to salvage modernity the American way." Arguably, this need is met by maintaining a similar gap between Nazi Germany and the United States. Hansen, "*Schindler's List*," 311.

[207] See Chapter One for a full discussion of Moses's work. A. Dirk Moses, "Conceptual Blockages and Definitional Dilemmas in the 'Racial Century': Genocides of Indigenous Peoples and the Holocaust," in *Colonialism and Genocide*, ed. A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone (Abingdon, Routledge: 2007), 148-180.

[208] Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), xv.

[209] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 183.

[210] Pierre Nora, "General Introduction: Between Memory and History," in *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past,* vol. 1, *Conflicts and Divisions*, ed. Lawrence D.

Kritzman, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (1992; New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 1.

[211] Museum of Tolerance, "We remember…" (leaflet distributed at the entrance to the Museum of Tolerance, Los Angeles, CA, November 2012). These pamphlets are available to visitors after they conclude their experience inside the Holocaust exhibition. At the start of the exhibition, visitors receive an electronic card synced to a narrative of a victim of the Holocaust. Visitors are able to "check in" on their victims' experience at selected moments in the exhibition. At the conclusion of the exhibition, they are able to print the narrative of the individual they were assigned.

This pamphlet also includes a quote attributed to Simon Wiesenthal, asserting that "'Hope lives when people remember.'"

[212] The words on the sign at the bottom of the ramp encourage visitors to "remember, dialogue, lobby, learn, envision, take a stand, commit, initiate, assist, speak out, support, educate, reach out, hope, lead, celebrate, listen, unite, contribute, participate, act, empower, respond, create." Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[213] Brown describes the other examples featured in the Millennium Machine. Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 121-124.

[214] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[215] Museum of Tolerance, "The Time is NOW."

[216] See page 283-284, 341n54.

[217] South Park Studios, "The Death Camp."

[218] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 139. [emphasis in the original]

[219] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 139. Visitor emarks quoted in Brown.

[220] Brown draws on Joan W. Scott's work to develop an argument about the power of such an experiential exhibition. She discusses the simulation of this Holocaust "experience" as "an important truth strategy that settles authority and eliminates the problem of interpretation." Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 140. Joan W. Scott, "'Experience,'" in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (New York: Routledge, 1992), 22-40.

Young substantially complicates this argument by highlighting the artificiality of the "experience" of the Holocaust created herein. In critiquing the use of identity cards at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Young cautions that such an attempt to recreate the Holocaust experience "obscures our contemporary actual reality of the Holocaust, which is not the event itself but *memory* of the event, the great distance between then and now, between there and here. The distance, not the Holocaust itself, is our preeminent reality now, no less than the Holocaust was the victims' preeminent reality then." More importantly, promoting this experience narrative may have insidious consequences. Young continues, "By inviting visitors to remember their museum experience as if it were a victim's Holocaust experience, the personal identity card asked us to confuse one for the other. While the 'experiential mode' has come into increasing favor in museums, it is also a mode that encourages a certain critical blindness on the part of visitors. Imagining oneself as a past victim may not be the same as imagining oneself, or another person, as a potential victim, the kind of leap necessary to prevent other 'holocausts.'" James E. Young, "America's Holocaust: Memory and the Politics of

Identity," in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed. Hilenen Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 77.

[221] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[222] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012.

[223] This adage is most commonly associated with George Santayana. George Santayana, *The Life of Reason: or the Phases of Human Progress: Volume 1: Introduction and Reason in Common Sense* (1905; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), 284.

[224] Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 141-142. Brown describes the link between the Holocaust and security culture as predicated on a sense of fatalism, resigning the institution and presumably its visitors to the need for security. She also explains why "tolerance" is an insufficient response to the problem posed by the Holocaust and security is needed.

[225] Similarly, such a manipulation of temporality harkens back to Vivian's discussion of "temporal folding." Vivian, "Times of Violence," 211.

[226] Biesecker, "No Time for Mourning," 152.

[227] Biesecker, "No Time for Mourning," 152.

[228] Nevertheless, Vivian urges his readers to be suspicious of the kinds of politics this form of "temporal folding" ushers into the present. Echoing Zelizer, his work suggests that the fixation on past violence occludes violence in the present. Vivian, "Times of Violence." See also Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*.

[229] Vivian argues that this slide between past, present, and future temporalities animates contemporary humanitarian projects. Vivian, "Times of Violence," 212. On the use of the Holocaust, see Vivian, "Times of Violence," 213.

[230] Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 70.

[231] Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 74.

[232] Patraka, "Situating History and Difference," 73.

CHAPTER FOUR:
Rhetorical Intimation and the Specter of the Exnominated within the USHMM's
Genocide Cessation Discourse

"I think that if Lemkin came back and saw the history of the last sixty years, in
part his heart would break over and over again that people have still been
targeted and been attacked with impunity.
But I think at the same time he would look at progress that has been made.
I think he would look at students who are agitating on behalf of people at risk
in Darfur or people at risk in Congo.
He would look at people of faith who are meeting in their synagogues and
their churches and their mosques to demand action by their governments.
He would look at this worldwide outcry with regard to Darfur, and I think he would –
he would have hope."
-- Jerry Fowler on Raphael Lemkin, featured as one of the "Eyewitness Testimonies"
in From Memory to Action[1]

In 2013, visitors to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's (USHMM)

Wexner Learning Center would find exhibitions about the Sudan, the legacy of the

Nuremberg Trials, and an installation titled, *From Memory to Action: Meeting the*

Challenge of Genocide. The latter, a multi-mediated exhibition, featuring videos, touch-

based interfaces,[2] and giant television screens constantly uploading content from the

Web, appeals to its audiences to take action to end genocide. Visitors are given the

opportunity to make personal pledges, offering written responses to the question: "What

will you do to help meet the challenge of genocide today?"[3] These pledge cards are

submitted to the large glass cases prominently situated near a wall of television screens.

Answers to the "what will you do" question are displayed in these cases and on the

television screens above them. A running tally is kept of the number of pledges made; on

an April afternoon in 2013, for example, 161,798 pledges had been received.

Amongst the pledge cards displayed, one finds a variety of commitments. Some

showcase affective and interpersonal responses. One card simply states, "I promise to

promote equality whenever possible." Another holds, "I promise to treat others fairly." A different type of response invokes outside actors or agencies – "I will divest my money from any company that is affiliated with genocide" or "I will make my synagogue hold events." Some responses contain pledges to "call the President" or "contact my Congress person." One individual makes reference to the USHMM and offers to communicate and transmit its content to others.[4] Some of these commitments have names attached to them; others are anonymous. Identifiable or not, the pledges collectively showcase numerous ways that "average" individuals are taking action to stop genocide.[5]

Also spotlighted on the USHMM's website are the pledge cards of political leaders and celebrities. Gen. Romeo Dallaire, the Commander of the UN Peacekeeping Forces in Rwanda during the 1994 genocide, writes, for example, that, "if we become activists for humanity, we will no more resort to conflict due to the frictions of our differences."[6] Juan Mendez, the former UN Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide, also offers his promise: "I will teach my law students. I will urge my human rights colleagues to act. I will 'speak truth to power' whenever and wherever I can."[7] Including voices like Dallaire and Mendez imparts a level of expertise to the proffered solutions. At the same time, though their connections to the politics of genocide are less apparent, the USHMM also features the voices of NBA All Star Player Dikembe Mutombo and Olympic Speedskater Joey Cheek, drawing on their celebrity more than their policy experience, even as both help bring needed attention to the problem of genocide.[8] Although the level of sophistication and understanding of genocide varies across responses, the overall impression conveyed by the aggregation of pledges is that

every person, regardless of their resources, knowledge base, or access to political power, is capable of doing *something* to end genocide.

Put differently, *From Memory to Action* works to convince audiences of their ability to contribute to genocide prevention or intervention while simultaneously reminding visitors of the consequences of past failures to act.[9] Despite the persistent hopefulness undergirding the exhibition, its displays detail the brutality of the atrocities that occurred in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sudan. The exhibition opens with a large photograph of a man whose face has been scarred from a machete attack in Rwanda next to an image of prisoners in striped uniforms from "an unidentified concentration camp."[10] Images fill the exhibition's walls of menacing perpetrators, emaciated children, and the skulls or partially decayed bodies of the dead. In addition to showcasing the number of pledges submitted to the exhibition, large wall-sized screens update with frequent genocide alerts, notifying the visitor to the threat of violence in such countries as Sudan, South Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Moreover, the exhibit's very location, inside the USHMM, situates the necessity of genocide prevention and intervention as a response to the Holocaust. Indeed, the exhibition's narrative begins where stories of the Holocaust often end: with early efforts to prohibit genocide through international law. In contrast to the optimism and sense of agency contained in some parts of the exhibit, *From Memory to Action* offers countless reminders of humanity's failure to prevent genocide in the wake of the Holocaust.[11] The juxtaposition between hopeful optimism and unconscionable failure, *even after the international community committed to ending genocide,* is strikingly apparent. Thus, USHMM is consequently left managing two competing narratives in *From Memory to Action,* at once promoting

positive messages about the viability of ending genocide while simultaneously inferring the intractability of some forms of genocidal violence.

Like the other texts examined thus far in this study, the USHMM's rhetoric of genocide cessation is fraught with contradictions. Its optimistic messages about the feasibility of genocide cessation compete with less hopeful discourses about the prevalence of genocidal violence. Through the strategic interplay of speech and silence, *From Memory to Action* constructs a complicated narrative containing incongruous messages about the definition, representation, resolution and remembrance of genocidal atrocities. In each of these four arenas, the exhibition proffers encouraging and politically palatable narratives about the role of the state and the public in genocide and genocide cessation while intimating arguments about genocidal violence that cannot be given forthright expression within the context of a partially state-funded institution. In sum, these acts of rhetorical intimation give the exhibition a dual-voiced quality;[12] the exhibit articulates confident and empowering messages about genocide and genocide cessation yet also gestures toward pessimistic discourses hinting at what cannot, or may never, be achieved.

The succeeding section provides background on the construction of the USHMM in order to establish the rhetorical obstacles the museum necessarily confronts in articulating anti-genocide messages. Because the USHMM is partially financed by the US government, the institution faces certain political constraints that shape the positions the institution is able to adopt in its exhibitions. With these challenges acknowledged, the chapter then turns to analyze the genocide cessation discourse contained in *From Memory to Action*, focusing on the exhibit's discussions of definition, representation, resolution,

and remembrance. Each section explicates the tensions underlying the exhibition's arguments about these four constructs. In the conclusion, I assess the merits and drawbacks of the USHMM's use of rhetorical intimation in constructing popular notions of genocide cessation.

The Politics of US Holocaust Memory & the USHMM

To argue that a text "intimates" or subtly hints is to invite questions as to the rhetorical obstacles which may prevent forthright expression.[13] The history of the USHMM suggests that one obstacle arises from the institution's uneasy relationship with the US government. In the words used by the institution, the USHMM is "[a] public-private partnership;"[14] it has clear ties to the federal government but is not entirely a governmental organization. Yet, parameters, shaped by US national and international political interests, have exerted some influence on the positions the institution is able to articulate.[15] These constraints may explain why some critics have charged the institution with advancing a version of Holocaust history that is advantageous to bolstering the image of the United States. In spite of such constraints, the USHMM has found creative ways of navigating these limitations, opening spaces for subtle critique through acts of rhetorical intimation while simultaneously avoiding the wholesale repudiation of its financial benefactor.

The history of the USHMM must be situated in three contexts, placed amid the backdrop of a larger cultural swing toward "a renewed period of intensive [Holocaust] memory work" as well as located within the intricacies of US presidential and international politics.[16] The idea for the USHMM emerged and germinated during the late 1970s, following on the heels of a variety of public events and popular texts familiarizing

US audiences with the events of the Shoah. Though some early Holocaust texts circulated in the late 1940s and 1950s,[17] many scholars credit the 1960s as a turning point in spurring the development of a more robust Holocaust memory, with the 1961 Eichmann trial providing a critical impetus for public discussion of the Holocaust.[18] Further, the Six-Day War (1967) and Yom Kippur War (1973) "reignited fears of the extermination of Jews in Israel" and "awakened dormant memories of the Holocaust,"[19] routing public attention back to memories of the Shoah.[20] In 1976, the Center for Holocaust Studies, the "oldest Holocaust center in the country," was formed in Brooklyn, New York.[21] In 1978, a variety of public events aided in the advancement of "Holocaust consciousness."[22] An American Nazi group proposed a march in Skokie, Illinois. The Office of Special Investigations was formed to track and prosecute Nazi war criminals. And, perhaps most importantly, NBC ran the miniseries titled *Holocaust*, attracting an estimated 120 million viewers.[23] Yet, as the number of media and public texts about the Holocaust proliferated, no US national memorial to the Holocaust existed.[24]

Plans for a memorial thus emerged amidst a cultural moment of growing Holocaust awareness. Simultaneously, a distrust of the presidency was increasing among Jewish Americans as a result of the Carter administration's perceived shortcomings and missteps. Carter's evangelical Christian background and voiced support for Palestinians was a source of concern for many American Jews.[25] According to Linenthal, the creation of a Holocaust memorial represented an opportunity for Carter to make amends with the Jewish community.[26] In 1977, following controversial comments by Carter on the sale of aircrafts to Israel, the Carter administration appointed a liaison to the Jewish community and began inquiries into existing Holocaust memorials.[27] After later establishing contact

with the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the Carter administration convened a commission to form a US Holocaust memorial. On May 1, 1978, the formal announcement of the commission was made at the White House during a celebration for the thirtieth anniversary of the state of Israel.[28] Noted Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel became the commission's first chairman. In Linenthal's words, it was a chance to "use the power of government to do something many would perceive as 'good' and, at the same time, reach out to an increasingly alienated ethnic constituency."[29] Politicized from the outset, the institution helped signal the administration's support of the Jewish community and more broadly the state of Israel.[30]

The institution's political origins were just the beginning of the complex relationship between the USHMM and the US government. Not long after the commission began its work, disputes began over issues such as the number and identity of the victims. The question quickly became "how expansive could a national memory of the Holocaust become without deviating from the established narrative of the Holocaust?"[31] In contrast to some who prioritized broadening Holocaust memory, Wiesel placed emphasis on the centrality of Judaism to the Shoah and the importance of maintaining a "Jewish core" at the heart of the museum. As a result, fierce debates erupted over issues ranging from the description of the victims to whether or not representatives from Eastern European nations should be included on United States Holocaust Memorial Council.[32]

The museum creators would face other complex political issues. Early in the commission's tenure, support emerged for the recognition of the Armenian genocide as part of the museum's mission.[33] Yet, backlash to this perceived "expansion" of the

museum's narrative emerged from multiple fronts. Some involved with the commission saw this inclusion as a dilution of the museum's work, which potentially opened the doors to a variety of claims for inclusion.[34] Beyond these concerns, external pressure from the Turkish government was exerted to curtail any US attempts to acknowledge the Armenian massacre as "genocide." Given that the Turkish government does not deem what happened to the Armenians in 1915 a "genocide," Turkish representatives made clear that Turkey would consider any recognition of the Armenian genocide an affront. They warned "that the well-being of Jews in Turkey might be threatened were Armenians included in a federal Holocaust museum."[35] Despite plans to include the Armenians in the exhibition,[36] the only reference in the permanent exhibition to the atrocity remains one quotation attributed to Hitler that is located on a fourth-floor wall: "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"[37]

Today, the institution remains as a public-private partnership. It is a clear beneficiary of the US government, but it is also not an expressly governmental institution. The institution sits on federally-owned land and roughly 60 percent of its operating budget is provided by the US government.[38] Yet, the institution is not a part of the Smithsonian, government-run complex and it retains its status as a semi-private museum, partially funded through private donations.

Though the USHMM is not operated by the US government, the institution nevertheless has been entrenched in debates related to the "Americanization of the Holocaust" and charged with crafting a version of the Holocaust memory that is politically advantageous to the United States.[39] In contrast to counter-memorial or postmodern forms of memorialization which can complicate or challenge nationalism,[40]

many Holocaust museums are read as nationalistic institutions, connected to and advancing the image of the nation-states they are housed within.[41] Unsurprisingly, the USHMM has been understood by many as a vehicle for the promotion of messages about US citizenship and US identity, "not only tell[ing] a story about America's role in the Holocaust, but provid[ing] a lesson in how to be a good citizen in the U.S. today."[42] In some ways, these lessons are provided through negation; US commitments to freedom and liberty are cast against the dismal backdrop of Nazi Germany's totalitarianism and enslavement.[43] These negations set up a stark contrast between US "goodness" and Nazi evil. "Auschwitz," Rose posits, functions "as the anti-city of the American political community."[44] As Ruffins charges, in this way the USHMM can explicate a politically palatable "narrative of European evil and American good [that] can live quite comfortably in the national Mall, and be financed by public funds in perpetuity."[45]

This narrative of US "goodness" is supported by representational choices which structure the permanent exhibition's narrative so that audiences adopt the subjectivities of US liberators.[46] The experiences of audiences are structured so that they are "discovering that hell [of the Shoah] through American eyes" as their entry to the permanent exhibition begins with audio testimony and a visual image of US soldiers encountering the concentration camps.[47] Crysler and Kusno charge that "an equivalence is constructed between the position of the unsuspecting U.S. soldier and that of the 'innocent' museum visitor who also comes upon the Holocaust for the first time."[48] This emphasis on liberation, Hasian alleges, plays a critical role within the USHMM, for it serves as the justification for positioning the Holocaust as "an American affair."[49] For these reasons

and others, many see the institution as crafting an "Americanized" version of Holocaust memory, one which is politically useful in enhancing the ethos of the US government.[50]

Other critics have extended this critique, arguing that the institution supports a self-righteous narrative about US innocence, benevolence, and American exceptionalism. Worthington's dissertation, as a noteworthy example, contends that the USHMM fosters the perception of the Shoah as a distinctive form of violence. Such constructions of Holocaust memory capitalize on the extremity of the Shoah to suggest that it exists on a completely different register from any abuses committed by the US government. These Americanized versions of Holocaust memory mark the Shoah as a "foreign" evil, removed from the behavior of the US nation-state and its citizens.[51] Viewed from these perspectives, the USHMM gives rise to the impression that "genocide is something that happens elsewhere."[52] "The evil that it [the USHMM] documents," as Ruffins notes, is "outside the U.S."[53] Such a sanitized message communicates to USHMM visitors that the United States is "safe from its [the Holocaust's] implications."[54] To read the USHMM from the perspectives voiced in these critiques is, in part, to see the institution as a mouthpiece for the promotion of pro-US government messages and to undervalue the subtle ways in which the institution creates space for critique.

In contrast, other critics argue that the institution enables criticism of the US government and inspires complex political discussions of contemporary atrocity. Reading the USHMM against the Museum of Tolerance, Patraka ultimately concludes that of the two institutions, the USHMM creates more space for audiences to "negotiat[e] meanings."[55] While admitting that the institution advances a nationalistic narrative which promotes the idea of the United States as a "liberal democratic government [that] would

prevent such a genocidal action," she also argues that the USHMM contains subtle

challenges to this narrative.[56] For instance, Patraka highlights the exhibition's reference

to the US's internal suppression of information about the camps.[57] Further, she reads the

USHMM against proximate governmental institutions (e.g., the US Treasury Building),

charging that its very location amid these federal buildings invites questions about the

historic role of US bureaucracy during times of atrocity. As a result, Patraka contends

that the USHMM enacts, "a localized historical contradiction to its own ideological

claims about how democracies respond to genocides."[58] In these ways, the institution is

able to sustain a multiplicity of stories, some which paradoxically contradict idealistic

moral rhetorics about US goodness and US commitments to genocide prevention.

Like Patraka, I read the institution as at once promoting narratives which benefit

the US government while subtly giving voice to competing positions that challenge US

authority or create doubt about the viability of genocide cessation. Constrained in its

ability to explicitly repudiate the US government, the institution instead engages in acts

of rhetorical intimation, articulating politically palatable messages regarding genocide

definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances all-the-while shadowed by

specters of genocidal immutability, stasis, and powerlessness.

Defining Genocide: Liberal Narratives and Post-Liberal Intimations

On the surface, *From Memory to Action* appears to trouble little with its

conceptualization of genocide. In a segment of the online portion of the exhibition titled

"What is Genocide," the USHMM clearly foregrounds the definition provided by the

1948 UN Convention**.**[59] However, the simplicity of this definition belies the difficulty of

applying and explaining the term through historical and political examples. As *From*

Memory to Action elaborates upon the concept of genocide by offering the narratives of particular cases, incongruences in the proffered examples undermine the stability imparted by the use of an authoritative, legal definition. These definitional inconsistencies are most evident as the exhibition attempts to add depth to the public's understanding of genocide by explaining genocidal causality. In treating causality, *From Memory to Action* showcases a primarily liberal understanding of genocide through its prioritization of the nation-state as the locus of genocide and genocide cessation work. At the same time, the exhibit creates space to intimate the influence of systemic or post-liberal causal philosophies. Nevertheless, these post-liberal intimations are restricted, and the contributions of colonialism and other systemic forces to genocide remain mystified. As such, the vestiges of colonial ideologies continue to structure the representations of the relationship between Western and non-Western countries within the exhibition.

Although the exhibition implies a hegemonic meaning of genocide by making recourse to the 1948 legal document to define the term, such stability in meaning is quickly complicated as the exhibition moves from discussing genocide in abstraction to contextualizing and explaining instances of genocidal violence. More pointedly, *From Memory to Action*'s attempts to explain causality highlight divergences in their conceptualization of genocide. As discussed in Chapter One, answers to the question "what causes genocide" can be discussed as falling into liberal and post-liberal camps.[60] The liberal orientation holds nation-states accountable and suggests the mutability of genocide but leaves under explained the contributions of international socio-, political, and economic systems to atrocity. The post-liberal orientation helps rectify this by creating a theoretical framework for discussing the contributions of systems such as

colonialism to genocidal acts. Because of their emphasis on systemic forces, however, post-liberal orientations risk rendering the problem of genocide intractable, seemingly eliminating or reducing clear opportunities for the exercise of human agency. Moreover, post-liberal orientations are politically threatening to Western nation-states as they expose the culpability of such actors in structuring the conditions for violence. Thus, a post-liberal approach would indict the USHMM's financial benefactor (the US government) and its audiences as complicit in genocide. Faced with a spectrum of options between the representation of genocide as a mutable, nation-state level problem and the representation of genocide as embedded into global systems, *From Memory to Action* offers a largely liberal narrative while rhetorically intimating post-liberal positionalities.

The exhibition showcases a primarily liberal understanding of genocide. It does so through the sustained emphasis on the importance of the nation-states as a categorical construct for comprehending genocidal violence. The state is the primary unit of analysis within the exhibition. The physical installation tells the story of three states' genocides, featuring narratives which insinuate that these tragedies are problems within and for Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sudan. The online exhibition replicates this structure with narratives arranged by nation-state.[61] This framework undermines other attempts in *From Memory to Action* to see these tragedies as interdependent on other global politics and instead encourages a kind of thinking that contains genocide, reducing it to a state-level problem. Such an orientation to the problem of genocide is politically useful; it shifts the blame for genocide to the states suffering such atrocities and contributes to perceptions of genocidal mutability (i.e., this local problem can be fixed).

This construction of genocide as a nation-state level problem is evident in *From Memory to Action*'s programming on South Sudan's 2011 referendum. Amongst the content on its website, *From Memory to Action* includes "Sudan at the Crossroads," a video of a November 2010 public program.[62] The primary focus of "Sudan at the Crossroads" is not on the genocidal violence in progress; rather, the USHMM frames the program as a means of reporting its findings from a "Museum-sponsored bearing witness trip to assess conditions in South Sudan" prior to the January 2011 referendum on the territory's independence.[63] While the video contains some discussion of past violence, the overall thrust of the film is on the importance of South Sudan attaining its own state. In the film, the likelihood of peace or violence is cast as contingent upon referendum's results.[64] The presumption that animates such positions is a primarily liberal one as it situates the locus of genocidal action or prevention at the nation-state level. Although the exhibit elsewhere critiques nationalism and sovereignty,[65] messages of this sort, either centralizing the culpability of afflicted nation-states or promoting state-building, elevate liberal understandings of genocide.

Yet, these liberal narratives are tempered by rhetorical intimations within the exhibition which gesture toward the influence of systems beyond the nation-state. The online profiles for Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) highlight, respectively, Britain's role in navigating north-south tensions in Sudan and the history of exploitation in the DRC set into motion through Belgium's King Leopold II.[66] Further, the explanation of the DRC's conflict hints at the ways in which contemporary market exigencies continue to fuel the violence in that region, discussing the "looting [of] diamonds, coltan, gold, and other resources from this mineral-rich region."[67] In other

instances, the institution seems aware of the geopolitical calculus that can be used to forestall preventative work. The discussion of the policy responses to the situation in the Sudan from 1985-2005 offers a remarkably nuanced assessment of the politics of genocide, taking into consideration how Cold War politics and the Sudan's alignment with Iraq in the first Gulf War influenced the international community's (lack of) response to the atrocities unfolding there.[68]

These verbal intimations also find subtle visual corroboration in the images that accompany *From Memory to Action*. Images are, in many ways, ideal vehicles for acts of rhetorical intimation. As Palczewski underscores, images can give "voice" to positions that cannot otherwise be spoken or written.[69] In this case, some of the images in *From Memory to Action* become a means of articulating a post-liberal emphasis on global interconnectivity, which subtly enacts challenges to the liberal narrative the images accompany. In a section of the website titled, "Who is at Risk," for example, each county's profile contains an image on its overview page. The South Sudan overview features an image of a lone male child. He stands in a fairly barren environment, arms at his side, gazing directly into the camera's lens. He wears faded clothing; yet, barely visible on his yellow shirt are two Chinese characters.[70] Chinese, of course, is not the native tongue of South Sudan; thus, the characters on the boy's shirt are a subtle reminder of China's role in the oil politics of the region, a fairly post-liberal indicator of the links between these global players.[71] Similarly, an image on the website of a victim of the violence in Bosnia, depicts a young seemingly Caucasian man in a black shirt bearing the text, "Hard Rock Café," a reminder of the reach of American culture and American influence.[72] These images bear visible traces of the forces of globalization and economic

interconnectivity. They consequently stand in for a more robust narrative that explains these complex global relationships, projecting visual intimations of a post-liberal understanding of genocide. These "nods" toward the influence of systemic conditions both complicate the exhibition's causal narrative as well as threaten to expose the USHMM's chief benefactor. They do so by drawing attention to roles that Western nation-states have played in carving up Africa, for example, or exploiting states through colonial and imperialistic economic relationships.

These intimations, however, are contained such that they fail to undermine the exhibition's predominantly liberal framework. As an illustrative example, the "Patterns of Genocide" section of *From Memory to Action* enacts this simultaneous intimation and containment. On the one hand, to talk about "patterns" is to recognize structural influences that transcend the internal and idiosyncratic politics of the nation-state. The recognition of common patterns in genocidal execution shifts attention from the nation-state as the primary locus of culpability to influences that supersede the particularities of state-level contexts. This post-liberal understanding is visibly modeled in the construction of the physical exhibition space. The narratives detailing the genocides in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sudan run in horizontal lines across three walls of the room. Parts of each nation-state's story are vertically aligned under headers, reading "past group violence," "preparations," "sounding alarms," etc.[73] This structure enables the visitor to analyze across genocides, encouraging, for example, contemplation of how the "preparations" for the Rwandan genocide might be similar or different from the "preparations" for the Bosnian genocide. On its face, the features within the exhibition which enable these cross-genocide comparisons encourage post-liberal thinking. Yet, the way *From Memory*

to Action frames the "Patterns of Genocide" section ultimately contains post-liberal thought. Prose introducing this portion of the website explains,

> Genocide does not occur spontaneously. While warning signs can vary from case to case, there are common indicators that suggest a growing potential for genocide. Some of these signs can be found within a society's history. The potential for genocide, however, increases when leaders decide to heighten tensions between groups and make specific plans to use violence.[74]

The passage stresses that the warming signs are "found in a society's history." The society is singular, sending the message that those studying genocide need only look *within* the internal politics of the country in question, not interrogating its connections to other global actors or the implications of larger economic systems, for example, which can structure internal affairs. Even then, the study of the society's history is further narrowed as the passage centralizes the actions of leaders, another move away from a systemic orientation hinted at in other parts of the exhibit. Ultimately, what "Patterns of Genocide" evidences is a process of containing post-liberal intimations; the gestures toward the influence of the systemic, again, are couched within a primarily liberal nation-state framework.

By only intimating or gesturing toward the post-liberal critique, *From Memory to Action*, at minimum, fails to challenge or overcome the colonialist and imperialistic politics that some argue have long contributed to these atrocities. At worst, the exhibition replicates these oppressive ideologies.[75] In spite of some discussion of the role of colonialism or the role of Western nations in shaping African nation-states, these

passages are often brief and underdeveloped. In some instances, the only trace of

colonialism is to be found in the country's profile, with the appearance of "English" as a

language spoken in the region, serving as a marker of the West's involvement in the

affairs of states. On other occasions, genocidal violence is framed as a post-colonial

phenomenon, such that these situations become problematic *after* colonial powers left.

The country profile for Rwanda, for example, reads, "Large-scale violence against

civilians because of ethnic identity began in Rwanda towards the end of Belgian colonial

rule."[76] Such a framing implies that violence in the region correlates with the departure of

Belgium, a narrative that takes no account of the influence of Belgium in reifying ethnic

divides during their rule. Similarly in Burundi, "[t]he Hutu-Tutsi divide" is cast as "a

post-independence phenomenon, resulting from the political use of ethnicity to

consolidate power."[77] These ways of discussing colonialism give rise to the sense that

colonial powers *kept* peace in the region—arguments that minimize the role of

colonialism in contributing to genocidal violence.

Visually, the exhibition replicates the problems of the colonialist gaze. As a

substantial part of genocide cessation, the exhibition endorses the importance of

"watching," "monitoring," or "surveying." *From Memory to Action* emphasizes the need

for its audiences to "remain vigilant"[78] and lists countries that need to be "monitor[ed]."[79]

The physical installation invites its audiences to partake in such ocular action. Visitors to

the installation are positioned in front of a series of screens which repeatedly turn into a

large map of the continents. The map zooms in on the continent of Africa as "alerts"

signal the danger of violence that lurks within the DR Congo, South Sudan, and Sudan.[80]

The viewers of the map have no geographic place. Existing outside the boundaries of the

map, they exist as something of omniscient subjects, given a removed and privileged view of the world.[81] Film and Media Studies scholar Lisa Parks charges that subjectivities akin to the ones described here and used in *From Memory to Action*, activate a familiar imperialistic gaze that relies upon "Western tropes of Africa as a 'dark continent' in need of 'exposure' and 'enlightenment.'"[82] The embrace of these visual practices leaves the exhibition fundamentally compromised: At the same time the exhibit espouses arguments for genocide cessation, it employs longstanding colonialist and imperialist conceptions of the relationship between the West and Africa as a structuring condition for the representation of genocidal atrocity. Such a strategy represents an ironic endorsement of an ideology that contributes to the very problem the exhibition is ostensibly trying to eradicate.

In sum, beneath a seemingly stable legal definition, the exhibition's explanations of genocide reveal inconsistencies in its conceptualizations of genocidal atrocities. Through the articulation of causal narratives, *From Memory to Action* blends elements of liberal and post-liberal ways of thinking about genocide. Centralizing liberal narratives while intimating the influence of post-liberal causal philosophies, *From Memory to Action* ultimately leaves mystified and replicates colonial ideologies that some have linked to genocide. As the exhibition's fraught relationship with colonialism reveals, inconsistencies in the exhibition's conceptualization of genocide reverberate through its attempts to represent such atrocities.

Ocular Action, Realism, and Metonymy: The Problematic Politics of Representation

Representations of genocide attain special significance within *From Memory to Action* because representations function both as the means through which audiences come

to understand the concept of genocide and as a key part of the exhibition's discourses of resolution. This dual function is especially true of visuality, which is punctuated as critical to the exhibition because of the linkages drawn among sight, knowledge, and action.[83] More specifically, *From Memory to Action* relies on specific forms of seeing, chiefly employing the genre of documentary realism and relying upon the use of visual metonymy as a means of depicting the scope and scale of genocide. However, at the same time the exhibition celebrates visuality, other discourses within the exhibit expresses considerable uncertainty about the role and value of such representations. In much the same way *From Memory to Action* articulates competing narratives about genocide definitions through the use of rhetorical intimation and exnomination, the exhibition's strategies of representation intimate anxieties over the sufficiency of photography and the links between photography and action.

From Memory to Action promotes practices of "sighting" as integral to genocide cessation work. The website abounds with photo essays, and the installation foregrounds the salience of *seeing* genocide (i.e., the giant television screens, the wall-sized digital map, the use of large photos). Both the web and physical installation also employ an ocular-centric language with their calls to remain vigilant (e.g., "watch," "monitor," or "survey"), and their references to featured advocates, victims, rescuers, journalists, and jurists as "*eye*witnesses." Thusly, the exhibition privileges an "ocular epistemology,"[84] validating long-established links between witnessing and knowing, sight and knowledge.[85] The import of sight is expressly articulated in the video for the 2006 "Darfur: Who Will Survive Today" event, one of two public programs which projected

images from contemporary atrocities in Sudan onto the USHMM's edifice. Upon seeing the public projection of these images, one attendee remarked on tape:

> It is very difficult for most Americans to understand what is going on in Darfur, and I think the best way to do that is visually. So to have these pictures projected and on such a large scale and a public place. I think is gonna to reach a lot more people than than [sic] many of the news stories will reach.[86]

Underscoring familiar arguments about the accessibility of the image,[87] such remarks establish clear links between seeing and knowing, with the corollary assumption undergirding such comments holding that once audiences know about genocide they will take action.[88]

By so punctuating and elevating the importance of sight, *From Memory to Action* makes recourse to an approach to visual culture, discussed by Torchin as grounded in an "Enlightenment-style faith in the power of knowledge."[89] From this perspective, sight leads knowledge, and knowledge leads to action in a fairly linear and direct fashion. Torchin explains that popular genocide texts tend to be read through these kinds of assumptions about the links between sight, knowledge, and action for two reasons. First, the 1948 UN Convention links genocide "recognition" and "obligation to act;"[90] therefore, the ties between visual recognition and action are bolstered by the framing of the Convention text. Second, this "Enlightenment-style" approach to visual culture dovetails with the growth of monitoring as an important part of journalistic and human rights work in the twentieth century.[91] As monitoring becomes an increasingly important form of human rights work, media texts are saddled "with transformative expectations,"

in Torchin's words, such that "revelation contributes to recognition, recognition demands action, and representations throughout transform audiences into witnesses and publics."[92] Of course, this approach to visual culture and media power rests upon presumptions of transparency and realism even as these presumptions of realism and transparency elide the extent to which media rely on "interpretive grid[s]" to construct the public's understandings of both "genocide" and "action."[93]

In line with these assumptions about the transformative power of atrocity images, *From Memory to Action* relies on strategic uses of documentary realism as a genre for representation and metonymy as a means of depicting the systemic nature of genocidal atrocity. With few exceptions the primary genre through which the USHMM attempts to represent atrocity might best be considered a form of photographic or documentary realism. The exhibition's alignment with realism is signaled by the extent to which *From Memory to Action* tethers itself to the work of photojournalists. *From Memory to Action* spotlights the work of these genocide cessation actors in featured programs and narratives. The installation relies heavily on their images, using photography as their preferred means of "showing" genocide.

In centralizing the work of photojournalists, the USHMM activates a generic framework long associated with transparency, objectivity, truth, and realism. As Jenkins explains, "[p]hotojournalism inculcates a specific, if often unrecognized, mode of seeing."[94] Chiefly, this form of representation traffics in the formation of an understanding of the image as "a window on the world."[95] Such representational strategies exert a potent influence insofar as they seek to obscure understandings of the image that would herald images as anything less than mechanical reproductions of the

real.[96] However, this "documentary mode of seeing" is, of course, a strategy of representation in and of itself and not an inherent quality of the image.[97] As Taylor concisely states, "[r]ealism is a matter of style, not content."[98] The use of documentary films or photojournalistic images like those featured in *From Memory to Action* erects a structured subjectivity and utilizes a particular set of generic conventions all-the-while seemingly doing little more than displaying "reality."[99]

If documentary realism is the primary genre for representation, within this genre, visual metonymy is one of the USHMM's critical strategies for the depiction of the systemic.[100] Metonymic representations are common in the representation of the atrocity as figurative resources signaling both partiality and generalizability.[101] Hariman and Lucaites showcase an example of visual metonymy through their concept of the "individual aggregate."[102] In Hariman and Lucaites's words, the individual aggregate enables the "depict[ion of] collective experience in a manner that fulfills both the need for collective action and the primacy of individual autonomy in a liberal-democratic society."[103] Put differently, Hariman and Lucaites suggest that systemic issues can be read as crystallized into representations of individualized experiences, which then stand in (within frame of the iconic photo) for larger collective issues. Of utmost importance here is a metonymic act of substitution. The individual within the frame functions rhetorically as a mode of representing a larger systemic influence which may otherwise "defy" or "escape" representation without the use of such metonymy.

To some degree, the USHMM relies on the logic of the individual aggregate, finding ways to allow the plight of a few individuals to stand in for many. Fowler, in a video program on the *From Memory to Action* website, stresses that "[s]ometimes when

we talk about numbers, when we talk about a place that's very far away, we forget that they are human beings and individuals;"[104] thus, it becomes important to represent them in a way that captures their individuality. Rwanda survivor and presenter at the USHMM's 2006 "Darfur: Who Will Survive Today" program, Clementine Wamariya, encourages this move, asking people, when they see "[t]he pictures outside, [to] just pick one person and be that person for a day in a desert, hungry, knowing that next day you won't wake up."[105] Using the logic of the individual aggregate, the USHMM attempts to minimize some of the challenges of representing genocide by depicting systemic issues through personalized plight.

Beyond the use of the individual aggregate, the institution engages in several actions of symbolic substitution. Some of these substitutions entail acts of repetition, using the same images over and over again within different contexts. Employed in a way that suggests these images operate as *symbols* rather than markers of specific occurrences,[106] certain images within the exhibition become ubiquitous, unmoored from their contexts and used repeatedly throughout the exhibition. The pictures from Steidle's and Fowler's photo essays as well as the images taken by Haviv appear in multiple contexts, reproduced in segments of the *From Memory to Action* exhibition and on USHMM promotional materials. For example, the images that appear as part of Fowler's photo essay, "Staring Genocide in the Face" also appear as images accompanying the "eyewitness" testimony pages for Jennifer Leaning, Omar Ismail, and in the "Smallest Witnesses" video.[107] In one instance, the exhibition makes use of an image from one genocide within the context of an entirely different genocide, allowing an image from the Nuremberg trials to illustrate the profile for Stephen Rapp, a prosecutor for the

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.[108] While seemingly benign acts of

representation, such forms of visual metonymy work against the "referentiality" and

documentary force of the image.[109]

Not only does the exhibition allow images from one context to stand in for

another, the USHMM employs visual metonymy in allowing shots of "violent" or

"victimized" landscapes to stand in for atrocity. This is particularly a troubling move that

can be seen as obscuring the culpability of agents and, in turn, reinforcing stereotypical

associations of Africa as a place carnage and death. Voth and Noland as well as Ewalt

have highlighted this tendency to represent Africa as a site of what Ewalt terms

"embedded injustice."[110] Adopting a Burkean framework, Voth and Noland argue that

media coverage of genocide tends to obscure the *agents* of genocide in favor of a focus

on *scenes*. Coverage of genocide consequently tends to lapse into language which

suggests the "'place is violent,'"[111] or as Ewalt would put it, "[i]nvasions of human rights

and injustices are embedded in the very spatiality of the African continent."[112] Both

Ewalt and Voth and Noland stress that this kind of place-centric discussion or

visualization of genocide tends to reinforce a sense of inevitability.[113] Such a construction

of genocide undermines other attempts in *From Memory to Action* to assure audiences of

the mutability of genocidal conditions while at the same time reifying colonialist

stereotypes of the African continent.[114]

To be sure, such representational practices are clearly on display in *From Memory

to Action*. The album, "Bearing Witness in the Congo," for example, includes a photo of

a UN peacekeeper secured in a bunker, gun visible, peering at an empty, lush African

landscape, "monitor[ing] the area for rebel activity."[115] No other actors or dwellings are

visible in the shot. Additionally, the album "Staring Genocide in the Face" opens with a

shot of the desert in Chad, and the caption,

> When you see the harshness of the desert, and how barren it is, and feel
>
> the heat, and see how few resources there are, how little margin for error
>
> there is, you realize that driving people into the desert and then making it
>
> difficult for them to get help is tantamount to condemning them to
>
> death.[116]

As captured in this caption, "the desert" is featured as the agent of destruction, promoting

the sense that *Africa* is dangerous. There is something about the land or the scene that

causes destruction; thus, it is not surprising to find a visual equation between the

hazardous African landscape and a menacing perpetrator in the image on the cover of a

USHMM brochure.[117]

At the same time, the metonymic use of the landscape can be read alternatively, as

part of the exhibitions' attempts to manage anxiety around "about to die" photos and their

inability to escape the problems of representing genocide. One of the images repeatedly

used in *From Memory to Action* shows the burning of Um Zaifa.[118] The image, although

cropped in various ways depending upon the context of its reproduction, depicts a series

of square plots of lands, fenced properties with domiciles included within each plot's

perimeter. Among these residences, the shot shows one of these fenced plots ablaze,

black smoke billows up toward the top of the frame, and scorched land is already visible

where part of the fence once stood. Here the destruction of property clearly substitutes for

images of the destruction of life. Although it is possible to read this as indicative of the

trends Voth and Noland as well as Ewalt describe, a testament to a *deadly place*, it is also

possible to see this image as employing the "subjunctive voice" of "about to die" photos.[119] As Zelizer explains, by depicting moments right before death, about to die images exist in the subjunctive tense, creating a sense of contingency as well as "the irrational hope that death may not occur."[120] The subjunctive helps "soften that force [contained in these "about to die" images] with qualifiers that are suggestive of possibility, contingency, and hypothesis."[121] In application, Zelizer uses the concept of the subjunctive to explain why the image of the Twin Towers was used to represent the violence of 9/11: In contrast to images of the "jumpers," the images of the buildings were able to sustain a greater sense of contingency.[122] Akin to use of the Twin Towers to represent 9/11, decisions to spotlight landscapes within *From Memory to Action* might be viewed productively as attempts to manage the problems of representing atrocity by engaging the subjunctive voice of the "about to die" photo, and thereby avoiding representations of more graphic carnage.[123]

Importantly, this landscape-based aesthetic is not only used to represent Africa. In its photo galleries, the *From Memory to Action* website has a series of images from Chechnya as well as from Srebrenica. The Chechnya album – "Chechyna: A View from the Ground" – showcases a destroyed marketplace and memorial which appears to be composed of (or mimics) an aesthetic of ruins.[124] Even the title of the albums reflects a decision to let the landscape, the "view from the ground," speak to the destruction, a substitution of damaged places for damaged bodies. The album from Srebrenica, though only containing six images, has a series of two photographs from a mass grave, allowing the long shot of the graveyard and the aluminum wire used to tie victims' hands found at the site to work in conjunction with an image of a body to represent destruction without

depicting violence.[125] Thus, the focus on place is not only used to represent Africa as a place of violence. These shots also suggest the use of landscape as part of a broader aesthetic, historically used during the Shoah,[126] to represent the devastation caused by genocide without having to represent graphic carnage.[127] Ergo, the focus on scene need not only be read as a replication of a colonial gaze that leads to assumptions about the inevitability of genocide in these locales. A metonymic focus on place, land, and buildings also can be read as offering a resolution to a representational quandary by creating a way to depict a systemic and horrific problem such as genocide in a way that avoids the gruesomeness of depicting slaughter.[128]

The exhibition's use of metonymic representation reaches its extreme with the "Smallest Witnesses" program—a public program which perhaps most clearly embodies the complications, uncertainties, and anxieties about the visual rhetoric of genocide. The program – available as a video on the *From Memory to Action* website – spotlights Dr. Annie Sparrow's work with Human Rights Watch during a 2005 trip to Darfur. Sparrow packed crayons and paper to allow the children she encountered to draw. The images they drew, in her words, "absolutely corroborate the testimony that we'd gathered…of the adults."[129] In the video, Sparrow unpacks the children's drawings insisting that a blue and red patch of color represents a woman who has been shot in the face and other children's sketches represent "sophisticated" weaponry such as AK-47s and Anntonov aircrafts.[130] Although not uncommon in certain forms of therapy to use artwork as a means of working through children's trauma,[131] in the context of this public program, the images aren't being used in a private, therapeutic context, but to stand in as evidence of genocide.[132] More specifically, the drawings are described as a means of accessing that

which the camera cannot capture—images that seemingly "show aspects of these crimes against humanity that have evaded photographers and television crews."[133] Far from the realism and the "naturalistic enthymeme" attributed to photography,[134] this unconventional choice exacerbates tensions surrounding the representation of genocide, intimating that the vehicles for action promoted as critical to stopping genocide may be inadequate.

This metonymic choice in particular (the use of the "Smallest Witnesses" drawings) creates a host of problems for the USHMM. First, the program's focus on the *imaginative* work of children threatens the *realism* of other representations of atrocity or at least potentially inspires questions about the *realism* elsewhere in the exhibition.[135] Given the importance of authenticity to the USHMM and to Holocaust memory more broadly,[136] these symbols of atrocity must be couched as real, as having some sort of evidentiary potential, not as the fictional or creative work of children. Further, these images lack the indexicality of photographs,[137] opening them to numerous interpretations. Thus, their "fatal polysemy" may make them hard to use to advance an argument for genocide cessation.[138] As Sparrow even acknowledges, "some of these pictures [are] … not immediately clear what they mean until … the children actually explain them."[139] She demonstrates this with an image of what looks like a multicolor flower but is "really" an image of a child's hut exploding. Through her efforts to decode the drawings for her audience, Dr. Sparrow attempts to control or manage the meanings of these images by capitalizing on what Biesecker terms "aesthetics of dematerialization." As Biesecker explains, this "aesthetics of dematerialization" comprise a mode of seeing which works against transparency by rejecting the idea that "'what one sees is what one gets.'" [140]

Individuals given the power to decipher these aesthetics are ceded positions of authority to make meaning.[141] On one hand then, the "Smallest Witnesses" images are an asset to the USHMM in bolstering their authority. On the other hand, they stand to cast doubt upon the authenticity of other modes of representation utilized by the exhibition.

The Specter of Insufficiency

The complications around the use of the "Smallest Witnesses" images gesture toward the inadequacies of some of the USHMM's strategies for representation, intimating uncertainty about the sufficiency of images as vehicles for the depiction of atrocity. This uncertainty exists on two levels. At the same time visuality is elevated as critical to genocide cessation, the exhibition also imparts contradictory messages suggesting that visual rhetoric is an inadequate medium for representation. Through such intimations, *From Memory to Action* activates longstanding forms of argumentation that treat the image as incapable of conveying the totality of trauma. Additionally, the exhibition calls into question the links between sight and action, opening spaces for debate over the viability of rhetorical resolutions as means of genocide cessation work. For all of the emphasis on sight in *From Memory to Action,* the exhibition is haunted by the shortcomings of visual rhetoric, creating a situation whereby the exhibition at once endorses the power of visual culture while calling it into question.

Among one of the largest fears "haunting" *From Memory to Action* is the sense that visual rhetoric is inadequate as a means of capturing the complexity of genocide. Just as the institution touts images as critical in helping the public understand genocide, the exhibition intimates that the image's power is limited. Nowhere in the exhibition is this more clearly demonstrated than during the 2006 "Darfur: Who Will Survive Today"

program. Ismail introduces the photographic exhibition by suggesting that the images will help the public "see what genocide looks like in Darfur."[142] Yet after praising the images, the tenor of his introduction shifts, and he stresses the limitations of photography:

> But it [the exhibition] will not show you the life of peoples destroyed. It will not show you the dignity of human being being [sic] stripped. It will not show you the stigma that a woman raped will carry around for the rest of her life. It will not show you the broken hearts of those who feel guilty because they survived. That is what you have to deduce for yourself from these images.[143]

By so hedging, Ismail contains the power of visual rhetoric, gesturing toward the limitations of the medium. Indeed, Ismail's discussion of the limitations of images is corroborated by absences in the exhibition. For example, *From Memory to Action* contains relatively few images of perpetrators and when these perpetrators are shown, they are shown at rest, holding their weapons or walking around. The images of genocide contained in *From Memory to Action* rarely depict abuses in action; images spotlight the body *after* the harm has been inflicted.[144] Although Ismail offers an explanation for some of these absences (i.e., he stresses that the "culprits" of certain genocides are "elusive"[145]), the exhibition is haunted by the sense that some critical facets of the problem of genocide have escaped representation. In this way, *From Memory to Action* rehearse familiar fears regarding the inadequacy of representation writ large, tapping into anxieties circulating in broader scholarly literature in Holocaust and genocide studies by implying that "traumas," such as genocide, can never be represented.[146]

These anxieties dovetail with the intimation of related fears concerning the relationship between images and action. As stated earlier, visuality attains special significance as a form of representation within *From Memory to Action* because it is also closely aligned with discourses of resolution. In contrast to earlier configurations of visuality as an integral part of genocide cessation, a subtle sense lingers within the exhibition that images might not "resolve" the problem of genocide. These anxieties are articulated in a narrative offered by photojournalist Ron Haviv in his "eyewitness testimony" in the exhibition. Haviv tells the story behind a photo, which appears on the pledge cards made available to exhibit's visitors.[147] The image shows a Bosnian man, hands raised in front of his body and a fearful expression on his face. Behind the man, clearly visible in the frame, are two individuals with firearms brandished. The man, with his imploring look in the midst of a seemingly perilous situation, seems to nonverbally ask visitors the question that is printed on their pledge cards: "What will you do to help meet the challenge of genocide today?"[148]

The subject of the picture, Haviv explains, was accused of being a Kosovo fundamentalist. In Haviv's story, the man is captured and taken away only to escape by jumping out of a second story window. Remarkably, the man survived the fall, though his captors found him, poured water on him, and continued to physically abuse the man as he lay on the ground.[149]

The photo Haviv snapped was taken just before the man was seized. In Haviv's words, the man "put his arms up and basically looked at me as if I was probably the only person that could save him, which, probably in his mind I was, but unfortunately there wasn't really anything I could do,"[150] besides, of course, take the picture. Unable to

"save" the man depicted in the sense of sparing him this abuse, Haviv recasts his role in the scene as something of a heroic documentarian. As Haviv recounts, "I was shaking, for sure, when I was doing it because I realized how precarious everything was, but I really thought it was unbelievably important to be able to have the world see what happened."[151] Constructing the scene so that it appears he too was in danger,[152] he returns to the importance of the photograph: "I had to make sure that there was a document," he declares, "there had to be evidence of this crime, of what was happening. And that, I think, gave me the courage to try – to take those photographs."[153]

Haviv's testimony reflects an artful form of negotiating the relationship between visuality and action: Unable to participate in genocide cessation by stopping the violence in front of him, Haviv's contribution – his way of taking action – is to create an image, to document atrocity. Confronted with the man's imploring gaze, Haviv's initial response is one of resignation: "unfortunately there really wasn't anything I could do."[154] This gesture toward *a lack of agency* to stop the atrocity seemingly intimates a sense of inevitability, suggesting the violence unfolding before Haviv could not be stopped. Haviv counters this sentiment by positing a relationship between photography and action. However, the conception of photography-as-action reflected in Haviv's narrative is clearly imperfect. In spite of Haviv's attempt to restore a sense of agency linked to visual documentation, Haviv's photographic intervention ultimately fails to stop the ensuing violence. The man is still seized, assaulted and thrown from a window. Haviv's photography does not bring an end to the violence before him. While the photo, or more precisely the narrative contextualizing the photos, links visuality and action, it also gestures toward Sontag's contentions about photography as a substitute for action.[155] By

so intimating a connection between photography and stasis, Haviv's testimony complicates the relationship between images, action, and the cessation of violence constructed elsewhere in the exhibition. In so doing, Haviv's narrative invites reflection on the connections between genocide representation and genocide resolution.

Rhetorical Resolutions: Potency & Powerlessness in *From Memory to Action*

As demonstrated above, representations are closely linked to resolutions in *From Memory to Action*. Indeed, in response to the question of "what can be done," the exhibition features rhetorical resolutions as key elements of genocide cessation. Writing and speaking, for example, are commonly presented as important parts of genocide prevention and intervention. The actors celebrated within the exhibition are often average individuals and collectives who take action by "speaking out" or otherwise creating discourses about genocide, creating space to recognize public agency. This focus on the importance of discourse to resolutions includes an emphasis on legal discourses, once again accentuating the significance of the 1948 UN Convention to genocide cessation efforts. Simultaneously, the exhibition expresses anxiety about the sufficiency of these rhetorical resolutions.[156] This anxiety is exacerbated by *From Memory to Action*'s treatment of martial action. By utilizing militaristic metaphors to refer to journalists and photojournalists as genocide cessation actors, the exhibition calls attention to its limited discussion of martial intervention as a viable means of genocide cessation.

At first blush, the exhibition clearly promotes the idea of rhetoric as a form of action,[157] offering rhetorical resolutions to the problem of genocide. The pledge cards, for example, exemplify this belief. The mere act of writing the pledge is seen as a part of a "transition;"[158] visitors move from consumers of representations to agents of genocide

cessation. In an article co-written by the exhibit designers, Bridget Conley-Zilkic and David Small explain that the prompt on the pledges cards ("What will you do to help meet the challenge of genocide today?") "is designed to provoke a first-person statement from the visitors, thereby asking them to write themselves into the solution."[159] The act of authoring a pledge becomes a form of taking action invested with special significance. As Conley-Zilkic and Small continue, "When visitors also see their pledge projected on the screen and visible to others, it helps them see their own choice as part of a larger movement, each choice to take action a unique contribution to a problem of global and historical dimensions."[160] Writing out the pledge then becomes a transformative act and key part of genocide cessation work.

Additionally, voice, speech, and speaking out are valorized within *From Memory to Action* as forms of rhetorical resolutions. The "What Can I Do" page encourages the USHMM's audiences to "Talk about the need to provide humanitarian assistance, protect civilians, stop the violence, and promote solutions to the crises."[161] Echoing this sentiment, former US Marine Brian Steidle reminds audiences in one website video that "the biggest things is [sic] talking, spreading the word, so that everybody knows what is happening… write your Senators, write your Congressmen, write the President, write Kofi Annan. Tell 'em that you are interested in this issue. Tell them that this must stop."[162] Museum resources further stress the power of individual voices, emphasizing to their visitors, "your voice can make a difference" and imploring audiences, "Do not be silent."[163]

The eyewitness testimony included in the exhibition features many individuals praised for speaking up, especially when doing so puts one in harm's way.[164] Holocaust

survivor Nesse Godin's eyewitness account includes a pointed emphasis on the importance of public discourse:

> And the world was silent while we were suffering, and I said, "We cannot be silent again." And I turned to the young woman that was standing there, and I said, "Yes, we are going to stand – I, personally, am going to stand shoulder to shoulder, and not allow the world to be silent."[165]

Godin's public promise to advocate on behalf of and alongside the people in Darfur rests upon the assumption that "speaking out" is a critical part of genocide prevention or intervention.[166] This emphasis on talking, advocating, or telling stories is repeated in various capacities throughout *From Memory to Action*. In describing his work photographing atrocity in Darfur, Fowler explains that the Darfuri refugees he spoke with want "to have their stories told."[167] The exhibition emphasizes that many of the former victims of genocide featured as "eyewitnesses" become advocates and activists, ostensibly continuing to model the importance of using one's voice as a form of action in combating injustices.[168]

In some ways, promoting "voice" as a form of action helps to allay anxiety surrounding perceptions of powerlessness in genocide cessation work.[169] Senator Proxmire's (D-WI) narrative embodies these connections between individual agency, rhetoric, and action. Although Proxmire inhabited a position of political power, his narrative is framed to underscore the remarkable capacity of the individual advocate's voice. Proxmire's story, states US Representative Ron Kind (D-WI) in a video in the exhibit, is an inspirational narrative about "the difference one person can still make in the course of events."[170] Proxmire is lauded by Kind in part for his commitment to public

discourse. Proxmire, his profile stresses, delivered "3,211 speeches arguing that the United States should sign the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide,"[171] a "constant drum beat" underscoring the importance of the United States becoming a party to the Convention.[172] His "legacy," according to Kind, is one "of the persistence of one man and how he made a tremendous difference for our country and throughout the world"[173] through the exercise of his voice. Proxmire's narrative affirms the importance of "speaking out" as a form of resolution. His story also suggests the salience of legal action to genocide cessation work.

The law functions as a significant arena for discursive action in *From Memory to Action,* accentuating the central role afforded to rhetoric in the exhibition. As Parry-Giles asserts, "[s]ystems of law and legal practice are decidedly rhetorical."[174] The law is rhetorical in multiple senses.[175] On the most obvious of levels, trials are forums for the exchange of public arguments and settings for deliberation.[176] Yet, more to the point, the entire legal enterprise, White suggests, might be viewed productively "as a branch of rhetoric." White treats law as a rhetorical "art by which community and culture are established, maintained, and transformed."[177] Thus, the case made through *From Memory to Action* about the importance of law is a repeated endorsement of the importance of *rhetoric* to genocide cessation efforts.

From Memory to Action punctuates the importance of legal action to genocide cessation efforts on multiple occasions. One of the "eyewitnesses" to genocide featured in the exhibition is Stephen Rapp, an international prosecutor involved in the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.[178] Rapp's profile mentions his efforts leading "a landmark case against three Rwandan journalists" and then contextualizes his

work amid "a marked change in the willingness of individual countries and the United Nations to use international criminal proceedings in response to atrocities."[179] In addition to the content on Rapp's profile, a section of the physical installation highlights the role of legal processes – prosecutions and international tribunals – in creating closure in the wake of atrocity.[180] Furthermore, the aforementioned "What is Genocide" timeline, focused on "trac[ing] the development of the word and law of genocide," inherently assumes the development of international law is a critical part of genocide cessation work.[181] Through the timeline, legal action is treated as so significant that it functions as something of a consolation in lieu of other steps to prevent or end atrocity. In the most basic sense, the timeline contributes to the perception that legal action is a meaningful way of participating in genocide cessation work.[182]

Above all, the exhibit's promotion of Raphael Lemkin and the 1948 UN Convention elucidates the sophisticated relationship constructed between rhetoric, law, and action. As stressed earlier, Lemkin's moment of rhetorical invention is credited by the exhibition as providing the authoritative legal definition of genocide.[183] Lemkin's definition appears as the first slide in the "What is Genocide" timeline and as the definition in the museum's brochures.[184] The UN Convention and the definition of genocide contained therein constitute the central reference point for the exhibition's discussion of genocide. By elevating Lemkin's work and the 1948 UN Convention and ascribing them a critical role in the exhibition's representation of genocide cessation work, *From Memory to Action* again returns to the importance of both law and discourse.

The Specter of Insufficiency

Alongside discourses celebrating individuals who "speak out," the exhibition intimates that rhetoric is an insufficient form of resolution. A looming sense that words alone are not enough lingers. One finds this sentiment in the featured pledge made by UN Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide Francis Deng. In his pledge, Deng promises "to turn the words into deeds."[185] Deng's comments assume that words and deeds are distinct, a formulation of the relationship between rhetoric and action that contradicts other conceptions within the exhibit of rhetoric *as* action. Ismail's remarks contain a similar configuration of the links between rhetoric and action. In Ismail's words, "[y]ou have to act;" rather than "just stand[ing] on the sidelines arguing" about the meaning of the word "genocide."[186] Ismail reinforces the idea that talking about genocide and taking action are separate and distinct constructs. On one hand, *From Memory to Action* endorses the power of the word; on the other, the exhibit is haunted by the sense that words are insufficient, evincing an uncertainty and anxiety about rhetoric that the exhibitions' earlier exhortations seem unable to dispel.

Further, the exhibition intimates that the act of naming "genocide" – a declamation central to the activation of a legal response to genocide[187] – is trivial and disconnected from violent acts. Despite Lemkin's Herculean efforts to codify the word and his earnest belief in the significance of promoting and using the word "genocide," others featured in the exhibition suggest that the word itself is meaningless. Such positions trivialize the importance of *naming genocide,* of using the appellation as a means of triggering international action as specified in the 1948 UN Convention. Jean-Phillipe Ceppi, a journalist included in the exhibition for being the first individual to publicly call the situation in Rwanda "genocide," dismisses the debates held over the use

of the word. Of his decision to use the term, Ceppi cites the piles of bodies he saw and the reports he heard of the tens of thousands of victims. He states: "for me, [it] was good enough to use this word 'genocide.'"[188] He remarks that, in the midst of watching the violence unfold in Rwanda, he never stopped to ask the question "is that a 'genocide' or what?"[189] His testimony consequently implies that "mincing words" matters little in light of the materiality of genocidal violence. A similar sentiment is found in Darfuri activist Omar Ismail's testimony in which he pleads, "There is a real issue here. Please don't reduce the suffering of my people to a mere issue of semantics."[190] Contained in both sets of remarks is a clear derision of the importance of the word. From Ceppi's and Ismail's perspectives, words don't matter nearly as much as others might assume, even when such words have the force of international law behind them.

Consequentially, the exhibition promotes the power of the word – and more specifically, the power of the word "genocide" – as a crucial part of international law while intimating that words are meaningless. At some points in the exhibition, the legal frameworks for "genocide" matter, and the legal codification of the word "genocide" is significant. At other points in time, troubling with the "semantics" of the word is absurd. These competing evaluations of the relationship between rhetoric and genocide cessation engender an anxiety about the potency of rhetoric as a form of atrocity resolution. In turn, such anxiety is fueled by incongruous uses of martial rhetorics to elevate journalists and photojournalists as key actors in genocide cessation while simultaneously sublimating considerations of military intervention as a form of genocide resolution.

The Specter of Martial Resolutions

As means of glorifying the work of discourse creators, *From Memory to Action* embraces martial rhetorics as a discursive framework for describing journalists' genocide cessation work. Journalists are commended for their valor, courageousness, and bravery.[191] This act of symbolic substitution, whereby journalists are cast as martial actors, draws attention to the relative lack of discussion of military intervention as a viable form of "resolution" within *From Memory to Action*. This absence within the exhibit stands in stark contrast to the promotion of a pro-US military narrative elsewhere in the USHMM. Indeed, rather than promote the US army-as-liberation force narrative, the exhibition complicates the feasibility of post-Holocaust US troop interventions, intimating the operation of larger political considerations pertaining to the use of US forces. Through the attention to speech/silence surrounding martial discourses, the situational constraints which hamstring the USHMM's genocide cessation discourse become the most apparent.

Militaristic discourses are engaged within the exhibition to construct a discursive framework for lauding journalistic action. The photograph of the Bosnian man accused of being a Kosovo fundamentalist illustrates conflations between military and journalistic intervention. Stressing the precariousness of the situation he experienced in Bosnia ("they were screaming at me not to take photographs"),[192] Haviv's "courage" to take the photos constructs journalistic intervention as a daring and dangerous act. Narratives about journalist killed during the atrocities in Chechnya reinforce this view of journalistic action.[193] This notion of journalists "under fire" or in danger mimics the kinds of discourse that might be used to talk about soldiers engaged in military interventions. Former USHMM Chairman Fred Zeidman's remarks at the 2006 "Darfur: Who Will

Survive Today" event are suggestive of how this mimicry works. Zeidman states, "The photographers who went to Darfur to document the tragedy are truly courageous, traveling to a dangerous region, risking their lives, and donating their photos in order to show us the faces of genocide. These brave photographers acted and they compel us to act." [194] Furthering the militaristic framing, Zeidman continues, "[w]e salute these individuals."[195] The hallmarks used here to describe journalists – courage, risk, and a sense of self-jeopardy – could just as easily be used to describe soldiers. Ultimately, such language valorizes the work of photographers as powerful agents of genocide cessation.

The narratives surrounding Brian Steidle, a former US Marine turned photographer, provides the clearest examples of this journalist-military conflation. Steidle's photographs are a critical part of the USHMM's exhibition. His photo of Um Zaifa appears on the Committee of Conscience's brochures. His work was featured in a public program made available as a video on the *From Memory to Action* page. He is an eyewitness in the exhibition, and he has a photo essay included on the website. Given his place of prominence in *From Memory to Action*, his work has been described by the USHMM in numerous ways. In one photo, Steidle, appears alongside men in camouflage, weapons visible. Steidle is wearing an all khaki outfit that resembles military attire. This photo accompanies his profile, which introduces Steidle as a "former U.S. Marine … invited to serve in Darfur as an unarmed military observer and U.S. representative to the African Union."[196] Steidle's former position as a US Marine stands in contrast with "his position as an *unarmed* military observer in Darfur."[197] Denuded of the defensive resources of a Marine, Steidle "did not have much in the way of equipment with him as an AU monitor, but he had a camera, and he took hundreds and hundreds of

photographs."[198] "Unarmed" and with minimal equipment, his camera becomes his primary means of intervening, standing in as a phantom appendage, a shallow substitute for the Marine's gun. Casting his camera as his "weapon" in the fight against atrocity, such an introduction furthers the militaristic comparison between "shooting" a camera and "shooting" a gun.[199] Steidle's enactment of the Marine-turned-journalist narrative represents the pinnacle of *From Memory to Action*'s martial conflation, enacting a symbolic substitution whereby journalists and photographers function in the place of other military actors.

Whereas journalists are cast through these highly militarized narratives, other martial actors play a minimal role within the exhibition. None of the featured "eyewitnesses" within *From Memory to Action* are part of a liberation force.[200] Nowhere on the "take action" pages does the exhibition suggest that military force might be necessary to end genocide. When military forces are spotlighted as part of liberation attempts, they are often depicted as failing in their missions, unable to "substantially alleviate the crisis" in the DRC,[201] "undermanned and ill-equipped" in Sudan,[202] and "severely handicapped" in Rwanda.[203] The visuals accompanying the "armed force" section of the physical installation reinforce these messages. In one image, Rwandan Patriotic Front soldiers stand behind a pile of victims' skulls, seemingly powerless in light of the violence that has obviously already occurred.[204] In another photo, coffins draped with AU-UN flags are identified as the fatalities of a peacekeeping mission in Darfur.[205] Indeed, the exhibition contains few models of successful military intervention campaigns.[206]

The near absence of martial figures in *From Memory to Action* and the accompanying narratives of "failed" military action exist in stark contrast with the prominence of US liberators and the glorification of US soldiers throughout the USHMM. As noted earlier, the subjectivity of the soldier-liberator is a predominant part of the visitor's experience at the USHMM; the role of the US military in liberating the concentration camps, in fact, serves as part of the justification for the USHMM's very existence on US soil.[207] The front entrance to the institution is lined with the flags of the US military divisions involved in the liberation of concentration camps.[208] The institution sponsored a special exhibition focused on liberation, complete with profiles of each of the divisions engaged in liberation on its website.[209] The result is a fairly pronounced juxtaposition: Whereas, the US military is a critical part of the narrative that the USHMM constructs about the Holocaust, the exhibition cedes little responsibility to US troops in contemporary genocide cessation discourse.

The inconsistencies in the USHMM's engagement with martial action intimate the political logics influencing deliberations over the expenditure of US resources. In his work on post-Holocaust genocide prevention, Ronayne stresses that "American foreign policy is not made in a vacuum;"[210] therefore, any consideration of US commitments to stop atrocities abroad must be factored against multiple other political considerations, among those, US domestic public opinion.[211] As Ronayne concisely points out, "[f]ear of political consequences at home should American forces suffer causalities during a humanitarian intervention" has historically inhibited some politicians' willingness to support the deployment of US troops.[212] Such fears were heightened, some argue, in the wake of the disastrous consequences of US intervention in Somalia in 1993.[213] The so-

called "Somalia Syndrome" has been cited as a reason for US reticence to aid or alleviate the genocidal violence in Rwanda and Bosnia.[214] Although some reporting on public opinion polls seemingly suggests that the American public favors the use of US troops to stop genocide,[215] trepidation over the loss of US lives haunts discussions of US resources in genocide cessation efforts.

These political logics are intimated within other USHMM discourses which complicate the feasibility of atrocity resolution. The *From Memory to Action* website features museum resources for educators that gesture toward the political factors that may hinder genocide intervention/prevention. As part of a set of guidelines for teaching about genocide, the USHMM offers the following advice:

> The world community is very different and far more complicated in the aftermath of the Holocaust…Students may become frustrated when they learn of governmental inaction in the face of genocide. While there are certainly cynical reasons for not intervening, teachers can lead students to understand the complexity of responding to genocide, that it is usually not a simple matter to step into another country across the world and tell one group to stop killing another group.[216]

Indeed, the guidelines go on to advise instructors to have their students consider questions such as "How much international cooperation can be mustered? How much is needed?" "What are the possible ramifications of intervention?" and "Is a nation willing to absorb casualties and death to stop a genocide?"[217] Notably, these rhetorics are distinct from the moral and idealistic rhetorics used to discuss the Shoah within the same

guidelines.[218] Instead, the aforementioned questions prime instructors and ultimately their

students to moderate their expectations for US action and atrocity resolution.

Consequentially, the USHMM paints a complicated picture of genocide cessation

work. The institution validates then repudiates the salience of rhetorical resolutions to

genocide. The exhibition valorizes journalists and photojournalists through militaristic

metaphors as crucial agents in genocide cessation but affords a limited role to martial

actors in *From Memory to Action*. The exhibit intimates but leaves exnominated the

broader deliberations which contextualize the politics of troop deployment. The result is

the promulgation of optimistic messages about genocide prevention and intervention

alongside subtle intimations of the importance of tempered expectations. Similar

contradictory assessments of historical successes and failures in genocide prevention and

intervention shape USHMM's discussions of genocide memory.

Remembering Genocide: Configurations of Temporality

Arguments about genocide remembrance are interwoven into discussions of

definition, representation, and resolution within *From Memory to Action*. At the most

basic level, Terdiman defines memory as "the modality of our relation to the past."[219]

From Terdiman's perspective on memory, the arguments contained in *From Memory to*

Action about the relationship between past genocides and the present political moment

speak to the politics of the museum's acts of genocide remembrance. The exhibition

connects the past and present in two distinct ways, utilizing a temporal narrative of

progress and one of stasis. The progress narrative promotes the perception of genocide as

mutable and contributes to the glorification of the nation-state as an actor in genocide

cessation work.[220] At the same time, the exhibition includes a temporal narrative that

insinuates stasis. Such a temporality presumes the inevitability of continued atrocity. From this vantage point, genocides will continue to happen as they have always happened. This view of time confers authority on the USHMM as an important institutional voice on matters of contemporary genocidal atrocity. Simultaneously, the omissions in the selective construction of the stasis temporal narrative enhance the palatability of the USHMM's genocide memories.

From one perspective, *From Memory to Action* offers hopeful narratives about the relationship between the past and the present, accentuating a sense of incremental progress. The physical installation constructs a temporal narrative stressing steady progress in safeguarding human rights from the 1940s to the present. The physical installation situates the Holocaust as a stimulus that ushered in a political culture attuned to human rights violations.[221] It proclaims that "OUT OF THE HOLOCAUST,"[222] as the first panel reads, "individuals and world leaders [were inspired] to devise new means to identify, prevent, and punish mass violence against entire civilian groups."[223] The narratives in the physical installation make a point of acknowledging the efforts made by "individuals, organizations, countries, and international coalitions" to stop the atrocities in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sudan.[224] In contrast to the first panel's pictures of genocidal violence, the installation ends with a panel featuring activists rallying on behalf of Darfur accompanied by text that reads, "THE FUTURE CAN BE DIFFERENT."[225] Thus, the narrative arc of the exhibition concludes with messages about empowerment, agency, mutability, and ultimately, if tentatively, progress.

Such notions of incremental progress are even more explicit in the "What Is Genocide" timeline included on the *From Memory to Action* website. After discussing the

failure of the signatories of the 1948 UN Convention to respond to the genocide in Cambodia,[226] the timeline notes several legal advances. Situating the late 1980s and the 1990s as something of a turning point, the tenor of the timeline changes in 1988 with the signature of US government officials on the 1948 Convention.[227] The narrative slides that follow this moment in time include: "The World Acts to Punish but Not to Halt Atrocities in the Former Yugoslavia" (1993),[228] "After the Genocide Ends, the World Creates a Tribunal for Rwanda" (1994),[229] and "A Permanent Court to Prosecute Atrocities against Civilians is Established" (1998),[230] highlighting the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC). The timeline ends in 2004 with the US declaration of genocide in Darfur.[231] Not only does such a framework trumpet the agency of the United States in matters of genocide cessation (as the turning point in the narrative is the entry of the United States into genocide prevention politics in 1988[232]), the narrative bends in the direction of incremental progress. Although the world did not prevent the atrocities in Bosnia, Rwanda, or Darfur, steps toward genocide cessation, the narrative reassures audiences, have been taken: tribunals were organized, war criminals were indicted, and the ICC was established. Though confronted with the international community's repeated failures to prevent genocide in the past, the timeline suggests that progress has been made.

On an ontological level, this conceptualization of genocide memory has important implications for arguments about US political power. Linear temporalities, such as the one employed here, enhance the authority of the nation-state, which helps to account for the correlation between the progress narrative and the glorification of US action featured prominently in the exhibition.[233] Edkins argues that traumatic events, such as the Holocaust or genocides, have the potential to break out of standard understandings of

time because traumas, by some definitions, defy society's conventional modes of representation.[234] Yet, "[b]y rewriting these traumas into a linear narrative of national heroism," Edkins asserts, "the state conceals the trauma that it has, necessarily, produced."[235] Put simply, Edkins holds that nation-states exert control over traumas such as genocide by working to fold them into linear time. In this way, states can inhibit the connections between the actions they may have undertaken to cause such traumas and instead can subsume the events within overarching narratives which promote a kind of heroic nationalism.[236] This vision of the nation-state is particularly well suited to support a liberal understanding of the problem of genocide given their shared focus on the primacy of the state. Thus, the utilization of this kind of temporality lends additional support to that strand of the exhibition's definitional discourse. Taken as a whole, the progress narrative aligns with a construction of genocide and genocide cessation that maintains perceptions of mutability, agency, and US benevolence.

At the same time, by writing the memory of past genocide into a narrative of progression, the USHMM weakens its institutional authority as the Committee on Conscience's operational mission is premised in the occurrence of ongoing atrocity. *From Memory to Action* is an initiative hosted by a part of the USHMM known as the Center for the Prevention of Genocide. The Center for the Prevention of Genocide is advised by the USHMM's Committee on Conscience (CoC), "a standing committee of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council."[237] The CoC's central mission "is to alert the national conscience, influence policy makers, and stimulate worldwide action to confront and work to halt acts of genocide or related crimes against humanity."[238] The CoC ensures the USHMM remains "a living memorial," able to safeguard against the

replication of genocidal violence in the wake of the Holocaust.[239] Ergo, the CoC's work is contingent upon the need for vigilance to avoid or stem the occurrence of atrocity. Its very exigence is grounded in an assumption of continued violence. Given that a narrative of progress undermines the CoC's reason for existence, this narrative is tempered by arguments intimating stasis, arguments which suggest the sustained and lingering threat of genocide. When the threat of genocide haunts contemporary politics, the CoC, and the USHMM in turn, is ceded additional authority as a voice in genocide cessation work.

Hence, alongside optimistic genocide memories, the exhibition intimates a second temporality marked by stasis. This temporality configures past-present relationships in less hopeful terms. In these narratives, violence has not been overcome but continues to haunt the present. A notion of a sustained genocidal threat manifests within *From Memory to Action* in multiple ways. On the most obvious of levels, *From Memory to Action* identifies a number of states as "at risk" for genocide. The "Who is at Risk?" webpage features profiles for the DRC, Sudan, South Sudan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rwanda, Burundi, and Chechnya.[240] The act of designating "at risk" states contributes to the sense of impending violence, suggesting the need for "monitoring" and enhancing the case for the CoC's operation. The presence of such a list clearly intimates that genocidal violence continues to occur, or at least the threat continues to lurk, in some (largely African) regions.

The "legacy" section of the profiles for each "at risk" country highlights the possibilities for the outbreak of future violence. "In [the] Congo," as the exhibition explains, "the violence continues to recur in spurts, never dissipating enough to provide real security for civilians or allow true post-conflict rebuilding to take root."[241] In the

Darfur region of Sudan, "violence continues with a wider array of perpetrators," and

"[c]ivilians continue to be displaced and suffer attacks that often take the form of

robbery, rape, and murder."[242] In other locales, there are problems of political recognition

(Bosnia),[243] lingering medical problems in the survivor community (Rwanda),[244] and

governmental instability (Burundi).[245] Removed from whatever progress has been made,

this construction of temporality posits each nation-state as potentially primed for

additional violence.

The selective examples employed to construct the stasis temporal narrative offer a

palatable form of genocide remembrance by focusing on minimally contestable instances

of past genocide while foreclosing debates about politically charged instances of past or

present atrocity. As Zelizer concludes, "we may remember earlier atrocities so as to

forget contemporary ones."[246] Curiously, three of the narratives for the nations featured

as "at risk" – Rwanda, Bosnia, and Chechnya – centralize violence that has occurred

nearly a decade before the exhibition. Though the legacy sections provide some

justification for their continued inclusion on this list of nations needing to be

"monitored,"[247] *From Memory to Action*'s recycling of past violence potentially raises the

question: "Are there no more current examples of atrocity to discuss?" The stasis

narrative's emphasis on these well-worn stories of violence in Rwanda and Bosnia

intimates other atrocities that are either relatively minimized or entirely absent. For

example, the physical installation and online exhibition overwhelmingly feature and

designate as "cause for concern" violence in Africa and – to a more limited extent –

Europe. Although the physical installation includes sporadic references to violence

outside of these regions,[248] at the broadest levels, the politics of the Middle East, Asia,

Australia, and the Americas, are given relatively little attention.[249] By spotlighting

familiar examples of past genocides, the institution minimizes its engagement with

present atrocities.

Furthermore, its version of genocide memory is tamed by omissions in the

narrative. *From Memory to Action* constructs an innocuous version of genocide memory

through conspicuous silences in its narration of the history of genocide. For example, the

choice to start the exhibition's narrative with Lemkin's invention of the word "genocide"

obfuscates important debates about pre-twentieth and early twentieth century violence as

well as issues related to indigenous slaughter. The USHMM's choice to construct the

narrative so that it coincides with the creation of the word "genocide" reduces the

"history of genocide" to 1944 and beyond, despite the fact that the concept of genocide

long preceded the coinage of the term.[250] By centralizing Lemkin's moment of rhetorical

invention, *From Memory to Action* not only reinforces arguments about the importance of

rhetorical resolutions, it provides the grounds for the exclusion of atrocities that preceded

the invention of the word. Thus, the controversy around the Armenian genocide can be

avoided as can discussions of the disastrous effects of colonization and imperialism on

indigenous populations, including the United States' own Native American communities.

By constructing the timeline for the exhibition so that it starts in 1944, the installation is

able to foreclose debates about the nature and morality of such violence and safeguards

these historical incidents from public scrutiny. At the most basic level, this construction

of temporality protects the image of the United States by shaping the memory of

genocide in such a way that the devastating violence visited upon native communities by

the US government is disconnected from the content of the exhibition.[251]

The contours of the USHMM's narratives of genocide remembrance are constructed through the simultaneous uses of competing temporalities. The progress narrative offers hopeful and empowering messages about genocide mutability while the stasis narrative intimates the intractability of some forms of violence. In establishing the linkages between the past and the present, gaps in the narratives showcase the politics of the institution's decisions to avoid or minimize selective instances of contemporary or historic atrocities. Taken as a whole, the exhibition's arguments about remembrance enact a familiar pattern whereby the institution offers innocuous narratives about atrocity while intimating the politics that underlie US genocide cessation discourses.

Competing Evaluations of the USHMM's Use of Rhetorical Intimation

Through the use of rhetorical intimation, the USHMM promotes contradictory or paradoxical messages about genocide definition, representation, resolution and remembrance. The exhibition advocates politically palatable messages about genocide and genocide cessation which contribute to a fairly positive image of the US government. At the same time, the exhibition's use of rhetorical intimation hints at facets of national and international politics that moderate the optimism of the exhibition's genocide cessation discourse. This rhetorical strategy suggests several implications. Although rhetorical intimation complicates overly simplistic narratives about US genocide cessation work, it ultimately leaves the many ideologies that factor in political decisions about genocide exnominated.

Rhetorical intimation facilitates a more sophisticated form of genocide cessation discourse by creating spaces for the articulation of less comforting narratives about atrocity. Its shortcomings aside, *From Memory to Action* rejects caricature and gestures

toward the complexity of the politics that surround genocide and genocide cessation. In this sense, the exhibition exceeds many scholarly expectations for a popular representation of genocide, especially one financed by the US government. By, at minimum, giving voice to competing perspectives and hinting at obstacles to genocide cessation work, the exhibition avoids the worst flaws of omission. Through such rhetorical maneuvers, the USHMM intimates unspeakable arguments about genocide and genocide cessation without the wholesale repudiation of the US government. On these grounds, this chapter's analysis departs from the aforementioned critiques of the institution, which place emphasis on its nationalistic and conservative dimensions.[252]

Nevertheless, as I have argued throughout this study, rhetorical intimation leaves the ideologies implicated in genocide and genocide cessation largely exnominated. These "hints" toward the influence of colonial ideologies, for example, are visible only to the most sophisticated viewers. As Morris suggests, the nods or intimations are received only by those who know what to look for.[253] The extent of the connections between genocide and broader domestic and international politics are never fully exposed, stripping viewers of the resources to launch a critique of these ideologies. The subtly of these acts of rhetorical intimation may render such gestures invisible to members of the public without the requisite knowledge in the subject area to recognize them. For an institution committed to accessibility and public education,[254] rhetorical intimation curbs the institution's pedagogical potential by merely gesturing towards complicated issues that require more substantive explanations.[255]

Such a conclusion corroborates Bartov's assessment of the USHMM by punctuating the substantial limitations imposed upon the museum's genocide cessation

discourse as a result of the institution's relationship with the US government.[256] By safeguarding the US government from extensive critique, the institution undercuts the potency of its genocide cessation arguments. Worse, rhetorical intimation leaves mystified some of the very ideologies that contribute to the continuation of genocide by failing to explicitly address them within *From Memory to Action*.

Undoubtedly, rhetorical intimation as a discursive strategy has its utility. As I have argued in this chapter, rhetorical intimation enables *From Memory to Action* to articulate a more robust form of genocide cessation discourse while working within USHMM's situational constraints. At the same time, such acts of intimation invariably alter the ways genocide is understood, represented, and remembered. The interplay of speech and silence creates a dual-voiced genocide cessation discourse within the USHMM that is optimistic yet tempered, palatable yet instigative. The implications of intimation and exnomination in genocide cessation discourse at the broadest levels are the subject of the Afterword to follow.

Notes

[1] Jerry Fowler, "Raphael Lemkin," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 2:53, from "Raphael Lemkin," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed June 28, 2012, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/lemkin.

At the time of authorship, this "Eyewitness Testimony" is available in two capacities. It is included in the exhibition as part of a touch-based interface whereby visitors to the exhibition are able to select which "eyewitnesses" they hear from. This information is also available online at: "Eyewitness Testimony" (video gallery), United

States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed June 28, 2012,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portraits. Unless otherwise noted,

all quotes and transcriptions were taken from the online version of the "eyewitness

testimony" pages. Notably, the USHMM transcribes the "Eyewitness Testimony" and

features it alongside the video as it appears online in the "Eyewitness Testimony" video

gallery. For the record, their transcriptions often lack inarticulates, and, in this case, the

transcription adds the word "their" before "governments" in the penultimate sentence.

Finally, no lengths are provided on the video files. All length information was timed by

the author.

[2] Over the course of the years I studied this exhibition, the USHMM changed the

design of the installation. By May 2013, these touch-based interfaces were gone. The

table was still present, but visitors could no longer select which narrative they wanted to

hear. Further a feature that had enabled visitors to save exhibition narratives to the

retained portion of their pledge cards had also been disabled.

[3] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Take Action!* (postcard distributed

as a part of the "From Memory to Action: Meeting the Challenge of Genocide"

installation, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., February

2011).

[4] This response card read, "I will tell my students to go to the exhibit website."

Other cards reference the importance of the Committee on Conscience.

[5] The institution displays a sample of the pledges it receives on its website. These

pledges were taken from the website's display of submitted content in April and May of

2013. Screenshots of the pledges were preserved by the author. "Pledge Wall,"

Preventing Genocide – Take Action – Pledge Wall, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 21, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/pledge#/browse.

[6] Gen. Romeo Dallaire, "Featured Pledges," Preventing Genocide – Take Action – Featured Pledges, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/featured_pledges. This quotation has been shortened.

[7] Juan Mendez, "Featured Pledges," Preventing Genocide – Take Action – Featured Pledges, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 17, 2011, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/featured_pledges. This quotation has been shortened.

[8] In some ways, this characterization is unfair; both Mutombo and Cheek have connections to genocide politics. However, whereas Dallaire and others are introduced with titles that make their connection to genocide prevention work clear, Mutombo and Cheek are simply presented on the USHMM website as athletes. Mutombo and Cheek both have a history of activism work. Mutumbo is an advocate for peace in the Congo. Cheek cofounded Team Darfur, an organization to help end the atrocities in that region. Mutombo's pledge reads: "Influence the United States and Europe to support the Congo, Uganda, and Southern Sudan in the arrest and capture of rebel leader Kony who is responsible for the genocide in northeast Congo." See Dikembe Mutombo, "Featured Pledges," Preventing Genocide – Take Action – Featured Pledges, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/featured_pledges. See also

Uzodinma Iweala, "Stop Trying To 'Save' Africa," *Washington Post*, July 15, 2007,

accessed May 17, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-

dyn/content/article/2007/07/13/AR2007071301714.html. Cheek's pledge card states: "I

will engage the athletes of the world to use their celebrity to fight the injustice of

genocide." Joey Cheek, "Featured Pledges," Preventing Genocide – Take Action –

Featured Pledges, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/featured_pledges. See also Martha

Heinemann Bixby, "Introducing Team Darfur," *Save Darfur* Blog, July 18, 2008,

accessed May 17, 2011, http://blogfordarfur.org/archives/44.

[9] In contrast to the optimism in the aforementioned pledges, Francis Deng, Former

UN Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, begins his commitment with an

acknowledgment of the international community's inability to deliver on past pledges.

His pledge card notes, "First, we must recognize that we have repeatedly pledged 'Never

again' and have repeatedly failed. But each failure raises our conscience and our

determination to do better, to turn the words into deeds, to prevent all forms of genocide.

I pledge to do my best, in my official and private capacity, to contribute toward this

goal." Francis Deng, "Featured Pledges," Preventing Genocide – Take Action – Featured

Pledges, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/featured_pledges.

[10] The image is contextualized with a caption identifying the man as "Nsabimana,

scarred by machete wounds." United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical

installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 24, 2013.

[11] As if to further punctuate the extent to which the horrors depicted in the installation are part of current affairs, contemporary narratives scroll across the top of the large screens near the glass pledge cases. During an exhibition visit on April 24, 2013, these stories focused on potential "crimes against humanity" in Syria, the prosecution of Bosnia's General Ratko Mladic, trials for Khmer Rouge generals, and violence in the Nuba region of Sudan. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 24, 2013.

[12] In discussing this exhibition as "dual-voiced," this discourse has parallels to what Ray discusses as the "double-voiced" quality of Benjamin Banneker's writing. See Angela G. Ray, "'In My Own Hand Writing': Benjamin Banneker Addresses the Slaveholder of Monticello," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 387-405.

[13] Silence works within larger ideological/disciplinary apparatuses and systems of power. Morris makes this clear at the beginning of his piece. Thus attention to the interplay of speech and silence demands an awareness of the political and ideological context. Charles E. Morris III, "Passing by Proxy: Collusive and Convulsive Silence in the Trial of Leopold and Loeb," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 3 (2005): 264-290.

[14] "About the museum," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013, http://www.ushmm.mobi/about/.

[15] See the debate over the USHMM's enumeration of the victims of the Shoah and its inclusion of the Armenian genocide. Both are explained below.

[16] Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 142. Notably, Linenthal also situates the emergence of the USHMM within these two contexts, the

cultural and the political. Edward T. Linenthal, *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 5-56.

[17] Lawrence Baron, "The Holocaust and American Public Memory, 1945-1960," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 17, no. 1 (2003): 62-88; Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1-79.

[18] Baron, "The Holocaust," 62; Tim Cole, *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler How History is Bought, Packaged and Sold* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 7-9; Leon A. Jick, "The Holocaust: its Use and Abuse within the American Public," *Yad Vashem Studies* 14 (1981): 310; Linenthal, *Preserving Memory,* 8-9; David B. MacDonald, *Identity Politics in the Age of Genocide: The Holocaust and Historical Representation* (Abdington: Routledge, 2008) 19; Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 11-12; Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999), 133, 144-145; Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 172.

Shandler complicates this narrative somewhat, arguing the "telecasts of the trial … did not emerge as a fixture of American Holocaust memory culture." Shandler problematizes the nature of the mediation of the trial to thus highlight its limitations. He argues, "despite its landmark status in the history of Holocaust documentation and commemoration, the trial telecasts have had a less enduring impact on American Holocaust remembrance than have either other contemporary phenomena – such as the film version of *Judgment at Nuremberg* or the English-language edition of Elie Wiesel's

Night, both of which appeared during 1961 – or more recent televised presentations of the Holocaust." See Shandler, *While America Watches*, 127-132. Lipstadt as well nuances the impact of the trial. See Deborah E. Lipstadt, "America and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1950-1965," *Modern Judaism* 16 (1996): 205-208.

[19] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory,* 9-10.

[20] Baron, "The Holocaust," 62; Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 10-12; Jick, "The Holocaust," 312-314; Lipstadt, "America," 208; MacDonald, *Identity Politics*, 19-20; Mintz, *Popular Culture*, 14-16; Novick, *The Holocaust*, 149-155; Shandler, *While America Watches*, 156; Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 172.

Elsewhere, Novick is emphatic about the importance of the Six-Day War, stating, "There is no difficulty in specifying the proximate, and most important, catalyst of Holocaust consciousness: the fears of a renewed Holocaust in the weeks immediately preceding the Six-Day War of June 1967." Peter Novick, "Holocaust Memory in America," in *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, ed. James E. Young (New York: Prestel, 1994), 161.

[21] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 18.

[22] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 11; MacDonald, *Identity Politics*, 22. Again, "Holocaust consciousness" is derived from Novick's work. See Novick, *The Holocaust*, 1

[23] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 11-12. On Skokie, see Novick, *The Holocaust*, 226.

On the miniseries, see Novick, *The Holocaust*, 209-214; Shandler, *While American Watches*, 155-178. Novick declares, "Without doubt the most important

moment in the entry of the Holocaust into general American consciousness was NBC's presentation, in April 1978, of the miniseries *Holocaust*." Novick, *The Holocaust,* 209.

The viewership numbers do range, and there is some debate about how many Americans watched the miniseries. For more on these estimates see Novick, *The Holocaust*, 333n5; Shandler, *While America Watches*, 288n1.

[24] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 18. It is worth pointing out that some local memorials did exist, with some proposed or emerging immediately after the war in places such as New York and Indianapolis to say nothing of memorials in Jewish cemeteries and synagogues. Baron, "The Holocaust," 77-78. For more on early forms of American Holocaust commemoration and memorialization, see James E. Young, "America's Holocaust: Memory and the Politics of Identity," in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed. Hilene Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 69-70; James Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 287-94.

For a broader sketch of the memorial context within which the USHMM emerged and operates, see Rabinbach's recounting of US Holocasut memory. Anson Rabinbach, "From Explosion to Erosion: Holocaust Memorialization in America since Bitburg," *History and Memory* 9, no. 1/2 (1997): 226-255.

[25] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 17-18. This narrative of the "politicized" origins of the USHMM is also contained in Philip Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth," *Harper's Magazine*, July 1993. A related political narrative appears in Greig Crysler and Abidin Kusno, "Angels in the Temple: The Aesthetic Construction of Citizenship at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum," *Art Journal* 56, no. 1 (1997): 53-54. See

also MacDonald, *Identity Politics*, 22-23. My narration of the USHMM's history over the next three paragraphs draws heavily on Linenthal's account of the construction of the USHMM.

[26] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 17-18.

[27] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 17-18.

[28] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 19.

[29] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 17.

[30] Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 13; Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 17-19.

[31] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 26.

[32] These debates are detailed in Linenthal's text. Regarding the description of the victims, Linenthal explains that the central problems included both the number used and the identity markers used to describe the victims. Quoting Linenthal, "these numbers would become the subject of increasingly bitter debates between the White House and members of the Commission and the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, particularly Elie Wiesel." For example, the controversy hinged on such matters as whether or not the victims should be described as "11 million innocent victims—6 million of them Jews," language that Lienthal quotes Carter as using, or for example, simply "'six million,'" another means Carter had used previously to describe the Holocaust dead. The numbers and adjectives used to describe the dead were taken as markers indicative of the forthcoming memorial's position on Jewish centrality and uniqueness. The way the victims were identified would offer insight on the national memorial's particularism or universalism. See Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 20, 27-28, 49-51.

On the debates over the United States Holocaust Memorial Council's composition, see Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 38-49.

For more on the tensions surrounding the maintenance of a "Jewish core," see Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 257-258; Rabinbach, "From Explosion to Erosion," 243.

[33] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 229.

[34] As a concrete example of such logic, Linenthal quotes Yaffa Eliach, a central figure in the USHMM's construction, as saying, "'Once you include the Armenians as part of the Holocaust, I don't see why other African tribes which are being annihilated at this very moment should not be included.'" See Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 229.

[35] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 232.

[36] Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 233.

[37] This quote was reproduced from the USHMM's online repository of quotes from the museum. The museum's reproduction of this quote can be found at: "About the Museum," Library – Frequently Asked Questions, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed June 4, 2012, http://www.ushmm.org/research/library/faq/details.php?lang=en&topic=06#15.

[38] The percentage I have arrived at here attempts to account for the different figures and variance in budgets from FY2012 and FY2013. The FY2013 projections can be found online: "Press Kits," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/museum/press/kits/details.php?content=99-general. FY2012 numbers were taken from United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, "Fiscal Year 2012 President's Budget Justification," February 14, 2011, http://www.ushmm.org/notices/budget/2012.pdf.

[39] Gourevitch suggests that Berenbaum coined the phrase, "'The Americanization of the Holocaust.'" Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth." Linenthal, too, discusses Berenbaum's view of the Holocaust's "'Americanization.'" Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 44-45, 255.

For more on the Americanization of the Holocaust, see Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*; Hilene Flanzbaum, ed., *The Americanization of the Holocaust* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); MacDonald, *Identity Politics*.

[40] See Akcan's review of links between modernity, monumentality, and countermemorial trends, which provides the basis for Akcan's review of the Berlin Jewish Museum. Esra Akcan, "Apology and Triumph: Memory Transference, Erasure, and a Rereading of the Berlin Jewish Museum," *New German Critique* 110 vol. 37, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 153-179. Akcan ultimately offers a more pessimistic read than Young, who discusses the potential of countermonuments as a form of Holocaust memorialization. See Young, *Texture of Memory*, 27-48.

For more on postmodern memorialization and counter monument trends, see Carole Blair, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci Jr., "Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 3 (1991): 263-288; John R. Gillis, "Introduction: Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship," in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 16-17.

By contrast, Hasian argues that "Unlike some of the more traditional structures, which maintain a respectful distance (both spatially and temporally) from the past, this new structure [the USHMM] was a blend of postmodern and modern expectations, an

edifice that blurred the lines between intellectual histories, public memories, and didactic museums." See Marouf Hasian, Jr., "Remembering and Forgetting the 'Final Solution': A Rhetorical Pilgrimage through the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21, no. 1 (2004): 71. Crysler and Kusno corroborate such a read of the USHMM seeing some grounds for what they discuss as "anti-memorial" (instead of countermemorial) elements of the USHMM. See Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple," 55-56.

[41] Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple," 55.

Holocaust museums can also be read as humanistic institutions, a counter to the nationalist reading. From this perspective, these museums are not merely about the nation-state they are housed within but strive to attain universal meanings. Omer Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 183; Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 175.

[42] Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple," 52. For more on the use of the USHMM as a form of civic education for US citizens, see also Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth." Further, many of the sources cited in note 39 also make this connection in the process of highlighting the construction of US identity within the USHMM through these acts of negation.

[43] In his article, Gourevitch writes that Berenbaum "explained to me that the museum's mission is twofold: to memorialize the victims of Nazism by providing an exhaustive historical narrative of the Holocaust; and, at the same time, to present visitors with an object lesson in the ethical ideals of American political culture by presenting the negation of those ideals." Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth."

See also Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple;" Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 154-155, 157-158; Linenthal, *Preserving Memory*, 255; Young, "America's Holocaust," 72-73; Rick Crownshaw, "Photography and Memory in Holocaust Museums," *Mortality* 12, no. 2 (2007): 177-178; Vivian Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering: Performing Presence, Absence, and Witness at U.S. Holocaust Museums," in *Memory and Representation: Constructed Truths and Competing Realities*, ed. Dena Elisabeth Eber and Arthur G. Neal (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001), 141-143; Isabel Wollaston, "Negotiating the Marketplace: The Role(s) of Holocaust Museums Today," *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 4, no. 1 (2005): 72; David L. Worthington, "American Exceptionalism and the Shoah: The Case of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2007), 3-4, ProQuest document ID 304856056.

[44] Gillian Rose, *Mourning Becomes the Law: Philosophy and Representation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 30. See also Hasian, "Remembering and Forgetting," 69.

[45] Fath Davis Ruffins, "Culture Wars Won and Lost: Ethnic Museums on the Mall, Part I: The National Holocaust Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian," *Radical History Review* 68 (Spring 1997): 89. Ruffins goes on to say that this powerful narrative of US goodness is so strong that "the possible complicity of the American government [in horrors of the Holocaust] is far outweighed by the story of American triumph over evil." Ruffins, "Culture Wars Won," 90.

This point about funding is critical. As Bartov is well aware, the funding sources and tethers to the federal government impose constraints on museum messaging. He

asserts, "no state would allow the erection of a major cultural institution devoted to subverting its very essence right in the heart of its own center of power." Omer Bartov, "Chambers of Horror: Holocaust Museums in Israel and the United States," *Israel Studies* 2, no. 2 (1997): 74; Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst*, 182.

[46] To be clear, the liberator subjectivity is not the only subjectivity offered to visitors to the USHMM. Other scholars argue that, in addition to or in the place of the vantage point of the liberator, visitors are also asked to identify with the victims or as "witnesses." See Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple;" Wollaston, "Negotiating the Marketplace;" Worthington, "American Exceptionalism;" Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 158-163; Carole Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places," *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001): 271-294. For a different perspective see K. Hannah Holtschneider, "Victims, Perpetrators, Bystanders? Witnessing, Remembering and the Ethics of Representation in Museums of the Holocaust," *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 13, no. 1 (2007): 82-102.

Cole and Gourevitch expressly discuss the confusing ways in which the USHMM casts its audiences into multiple subjectivities simultaneously. Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 163; Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth."

[47] Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth."

[48] Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple," 56.

[49] Hasian, "Remembering and Forgetting," 75.

[50] Hasian, "Remembering and Forgetting;" Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple;" Gourevitch, "Behold Now Behemoth;" Worthington, "American Exceptionalism."

[51] Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 14, 155, 157; Worthington, "American Exceptionalism," 5, 11.

[52] Crownshaw, "Photography and Memory," 178-179.

[53] Ruffins, "Cultural Wars Won," 90.

[54] Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst,* 180. Bartov's argument here invokes a problem connected to the representation of temporality within the USHMM, a subject I will return to later in this chapter. He argues "the Holocaust keeps happening only within the confines of the museum, and we, the visitors, are safe from its implications by the very fact that we can only see it exhibited as an historical event. Since by now most visitors to the museum were born after the event, they may well come out with the sense that terrible things had happened in the past, in some cases even to their own relatives, but that these concern them only as historical facts, not as related in any direct manner to their present society."

[55] Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 144.

[56] Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 142.

[57] Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 143

[58] Patraka, "Spectacular Suffering," 144.

[59] The content of the slide in full reads:

"Genocide is a term created during the Holocaust and declared an international crime in the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the

Crime of Genocide. The Convention defines genocide as any of the following acts

committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or

religious group, as such:

a. Killing members of the group;

b. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

c. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its

physical destruction in whole or in part;

d. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

e. Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The specific 'intent to destroy' particular groups is unique to genocide. A closely related

category of international law, crimes against humanity, is defined as widespread or

systematic attacks against civilians.

This timeline traces the development of the word and law of genocide."

See "What is Genocide?" (slide number 1: "An Evolving International

Framework"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 20, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[60] The use of the labels "liberal" and "post-liberal" to make sense of competing

approaches to understanding the causes of genocide emerges from the work of A. Dirk

Moses. I treat Moses's understanding of the varied approaches to understanding

genocide's causes more fully in Chapter One. See A. Dirk Moses, "Conceptual

Blockages and Definitional Dilemmas in the 'Racial Century': Genocides of Indigenous

Peoples and the Holocaust," in *Colonialism and Genocide*, ed. A. Dirk Moses and Dan

Stone (London: Routledge, 2007), 148-180.

[61] Although the "Who is at Risk" section of the website replicates the physical installation in organizing the narratives by nation-state, other parts of the *From Memory to Action* website offer different constructs through which a visitor to the exhibition can read and understand how genocide occurs. The "Patterns of Genocide" interactive web feature is organized first by the stages of genocidal progression (e.g. "Warning Signs," "Acts of Violence," "Responses," and "Legacy") and then supported by narratives from each nation-state's genocide. I will discuss the "Patterns of Genocide" web content later in this chapter; nevertheless, I pause to temper the assertion I make in this paragraph to note that there are some alternative ways of organizing content within the exhibition. See "Who is at Risk?" United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk. See also "Patterns of Genocide and Related Crimes Against Humanity," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed August 30, 2012, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide/patterns.

[62] "Sudan at the Crossroads," USHMM video, 8:54, from "Preventing Genocide: Learn More & Take Action" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/video/11. This video is also accessible via YouTube. "Sudan at the Crossroads," YouTube video, 8:54, posted by "ushmm," January 5, 2011, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NziZwhbv1qE.

[63] "Sudan at the Crossroads," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed August 30, 2012, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/video/11.

[64] In the video, peace is closely aligned with South Sudan's statehood. One boy holds a sign that reads "SEPERATION MEANS PEACE." Later in the film, Sudanese governmental official Gabriel Changson Chang, interprets the options posed by the referendum as "this dream" [the separate state] or "war." Chang states, "is this dream going to be realized or not; are we going back to war or not?" "Sudan at the Crossroads," USHMM video.

[65] The timeline is forthright, for example, in making reference to the fear that signing the 1948 UN Genocide Convention "would diminish U.S. sovereignty." This part of the timeline reads in full, "Despite facing strong opposition by those who believed it would diminish U.S. sovereignty, President Ronald Reagan signed the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide on November 4, 1988." What is Genocide?" (slide number 6: "1988 The United States Ratifies the Convention"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 3, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

Similarly, the discussion of the cause of the conflict in Bosnia implicates nationalism as a causal factor. The "Warning Signs" page for Bosnia-Herzegovina reads: "Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic seized on nationalism, which gained momentum after the 1980 death of Yugoslavia's longtime leader, Josip Broz Tito, to engineer changes in the Yugoslav constitution that strengthened Serbia's position. He also transformed the military so that it became 90% Serbian and extended his control over the country's financial, mass-media, and security structures to support Serbian nationalists in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia." Such small concessions align with the robust discussions in genocide studies literature on the dangers of nationalism and the role of nationalism in

triggering genocidal conflict and signal, in part, the ways the exhibition moves away from a liberal understanding of genocide. "Bosnia-Herzegovina – Warning Signs," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 3, 2013, www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/bosniaherzegovina/warning.

[66] As stated on the "Sudan – Warning Signs" page, "From 1924-1956, the British had treated the north and south as two separate entities. The first Sudanese civil war (1955-1972) erupted on the eve of independence, prompted by angry southerners who had been promised and then denied regional autonomy." From the "DR Congo – Warning Signs" page, "Since European colonization in the nineteenth century, civilians in the DRC [formerly Zaire] have endured several periods of violence and systematic exploitation. Under Belgian King Leopold II, the country's natural resources were systematically looted and its people enslaved, beaten, and killed in massive numbers. Leopold transferred power to the state of Belgium in 1908. The period around independence in 1960 was marked by intense and often violent Congolese bids for power and succession, caught up in the tensions and geopolitics of the Cold War era." Noticeably, this is a much richer explanation of the violence than is contained in the physical installation. "Sudan – Warning Signs," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/sudan/warning; "DR Congo – Warning Signs," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed, April 24, 2013, www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/dr-congo/warning.

[67] "DR Congo – Warning Signs." The quote in full is a bit vague but hints at a post-liberal narrative. Quoting from the website: "A bewildering array of local rebel

groups and militias, some ethnically based and many sponsored by up to nine foreign militaries, also formed and took part in the conflict. The UN has accused all nations involved of using the war as a cover for looting diamonds, coltan, gold, and other resources from this mineral-rich region."

[68] "Sudan – Responses," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/sudan/responses. Quoting from the explanation: "The international policy responses to the conflict in Sudan (1985-2005) varied greatly over the twenty years of the conflict, affected by the Cold War, multiple conflicts and regime changes in neighboring countries, and other shifting geopolitical and economic interests. The governments of neighboring Ethiopia, Eritrea, Egypt, Libya, Chad, Uganda, and Kenya all played significant roles. Key players among the broader international community included the U.S., United Kingdom, and China. Sudan's support for Iraq during the first Gulf War and various radical Islamist movements (including hosting Osama Bin Laden from 1992-1996) resulted in increased isolation from western countries. In 1993, the U.S. placed Sudan on its list of state sponsors of terrorism and imposed sanctions in 1997."

Notably, this understanding of the political situation in Sudan bears the traces of the logic Herman and Peterson discuss as guiding human rights work and genocide cessation work. They argue that US responses to genocidal violence upon "*who* does *what* to *whom*—and *where does power lie*" as noted in the Introduction. See Edward S. Herman and David Peterson, *The Politics of Genocide*, with a foreword by Noam Chomsky (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010), 27.

[69] Catherine H. Palczewski, "The Male Madonna and the Feminine Uncle Sam: Visual Argument, Icons, and Ideographs in 1909 Anti-Woman Suffrage Postcards," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 4 (2005): 374, 385-387.

[70] "South Sudan – Overview," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/South-Sudan.

[71] Alexander Dziadosz, "Special Report: South Sudan's Chinese Oil Puzzle," *Reuters*, November 14, 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/14/us-southsudan-chinese-oil-idUSBRE8AD0B520121114; Alex de Waal, interviewed by Christopher Alessi, "Oil Diplomacy in the Sudans," Council on Foreign Relations, October 8, 2012, accessed May 3, 2013, http://www.cfr.org/sudan/oil-diplomacy-sudans/p29214?cid=rss-analysisbriefbackgroundersexp-oil_diplomacy_in_the_sudans-100812; Peter S. Goodman, "China Invests Heavily In Sudan's Oil Industry," *Washington Post*, December 23, 2004, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A21143-2004Dec22.html; Herman and Peterson, *The Politics of Genocide*, 39.

[72] Hasan Nuhanović, "Hasan Nuhanović," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/nuhanovic.

[73] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 24, 2013.

[74] "Patterns of Genocide." This prose is also included in the physical installation. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[75] For a full discussion of the links between colonialism and genocide, see Chapter One.

Both Ewalt and Parks have highlighted the traces of colonialism and reproduction of colonialist ideologies within the USHMM's genocide prevention initiatives. Their work, on the extent to which the USHMM's means of visualizing genocide replicates a colonialist gaze, is engaged more fully in the ensuing discussion of visuality and colonialism. See Joshua P. Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice: The *World is Witness,* Place-Framing, and the Politics of Viewing on Google Earth," *Communication, Culture & Critique* 4, no. 4 (2011): 333-354; Lisa Parks, "Digging into Google Earth: An analysis of 'Crisis in Darfur,'" *Geoforum* 40, no. 4 (2009): 535–545.

[76] "Rwanda – Warning Signs," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/rwanda/warning. This prose also appears in the physical installation. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[77] "Burundi – Warning Signs," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/burundi/warning.

[78] Mike Abramowitz to USHMM Genocide Prevention e-Newsletter, "What I Saw in Sudan," October 15, 2010.

[79] "Monitor" is one of the designations used to spotlight countries "at risk" for genocidal violence. See "Who is at Risk?"

[80] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 24, 2013.

[81] Ewalt "Mapping Injustice," 339.

Notably, these practices of sighting in the exhibition bear some resemblance to the discursive practices contained in another USHMM initiative: its partnership with Google Earth to draw awareness to atrocities in Darfur and elsewhere. Both Parks and Ewalt critique this initiative. See Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice;" Parks, "Digging into Google Earth."

[82] Parks, "Digging into Google Earth," 537. In advancing this claim, Parks activates lines of argument associated with Dennis Hickey and Kenneth C. Wylie, *An Enchanting Darkness: The American Vision of Africa in the Twentieth Century* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1993); Paul S. Landau and Deborah D. Kaspin, eds. *Images and Empires: Visuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1992).

For an additional example and further discussion of the links between contemporary media and colonialism, see Casey Kelly, "Neocolonialism and the Global Prison in National Geographic's *Locked Up Abroad*," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 29, no. 4 (2012): 331-347.

[83] More than any other text in this study, Torchin artfully explicates how these assumptions are mapped onto contemporary media texts engaging genocide and other

human rights abuses. See Leshu Torchin, *Creating the Witness: Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the Internet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).

[84] Mari Boor Tonn, "'From the Eye to the Soul': Industrial Labor's Mary Harris 'Mother' Jones and the Rhetorics of Display," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2011): 233.

[85] Ron Burnett, "Images and Vision," in *Cultures of Vision: Images, Media & the Imaginary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 1-31; Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 1.

[86] "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video, 18:32, from "Preventing Genocide: Learn More & Take Action" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/video/3.

[87] Mitchell Stephens, *The Rise of the Image the Fall of the Word* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 61.

[88] The problem with such an assumption, as Torchin illuminates, is that this configuration of the links between sight, knowledge, and action "presume[s] a transparent display of information and the inevitability of political response." For reasons to be explored below, such assumptions are clearly flawed. Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 2.

[89] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 1.

[90] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 3-4. See the Chapter One for a full explanation of the relationship between recognition and action as interpreted as adhering in the Convention text.

[91] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 4.

[92] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 4-5.

[93] Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 2.

[94] Eric S. Jenkins, "Seeing Katrina: Perspectives of Judgment in a Cultural/Natural Disaster," *Visual Communication Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (2007): 94.

[95] Jenkins, "Seeing Katrina," 94. Taylor likewise centralizes the window metaphor as a key part of his analysis of documentary realism. See John Taylor, "Iraqi Torture Photographs and Documentary Realism in the Press," *Journalism Studies* 6, no. 1 (2005): 39-49.

[96] In other words, such perspectives on the image disavow "artistic" representations in favor of "documentary." For more on the tensions between art and documentary, see Cara A. Finnegan, "Documentary as Art in *U.S. Camera," Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (2001): 37-68.

[97] Jenkins, "Seeing Katrina," 93.

[98] Taylor, "Iraqi Torture Photographs," 42.

[99] Moreover, this subjectivity, as Jenkins explains, correlates with a position that invites the viewer to issue judgments. In analyzing images from Hurricane Katrina, Jenkins notes the ease with which this "documentary mode" situates viewers "in a position that is distant, above, outside and uninvolved with the image objects." Jenkins, "Seeing Katrina," 95.

Notably, such a viewpoint also correlates with the discussion of the colonialist gaze featured earlier.

[100] By way of definition, Willerton discusses metonymy as an associative form of thought whereby an idea or concept is conveyed through the use of an "attributive or suggestive word." He provides the example of the "White House" functioning

metonymically to convey the idea of the US presidency. Visual metonymy, by extension, entails using an image to convey that thought, idea, or concept. Thus, an image of the White House would stand in for the US presidency. See Russell Willerton, "Visual Metonymy and Synecdoche: Rhetoric for Stage-Setting Images," *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 35, no. 1 (2005): 11-13.

Some scholarship on photography suggests that photography cannot escape metonymy. Photography has an intrinsic connection to metonymy. In Cloud's words, "[p]hotographic images are marked by metonymy, the reduction of complex situations into simpler visual abstractions." Dana L. Cloud, "'To Veil the Threat of Terror': Afghan Women and the <Clash of Civilizations> in the Imagery of the U.S. War on Terrorism," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 3 (2004): 289.

[101] Numerous individuals working on the representation of the Holocaust or genocide have noted the utility of metonymy in the depiction of these mass atrocities. Highlighting the relationship between the partial nature of the image and the larger tragedy, Zelizer explains that "[t]aken together, the images portrayed both individual agony and the far-reaching nature of mass atrocity, suggesting that the depiction of each individual instance of horror represented thousands more who had met the same fate." Herein we see the logic of metonymy in action. Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 111. For more on metonymy in Holocaust and genocide studies representations, see Susan A. Crane, "Choosing Not to Look: Representation, Repatriation, and Holocaust Atrocity Photography," *History and Theory* 47 (October 2008): 315-317, 324, 326; Michael Dorland, "PG – Parental Guidance or Portrayal of Genocide: the Comparative Depiction

of Mass Murder in Contemporary Cinema," in *The Media and the Rwanda Genocide*, ed. Allan Thompson (London: Pluto Press, 2007), 424; Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 44.

Crysler and Cysler and Kusno advance arguments regarding the USHMM's use of metonymy. C. Greig Crysler, "Violence and Empathy: National Museums and the Spectacle of Society," *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* 17, no. 2 (2006): 23; Crysler and Kusno, "Angels in the Temple," 161.

[102] Robert Hariman, and John Louis Lucaites, *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 21, 88-89.

[103] Hariman, and Lucaites, *No Caption Needed*, 21.

[104] "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video, 5:51, from "Preventing Genocide: Learn More & Take Action" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/video/4. Intriguingly, Fowler is using this logic to talk about the importance of the "Smallest Witness" program, a form of metonymy that forsakes realism. The individuality that Fowler is referencing is conveyed through images drawn by children not photos of individuals. I complicate the use of the "Smallest Witnesses" later in this chapter.

[105] Clementine Wamariya, "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video. Notably, Clementine's name is spelled differently in different contexts. Here her first name is spelled with three "e's." Elsewhere in the exhibition, her name is spelled "Clemantine." See "Eyewitness Testimony," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portraits.

[106] Zelizer explains that images of atrocity were used similarly during the Holocaust. Such images served as symbols "used more to mark general discourse – about atrocity and war – and less as providers of definitive information about certain actions, camps, or victims." Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 86, 92-94, 118.

[107] "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video; "Omer Ismail," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/ismail; "Jennifer Learning," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/leaning.

[108] The picture is captioned, "Defendants in the dock at the International Military Tribunal (IMT) trial of war criminals, Nuremberg, Germany, November 1945. The IMT was the first international criminal tribunal, and it established legal precedents that continue to influence international proceedings today. | Photo: National Archives and Records Administration." It accompanies Rapp's profile within the Eyewitness Testimony gallery. "Stephen Rapp," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/rapp.

[109] Again, Zelizer stresses that a similar move occurs with Holocaust photography. Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget,* 118.

[110] Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice," 335.

[111] Ben Voth and Aaron Noland, "Argumentation and the International Problem of Genocide," *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 28 (2007): 43.

[112] Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice," 345.

[113] Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice," 341-342; Voth and Noland, "Argumentation."

Related to this discussion of inevitability, see Parks's problemization of the temporality the USHMM's work with Google Earth. Parks, "Digging into Google Earth," 540-541.

[114] Parks, "Digging into Google Earth," 537. Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice," 345, 347.

[115] "Bearing Witness in Congo," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/6#/9.

[116] "In Sudan, Staring Genocide in the Face," Preventing Genocide photo gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/3#/1.

A similar idea is articulated in Learning's eyewitness testimony. See 1:07, from Jennifer Learning, "Jennifer Learning," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, "Jennifer Learning," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/leaning.

[117] The brochure titled, "Responding to Genocide Today," featured a man with a dark complexion wearing flowing white robes and an orange turban standing amid a ravaged landscape. The man appears perched on a ridge; his posture and positioning contribute to a reading of the figure as engaged in surveying the landscape and preparing for his next steps. He is alone and his face is obscured by his turban, which further

contributes to a sense of the figure as potentially menacing. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Responding to Genocide Today* (brochure, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., May 2013).

Further, he is flanked on both sides by damaged wood or trees roughly his height. From this angle, the man looks as much a part of the landscape as the destroyed trees and wood. The image creates a visual equation between the ravaged landscape and this figure. All of these components of the image corroborate Ewalt's arguments about the links between violence and "spatiality of the African continent." Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice," 347.

[118] This image appears in multiple capacities. It is the image used to represent the exhibition on the Center for the Prevention of Genocide's homepage. It appears on brochures. It is featured in the physical installation. It is featured in the photo gallery section of the *From Memory to Action* online exhibition. It is part of the online "Our Walls Bear Witness" photo gallery. As an image taken by Brian Steidle, it is shown in the video program featuring Steidle's work. As will be discussed later in this chapter, the photo attains additional significance because it is one of Steidle's images, thusly linking photo to a thread of argumentation contained in *From Memory to Action* which links photography and martial action.

See "Center for the Prevention of Genocide," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Responding to Genocide Today* (brochure, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., May 2013); United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation image, "From Memory to Action," visited April

24, 2013; "In Darfur, My Camera Was Not Enough: Brian Steidle," Preventing Genocide photo gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/2; "Our Walls Bear Witness, Part I," Preventing Genocide photo gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/13#/11; "Darfur Eyewitness," *Witnessing Darfur: Genocide Emergency*, produced by United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (Washington, DC: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2005), DVD. This video is also available online as part of the exhibition's video gallery.

[119] Barbie Zelizer, *About to Die: How News Images Move the Public* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 12-14; Barbie Zelizer, "The Voice of the Visual in Memory," in *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 157-186.

[120] Zelizer, "The Voice of the Visual," 167.

[121] Zelizer "The Voice of the Visual," 165.

[122] Zelizer, "The Voice of the Visual."

[123] Barbie Zelizer, *About to Die*, 18-25.

[124] "Chechnya: A View from the Ground," Preventing Genocide photo gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/13#/11.

[125] "Srebrenica: Legacy of Genocide," Preventing Genocide photo gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/15.

[126] Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 97-100.

[127] Shots of landscapes could also be read as part of what Torchin describes as "'effects footage.'" Torchin, *Creating the Witness,* 8.

[128] See Zelizer's discussion of this quandary as it pertains to carnage and news images. Zelizer, *About to Die.* 21-22.

[129] "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video.

[130] "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video.

[131] Cathy A. Malchiodi, *Breaking the Silence: Art Therapy with Children From Violent Homes*, 2nd ed. (Florence, KY: Brunner/Mazel, 1997); Laura V. Loumeau-May, "Grieving in the Public Eye: Art Therapy with Children Who Lost Parents in the World Trade Center Attacks," in *Creative Interventions with Traumatized Children*, ed. Cathy A. Malchiodi (New York: The Guilford Press, 2008), 81-111.

[132] Sparrow treats the images as containing grounds for charges indicting the Sudanese government, claiming, "[T]hey [the pictures] also give this enormous credibility to the complicity of the government of Sudan as the architects of this crisis." "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video.

[133] "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video.

[134] Cara A. Finnegan, "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy,'" *Argumentation and Advocacy* 37, no. 3 (2001): 133-149.

[135] Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles articulate a similar point about representation and realism in their work on *Fahrenheit 9/11*. See Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles, "*Fahrenheit 9/11*—Virtual Realism and the Limits of Commodified Dissent," in

The Rhetoric of the New Political Documentary, ed. Thomas W. Benson and Brian J. Snee (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 24-53.

[136] Cole, *Selling the Holocaust,* 159-161, 164.

[137] See Messaris on the importance of indexicality to images. Paul Messaris, *Visual Persuasion: The Role of Images in Advertising* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 129-142.

[138] Umberto Eco, *The Search for the Perfect Language*, trans. James Fentress (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1994), 174; Stephens, *The Rise*, 66.

[139] "Smallest Witnesses," USHMM video. The ellipses in the reproduction of the quote are used to remove inarticulates.

[140] Barbara A. Biesecker, "No Time for Mourning: The Rhetorical Production of the Melancholic Citizen-Subject in the War on Terror," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 40, no. 1 (2007): 158.

[141] Biesecker, "No Time for Mourning," 159-163.

[142] Omer Ismail, "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video.

[143] Omer Ismail, "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video.

[144] As Torchin explains, footage of these "events as they unfold" may be "rare;" instead, depictions feature "the aftermath that often include[s] the nonspeaking bodies of victims." Torchin, *Creating the Witness*, 8.

The only images that come close to showcasing abuse in action are from a video featured on Nataša Kandić's "Eyewitness Testimony" page. The video shows a group of perpetrators called the Skorpions preparing Bosniak men for an execution. See Nataša Kandić, "Nataša Kandić," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 2:07,

from "Nataša Kandić," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 9, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/kandic.

The physical installation also includes an image of a man being beaten as part of its discussion of violence directed at Albanians. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation image, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[145] Omer Ismail, "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video.

[146] Michael S. Roth and Charles G. Salas, "Introduction," in *Disturbing Remains: Memory, History, and Crisis in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Michael S. Roth and Charles G. Salas (Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Research Institute, 2001), 2-3.

[147] This photo appears in more than one place. For example, in addition to appearing on the pledge card, the image also accompanies Haviv's profile in the "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery.

[148] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Take Action!* (postcard distributed as a part of the "From Memory to Action: Meeting the Challenge of Genocide" installation, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., February 2011).

[149] Ron Haviv, "Ron Haviv," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 2:07, from "Ron Haviv," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed June 28, 2012, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/haviv.

[150] Haviv, "Ron Haviv." Again, the audio and USHMM transcription of Haviv's testimony vary. My quotations reflect the version of the story contained in the transcription.

[151] Haviv, "Ron Haviv."

[152] Haviv notes that "they [the man's assailants] were screaming at me not to take photographs." Haviv, "Ron Haviv."

[153] Haviv, "Ron Haviv."

[154] Haviv, "Ron Haviv."

[155] Susan Sontag, "In Plato's Cave," in *On Photography* (New York: Picador, 1977), 9-12.

[156] This anxiety about rhetoricity has a history that goes beyond the contemporary genocide cessation texts examined in this study. For more on the anxiety surrounding rhetoricity as woven into human rights discourse, see Erik Doxtader, "The Rhetorical Question of Human Rights – A Preface," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 96, no. 4 (2010): 353-379.

[157] Admittedly to assert that the USHMM "promotes the idea of rhetoric as a form of action" is to enter into the contentious territory around the nature of the relationship between rhetoric and action. Even the most cursory survey of the literature in rhetoric reveals substantial contradictions about how such a relationship is to be conceived. On one hand, some perspectives on rhetoric affirm this equation, asserting that rhetoric *is* action. Rhetoric is not a pathway toward action; it is action in and of itself (Benson, Medhurst, Terrill). If this is the case, then "speaking out" could be seen as a crucial way of engaging in genocide cessation work. See Benson and Medhurst for rhetoric as a "way

of doing." Thomas W. Benson, "Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcolm X," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 1 (1974): 1-13; Martin J. Medhurst, "Afterword: The Ways of Rhetoric," in *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996), 220. See Terrill for the argument about "rhetoric *as* action." Robert E. Terrill, *Malcolm X: Inventing Radical Judgment* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2004), 3.

On the other hand, some critics have charged that rhetoric, specifically the rhetoric of "awareness" or "conversation" for example, functions as a substitute for action. Tonn's work on political "conversation" seems to suggest that "talk" stands as a substitute for other actions that could be taken to change material conditions. The tension between these divergent conceptions of the rhetoric-action relationship manifest in the *From Memory to Action* exhibition. Mari Boor Tonn, "Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8, no. 3 (2005): 405-430.

[158] Bridget Conley-Zilkic and David Small, "From Memory to Action: Engaging Visitors in a Holocaust Museum," *Interpretation* 16, no. 1 (2011): 21. Conley-Zilkic and Small emphasize the extent to which the pledge card portion of the exhibition serves as a critical vehicle for helping visitors make the connections between genocide and their own actions. They are optimistic about the power of this portion of the exhibition; although, at the time of their article's publication, they suggest that only "around 10% of visitors to the space" author a pledge.

[159] Conley-Zilkic and Small, "From Memory to Action," 21. Conley-Zilkic and Small quote the question as stating "'what will you do to help meet the challenge of responding to genocide today?'" The pledge cards collected from the USHMM in August

of 2011 read instead, "What will you do to help meet the challenge of genocide today?" I opt to use the language from the cards in this chapter.

[160] Conley-Zilkic and Small, "From Memory to Action," 21.

[161] "What Can I Do?" United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/action/what_can_i_do.

[162] "Darfur Eyewitness."

[163] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Genocide Warning: Sudan* (electronic flyer, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., January 2012).

[164] Norah Bagarinka's narrative spotlights the efforts of Bagarinka's former employee, a man who saves Bagarinka's life as well as the life of her mother. Bagarinka and her mother were being abused. Under the auspices of wanting to kill them personally, this man stopped their abuse, bandaged Bagarinka's wounds, offered an apology, and released them. See Norah Bagarinka, "Norah Bagarinka," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:45, from "Norah Bagarinka," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/bagarinka.

[165] Nesse Godin, "Nesse Godin," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:02, from "Nesse Godin," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/godin.

[166] In other words, Godin's testimony rests upon a particular understanding of agency as connected to the idea of voice. For a review of the literature on agency and

voice as well as alternative ways of conceptualizing agency, see Sara Christine VanderHaagen, "'So You Will Always Remember': Creating Public Memories and Inventing Agents in Biographical Texts for Children" (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2010), 132-146, ProQuest document ID 305212871.

[167] This is the caption to one of the photos in Fowler's album. "In Sudan, Staring Genocide in the Face," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Preventing Genocide photo gallery, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/photo/3#/11. This content is also available as part of the DVD, *Witnessing Darfur: Genocide Emergency*, produced by United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (Washington, D.C.: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2004).

[168] Godin, "Nesse Godin;" Bagarinka, "Norah Bagarinka." Similar refrains about the importance of speaking out are echoed in the Eyewitnesses testimonies offered by Clemantine Wamariya and Niemat Ahmadi. Clemantine Wamariya, "Clemantine Wamariya," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:39, from "Clemantine Wamariya," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/wamariya; Niemat Ahmadi, "Niemat Ahmadi," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:07, from "Niemat Ahmadi," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/ahmadi.

[169] See again VanderHaagen for a discussion of the links between voice and agency. VanderHaagen, "'So You Will Always,'" 132-146.

[170] Ron Kind, "Sen. William Proxmire," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:29, from "Sen. William Proxmire," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/proxmire.

[171] "Sen. William Proxmire," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/proxmire.

[172] Ron Kind, "Sen. William Proxmire."

[173] Ron Kind, "Sen. William Proxmire."

[174] Trevor Parry-Giles, *The Character of Justice: Rhetoric, Law, and Politics in the Supreme Court Confirmation Process* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006), 4. Notably, popular sentiment occasionally challenges this idea, assuming law to be outside the provenance of rhetoric. See Marouf A. Hasian, Jr., *Rhetorical Vectors of Memory in National and International Holocaust Trials* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006), 14.

[175] Robert Hariman, "Introduction," in *Popular Trials: Rhetoric, Mass Media, and the Law*, ed. Robert Hariman (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1990), 3.

[176] Hariman, "Introduction," 3.

[177] James Boyd White, "Law as Rhetoric, Rhetoric as Law: The Arts of Cultural and Communal Life," *The University of Chicago Law Review* 52, no. 3 (1985): 684.

[178] "Stephen Rapp," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/rapp.

[179] "Stephen Rapp," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery.

[180] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

This is also an important part of the response narrative featured in the online portion of the exhibition. See "Bosnia – Responses," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/bosniaherzegovina/responses; "Burundi – Responses," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/burundi/responses; "Chechnya – Responses," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/chechnya-russia/responses; "DR Congo – Responses," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/dr-congo/responses; "Rwanda – Responses," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/rwanda/responses; "Sudan – Responses."

[181] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 1: "An Evolving International Framework"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 25, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[182] This claim – that legal action is a meaningful way of participating in genocide cessation work – is a dubious contention in the eyes of scholars such as Mennecke who question the role of law in genocide prevention. Martin Mennecke, "Punishing Genocidaires: A Deterrent Effect or Not?" *Human Rights Review* 8, no. 4 (2007): 319-339.

Notably, within the exhibition, Rapp gives voice to this prevention-based argument. Rapp argues that through legal work, "I think we're creating a perception in the minds of those people that are doing these things that, 'Hey, one of these days they'll be coming for me.'" See Stephen Rapp, "Stephen Rapp," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:15, from "Stephen Rapp," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/rapp.

[183] Lemkin's work also ends the exhibition. This quote appears as part of the last panel: "'THE FUNCTION OF MEMORY IS NOT ONLY TO REGISTER PAST EVENTS, BUT TO STIMULATE HUMAN CONSCIENCE.' – RAPHAEL LEMKIN, Holocaust survivor who coined the word *genocide*."

[184] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 1: "An Evolving International Framework"); United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Responding to Genocide Today* (brochure, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., May 2013).

[185] Deng, "Featured Pledges."

[186] Ismail, "Omer Ismail."

[187] For an explanation of the perceptions of the term's gravitas, see Samuel Totten, "To Deem or Not to Deem 'It' Genocide: A Double-Edged Sword," in *The Genocidal Temptation: Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Rwanda, and Beyond*, ed. Robert S. Frey (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), 41-55.

[188] Jean-Philippe Ceppi, "Jean-Philippe Ceppi," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 2:01, from "Jean-Philippe Ceppi," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/ceppi.

[189] Ceppi, "Jean-Philippe Ceppi."

[190] Omer Ismail, "Omer Ismail," USHMM "From Memory to Action" exhibition video, 1:10, from "Omer Ismail," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/ismail.

[191] Daniel H. Kim, "'If you do this, I will own you forever': Materializing the Pulitzer Prize for Photography" (paper presentation, Rhetoric Society of America Biennial Conference, Philadelphia, PA, May 25, 2012).

[192] Haviv, "Ron Haviv."

[193] "Chechnya – Responses." To quote the website's narrative, "Chechens, including many who worked with Memorial, a Russian human rights organization, were critical in getting out information about violence against civilians. Despite facing threats, these Chechens bravely documented and publicized abuses. Journalists had limited capacity to cover the situation, with strict Russian government control over their movements. Anna Politkovskaya, a Russian journalist well-known for her opposition to

the Chechen wars, was assassinated in her apartment building in Moscow on October 7,

2006. Despite being arrested and subjected to a mock execution by Russian military

forces, Politkovskaya had continued to report on the conflict, earning international

attention and prizes for her work. Little progress has since been made to solve the

murder."

[194] Fred Zaidman, "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video.

[195] Fred Zaidman, "Our Walls Bear Witness," USHMM video.

[196] "Brian Steidle," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery, United States

Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 24, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/steidle.

[197] "In Darfur, My Camera Was Not Nearly Enough," "Preventing Genocide:

Learn More & Take Action" video gallery, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum,

accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/video/1.

[emphasis mine]

[198] "In Darfur, My Camera Was Not Nearly Enough."

[199] Sontag, "In Plato's Cave," 13-15.

[200] A caveat is in order here: Gen. Roméo Dallaire and Brian Steidle (discussed

below) are part of the featured eyewitnesses. They offer the closest representations of

martial figures; however, Steidle was not part of a US military campaign while in Sudan

and Dallaire is Canadian. Indeed, Dallaire was present as part of a "peacekeeping force,"

and the failure of his work in Rwanda could be interpreted as further evidence of the

failure of martial action. "Gen. Roméo Dallaire," "Eyewitness Testimony" video gallery,

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/gallery/portrait/dallaire; "Brian Steidle."

[201] "DR Congo – Responses."

[202] "Sudan – Responses."

[203] "Rwanda – Responses."

[204] The photo is attributed to Corrine Dufka and captioned, "Soldiers from the Rwandan Patriotic Front stand in front of remains from victims of the genocide." United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[205] This photo is accompanied by the caption, "Military personnel from the African Union United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur at a funeral service for seven peacekeepers killed in an ambush by heavily armed gunmen. Al Fashir. Sudan. July 12, 2008. UN Photo/Stuart Price." United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[206] The only military intervention promoted as successful was the NATO bombings during the genocide in Bosnia and even this narrative comes only after positioning earlier efforts on the ground as ineffective. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[207] Hasian, "Remembering and Forgetting," 75-76.

[208] Further, one of the hallways leading to the entrance to *From Memory to Action* is lined with the flags of the nations that took place in the liberation of the camps. United

States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[209] "Liberation," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/museum/exhibit/focus/liberation/. Notably this page contains a sidebar which enables the visitor to site to "print liberating division histories and their insignia."

[210] Peter Ronayne, *Never Again? The United States and the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide since the Holocaust* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 205.

[211] Ronayne, *Never Again?* 200. Ronayne charges, "From the UNGC debate in the Senate onward, domestic politics have influenced America's response to genocidal atrocities abroad."

[212] Ronayne, *Never Again?* 200.

[213] According to Patman, "Two Black Hawk helicopters were shot down. Eighteen American soldiers were killed – the largest number of U.S. battlefield causalities in a single engagement since Vietnam…Moreover, the body of a dead American soldier was dragged through the streets of Mogadishu in front of jeering local crowds…" Robert G. Patman, *Strategic Shortfall: The Somalia Syndrome and the March to 9/11* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010), 53. See also Rosa Brooks, "Somalia's Deadly Lessons," *Los Angeles Times*, June 23, 2006, http://articles.latimes.com/2006/jun/23/opinion/oe-brooks23; Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 317.

[214] Darren C. Brunk, "Curing the Somalia Syndrome: Analogy, Foreign Policy Decision Making, and the Rwandan Genocide," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 4, no. 3 (2008): 301-320; Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Worse than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2009), 245; Arthur Jay Klinghoffer, "American Reticence," in *The International Dimension of Genocide in Rwanda* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 95-96; Patman, *Strategic Shortfall,* 89-93; Brooks, "Somalia's Deadly Lessons;" Power, *"A Problem from Hell,"* 317-318, 366.

[215] Ronayne, *Never Again?* 201; Scott Clement, "Syria: Will Americans Support Military Action?" Behind the Numbers: The Post's Take on Polls and Polling, *The Washington Post*, June 1, 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/behind-the-numbers/post/syria-will-americans-support-military-action/2012/06/01/gJQA7EJk6U_blog.html.

[216] "Guidelines for Teaching about the Holocaust," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, www.ushmm.org/education/foreducators/guideline/#5_guidelines.

[217] "Guidelines for Teaching about the Holocaust."

[218] For example, the instructional guidelines for teaching about the Holocaust cast the Shoah as "one of the most effective subjects for an examination of basic moral issues." "Guidelines for Teaching about the Holocaust."

[219] Richard Terdiman, "Historicizing Memory," in *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 7.

[220] The progress narrative is contingent upon a "Newtonian" or a linear understanding of time. Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, xiv-xv.

[221] In so doing, the exhibition constructs a narrative that is congruent with a scholarly perspective voiced by Levy and Snzaider about the importance of Holocaust memory to contemporary human rights culture. See Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "The Institutionalization of Cosmopolitan Morality: The Holocaust and Human Rights," *Journal of Human Rights* 3, no. 2 (2004): 143-157.

[222] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 26, 2013. [capitalization in the original].

[223] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 26, 2013.

[224] Full quote from the physical installation: "In each of the three cases presented here, individuals, organizations, countries, and international coalitions responded in a range of ways. Some actions were helpful; others were not. Understanding when and how different responses were tried, what they achieved, and where they failed can improve response in the future." United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited June 28, 2012.

[225] This header appears at the end of the exhibition. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited April 26, 2013. [capitalization in the original]

[226] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 5: "1950s-1990s The Promise Goes Unfulfilled"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[227] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 6: "1988 The United States Ratifies the Convention"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 3, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide

[228] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 7: "1993 The World Acts to Punish but Not to Halt Atrocities in the Former Yugoslavia"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[229] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 8: "1994 After the Genocide Ends, the World Creates a Tribunal for Rwanda"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[230] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 10: "1998 A Permanent Court to Prosecute Atrocities against Civilians is Established"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[231] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 11: "2004 U.S. Declares that Genocide Is Occuring [sic] in Darfur, Sudan"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 5, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide.

[232] "What is Genocide?" (slide number 6: "1988 The United States Ratifies the Convention"), United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 3, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/genocide

[233] Notably, critical moments in the timeline and installation appear to hinge upon acts that US actors have undertaken, offering up optimistic mnemonic discourses. Progress in USHMM's timeline begins to occur after US officials sign the Genocide Convention in 1988. The US government is celebrated for its decision to refer to Darfur

as a genocide. The physical installation features the work of Americans such as *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof and former Secretary of State Colin Powell. Kristof is praised as "play[ing] a critical role in alerting the public to violence in Darfur," and Powell appears resolute in a large photo confronting visitors. His image accompanies a quote, capitalized for emphasis in the exhibit, attributed to the former Secretary, as he "conclude[s] that genocide has been committed in Darfur and may still be occurring." (Although this quotation appears in all capital letters in the original, I've taken it out of all caps for stylistic reasons.) United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited June 28, 2012.

In the last panel in the physical installation, the Darfur rally is clearly constructed as an American event; the image accompanies a caption explaining that "[g]rassroots activists in the U.S. emerged as influential political players in response to the genocide in Darfur."

[234] See again the discussion of the links between trauma and representation featured in Chapter One.

[235] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory,* xv.

[236] Edkins, in fact, demonstrates how this process works with a chapter on Holocaust memorials and museums (including her analysis of the USHMM). See Jenny Edkins, "Concentration Camp Memorials and Museums: Dachau and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum," in *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 111-174.

[237] Although the Committee on Consciousness still exists, between the original drafting of this chapter and its submission, the "Committee on Conscience" appears to

have taken on more of an advisory role as its work is done through a new branch of the

Museum known as "The Center for the Prevention of Genocide." "About the Center for

the Prevention of Genocide," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April

29, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/about/.

[238] "About the Center."

[239] "About the Center."

[240] The USHMM uses the labels "warning" and "monitor" to designate areas of

concern. The DRC, Sudan and South Sudan were issued "warning[s]" at the time of

authorship; whereas, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rwanda, Burundi, and Chechnya were listed

as "monitor." See "Who is at Risk?"

[241] "DR Congo – Legacy," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed

April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/dr-

congo/legacy.

[242] "Sudan – Legacy," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed

April 26, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/sudan/legacy.

[243] "Bosnia-Herzegovina – Legacy," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum,

accessed April 26, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/bosniaherzegovina/legacy.

Quoting the online exhibition: "In January 2008, Kosovar Albanian leaders declared their

independence but have gained only partial international recognition."

[244] "Rwanda – Legacy," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed

April 26, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/rwanda/legacy. The online

exhibition explains, "Many survivors have lost their spouses, parents, children, extended families, and friends. They suffer complex health problems, like HIV/AIDS, as a result of sexual violence during the genocide. Large numbers live in dire poverty."

[245] "Burundi – Legacy," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 26, 2013,

http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/burundi/legacy. As the country's online profile states, "The government has been accused of violating the rule of law, committing human rights abuses, and establishing a system of patronage and corruption. The last remaining rebel group, the National Liberation Force, signed a formal ceasefire in September 2006 in talks mediated by South Africa. Since then, however, hostilities between the national security forces and the FNL [National Liberation Force] have resumed and threaten to destabilize the nation."

[246] Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget*, 227. More recently, Vivian has articulated a similar argument about the West's preoccupation with violence past. He argues, "omnipresent public investments in displaying the realities of historical violence and disseminating their ostensibly universal truth can unwittingly eclipse efforts to publicize the realities of emerging or ongoing patterns of systemic violence." Bradford Vivian, "Times of Violence," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, no. 2 (2013): 210.

[247] The case for the inclusion of Rwanda is premised in "Shifting Violence" involving Rwandans in the conflict in the DRC. The case for the inclusion of Bosnia is couched in the incomplete process of repopulating Srebrenica with Bosnians, the " partial international recognition" afforded to "Kosovar Albanian[s]," and the vulnerability of some populations who have fled Kosovo (part of a case again premised in "Shifting

Violence"). Similarly the inclusion of Chechnya is couched as part of larger narrative about continued "Tensions throughout the North Caucasus" as Chechnya is discussed as lacking an internal commitment to human rights as well as problems of infrastructure and accountability. "Rwanda – Legacy;" "Bosnia-Herzegovina – Legacy;" "Chechnya, Russia – Legacy," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed May 3, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org/genocide/take_action/atrisk/region/chechnya-russia/legacy.

[248] During a visit at the start of May 2013, *From Memory to Action* featured four news items in a ticker scrolling across the top of the giant screens in front of the glass pledge submission cases. Two of these news items made references to a country beyond the three featured in the physical installation and seven featured online. These news items referenced Syria and Cambodia. The former read "Syria: Civilians at risk of genocide." The other read "Cambodia: Trials of Khmer Rouge 'Killing Fields' Generals Under Way." United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, physical installation text, "From Memory to Action," visited May 8, 2013.

[249] Over the course of the years I have been working on this project, the USHMM has shown optimistic signs of increasing the scope its genocide cessation work to recognize atrocities in countries beyond the ones prominently featured in *From Memory to Action*. The May 2013 Genocide Prevention email newsletter featured discussions of atrocities in Guatemala, Syria, Burma, and Iran. USHMM Genocide Prevention e-Newsletter, "Verdict in Guatemala Genocide Trial Overturned," May 22, 2013.

[250] Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 11. In Kuper's words, "[t]he word is new, the crime ancient."

[251] Such rhetorical moves seemingly corroborate the thesis advanced in Novick's work; a focus on the Holocaust allows Americans to avoid grappling with their own history of atrocity. Novick, *The Holocaust*, 15. For a more thorough discussion of the relationship between the US Holocaust memory and indigenous atrocities see Chapter One.

[252] For example, Worthington, "American Exceptionalism;" Ewalt, "Mapping Injustice;" Parks, "Digging into Google Earth."

[253] Morris, "Passing by Proxy;" Charles E. Morris III, "Pink Herring & The Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 2 (2002): 230-231.

[254] Like the MOT featured in the last chapter, reaching out to school-age children is also a major component of the USHMM's work. Its homepage spotlights the number of educational resources available for teachers and students. Additionally, the institution's emphasis on accessibility is readily apparent. For example, the homepage also highlights the number of languages used to transmit the USHMM's content. Both of these components speak to the institution's emphasis on public education. See United States Holocaust Memorial Museum homepage, accessed May 21, 2013, http://www.ushmm.org.

[255] Sincerest thanks to Shawn Parry-Giles for her insight in noting the special irony that comes from the use of rhetorical intimation in an institution ostensibly attempting to reach publics with little knowledge of the subject area.

[256] Bartov, "Chamber of Horrors," 72-74.

AFTERWORD:
The Productivity of Anxiety in Popular Genocide Rhetorics

Phrases such as "never again" or "always remember" have become clichés in popular conversations about genocide. Platitudes like these contribute to a perception of genocide cessation discourse as simplistic and grossly reductive. Such pithy remarks can seem barely worthy of critical attention, bemoaned as shallow and superficial ways of engaging the subject of genocide prevention. Multiple scholars argue that current rhetorics of genocide cessation are woefully inadequate,[1] even when such discourses emerge from sites of political power. Rieff critiques a report on genocide prevention overseen by former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and former US Secretary of Defense William Cohen, arguing that it contains "little history" and is "painted with a disturbingly broad brush."[2] Rieff calls the "solutions . . . hollow" because the world created in the document "bears little or no resemblance to the complexities that actually exist."[3] Similarly, Üngör laments the "obscure jargon, vague abstractions, incredible non sequiturs [and] caricatural acronyms" found in the US Army's *MARO* (Mass Atrocity Response Operations) report.[4] Echoing Rieff's critique, Üngör contends that the *MARO* document offers a naïve form of genocide cessation rhetoric that masks "the complexity of the many processes that occur during genocide."[5] Joining this chorus, Langer punctuates the insufficiency of extant genocide cessation appeals and issues a call for "a new kind of discourse," one appropriately "disturb[ing to] our collective consciousness" and capable of inciting "practical action that moves beyond mere pity."[6]

Undoubtedly, popular cultural discussions of genocide are limited in numerous ways.[7] Yet, to dismiss such discourses as superficial is to risk overlooking their potential to elucidate the politicized nature of genocide and genocide cessation. The preceding

analyses highlight a deep-seated ambivalence regarding the associations among the nation-state, its citizens, and genocidal violence within popular cultural texts on genocide. This ambivalence manifests in the numerous contradictions and vacillations both within and across textual attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember such atrocities. The inconsistencies in these arenas reflect broader tensions over the role of state authority and public agency in scholarly discussions of genocide and genocide cessation. The textual vacillations and incongruences in these popular cultural discussions create a palpable anxiety percolating throughout the texts in this study. In turn, the two museums and single documentary spotlighted in this project manage this anxiety in distinct ways, sublimating, exacerbating, or acknowledging such frictions.

On the surface, these three texts are replete with optimistic and easy-to-consume narratives about genocide and genocide cessation. Both the US nation-state and its citizens are celebrated as empowered genocide cessation actors. *Worse Than War* suggests that a US bounty program for hunting terrorists might offer the best model for genocide cessation efforts, and *From Memory to Action* lauds the efforts of prominent political figures such as former Secretary of State Colin Powell and former Senator William Proxmire for using their privileged platforms to discuss genocide. The texts construct an image of the US nation-state as a benevolent agent of genocide cessation, authorized to undertake the requisite actions to end genocide.

Such texts also suggest that their audiences are powerful agents of genocide cessation. By creating numerous opportunities for audiences to signal their opinions on atrocity, the Museum of Tolerance gives rise to the impression that the voices of its visitors matter. Its motivational refrains stress the public's agency to halt violence,

explicitly affirming to their visitors, "YOU can make a difference."[8] Similarly, *From Memory to Action* provides a list of actions that visitors to their website can undertake to contribute to genocide cessation. These textual features reinforce a sense of public efficacy. By encouraging their audiences to remain vigilant, monitor global affairs, and use their voices to raise awareness about genocide, the texts allot "average individuals" an important role in genocide cessation.

Yet, alongside such hopeful messaging, the texts also contain traces of darker or more doubtful discourses, intimating connections between political violence and the nation-state and raising doubts about their audiences' abilities to participate in genocide cessation work. Scholarly literature on atrocity tethers the nation-state to genocide in multiple ways, and the texts in this study gesture toward some of these troubling associations. At times, the texts contain subtle challenges to the legitimacy of the state's use of violence, including haunting reminders of the state's use of force to commit atrocities against its own people. The spatial juxtaposition of the Nazi surveillance tower and the contemporary security camera in the Museum of Tolerance functions as the most blatant prompt for reconsidering the validity of state actions and the illegitimacy of state power as shown through distinctions between "good" and "bad" state behavior. On other occasions, the texts implicate the nation-state in a web of violence harkening back to the structural inequalities incited by histories of colonialism and imperialism.[9] The subtle intimations of the role of colonial powers in *From Memory to Action*'s profiles of "at risk" states serve as one such reminder of these exnominated connections (e.g., the references to Belgium's role in shaping the Congo or Rwanda).[10] On the whole, these discomforting

components of the texts' narratives jeopardize the aforementioned image of the nation-state as a benevolent actor and critical component of genocide cessation.

The texts also suggest that publics may be limited in their abilities to participate in efforts to end genocide. The film *Worse Than War* constructs its understanding of authority in such exclusionary ways that the majority of the film's viewers seemingly lack the needed spatial or experiential access to engage matters of atrocity. Alternatively, the texts question the sufficiency of the resources at the public's disposal. *From Memory to Action* suggests that audiences "speak out" about genocide at the same time the exhibition implies that words may be powerless in the face of such extreme violence. Despite earlier arguments promoting the power of "average individuals," such conflicting messages leave the audience few options for engaging with anti-genocide campaigns. Resultantly, such doubt contributes to pessimistic assessments of public agency and the immutability of global violence.

This profound ambivalence is signaled by a host of textual inconsistencies across the definitions, representations, resolutions, and remembrances of genocide included in this study. *Worse Than War*, for example, depicts genocide as both a form of rational and irrational behavior. On other occasions, the texts simultaneously embrace competing "liberal" and "post-liberal" logics in their conceptualization of genocide. They also blend incompatible genres by turning to such popular forms as horror, melodrama, Christian iconography, self-help, documentary, and academic discourse to represent such atrocities.[11]

And further evidence of this ambiguity is visible in the textual practice of rhetorical intimation that gestures toward the *exnominated*.[12] As showcased in *From*

Memory to Action, the use of rhetorical intimation forecloses the most disturbing

arguments that link the US nation-state to instances of political violence. Demonstrably,

the exhibition's choice to begin their narrative in the 1940s excludes the United States'

treatment of its Native American populations—atrocities that some label as genocide.[13]

By attending to these inconsistencies, this study reveals the presence of substantive

anxieties associated with an uncertainty over the linkages among state power, public

agency, and political violence.

Ultimately, the texts in the study converge in validating state power while

expressing doubts about public agency. *Worse Than War*, the Museum of Tolerance, and

From Memory to Action undermine their gestures toward public agency by exhibiting

considerable skepticism over their audiences' capacity to participate in genocide

cessation.[14] Consequently, the resolutions offered in these texts favor empowered

political actors and contribute to the construction of genocide as a nation-state-level

problem. This understanding of atrocity reifies the perception of genocide as a "foreign"

affair, largely divorced from the lives of US citizens.[15]

In spite of all of their shortcomings, however, the internal inconsistencies in these

texts create a productive anxiety by imparting messages about audience accountability

and by prompting critical reflection on issues of state power, public agency, and violence.

By treating anxiety as productive, this study further aligns itself with Fiske's perspective

on popular culture. Fiske embraces the contradictions in texts and treats "the repression

of contradictions" as "a reactionary ideological practice" because "it mobilizes a

consensus around the status quo and thus militates against social change."[16] The case

studies featured above avoid such repression. Rather, the incongruences, vacillations, and

silences in these texts contribute to a lingering sense of unease regarding their audiences' connections to genocide and genocide cessation efforts. Although the texts foreground hopeful narratives about the viability of genocide cessation and offer seemingly simplistic solutions, their attempts to define, represent, resolve, and remember genocide are fraught with inconsistencies and intimate less optimistic arguments about the likelihood of ending atrocities. This ambivalence denies their audiences the satisfaction of "easy answers." Read from the more productive perspective,[17] I suggest that the lingering doubt created by textual contradictions may foster a sense of *irresolution* that frustrates audiences' ability to "wash their hands" of their responsibility to engage issues of political violence. At best, the anxiety produced by this lack of closure or absence of simplistic arguments may induce a sense of accountability and invite audiences to reconsider their connections to the politics of atrocity and their role(s) in genocide cessation work. To that end, the texts help constitute a role for citizens in deliberations over genocide and genocide cessation.

Furthermore, these texts stand to raise substantive questions about the nature of political violence and the tenuous associations among violence, the nation-state, and its citizens. As discussed in Chapter One, Holocaust and genocide studies scholars have been exploring these associations for decades with scholars operating from a "post-liberal" perspective suggesting an implicit link between the nation-state and genocide. Scholars such as Levene posit that "genocide … is at the very heart of modern historical development," woven into the fabric of international relations.[18] Such arguments have the potential to be profoundly threatening because they raise the specter of state complicity or, worse, culpability.[19] Despite these unsettling implications, the popular

cultural discourses examined in this study do not avoid these issues entirely. Rather, to

borrow Radway's metaphor, the textual incongruences across and within the three case

studies may have their most utility in exposing the "ideological seams" contained within

popular cultural discussions of political violence.[20] By highlighting these seams and

engaging discomforting arguments about complicity -- *even if only through rhetorical*

intimation -- the texts open opportunities for confronting and challenging the ideologies

which contribute to atrocity. Such a reading of these texts corroborates Edkins's assertion

that atrocity representations and remembrances are "site[s] of struggle" wherein the

balance of political power between the state and its citizens stands to be recalibrated, for

better or for worse.[21] Such textual intimations constitute state actions as subject to public

scrutiny, opening for interrogation a host of state decisions ranging from domestic uses of

force to inaction in the face of global violence.[22]

To be more explicit, the anxiety created by the inconsistencies in popular

genocide cessation discourse may prompt scrutiny of the linkages among the nation-state,

the public, and violence. Such an assertion stands to be the most progressive

interpretation of the preceding analyses. The unresolved ambivalence at the core of these

texts opens space to consider systemic forms of violence and interrogate the connections

among colonialism, imperialism, and genocide.[23] By hinting at darker discourses

regarding the state's role in the execution of various genocides, such texts at least prime

audiences to be critical of the state's use of power, both domestically and abroad.

As I pen this Afterword, considerable anxiety exists surrounding the moral and

political problems created by the horrific state-sponsored violence in Syria. As various

commentators and governmental officials invoke genocide rhetorics,[24] such rhetors

struggle with a familiar set of tensions surrounding atrocity definition, representation, resolution, and remembrance. US leaders and US citizens ponder whether the actions by the Syrian government constitute genocide. They deliberate over the appropriateness of comparing past atrocities like the Holocaust to the Syrian conflict. They also debate whether or not to air horrific images of children who died from such chemicals. And they differ over how best to respond to such acts in order to resolve it. Most contested still is whether the reputation of the US government and its citizens will be tarnished by the engagement or non-engagement in the atrocities. .

Unfortunately, no easy answers exist, and the lack of clarity in each of these four arenas only compounds the complexity of the situation. The case studies featured in this project do not offer a clear path forward. They provide no simple "takeaways," lessons, or guides for navigating situations like the one in Syria in the fall of 2013. Yet, even though such texts may fail to provide answers, perhaps their merit lies in raising discomforting questions. Through their ambivalent treatment of issues of state authority, public agency, and atrocity, the texts prompt audiences to consider their connections to political violence and beg us to ask: What (if any) role should US citizens and US governmental officials play in ending genocidal atrocities?

<div align="center">Notes</div>

[1] Of course, Langer does not take as his subject "genocide cessation discourses" specifically; rather, he is speaking more broadly about the language used to describe atrocities. Lawrence L. Langer, "The Alarmed Vision: Social Suffering and Holocaust Atrocity," *Daedalus* 125, no. 1 (1996): 47-65.

[2] David Rieff, "The Persistence of Genocide," *Policy Review* 36 (February/March 2011): 35. Specifically, in this passage, Rieff is describing the report's discussion of the situation in Darfur; yet, ahistoricism is a hallmark of the report. Rieff punctuates the extent to which the authors of the report disavow the need for any engagement with history. See also Rieff, "The Persistence of Genocide," 40.

[3] Rieff, "The Persistence of Genocide," 34. Rieff continues in his analysis to imply that cowardice contributes to the report's generalities. Rieff most explicitly develops this argument through an example toward the end of his analysis in which he laments the lack of "courage" demonstrated by Albright and Cohen in regard to their response to the Armenian genocide. See Rieff, "The Persistence of Genocide," 39-40.

[4] Uğur Ümit Üngör, "Team America: Genocide Prevention?" *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (2011): 36.

[5] Üngör, "Team America," 37.

[6] Langer, "Alarmed Vision," 47.

[7] Some of these issues are byproducts of popular cultural forms of expression. Critiques from Bartov and Baron featured earlier in this study highlight the limitations of conveying atrocity narratives through popular cultural channels. Lawrence Baron, "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema: Crossing Disciplinary, Genre, and Geographical Borders: Editor's Introduction," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 4; Omer Bartov, *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 168-171.

[8] Museum of Tolerance, physical installation, visited November 12, 2012. [I have preserved the capitalization from the original]

[9] See again the discussion of the "post-liberal" approach spotlighted in Chapter One, page 90.

[10] Refer to the discussion of these profiles on pages 391-393 in Chapter Four.

[11] In such ways, the study reifies the work of scholars such as Torchin, Rothe and Picart and Franke who discuss genocide representations as drawing on some of the genres above. Leshu Torchin, *Creating the Witness: Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the Internet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012); Anne Rothe, *Popular Trauma Culture: Selling the Pain of Others in the Mass Media* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011); Caroline Joan (Kay) S. Picart and David A. Frank, *Frames of Evil: The Holocaust as Horror in American Film* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006).

[12] Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers (1957; New York: Hill and Wang, 1972).

[13] See again the work of Churchill and Stannard. Ward Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present* (San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, 1997); David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

[14] Again, Brown's work centralizes this component of the Museum of Tolerance in her reading of that institution. Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

[15] Langer is especially critical of this framing as he disparages efforts to "sequester[s] mass suffering in other regions of the world from the comfort and safety we enjoy far from its ravages." Langer, "Alarmed Vision," 47.

[16] Fiske's point of departure here is Althusser's conception of ideology, which Fiske interprets as a form of resolving or "iron[ing] out contradictions." Challenges to ideologies, then, are inspired by the presence of contradiction. John Fiske, *Television Culture* (1987; New York: Routledge, 2006), 88.

[17] In other words, I challenge the assessments of genocide cessation discourse offered at the beginning of this piece. Although these discourses have their shortcomings, I suggest that these texts offer more nuanced accounts of the politics of genocide cessation than first meets the eye.

[18] Mark Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation-State*, vol. 1, *The Meaning of Genocide* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 32.

[19] Moving beyond the "post-liberal" approach, Edkins's study departs from a critical perspective on the state that fundamentally links it to violence. See again Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 6-7.

[20] Janice A. Radway, "Identifying Ideological Seams: Mass Culture, Analytical Method, and Political Practice," *Communication* 9, no. 1 (1986): 93-123.

This is where Edkins sees the most potential. The texts have a revelatory function as they possess the capacity to "expose" the state and the harms the state has caused. Edkins adopts the language of "betrayal" and the illumination of betrayal to talk about this capacity. In this way, her work moves toward the same argument: The texts have merit insofar as they help expose the fault lines. Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, 11.

[21] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*, 15. The language of "recalibration" may be overly optimistic; however, Edkins does see these texts and these moments as having

great potential. Jenny Edkins, "Remembering Relationality: Trauma Time and Politics,"
in *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past
and Present*, ed. Duncan Bell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 99-115.

[22] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory*; Edkins, "Remembering Relationality."

[23] See, for example, Moses's recent edited collection. A. Dirk Moses, ed., *Empire,
Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*
(New York: Berghahn Books, 2008).

[24] For stories about governmental officials making allusions to past genocides, see
Emma Roller, "You May Have Missed John Kerry's Subtle Holocaust Reference at the
Syria Hearing," *Slate*, September 3, 2013, accessed September 8, 2013,
http://www.slate.com/blogs/weigel/2013/09/03/john_kerry_compares_syria_chemical_att
ack_to_the_holocaust.html; "Obama Raises Rwanda to Justify Possible Syria Action,"
Voices of America, September 6, 2013, accessed September 8, 2013,
http://www.voanews.com/content/obama-raises-rwanda-to-justify-possible-syria-
action/1744694.html.

For opinion pieces casting the situation in Syria through the prism of genocide,
see Jerry Lanson, "Why, Again, Must America Be the World's Policeman?" *The Blog,
Huffington Post*, September 4, 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jerry-lanson/why-
again-must-america-be_b_3865119.html; Helen Ouyang, "Why the US Should Intervene
in Syria," *The Blog, Huffington Post*, September 5, 2013,
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/helen-ouyang/why-the-us-should-
interve_b_3869698.html; Jeff Greene, "America Must End the Genocide in Syria,"

CNNOpinion, CNN, September 6, 2013, http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/06/opinion/greene-syria-genocide/.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akcan, Esra. "Apology and Triumph: Memory Transference, Erasure, and a Rereading of the Berlin Jewish Museum." *New German Critique* 110 vol. 37, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 153-179.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. "Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma." In *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, edited by Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernhard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser and Piotr Sztompka, 1-30. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

—."On the Social Construction of Moral Universals: The 'Holocaust' from War Crime to Trauma Drama." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no. 1 (2002): 5-85.

Allen, Robert C. "Audience-Oriented Criticism and Television." In *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled: Television and Contemporary Criticism*, edited by Robert C. Allen, 2nd ed., 101-137. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed., 79-87. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing 2006. First published 1971.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised ed. London: Verso, 2006. First published 1983.

Andreopoulos, George J. "Introduction: The Calculus of Genocide." In *Genocide: Conceptual and Historical Dimensions*, edited by George J. Andreopoulos, 1-28. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Arnold, Ken. "*Birth and Breeding*: Politics on Display at the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine." In *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture,* edited by Sharon MacDonald, 183-196. London: Routledge, 1998.

Appadurai, Arjun. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2, no. 2 (1990): 1-24.

Asen, Robert. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 2 (2004): 189-211.

Ash, Mitchell G. "Review Essay: American and German Perspectives on the Goldhagen Debate: History, Identity, and the Media." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 11, no. 3 (1997): 396-411.

Assmann, Aleida. "The Holocaust – a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community." In *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, edited by Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, 97-117. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Avant-Mier, Roberto, and Marouf A. Hasian, Jr. "Communicating 'Truth': *Testimonio*, Vernacular Voices, and the Rigoberta Menchú Controversy." *The Communication Review* 11 (2008): 323-345.

Bakhtin, M.M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

—. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.

Ballinger, Pamela. "The Culture of Survivors: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Memory." *History & Memory* 10, no. 1 (1998): 99-132.

Baron, Lawrence. "The Holocaust and American Public Memory, 1945-1960." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 17, no. 1 (2003): 62-88.

—. "Holocaust and Genocide Cinema: Crossing Disciplinary, Genre, and Geographical Borders: Editor's Introduction." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 1-9.

Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1981.

—. "The Death of the Author." In *Image-Text-Music*, translated by Stephen Heath, 142-148. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978. First published 1977.

—. *Mythologies*. Translated by Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972. First published 1957.

—. "From Work to Text." In *Image-Text-Music*, translated by Stephen Heath, 155-164. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978. First published 1977.

Bartov, Omer. "Chambers of Horror: Holocaust Museums in Israel and the United States." *Israel Studies* 2, no. 2 (1997): 66-87.

—. *Murder in Our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

—. "Reception and Perception: Goldhagen's Holocaust and the World." In *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism – Facing the German Past*, edited by Geoff Eley, 33-87. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Baudrillard, Jean. "The Precession of Simulacra." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed., 453-481. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. First published 1994.

Bauer, Yehuda. "Editor's Introduction." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1, no. 1 (1986): 1-2.

—. *Rethinking the Holocaust*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.

Baum, Steven K. *The Psychology of Genocide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Bauman, Zygmunt. "The Holocaust's Life as a Ghost." *Tikkun* 13, no. 4 (1998): 33-38.

—. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Beasley, Vanessa B. *You, the People: American National Identity in Presidential Rhetoric*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.

Bell, Duncan. "Introduction: Memory, Trauma, and World Politics." In *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*, edited by Duncan Bell, 1-29. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed., 18-40. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Benson, Thomas W. "Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcolm X." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 1 (1974): 1-13.

Bergman, Teresa. "A Critical Analysis of the California State Railroad Museum's Orientation Films." *Western Journal of Communication* 67, no. 4 (2003): 427-448.

Biesecker, Barbara A. "No Time for Mourning: The Rhetorical Production of the Melancholic Citizen-Subject in the War on Terror." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 40, no. 1 (2007): 147-169.

—. "Remembering World War II: The Rhetoric and Politics of National Commemoration at the Turn of the 21st Century." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 4 (2002): 393-409.

Bigelow, Katharine R. "A Campaign to Deter Genocide: The Bahá'í Experience." In *Genocide Watch*, edited by Helen Fein, 189-196. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Bischoping, Katherine and Andrea Kalmin. "Public Opinion about Comparisons to the Holocaust." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (1999): 485-507.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.

Black, Edwin. "Response to Being Honored." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4, no. 3 (2001): 540-541.

—. *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

—. "The Second Persona." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56, no. 2 (1970): 109-119.

Blair, Carole. "Communication as Collective Memory." In *Communication as…Perspectives on Theory*, edited by Gregory J. Shepherd, Jeffery St. John, and Ted Striphas, 51-59. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2006.

Blair, Carole, and Neil Michel. "Commemorating in Theme Park Zone: Reading the Astronauts Memorial." In *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies,* edited by Thomas Rosteck, 29-83. New York: The Guilford Press, 1999.

—. "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places." *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001): 271-294.

—. "Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2000): 31-55.

Blair, Carole, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci Jr. "Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 3 (1991): 263-288.

Bodley, John H. *Victims of Progress*. 2nd ed. Menlo Park, CA: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc., 1982.

Bodroghkozy, Aniko. "'Is This What You Mean by Color TV?' Race, Gender, and Contested Meanings in NBC's *Julia*." In *Private Screenings: Television and the Female Consumer*, edited by Lynn Spigel and Denise Mann, 143 – 167. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Brennan, Michael. "Some Sociological Contemplations on Daniel J. Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*," *Theory, Culture & Society* 18, no. 4 (2001): 83-109.

Brenner, David. "Working Through the Holocaust Blockbuster: *Schindler's List* and *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, Globally and Locally." *The Germanic Review* 75, no. 4 (2000): 296-316.

Briggs, Charles L. "Introduction: The Power of Discourse in (Re)Creating Genocide." *Social Identities* 3, no. 3 (1997): 407-414. http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy-

um.researchport.umd.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=1443339&site=e host-live.

Brooks, Peter. *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976.

Brouwer, Dan. "The Precarious Visibility Politics of Self-Stigmatization: The Case of HIV/AIDS Tattoos." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1998): 114-136.

Brown, Wendy. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Brunk, Darren C. "Curing the Somalia Syndrome: Analogy, Foreign Policy Decision Making, and the Rwandan Genocide." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 4, no. 3 (2008): 301-320.

—. "Dissecting Darfur: Anatomy of a Genocide Debate." *International Relations* 22, no. 1 (2008): 25-44.

Buckley-Zistel, Susanne. "Remembering to Forget: Chosen Amnesia as a Strategy for Local Coexistence in Post-Genocide Rwanda." *Africa* 76, no. 2 (2006): 131-150.

Burnett, Ron. *Cultures of Vision: Images, Media & the Imaginary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Byrd, Jodi A. "'Living My Native Life Deadly': Red Lake, Ward Churchill, and the Discourses of Competing Genocides." *American Indian Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (2007): 310-332.

Bytwerk, Randall L. "Is It Really That Simple? A Response to Goldhagen (and Newman)." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 425-433.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Rhetorical Criticism 2009: A Study in Method." In *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, edited by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, 86-107. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction." In *Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action*, edited by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, 9-32. Falls Church, VA: The Speech Communication Association, 1978.

Caplan, Jane. "Reflections on the Reception of Goldhagen in the United States." In *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism – Facing the German Past*, edited by Geoff Eley, 151-162. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Carey, James. *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Caruth, Cathy. "Introduction." In *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, edited by Cathy Caruth, 3-12. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Casey, Edward S. "Public Memory in Place and Time." In *Framing Public Memory*, edited by Kendall R. Phillips, 17-44. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004.

Ceccarelli, Leah. "Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84, no. 2 (1998): 395-415.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.

Chalk, Frank and Kurt Jonassohn. *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Quebecois*."

> *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (May 1987): 133-150.

Charny, Israel W. "Editor's Preface." In *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of*

> *Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and*

> *Genocide*, edited by Israel W. Charny, xvii – xix. Boulder, CO: Westview Press,

> 1984.

—. "Preface: Which Genocide Matters More? Learning to Care about Humanity." In

> *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, edited by Samuel

> Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed., xi-xvi. New York:

> Routledge, 1997.

Chirot, Daniel and Clark McCauley. *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention*

> *of Mass Political Murder*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Chorbajian, Levon. "Introduction." In *Studies in Comparative Genocide*, edited by Levon

> Chorbajian and George Shirinian, xv-xxxv. Hampshire: MacMillan Press, LTD,

> 1999.

Churchill, Ward. *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas*

> *1492 to the Present*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1997.

Clark, E. Culpepper, and Raymie E. McKerrow. "The Rhetorical Construction of

> History." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J.

> Turner, 33-46. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

Cloud, Dana L. "Concordance, Complexity, and Conservatism: Rejoinder to Condit."

> *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14 (1997): 193-197.

—. *Control and Consolation in American Culture and Politics: Rhetorics of Therapy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1998.

—. "The First Lady's Privates: Queering Eleanor Roosevelt for Public Address Studies." In *Queering Public Address: Sexualities in American Historical Discourse*, edited by Charles E. Morris III, 23-44. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2007.

—. "Hegemony or Concordance? The Rhetoric of Tokenism in 'Oprah' Winfrey's Rags-to-Riches Biography." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 115-137.

—. "*The Matrix* and Critical Theory's Desertion of the Real." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 4 (2006): 329-354.

—. "'To Veil the Threat of Terror': Afghan Women and the <Clash of Civilizations> in the Imagery of the U.S. War on Terrorism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 3 (2004): 285-306.

Clover, Carol J. "Her Body, Himself: Gender in the Slasher Film." *Representations* 20 no. 1 (1987): 187-228.

Cohen, Hal. "The Unmaking of Rigoberta Menchú." In *Genocide, Collective Violence, and Popular Memory: The Politics of Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, edited by David E. Lorey and William H. Beezley, 53-64. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002.

Cole, Tim. *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler How History is Bought, Packaged and Sold*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Condit, Celeste M. "Clouding the Issues: The Ideal and the Material in Human Communication." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14 (1997): 197-200.

—. "Hegemony, Concordance, and Capitalism: Reply to Cloud." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 382-384.

—. "Hegemony in a Mass-Mediated Society: Concordance about Reproductive Technologies." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 11, no. 3 (1994): 205-230.

—. "The Rhetorical Limits of Polysemy." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 6, no. 2 (1989): 103-122.

Conley-Zilkic, Bridget and David Small. "From Memory to Action: Engaging Visitors in a Holocaust Museum." *Interpretation* 16, no. 1 (2011): 20-21.

Connerton, Paul. "Seven Types of Forgetting." *Memory Studies* 1, no. 1 (2008): 59-71.

Crane, Susan A. "Choosing Not to Look: Representation, Repatriation, and Holocaust Atrocity Photography." *History and Theory* 47 (October 2008): 309-330.

Crowley, Sharon. "Reflections on an Argument That Won't Go Way: A Turn of the Ideological Screw." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78 (1992): 450-465.

Crownshaw, Rick. "Photography and Memory in Holocaust Museums." *Mortality* 12, no. 2 (2007): 176-192.

Crysler, C. Greig. "Violence and Empathy: National Museums and the Spectacle of Society." *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* 17, no. 2 (2006): 19-38.

Crysler, Greig, and Abidin Kusno. "Angels in the Temple: The Aesthetic Construction of Citizenship at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum." *Art Journal* 56, no. 1 (1997): 52-64.

Dayan, Daniel, and Elihu Katz. *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

de Waal, Alex. "War Games: The West's Response to Darfur Reveals More About Its Own Agenda than the Reality of the Crisis." *Index on Censorship* 36, no. 4 (2007): 6-11.

Dean, Carolyn J. *The Fragility of Empathy after the Holocaust*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Devitt, Amy J. "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept." *College Composition and Communication* 44, no. 4 (1993): 573-586.

—.*Writing Genre*s. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Derwin, Susan. "Sense and/or Sensation: The Role of the Body in Holocaust Pedagogy." In *Impossible Images: Contemporary Art after the Holocaust*, edited by Shelley Hornstein, Laura Levitt, and Laurence J. Silberstein, 245-259. New York: New York University Press, 2003.

Dickinson, Greg, Brian Ott, and Eric Aoki. "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum." *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (2005): 85-108.

—. "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2006): 27-47.

Donofrio, Theresa Ann. "Ground Zero and Place-Making Authority: The Conservative Metaphors in 9/11 Families' 'Take Back the Memorial' Rhetoric." *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 2 (2010): 150-169.

Dorland, Michael. "PG – Parental Guidance or Portrayal of Genocide: the Comparative Depiction of Mass Murder in Contemporary Cinema." In *The Media and the*

Rwanda Genocide, edited by Allan Thompson, 417-432. London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Dow, Bonnie J. "*Ellen*, Television, and the Politics of Gay and Lesbian Visibility." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 18, no. 2 (2001): 123-140.

—. "Fixing Feminism: Women's Liberation and the Rhetoric of Television Documentary." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 1 (2004): 53-80.

—. *Prime-Time Feminism: Television, Media Culture, and the Women's Movement Since 1970*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.

Doxtader, Erik. "The Rhetorical Question of Human Rights – A Preface." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 96, no. 4 (2010): 353-379.

Ebbrecht, Tobias. "Migrating Images: Iconic Images of the Holocaust and the Representation of War in Popular Film." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 86-103.

Eco, Umberto. *The Search for the Perfect Language*. Translated by James Fentress. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1994.

Edelman, Murray. *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Edkins, Jenny. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

—. "Remembering Relationality: Trauma Time and Politics." In *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*, edited by Duncan Bell, 99-115. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Ehrenhaus, Peter. "Why We Fought: Holocaust Memory in Spielberg's *Saving Private Ryan*." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 18, no. 3 (2001): 321-337.

Eley, Geoff. "Ordinary Germans, Nazism, and Judeocide." In *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism – Facing the German Past*, edited by Geoff Eley, 1-31. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Ewalt, Joshua P. "Mapping Injustice: The *World is Witness,* Place-Framing, and the Politics of Viewing on Google Earth." *Communication, Culture & Critique* 4, no. 4 (2011): 333-354.

Farrell, Kirby. "Introduction: Trauma as Interpretation of Injury." In *Post-traumatic Culture: Injury and Interpretation in the Nineties*, 1-33. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Feldman, Jeffrey D. "One Tragedy in Reference to Another: September 11 and the Obligations of Museum Commemoration." *American Anthropologist* 105, no. 4 (2003): 839-843.

Fein, Helen. *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective.* London: Sage Publications, 1993.

—. *Human Rights and Wrongs: Slavery, Terror, Genocide*. Boulder CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2007.

—. "Scenarios of Genocide: Models of Genocide and Critical Response." In *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide*, edited by Israel W. Charny, 3-31. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984.

Feinstein, Stephen C. "Introduction: *A Scream/A Repetition/A Transformation.*" In *Absence/Presence: Critical Essays on the Artistic Memory of the Holocaust*,

edited by Stephen C. Feinstein, xxi-xxxii. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University
Press, 2005.

Finkelstein, Norman G. *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, 2nd. ed. London: Verso, 2003.

Finnegan, Cara A. "Documentary as Art in *U.S. Camera*." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (2001): 37-68.

—. "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy.'" *Argumentation and Advocacy* 37, no. 3 (2001): 133-149.

Finnegan, Cara A. and Jiyeon Kang. "'Sighting' the Public: Iconoclasm and Public Sphere Theory." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90, no. 4 (2004): 377-402.

Fiske, John, and John Hartley. "Bardic Television." In *Reading Television*, 85-100. London: Methuen, 1978.

Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2006. First published 1987 by Methuen.

Fisher, Walter R. "Genre: Concepts and Applications in Rhetorical Criticism." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44, no. 4 (1980): 288-299.

Flanzbaum, Hilene, ed. *The Americanization of the Holocaust*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Fontana, Benedetto. "The Democratic Philosopher: Rhetoric as Hegemony in Gramsci." *Italian Culture* 23 (2005): 97-123.

Foote, Kenneth E. *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*. 2nd ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.

Fowler, Jerry. "Out of that Darkness: Responding to Genocide in the 21st Century." In *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, edited by Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed., 455-468. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Fraser, Nancy. "Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World." *New Left Review* 36 (November-December 2005): 69-88.

Fried, Amy. "The Personalization of Collective Memory: The Smithsonian's *September 11* Exhibit." *Political Communication* 23, no. 4 (2006): 387-405.

Friedlander, Saul. "Introduction." In *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution,"* edited by Saul Friedlander, 1-21. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Furedi, Frank. "Introduction," In *Therapy Culture: Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age*, 1-23. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Gellately, Robert, and Ben Kiernan. "The Study of Mass Murder and Genocide." In *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*, edited by Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan, 3-26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Gerbner, George, and Larry Gross. "Living with Television: The Violence Profile." *Journal of Communication* 26, no. 2 (1976): 172-199.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press, 1973.

Gilbert, Martin. "Plenary Address." In *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide*. Edited by John K. Roth and Elisabeth Maxwell. Vol. 1*, History*, 5-7. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Gillis, John R. "Introduction: Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship." In *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, edited by John R. Gillis, 3-24. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Giroux, Henry A. "Cultural Studies, Public Pedagogy, and the Responsibility of Intellectuals." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 59-79.

Glassner, Barry. *The Culture of Fear: Why Americans are Afraid of the Wrong Things*. New York: Basic Books 1999.

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

—. *Worse than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2009.

Gray, Peter, and Kendrick Oliver. "Introduction." In *The Memory of Catastrophe*, edited by Peter Gray and Kendrick Oliver, 1-18. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Grabe, Maria Elizabeth and Erik Page Bucy. *Image Bite Politics: News and the Visual Framing of Elections*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Gronbeck, Bruce E. "The Rhetorics of the Past: History, Argument, and Collective Memory." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 47-60. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

Gross, Larry. "Out of the Mainstream: Sexual Minorities and the Mass Media." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, 405-423. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Gunn, Joshua. "Father Trouble: Staging Sovereignty in Spielberg's *War of the Worlds*." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 1 (2008): 1-27.

——. "Mourning Speech: Haunting and the Spectral Voices of Nine-Eleven." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 24, no. 2 (2004): 91-114.

——. "Review Essay: Mourning Humanism, or, the Idiom of Haunting." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92, no. 1 (2006): 77-102.

Haggith, Toby and Joanna Newman, ed. *Holocaust and the Moving Image: Representations in Film and Television Since 1933*. London: Wallflower Press, 2005.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated and edited by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms." In *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, edited by Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley and Sherry B. Ortner, 520-538. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. First published 1980.

——. "Encoding/Decoding." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed., 163-173. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2006.

——. "Notes on Deconstructing 'the Popular.'" In *Cultural Resistance Reader*, edited by Stephen Duncombe, 185-192. New York: Verso, 2002.

Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order.* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillian, 1978.

Hamamoto, Darrell Y. *Nervous Laughter: Television Situation Comedy and Liberal Democratic Ideology*. New York, Praeger, 1989.

Hamber, Brandon. "Conflict Museums, Nostalgia, and Dreaming of Never Again." *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 18, no. 3 (2012): 268-281.

Hamburg, David A. *Preventing Genocide: Practical Steps Toward Early Detection and Effective Action*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2008.

Hansen, Miriam Bratu. "*Schindler's List* Is Not *Shoah*: The Second Commandment, Popular Modernism, and Public Memory." *Critical Inquiry* 22, no. 2 (1996): 292-312.

Hantke, Steffen. "Horror Film and the Historical Uncanny: The New Germany in Stefan Ruzowitzky's *Anatomie*." *College Literature*, 31, no. 2 (2004): 117-142.

—. "Introduction: Horror Film and the Apparatus of Cinema." In *Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear*, edited by Steffen Hantke, vii-xiii. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004.

Herbert, Ulrich. "Academic and Public Discourses on the Holocaust: The Goldhagen Debate in Germany." *German Politics and Society* 17, no. 3 (1999): 35-54.

Harff, Barbara. "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing the Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955." *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003): 57-73.

—. "Recognizing Genocides and Politicides." In *Genocide Watch*, edited by Helen Fein, 27-41. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Hariman, Robert. "Introduction." In *Popular Trials: Rhetoric, Mass Media, and the Law*, edited by Robert Hariman, 1- 16. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1990.

Hariman, Robert, and John Louis Lucaites. *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Harrell, Jackson and Wil A. Linkugel. "On Rhetorical Genre: An Organizing Perspective." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 11, no. 4 (1978): 262-281.

Hart, Roderick P. *Seducing America: How Television Charms the Modern Voter*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Hartley, John. *The Politics of Pictures: The Creation of the Public in the Age of Popular Media*. London: Routledge, 1992.

—. *Television Truths*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Hartman, Geoffrey H. "Introduction: Darkness Visible." In *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory*, edited by Geoffrey H. Hartman, 1-22. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Hasian, Marouf, Jr. "Authenticity, Public Memories, and the Problematics of Post-Holocaust Remembrances: A Rhetorical Analysis of the *Wilkomirski* Affair." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 3 (2005): 231-263.

—. "Remembering and Forgetting the 'Final Solution': A Rhetorical Pilgrimage through the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21, no. 1 (2004) 64-92.

—. *Rhetorical Vectors of Memory in National and International Holocaust Trials*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006.

Hasian, Marouf, Jr., and Robert E. Frank. "Rhetoric, History, and Collective Memory: Decoding the Goldhagen Debates." *Western Journal of Communication* 63, no. 1 (1999): 95-114.

Hasian, Marouf, Jr., and Rulon Wood. "Critical Museology, (Post)Colonial Communication, and the Gradual Mastering of Traumatic Pasts at the Royal Museum for Central Africa (RMCA)." *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 2 (2010): 128-149.

Hayden, Robert M. "Schindler's Fate: Genocide, Ethnic Cleansing and Population Transfers." *Slavic Review* 55, no. 4 (1996): 727-748.

Heide, Margaret J. *Television Culture and Women's Lives:* thirtysomething *and the Contradictions of Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Heidenrich, John G. *How to Prevent Genocide: A Guide for Policymakers, Scholars, and the Concerned Citizen*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001.

Hein, Hilde S. *The Museum in Transition: A Philosophical Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

Herman, Edward S. and David Peterson. *The Politics of Genocide*. With a foreword by Noam Chomsky. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010.

Hesford, Wendy S. "Documenting Violations: Rhetorical Witnessing and the Spectacle of Distant Suffering." *Biography* 27, no. 1 (2004): 104-144.

—. "Human Rights Rhetoric of Recognition." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2011): 282-289.

—. "Rhetorical Memory, Political Theater, and the Traumatic Present." Review of *Eyes of the Heart: A Play in Two Acts*, by Catherine Filloux and *Photographs from S-21*, by Catherine Filloux. *Transformations* XVI, no 2 (2005): 104-117.

Hinton, Alexander Laban. "The Dark Side of Modernity: Toward an Anthropology of Genocide." In *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, edited by Alexander Laban Hinton, 1-40. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Hirsch, Marianne. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today* 29, no. 1 (2008): 103-128.

—. "Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile." *Poetics Today* 17, no. 4 (1996): 659-686.

Hoffman, Eva. *After Such Knowledge: Memory, History, and the Legacy of the Holocaust*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2004.

Holtschneider, K. Hannah. "Victims, Perpetrators, Bystanders? Witnessing, Remembering and the Ethics of Representation in Museums of the Holocaust." *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 13, no. 1 (2007): 82-102.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, rev. ed., 41-72. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing 2006.

Hoskins, Andrew. "Signs of the Holocaust: Exhibiting Memory in a Mediated Age." *Media, Culture and Society* 25, no. 1 (2003): 7-23.

Hughes, Rachel. "The Abject Artefacts of Memory: Photographs from Cambodia's Genocide." *Media, Culture & Society* 25 (2003): 23-44.

Hungerford, Amy. *The Holocaust of Texts: Genocide, Literature, and Personification*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Huyssen, Andreas. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

Israeli, Raphael, Shmuel Berkovits, Jacques Neriah, and Marvin Hier. "'The Architecture of Erasure' – Fantasy or Reality?" *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 3 (2010): 563-594.

Jacobs, Janet. *Memorializing the Holocaust: Gender, Genocide and Collective Memory*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2010.

Jamieson, Kathleen M. "Antecedent Genre as Rhetorical Constraint." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 4 (1975): 406-415.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell. "Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68, no. 2 (1982): 146-157.

Jasinski, James. "A Constitutive Framework for Rhetorical Historiography: Toward an Understanding of the Discursive (Re)constitution of 'Constitution' in *The Federalist Papers*." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Kathleen J. Turner, 72-92. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

Jasinksi, James, and Jennifer R. Mercieca. "Analyzing Constitutive Rhetorics: The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions and the 'Principles of '98.'" In *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, edited by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, 313-341. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2010.

Jenkins, Eric S. "Seeing Katrina: Perspectives of Judgment in a Cultural/Natural Disaster." *Visual Communication Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (2007): 90-107.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide.* Updated with a new afterword. New York: New York University Press, 2008. First published 2006.

—. "*Star Trek* Rerun, Reread, Rewritten: Fan Writing as Textual Poaching." In *Fans, Bloggers, and Gamers: Exploring Participatory Culture*, 37-60. New York: New York University, 2006.

Jick, Leon A. "The Holocaust: its Use and Abuse within the American Public." *Yad Vashem Studies* 14 (1981): 303-318.

Johnson, Richard. "What is Cultural Studies Anyway?" *Social Text* 16 (Winter 1986/87): 38-80.

Jokic, Aleksandar. "Genocidalism." *The Journal of Ethics* 8, no. 3 (2004): 251-297.

Jonassohn, Kurt. "What is Genocide?" In *Genocide Watch*, edited by Helen Fein, 17-26. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Jones, Adam. *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 2nd. ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.

—. "Review: Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity." *Journal of Genocide Research* 12, no. 3-4 (2010): 271-278.

Jones, David H. "On the Prevention of Genocide: The Gap between Research and Education." *War Crimes, Genocide, & Crimes against Humanity* 1, no. 1 (2005): 5-46.

Jordan, John W. "Transcending Hollywood: The Referendum on United 93 as Cinematic Memorial." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 2 (2008): 196-223.

Jorgensen-Earp, Cheryl R. "Satisfaction of Metaphorical Expectations through Visual

    Display: The *Titanic* Exhibition." In *Rhetorics of Display*, edited by Lawrence J.

    Prelli, 41-65. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.

Judt, Tony. "The Past Is Another Country: Myth and Memory in Postwar Europe."

    Daedulus 121, no. 4 (1992): 83-118.

Kammen, Michael. *The Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in*

    American Culture. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1991.

Katriel, Tamar. "Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement

    Museums." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80, no. 1 (1994): 1-20.

Katz, Steven T. *The Holocaust in Historical Context*. Vol 1, *The Holocaust and Mass*

    Death before the Modern Age. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Kavanagh, Gaynor. *Dream Spaces: Memory and the Museum*. London: Leicester

    University Press, 2000.

Keil, Chris. "Sightseeing in the Mansions of the Dead." *Social & Cultural Geography* 6,

    no. 4 (2005): 479-94.

Kellner, Douglas. "Media Culture and the Triumph of the Spectacle." In *Media*

    Spectacle, 1-33. London: Routledge, 2003.

Kelly, Casey. "Neocolonialism and the Global Prison in National Geographic's *Locked*

    Up Abroad." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 29, no. 4 (2012): 331-347.

Kerner, Aaron. *Film and the Holocaust: New Perspectives on Dramas, Documentaries,*

    and Experimental Films. New York: The Continuum International Publishing

    Group, 2011.

Kimura, Akio. "Genocide and the Modern Mind: Intention and Structure." *Journal of Genocide Research* 5, no. 3 (2003): 405-420.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. "Folklorists in Public: Reflections on Cultural Brokerage in the United States and Germany." *Journal of Folklore Research* 37, no. 1 (2000): 1-21.

Kitch, Carolyn. "'A Death in the American Family': Myth, Memory, and National Values in the Media Mourning of John F. Kennedy, Jr." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2002): 294-309.

Klinghoffer, Arthur Jay. "American Reticence." In *The International Dimension of Genocide in Rwanda*, 91-100. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Kogen, Lauren. "Why the Message Should Matter: Genocide and the Ethics of Global Journalism in the *Mediapolis*." *The Journal of International Communication* 15, no. 2 (2009): 62-78.

Kornblau, Gary. "The Museum of Tolerance." *Art Issues*, May/June 1993, 48.

Kosicki, Piotr H. "Sites of Aggressor-Victim Memory: The Rwandan Genocide, Theory and Practice." *International Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 1 (2007): 10-29.

Kramer, Richard. "The Logic of the Goldhagen Debate." *Res Publica* 6, no. 2 (2000): 155-177.

Kreps, Sarah E. "Social Networks and Technology in the Prevention of Crimes Against Humanity." In *Mass Atrocity Crimes: Preventing Future Outrages*, edited by Robert I. Rotberg, 175-191. Cambridge, MA: World Peace Foundation / Harvard Kennedy School Program on Intrastate Conflict / Washington, D.C., Brookings Institute Press, 2010.

Kristof, Nicholas D., "The Problem of Memory." *Foreign Affairs* 77, no. 6 (1998): 37-49.

Kuper, Leo. *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.

—. *The Prevention of Genocide*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

—. "Reflections on the Prevention of Genocide." In *Genocide Watch*, edited by Helen Fein, 135-161. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Kurasawa, Fuyuki. "A Message in a Bottle: Bearing Witness as a Mode of Transnational Practice." *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, no. 1 (2009): 92-111.

Kuusisto, Rikka. "Heroic Tale, Game, and Business Deal? Western Metaphors in Action in Kosovo." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 1 (2002): 50-68.

Kyriakides, Yvonne. "'Art After Auschwitz is Barbaric': Cultural Ideology of Silence through the Politics of Representation." *Media, Culture & Society* 27, no. 3 (2005): 441-450.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Lakoff, George. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 2nd ed., 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Lal, Vinay. "Genocide, Barbaric Others, and the Violence of Categories: A Response to Omer Bartov." *American Historical Review* 103, no, 4 (1998): 1187-1190.

Lancioni, Judith. "The Rhetoric of the Frame: Revisioning Archival Photographs in *The Civil War*." *Western Journal of Communication* 60, no. 4 (1996): 397-414.

Landsberg, Alison. "America, the Holocaust, and the Mass Culture of Memory: Toward a Radical Politics of Empathy." *New German Critique* 71 (1997): 63-86.

Lang, Berel. *The Future of the Holocaust: Between History and Memory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Langer, Lawrence, L. "The Alarmed Vision: Social Suffering and Holocaust Atrocity," *Daedalus* 125, no. 1 (1996): 47-65.

Laub, Dori. "Bearing Witness, or the Vicissitudes of Listening." In *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, edited by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, 57-74. New York: Routledge, 1992.

—. "An Event Without a Witness: Truth, Testimony and Survival." In *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, edited by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, 75-92. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Lentin, Ronit. "Introduction: Postmemory, Unsayability and the Return of the Auschwitz Code." In *Re-Presenting the Shoah for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Ronit Lentin, 1-24. New York: Berghahn Books, 2004.

Levene, Mark. "A Dissenting Voice: Or How Current Assumptions of Deterring and Preventing Genocide May Be Looking at the Problem Through the Wrong End of the Telescope, Part I." *Journal of Genocide Research* 6, no. 2 (2004): 153-166.

—. *Genocide in the Age of the Nation-State*. Vol. 1, *The Meaning of Genocide*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2005.

—. "A Moving Target, the Usual Suspects and (Maybe) a Smoking Gun: The Problem of Pinning Blame in Modern Genocide." *Patterns of Prejudice* 33, no. 4 (1999): 3-24.

—."Why Is the Twentieth Century the Century of Genocide?" *Journal of World History* 11, no. 2 (2000): 305-336.

Levi, Primo. *Survival in Auschwitz: The Nazi Assault on Humanity.* Translated by Stuart Woolf. New York: Touchstone, 1996. First published as *Se Questo É un Uomo* in 1958 by Giulio Einaudi editore S.p.A.

Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider. "The Institutionalization of Cosmopolitan Morality: The Holocaust and Human Rights." *Journal of Human Rights* 3, no. 2 (2004): 143-157.

—. "Revised Introduction to the English Edition." In *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, translated by Assenka Oksiloff, 1-20. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2006.

Liebes, Tamar. "Television's Disaster Marathons: A Danger for Democratic Processes?" In *Media, Ritual and Identity*, edited by Tamar Liebes and James Curran, 71-84. London: Routledge, 1998.

—. "Viewing and Reviewing the Audience: Fashions in Communication Research." In *Mass Media and Society*, edited by James Curran and Michael Gurevitch, 4th ed., 356-374. London: Hodder Arnold, 2005.

Lim, Jie-Hyun. "Victimhood Nationalism in Contested Memories: National Mourning and Global Accountability." In *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, edited by Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, 138-162. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Linenthal, Edward T. *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Lipsitz, George. "Listening to Learn and Learning to Listen: Popular Culture, Cultural Theory, and American Studies." *American Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1990): 615- 636.

Lipstadt, Deborah E. "America and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1950-1965." *Modern Judaism* 16 (1996): 195-214.

—. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. New York: Plume, 1994.

Lisus, Nicola A. and Richard V. Ericson. "Misplacing Memory: The Effect of Television Format on Holocaust Remembrance." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 46 no. 1 (1995): 1-19.

Lorenz, Chris. "Model Murderers: Afterthoughts on the Goldhagen Method and History." *Rethinking History* 6, no. 2 (2002): 131-150.

Loumeau-May, Laura V. "Grieving in the Public Eye: Art Therapy with Children Who Lost Parents in the World Trade Center Attacks." In *Creative Interventions with Traumatized Children*, edited by Cathy A. Malchiodi, 81-111. New York: The Guilford Press, 2008.

Lowenstein, Adam. "Introduction: The Allegorical Moment," In *Shocking Representation: Historical Trauma, National Cinema, and the Modern Horror Film*, 1-16. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Lucas, Colin. "Opening Address." In *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide*. Edited by John K. Roth and Elisabeth Maxwell. Vol. 1, *History*, 3-4. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Luke, Timothy W. *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002.

MacDonald, David B. *Identity Politics in the Age of Genocide: The Holocaust and Historical Representation*. Abdington: Routledge, 2008.

MacDonald, Susan, ed. *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Magelssn, Scott. "The Staging of History: Theatrical, Temporal and Economic Borders of Historyland." *Visual Communication* 2, no. 1 (2003): 7-24.

Maier, Charles S. "A Surfeit of Memory? Reflections on History, Melancholy and Denial." *History and Memory* 5, no. 2 (1993): 136-152.

Makino, Uwe. "Final Solutions, Crimes against Mankind: On the Genesis and Criticism of the Concept of Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research* 3, no. 1 (2001): 49-73.

Malchiodi, Cathy A. *Breaking the Silence: Art Therapy with Children From Violent Homes*. 2nd ed. Florence, KY: Brunner/Mazel, 1997.

Mandel, Naomi. "Rethinking 'After Auschwitz': Against a Rhetoric of the Unspeakable in Holocaust Writing." *boundary 2* 28, no. 2 (2001): 203-228.

Margalit, Avishait. *The Ethics of Memory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Markovitz, Jonathan. "*Ararat* and Collective Memories of the Armenian Genocide." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 2 (2006): 235-55.

Maxwell, Ashley, and Ann H. Ross. "Epidemiology of Genocide: An Example from the Former Yugoslavia." *Forensic Science Policy & Management: An International Journal* 2, no. 2 (2011): 94-102.

Mayer, Arno J. "Memory and History: On the Poverty of Remembering and Forgetting the Judeocide." *Radical History Review* 56 (1993): 5-20.

Messaris, Paul. *Visual Persuasion: The Role of Images in Advertising*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.

McGee, Michael C. "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (October 1975): 235-49.

—. "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54 (1990): 274-289.

McGovern, Charles F. *Sold American: Consumption and Citizenship, 1890-1945*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

McLuhan, Marshall, and Quentin Fiore. *The Medium Is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects*. Produced by Jerome Agel. Berkley, CA: Gingko Press, Inc., 2001. First published 1967.

Medhurst, Martin J. "Afterword: The Ways of Rhetoric." In *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst, 218-226. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996.

Medhurst, Martin J., and Thomas W. Benson. "Introduction: Rhetorical Studies in a Media Age." In *Rhetorical Dimensions in Media: A Critical Casebook*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst and Thomas W. Benson, ix-xxiii. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1984.

Mennecke, Martin. "Punishing Genocidaires: A Deterrent Effect or Not?" *Human Rights Review* 8, no. 4 (2007): 319-339.

Metz, Walter C. "'Show Me the Shoah!': Generic Experience and Spectatorship in

    Popular Representations of the Holocaust." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal*

    of Jewish Studies 27, no. 1 (2008): 16-35.

Meyrowitz, Joshua. "New Sense of Politics: How Television Changes the Political

    Drama." *Research in Political Sociology* 7 (1995): 117-138.

—. "Television and Interpersonal Behavior: Codes of Perception and Response." In

    Inter/Media: Interpersonal Communication in a Media World, edited by Gary

    Grumpert and Robert Cathcart, 221-241. New York: Oxford University Press,

    1982.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, no. 2

    (1984): 151-167.

Miller, David and Greg Philo, "The Active Audience and Wrong Turns in Media Studies:

    Rescuing Media Power." *Soundscapes: Journal on Media Culture* 4 (September

    2001), http://www.icce.rug.nl/~soundscapes/VOLUME04/Active_audience.shtml.

Mintz, Alan. *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America.* Seattle:

    University of Washington Press, 2001.

Morris III, Charles E. "Passing by Proxy: Collusive and Convulsive Silence in the Trial

    of Leopold and Loeb." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 3 (2005): 264-290.

—."Pink Herring & The Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic." *Quarterly*

    Journal of Speech 88, no. 2 (2002): 228-244.

Morris, Charles E., III, and John M. Sloop. "'What Lips These Lips Have Kissed':

    Refiguring the Politics of Queer Public Kissing." *Communication and*

    Critical/Cultural Studies 3, no. 1 (2006): 1-26.

Moses, A. Dirk. "Book Review: Robert A. Shandley, ed., *Unwilling Germans? The Goldhagen Debate;* Geoff Eley, ed., *The "Goldhagen Effect": History, Memory, Nazism Facing the German Past;* D. D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust on Trial." The Journal of Modern History* 75, no. 4 (2003): 994-1000.

—. "Conceptual Blockages and Definitional Dilemmas in the 'Racial Century': Genocides of Indigenous Peoples and the Holocaust." In *Colonialism and Genocide*, edited by A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone, 148-180. London: Routledge, 2007.

—. "Structure and Agency in the Holocaust: Daniel J. Goldhagen and His Critics." *History and Theory* 37, no. 2 (1998): 194-219.

Moses, A. Dirk, and Dan Stone. "Introduction." In *Colonialism and Genocide*, edited by A. Dirk Moses and Dan Stone, vi-ix. London: Routledge, 2007.

Newman, Robert P. "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry Goldhagen: A Narrative of Guilt and Redemption." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 407-424.

Newman, Leonard S. and Ralph Erber, ed. *Understanding Genocide: The Social Psychology of the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Nora, Pierre. "General Introduction: Between Memory and History." In *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past.* Edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Vol. 1, *Conflicts and Divisions*, 1-20. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996. First published 1992.

Norden, Edward. "Yes and No to the Holocaust Museums." *Commentary* 96, no. 2 (1993): 23-32.

Norfolk, Simon. *For Most of It I Have No Words: Genocide Memory Landscape*, with an essay by Michael Ignatieff. Stockport: Dewi Lewis press, 1998.

Norridge, Zoë. "Writing against Genocide: Genres of Opposition in Narratives from and about Rwanda." In *Postcolonial Poetics: Genre and Form*, edited by Patrick Crowley and Jane Hiddleston, 240-261. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999.

—. "Holocaust Memory in America." In *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, edited by James E. Young, 158-165. New York: Prestel, 1994.

Oliner, Samuel P. and Pearl M. Oliner. *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: The Free Press, 1988.

O'Neill, Kevin Lewis, and Alexander Laban Hinton. "Genocide, Truth, Memory, and Representation: An Introduction." In *Genocide: Truth, Memory, and Representation*, edited by Alexander Laban Hinton and Kevin Lewis O'Neill, 1-26. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.

Ozick, Cynthia. "Roundtable Discussion: Raul Hilberg, Cynthia Ozick, Aharon Appelfeld, Saul Friedländer." In *Writing and the Holocaust*, edited by Berel Lang, 277-284. New York: Holmes & Meir, 1988.

Palczewski, Catherine Helen. "The Male Madonna and the Feminine Uncle Sam: Visual Argument, Icons, and Ideographs in 1909 Anti-Woman Suffrage Postcards." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, no. 4 (2005): 365-394.

—. "When Times Collide: Ward Churchill's Use of an Epideictic Moment to Ground
Forensic Argument." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 41, no. 3 (2005): 123-138.

Parks, Lisa. "Digging into Google Earth: An analysis of 'Crisis in Darfur.'" *Geoforum*
40, no. 4 (2009): 535–545.

Parry-Giles, Shawn J. "Mediating Hillary Rodham Clinton: Television News Practices
and Image-Making in the Postmodern Age." *Critical Studies in Media
Communication* 17, no. 2 (2000): 205-226.

Parry-Giles, Trevor. *The Character of Justice: Rhetoric, Law, and Politics in the
Supreme Court Confirmation Process*. East Lansing: Michigan State University
Press, 2006.

Parry-Giles, Shawn J. and Trevor Parry-Giles. "*Fahrenheit 9/11*—Virtual Realism and
the Limits of Commodified Dissent." In *The Rhetoric of the New Political
Documentary*, edited by Thomas W. Benson and Brian J. Snee, 24-53.
Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Parry-Giles, Trevor and Shawn J. Parry-Giles. *The Prime-Time Presidency:* The West
Wing *and U.S. Nationalism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006.

Patman, Robert G. *Strategic Shortfall: The Somalia Syndrome and the March to 9/11*.
Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010.

Patraka, Vivian M. "Situating History and Difference: The Performance of the Term
Holocaust in Public Discourse." In *Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish
Cultural Studies*, edited by Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin, 54-78.
Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press: 1997.

—. "Spectacular Suffering: Performing Presence, Absence, and Witness at U.S.

Holocaust Museums." In *Memory and Representation: Constructed Truths and Competing Realities*, edited by Dena Elisabeth Eber and Arthur G. Neal, 139-166. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 2001.

Paul, J. Gavin. "Ashes in the Gutter: 9/11 and the Serialization of Memory in DC Comics' Human Target." *American Periodicals* 17, no. 2 (2007): 208-227.

Phillips, Kendall R. "Introduction." In *Framing Public Memory*, edited by Kendall R. Phillips, 1-14. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004.

Picart, Caroline Joan (Kay) S., and David A. Frank. *Frames of Evil: The Holocaust as Horror in American Film*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006.

Power, Samantha. *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Perennial, 2003.

—. "To Suffer by Comparison?" *Daedalus* 128, no. 2 (1999): 31-66.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Security." In *Shock and Awe: War on Words*, edited by Bregje van Eekelen, Jennifer Gonzalez, Anna Tsing, and Bettina Stotzer, 140-141 .Santa Cruz, CA: New Pacific Press, 2004.

Prosise, Theodore O. "Prejudiced, Historical Witness, and Responsible: Collective Memory and Liminality in the Beit Hashoah Museum of Tolerance." *Communication Quarterly* 51, no. 3 (2003): 351-366.

Rabinbach, Anson. "From Explosion to Erosion: Holocaust Memorialization in America since Bitburg." *History and Memory* 9, no. 1/2 (1997): 226-255.

Radway, Janice A. "Identifying Ideological Seams: Mass Culture, Analytical Method, and Political Practice." *Communication* 9, no. 1 (1986): 93-123.

Ray, Angela G. "'In My Own Hand Writing': Benjamin Banneker Addresses the Slaveholder of Monticello." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 387-405.

Ray, Larry. "Memory, Trauma and Genocidal Nationalism." *Sociological Research Online* 4, no. 2 (1999): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/4/2/ray.html

Rieff, David. "The Persistence of Genocide." *Policy Review* 36 (February/March 2011): 29-40.

Romaniuk, Scott Nicholas. "Book Review: Worse Than War." *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (2011): 107-110.

Ronayne, Peter V. *Never Again? The United States and the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide since the Holocaust.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

—. "The United States and the 'G-Word': Genocide and Denial Before and Beyond Rwanda." In *The Genocidal Temptation: Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Rwanda, and Beyond*, edited by Robert S. Frey, 101-114. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004.

Rose, Gillian. *Mourning Becomes the Law: Philosophy and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Rosenbaum, Alan S. ed., *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Contemporary Genocide*, 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2009.

Rosenfeld, Alvin H. *The End of the Holocaust*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011.

Rosenfeld, Gavriel V. "A Flawed Prophecy? *Zakhor*, the Memory Boom, and the Holocaust." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 97, no. 4 (2007): 508-520.

—. "The Politics of Uniqueness: Reflections on the Recent Polemical Turn in Holocaust and Genocide Scholarship." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 13, no. 1 (1999): 28-61.

Ross, Gina. "What Everyone Should Know About Trauma." In *Beyond the Trauma Vortex: The Media's Role in Healing Fear, Terror, & Violence*, 1-20. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books, 2003.

Rosteck, Thomas. "Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81, no. 3 (1995): 386-403.

—. "Form and Cultural Context In Rhetorical Criticism: Re-Reading Wrage." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84, no. 4 (1998): 471-490.

—. "Introduction: Approaching the Intersection: Issues of Identity, Politics, and Critical Practice." In *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies,* edited by Thomas Rosteck, 1-23. New York: The Guilford Press, 1999.

Rotberg, Robert I. "Deterring Mass Atrocity Crimes: The Cause of Our Era." In *Mass Atrocity Crimes: Preventing Future Outrages*, edited by Robert I. Rotberg, 1-24. Cambridge, MA: World Peace Foundation / Harvard Kennedy School Program on Intrastate Conflict / Washington, D.C., Brookings Institute Press, 2010.

Roth, John K. "Epilogue: 'After?...Meaning What?'" In *Genocide and Human Rights: A Philosophical Guide*, edited by John K. Roth, 326-333. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

—. "Prologue: Philosophy and Genocide." In *Genocide and Human Rights: A Philosophical Guide*, edited by John K. Roth, xvi-xxi. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

—. "Will Genocide Ever End? Genocide's Challenge to Philosophy." In *Genocide and Human Rights: A Philosophical Guide*, edited by John K. Roth, 149-152. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Roth, Kenneth. Foreword to *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton, ix-xi. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

Roth, Michael S., and Charles G. Salas. "Introduction." In *Disturbing Remains: Memory, History, and Crisis in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Michael S. Roth and Charles G. Salas, 1-13. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Research Institute, 2001.

Rothe, Anne. *Popular Trauma Culture: Selling the Pain of Others in the Mass Media*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011.

Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

—. *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Ruffins, Fath Davis. "Culture Wars Won and Lost: Ethnic Museums on the Mall, Part I: The National Holocaust Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian." *Radical History Review* 68 (Spring 1997): 79-100.

Samek Alyssa A., and Theresa A. Donofrio. "'Academic Drag' and the Performance of the Critical Personae: An Exchange on Sexuality, Politics, and Identity in the Academy." *Women's Studies in Communication* 36, no. 1 (2013): 28-55.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *On Genocide*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Schaller, Dominik J. "From the Editor(s): Genocide Research, Preventionism and Politics of Memory – a Personal Note." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 3 (2006): 245-248.

Schulman, Norma. "Conditions of their Own Making: An Intellectual History of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 18, no. 1 (1993). http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewArticle/717.

Scott, Joan W. "'Experience.'" In *Feminists Theorize the Political*, edited by Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, 22-40. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Semelin, Jacques. "What is 'Genocide'?" *European Review of History* 12, no. 1 (2005): 81-89.

—. *Purify and Destroy: The Political Uses of Massacre and Genocide*. Translated by Cynthia Schoch. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Shandler, Jeffrey. *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Shugart, Helene A. "An Appropriating Aesthetic: Reproducing Power in the Discourse of Critical Scholarship." *Communication Theory* 13, no. 3 (2003): 275–303.

Simon, Roger I. "Museums, Civic Life, and the Educative Force of Remembrance." *Journal of Museum Education* 31, no. 2 (2006): 113-121.

Simon, Roger I., Sharon Rosenberg, and Claudia Eppert. "Introduction: Between Hope and Despair: The Pedagogical Encounter of Historical Remembrance." In *Between Hope and Despair: Pedagogy and the Remembrance of Historical*

Trauma, edited by Roger I. Simon, Sharon Rosenberg, and Claudia Eppert, 1-8. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000.

Sloop, John M. and Mark Olson, "*Cultural* Struggle: A Politics of Meaning in Rhetorical Studies." In *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies,* edited by Thomas Rosteck, 248-265. New York: The Guilford Press, 1999.

Smith, Cynthia E. and Tony Pipa. "The Politics of Genocide: U.S. Rhetoric vs. Inaction in Darfur, 7 April – 26 September 2004." *Kennedy School Review* 6 (2005): 131-140.

Smith, James L. *Melodrama*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1973.

Sontag, Susan. "In Plato's Cave." In *On Photography*, 3-24. New York: Picador, 1977.

—. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Picador, 2003.

Stahl, Roger. "A Clockwork War: Rhetorics of Time in a Time of Terror." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 94, no. 1 (2008): 73-99.

Stannard, David E. *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Staub, Ervin. *Overcoming Evil: Genocide, Violent Conflict, and Terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2011.

—.*The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Stein, Arlene. "Whose Memories? Whose Victimhood? Contests for the Holocaust Frame in Recent Social Movement Discourse." *Sociological Perspectives* 41, no. 3 (1998): 519-540.

Steinweis, Alan E. "The Auschwitz Analogy: Holocaust Memory and American Debates over Intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 19, no. 2 (2005): 276-289.

Stephens, Mitchell. *The Rise of the Image the Fall of the Word*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Stier, Oren Baruch. *Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

—. "Virtual Memories: Mediating the Holocaust at the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Beit Hashoah-Museum of Tolerance." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 64, no. 4 (1996): 831-851.

Stone, Dan. *History, Memory and Mass Atrocity: Essays on the Holocaust and Genocide*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2006.

Stratton, Jon. "Thinking Through the Holocaust. A Discussion Inspired by Hilene Flanzbaum (ed.), *The Americanization of the Holocaust*." *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 14, no. 2 (2000): 231-245.

Straus, Scott. "Contested Meanings and Conflicting Imperatives: A Conceptual Analysis of Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research* 3, no. 3 (2001): 349-375.

Struken, Marita. "The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero." *American Ethnologist* 31, v. 3 (2004): 311-325.

—. "Memorializing Absence." In *Understanding September 11*, edited by Craig Calhoun, Paul Price, and Ashley Timmer, 374-384. New York: The New Press, 2002.

—. *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Sue, Derald Wing. "Microaggressions, Marginality, and Oppression: An Introduction." In *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestations, Dynamics, and Impact*, edited by Derald Wing Sue, 3-22 .Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2010.

Sue, Derald Wing, Christina M. Capodilupo, Gina C. Torino, Jennifer M. Bucceri, Aisha M. B. Holder, Kevin L. Nadal, and Marta Esquilin. "Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice." *American Psychologist* 62, no. 4 (2007): 271-286.

Tait, Sue. "Pornographies of Violence? Internet Spectatorship on Body Horror." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25, no. 1 (2008): 91-111.

Taylor, John. "Iraqi Torture Photographs and Documentary Realism in the Press." *Journalism Studies* 6, no. 1 (2005): 39-49.

—. *Body Horror: Photojournalism, Catastrophe and War*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Terdiman, Richard. "Historicizing Memory." In *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis*, 3-32. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Terrill, Robert E. *Malcolm X: Inventing Radical Judgment*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2004.

Teslow, Tracy Lang. "Reifying Race: Science and Art in *Races of Mankind* at the Field Museum of Natural History." In *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture,* edited by Sharon MacDonald, 53-76. London: Routledge, 1998.

Tonn, Mari Boor. "'From the Eye to the Soul': Industrial Labor's Mary Harris 'Mother'

Jones and the Rhetorics of Display," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (2011):

231-249.

—. "Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8,

no. 3 (2005): 405-430.

Torchin, Leshu. *Creating the Witness: Documenting Genocide on Film, Video, and the

Internet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Totten, Samuel. "To Deem or Not to Deem 'It' Genocide: A Double-Edged Sword." In

The Genocidal Temptation: Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Rwanda, and Beyond, edited

by Robert S. Frey, 41-55. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004.

—. "The Intervention and Prevention of Genocide: Where There *Is* the Political Will,

There Is a Way." In *Century of Genocide: Eyewitness Accounts and Critical

Views*, edited by Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd

ed., 469-490. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Totten, Samuel, and Steven Leonard Jacobs. "Introduction." In *Pioneers of Genocide

Studies*, edited by Samuel Totten and Steven Leonard Jacobs, xi-xvii. New

Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

Totten, Samuel, and William S. Parsons. "Introduction." In *Century of Genocide:

Eyewitness Accounts and Critical Views*, edited by Samuel Totten, William S.

Parsons, and Israel W. Charny, 2nd ed., 1-13. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Tregoning, Will. "Authentic Self, Paranoid Critique and Getting a Good Night's Rest."

Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies 20, no. 2 (2006): 175-188.

Tuchman, Gaye. "Introduction: The Symbolic Annihilation of Women by the Mass Media." In *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media*, edited by Gaye Tuchman, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, and James Benét, 3-38. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

—. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press, 1978.

—. "Objectivity as a Strategic Ritual." *American Journal of Sociology* 77, no. 4 (1972): 660-679.

Turner, Graeme. "Ideology." In *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, 3rd ed., 166-195. London: Routledge, 2003.

Üngör, Uğur Ümit. "Team America: Genocide Prevention?" *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (2011): 32-38.

VanderHaagen, Sara Christine. "'So You Will Always Remember': Creating Public Memories and Inventing Agents in Biographical Texts for Children." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2010. ProQuest (305212871).

Vivian, Bradford. "On the Language of Forgetting." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 1 (2009): 89-104.

—. "'A Timeless Now': Memory and Repetition." In *Framing Public Memory*, edited by Kendall R. Phillips, 187-211. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004.

—. "Times of Violence." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, no. 2 (2013): 209-217.

Voth, Ben, and Aaron Noland. "Argumentation and the International Problem of Genocide." *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 28 (2007): 38-46.

Walker, Janet. "Catastrophe, Representation, and the Vicissitudes of Memory." In
   Trauma Cinema: Documenting Incest and the Holocaust, 3-29. Berkeley:
   University of California Press, 2005.

Waller, James. *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass
   Killing*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford, 2007.

Wander, Philip. "The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism." *Central States Speech
   Journal* 34, no. 1 (1983): 1-18.

White, James Boyd. "Law as Rhetoric, Rhetoric as Law: The Arts of Cultural and
   Communal Life." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 52, no. 3 (1985): 684-
   702.

White, Mimi. "'Reliving the Past Over and Over Again': Race, Gender, and Popular
   Memory in *Homefront* and *I'll Fly Away*." In *Living Color: Race and Television
   in the United States*, edited by Sasha Torres, 118-139. Durham, NC: Duke
   University Press, 1998.

—. *Tele-advising: Therapeutic Discourse in American Television*. Chapel Hill: The
   University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Wiener, Jon. "The Other Holocaust Museum." *Tikkun* 10, no. 3 (1995):
   http://www.tikkun.org/article.php/may1995_wiener

Wiesel, Elie. "Opening Address." In *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an
   Age of Genocide*. Edited by John K. Roth and Elisabeth Maxwell. Vol. 1, *History*,
   8-11. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Williams, Linda. "Film Bodies: Gender, Genre, and Excess." *Film Quarterly* 44, no. 4
   (1991): 2-13.

Williams, Paul. "The Memorial Museum Identity Complex: Victimhood, Culpability, and Responsibility." In *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, edited by Bettina Messias Carbonell, 2nd ed., 97-115. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Willerton, Russell. "Visual Metonymy and Synecdoche: Rhetoric for Stage-Setting Images." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 35, no. 1 (2005): 3-31.

Witcomb, Andrea. "Interactivity in Museums: The Politics of Narrative Style." In *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, edited by Bettina Messias Carbonell, 2nd ed., 580-589. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Wollaston, Isabel. "Negotiating the Marketplace: The Role(s) of Holocaust Museums Today." *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 4, no. 1 (2005): 63-80.

Worthington, David L. "American Exceptionalism and the Shoah: The Case of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum." PhD diss., Indiana University, 2007. ProQuest (304856056).

Wrage, Ernest J. "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33, no. 4 (1947): 451-457.

Young, James E. "America's Holocaust: Memory and the Politics of Identity." In *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, edited by Hilene Flanzbaum, 68-82. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

—. *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

—. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Zelizer, Barbie. *About to Die: How News Images Move the Public.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

—. *Covering the Body: The Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

—. "Introduction: On Visualizing the Holocaust." In *Visual Culture and the Holocaust,* edited by Barbie Zelizer, 1-10. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.

—. "Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12, no. 2 (1995): 211-239.

—. *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

—. "The Voice of the Visual in Memory." In *Framing Public Memory*, edited by Kendall R. Phillips, 157-186. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004.