Maya Angelou observed in her poem *On the Pulse of Morning*, recited at the first Clinton inauguration. Nonetheless, the history of genocide and mass violence is full of patterns that echo through time. Thus, a major conference at the Strassler Center, *E Pluribus Unum? Memory Conflicts, Democracy, and Integration*, gathered leading scholars to compare how nations deal with the traumatic past. Participants focused on mass atrocities related to slavery and Native Genocide in the US context and the Holocaust in post-Nazi Germany. Sadly, the precipitous rise of nationalism, white supremacy, and virulent antisemitism challenge Angelou’s optimism. Our vision is to address these troubling developments by expanding the Strassler Center’s research agenda to reckon with the legacy of racial injustice that is central to the American story.

In addition, our sustained engagement with the particular histories of the Holocaust and the Armenian Genocide continues at the same time as we embrace opportunities to advance research and teaching on genocides in Africa, Asia, and the Americas. By including human rights education, we aim to strengthen knowledge about individual genocides and to provide a theoretical framework that deepens appreciation for similarities and differences. Such an approach offers hope for understanding possible strategies for prevention, steps toward intervention, and insights into promoting democracy and justice in the aftermath of violence. To that end, we seek to establish new areas of research and teaching by growing our faculty.

We are committed to expanding the vision of the Strassler Center in keeping with the universalizing trend that has become essential to the field of Holocaust and Genocide Studies. Yet, in response to the disturbing intensification of violence and incitement against Jews around the globe, we also recognize the need to deepen research on the complex and continuing history of antisemitism. We are anxious to put recent developments into historical context, and to meet the increasing interest of our students regarding these issues. The revival of antisemitism in the US and Europe teaches us that the memory of the Holocaust is not an antidote to hatred and violence. Indeed, the current phenomenon of Holocaust denial or politicization in such places as Hungary, Poland, and Lithuania demonstrate the limits of tolerance and memory. A focus on the long history of European antisemitism as well as contemporary manifestations of Jew hatred would strengthen the graduate training we offer and elevate our research profile in an area for which we are already globally recognized.

“In any free society where terrible wrongs exist, some are guilty - all are responsible,” according to Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel. There is no shortage of historic wrongs to address and in keeping with Rabbi Heschel’s exhortation we hope to deepen knowledge and understanding about some of the most egregious cases. If colleagues in less free societies can face the past, like Professor Ayşe Gül Altinay in Turkey, profiled in the *New York Times* (8 July 2019) for her brave scholarship on the Armenian Genocide, how can we do less? Professor Altinay attended the 2013 Strassler Center conference, *Policy and Practice* and participated on the keynote panel on “History, Politics, and Education.” Her scholarship and courage in the face of government intimidation are an inspiration.

The conference *E Pluribus Unum* highlighted the distinction between memory and history: participants argued that when state sponsored violence remains in the realm of that history cannot be mobilized to advance change. We seek to incorporate human rights and genocide prevention into the Strassler Center program in order to forge dynamic connections between academia, pedagogy, and activism. With your support, we can take responsibility for terrible wrongs and by facing them critically and honestly, we may realize Angelou’s aspiration that “history need not be lived again.”

MARY JANE REIN, PhD
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
THOMAS KÜHNE
STRASSLER PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR
The Rohingya, a Muslim minority in Rakhine State (Myanmar), currently face the fastest growing humanitarian emergency in the world. Professor Ken MacLean organized a panel discussion to broaden understanding of this conflict, with the support of Clark alumni Judith T. ’75 and Lawrence S. MA ’76 Bohn. In addition to the Strassler Center, sponsors included the Asian Studies, Peace Studies, Women’s and Gender Studies, International Development programs; the School of International Development, Community, and Environment; STAND (a student led movement to end mass atrocities); the Political Science Department (Chester Bland Fund); and the Asian Studies Program at the College of the Holy Cross. Rohingya survivor Tun Khin (President, Burmese Rohingya Organization UK), Debbie Stothard (Director, Altseam-Burma and Secretary General, International Federation for Human Rights), Matt Wells (Senior Crisis Advisor, Amnesty International), and John Knaus (Associate Director for Asia, National Endowment for Democracy) provided expert commentary. They examined the historical roots of the crisis, the broader political and military context of the Rohingya’s forced migration to Bangladesh, and steps for ensuring the fundamental rights of Rohingya refugees and Burma/Myanmar’s Rohingya community.

The discussion dispelled the common misperception that violence against Myanmar’s Rohingya minority began in the 21st century. On the contrary, the country’s Buddhist nationalist majority has persecuted the Rohingya since the 1950s, they have imposed forced deportations since the 1970s, and they continue to deny them citizenship under legislation enacted in 1982. The Rohingya have been stateless for decades, with devastating consequences—mobility is nearly impossible for more than half a million refugees currently living in refugee camps in Bangladesh, Rohingya children have little access to health services or hope of an education, and Rohingya of all ages have no recourse to government protection. Instead, they face state-organized mass violence at the hands of the nation’s military under the banner of Buddhist nationalism, culminating in the burning of their villages, rape and murder, and forced removal from their homes in Rakhine State.

Under the cover of a developing democracy, the National League of Democracy party and its de facto leader Aung San Suu Kyi authorize mass violence on the pretext of responding to Rohingya “threats.” The government intentionally employs hate speech and incitement to bolster the perception of this threat, while compounding the community’s powerlessness through enforcement of anti-miscegenation laws, denial of citizenship, and support for the military’s physical destruction of the population. Together, the military and the government are not simply murdering Rohingya individuals; they are destroying their community, their identity, and their way of life. The UN might call the plight faced by the Rohingya a “textbook example of ethnic cleansing,” but, as survivor-activist Tun Khin poignantly demonstrated, this is actually the face of genocide.

The participants emphasized that any proposed solution to the conflict must involve the restoration of citizenship rights. Forced repatriation by the UN is not an adequate response. Without citizenship, Rohingya existence is constantly at risk in Rakhine State. The international community should demand justice and accountability for the crimes committed by the military against the Rohingya and other minority groups. International governmental and private organizations also need to pay attention to the economic factors that fuel the violence, and they should consider whether to maintain economic development projects with the Myanmar government. They should also ascertain how to collaborate with the Rohingya and other minority groups in the region to empower them and promote the formation of alliances between minority groups instead of the damaging competition encouraged by the rhetoric and policy of the government. These proposed actions, alone, will not end the violence unless citizenship is available to the million-plus Rohingya who remain stateless under the law of their homeland, whether living as refugees or within Myanmar’s borders.

The panelists called the audience to action. They suggested that concerned individuals should pressure international institutions involved in the economic development of the region to act with concern for this vital process.

Alexandra Kramen
Steve Ross, a child survivor of ten concentration camps, channeled the hardships he experienced during the Holocaust into his career working on behalf of disadvantaged youth in Boston. Introduced to Ross’s compelling story, journalist Roger Lyons devoted himself to making a documentary about him, Etched in Glass: The Legacy of Steve Ross. Clark University President David Angel invited Michael Ross ’93, a lawyer and former Boston City Councilman, to comment on his father’s incredible story at a screening. The Strassler Center showed the film in collaboration with the Anti-Defamation League, the Worcester Jewish Community Center, the Jewish Federation of Central Massachusetts, and Clark University Hillel.

The film follows Ross’s life, the youngest of six children in Łódź, Poland, beginning with the German invasion in September 1939. Realizing they could not escape the Nazis, his parents saved him by leaving him with Polish farmers. Complete strangers, they nonetheless sheltered him but, fearful for their own lives, they eventually turned him away. Captured by the Nazis, Ross was subject to brutal assaults and medical experiments. Yet, through a combination of luck and intuition, he escaped from the lines of prisoners heading toward death. Ross recalled hiding in a frozen latrine in one camp and riding underneath a train to escape from another. Unfortunately, the train drove directly to Dachau, where Ross spent another year before liberation. By war’s end, only Ross and one brother had survived.

During Dachau’s liberation, Ross encountered an American soldier riding a tank. To his surprise, the soldier jumped down, hugged him, and gave him his rations and a small American flag. This stranger’s kindness restored his faith in humanity. An orphan and illiterate, Ross immigrated to America and taught himself to read and write in order to complete his schooling. Following service in the Korean War, he attended Goddard College on the GI Bill and earned an MA in psychology from Boston University. Throughout his life, Ross searched for the soldier who had consoled him. He submitted his liberation story to the television program Unsolved Mysteries, hoping to discover him. The daughter of Lieutenant Steve Sattler recognized her father’s story of embracing an emaciated child outside of Dachau. The 67-year long search ended on Veteran’s Day 2012; although Sattler had passed away, Ross met his family at a tearful reunion in the Boston Statehouse.

For over forty years, Ross counseled at-risk youth in Boston, inspiring many young men to pursue higher education. He visited countless Boston area schools dressed in a striped shirt and cap like those he wore in the Nazi camps. Ross used these speaking engagements to inspire young people to stand up against prejudice and bigotry. As the driving force behind the creation of the New England Holocaust Memorial on Boston’s Freedom Trail, Ross was instrumental in establishing a monument to commemorate and mourn the victims. The memorial, consisting of six glass towers etched with prisoner numbers, symbolizes the six Nazi death camps and the six million victims of the Holocaust. Steam travels up the towers and surrounds visitors as they walk through the memorial, alluding to the camps’ crematoria. Sadly, on two occasions in 2017, vandals damaged the memorial during a period of heightened antisemitism and race hate. These events furnished the title of Ross’ memoir, From Broken Glass: My Story of Finding Hope in Hitler’s Death Camps to Inspire a New Generation (2018).

Michael Ross left the audience with a message of hope as he recalled the damage to the memorial that occurred in the wake of the white supremacist rally in Charlottesville, VA where antisemitic marchers shouted, “Jews will not replace us.” Eager to see people’s humanity, Michael’s father consoled him that, although vandals shattered the glass, two strangers intervened because it was the right thing to do.

Ellen Johnson
18 OCTOBER 2018

The Upstander Project, an organization that raises awareness through unique documentaries that challenge indifference to injustice, visited Clark to screen their newest film, *Dawnland*. Presented as an Especially for Students event, the film and associated talk focused on the harmful legacy of European colonialism on Native Peoples. Past injustices continue to have harmful consequences that have endured until today. After creating a successful documentary on the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda, Mishy Lesser, Learning Director of the Upstander Project, “began to feel morally uncomfortable teaching about a faraway place” in light of her recognition that she inhabits stolen land. With this moral discomfort, Lesser and the Upstander team created *Dawnland*, a documentary that highlights the work of the Maine “truth and reconciliation commission,” which worked tirelessly to uncover the truth about the devastating impact of the state’s child welfare practices on Native Families. The Strassler Center and the Center for Gender, Race, and Area Studies hosted this important screening with several co-sponsors: the Higgins School of Humanities, and the Departments of Sociology, History, English, and Political Science (Chester Bland Fund).

As the film explains, the United States has a shameful history of forcibly taking Native Children from their homes. Officials systematically forced them into boarding schools or placed them with white families in order to “kill the savage to save the man.” The practice of separating families in order to suppress Native culture came out of the genocide of First Peoples and continued well into the 20th century. The number of Native Children in boarding schools doubled in the 1960s and as recently as the 1970s, about a quarter of all Native Children were living apart from their families. With this disturbing history as the backdrop, *Dawnland* recounts the creation of the Maine truth and reconciliation commission—the first of its kind in the United States—that sought to collect testimonies from the Wabanaki peoples in Maine regarding their experiences with the child welfare system. *Dawnland* documents the many challenges that arose through the truth and reconciliation process. Native Peoples found it difficult to discuss their painful experiences as children who spent much of their lives in the foster care system or as parents of children taken away. Moreover, the film explores the struggles and disagreements that arose over the role that non-native peoples played within the commission. The emotional impact of the film was palpable as it dealt unflinchingly with the hurdles faced by those participating in the commission. The filmmakers chose to include raw and unedited moments.

Ultimately, the commission succeeded in collecting 153 testimonies of Wabanaki men, women, and children impacted by the child welfare system. Wabanaki, which means “peoples of the first light” or “People of the Dawnland,” is a confederacy of five different nations largely located in present-day Maine. Their stories reflect the experiences of Native Peoples from tribes across the United States; they leave the viewer with the devastating impression that little has changed regarding the treatment of Indigenous Peoples. *Dawnland* reminds viewers that Native Peoples are not simply historical figures confined to the pages of history books. The film highlights the experience in the 21st century and poignantly asks the viewer to reflect critically on how they can make a difference. Lesser concluded the program with a powerful question: “how can we, the non-Native peoples in the audience, transform from occupiers to neighbors?”

*Casey Bush ’19*
Two distinguished scholars of the Armenian Genocide opened the conference, *The Abdul Hamid Era and Beyond: Massacres and Reform, Rupture and Continuity*. Ronald Suny (University of Michigan) and Stephan Astourian (University of California, Berkeley) discussed whether violence in the Ottoman Empire was continuous from the Hamidian era to the Armenian genocide, and into the Republic of Turkey. NAASR (National Association for Armenian Studies and Research), the Knights of Vartan, and the Friends of the Kaloosdian Mugar Chair generously co-sponsored the panel and two-day conference.

In his paper, “Exemplary Repression or Genocide? The Hamidian Massacres,” Suny proposed a typology of violence: exemplary, excisionary, and residual. In exemplary violence, regimes use terror to coerce victims. State-induced actors seek to eliminate certain groups using excisionary violence. Residual violence inflicts harm against victims not originally targeted, but severely impacted by collateral damage. According to Suny, liberal use of the term genocide in the case of mass killings dilutes its potency. He argued that the Hamidian era mass killings of the 1890s were exemplary, the result of locally organized, spontaneous episodes. The violence evolved as the Ottoman Empire lost territory and justified mass killings as a policy necessary to preserve the empire. Many Armenians defected to Russia and mobilization of the population incited regional massacres against Armenians. The anti-Armenian mentality demonstrated insecurity about the deterioration of Ottoman culture. European involvement further complicated matters. Impunity for Hamidian era perpetrators showed European disregard for domestic Ottoman affairs, which encouraged the Young Turks’ confidence in pursuing their genocidal plans.

In his paper, “From the Hamidian Era to the Young Turks: Reflections on Issues of Continuity and Discontinuity,” Astourian discussed genocide as a process and emphasized that long-term violence foreshadowed genocide. Employing a chronological approach, he highlighted agrarian issues, failed Ottoman policies the aftermath of the Russo-Turkish war (1877), and sporadic violence between Armenians and Muslims, as well as Turks and Kurds. Following the Russo-Turkish war, Kurdish migration southward, confiscation of Armenian land, and imposition of double taxation laws contributed to the anti-Armenian violence, beginning in the 1880s. The failure of the Tanzimat reforms emphasized Muslim superiority and marginalized Armenians. Religious differences, massive prejudice and racism, and politicized rightist and leftist ideologies incited animosity. The rise of Armenian revolutionary parties, in response to the lack of rights and constant local abuse, became a direct threat to the regime. While no serious Armenian insurrection was imminent, given the failure of Armenian revolutionaries to produce collective action, the establishment of these political parties fueled paranoia about Armenian aspirations to establish their own nation-state, as had recently occurred in the Balkans. Denying Armenian rights, Astourian argued, showed the failure of the social contract. With the transition from empire to nation-state, Mustafa Kemal preserved Turkey as a nation exclusive to the Turkish people, an ideology that continued throughout the twentieth century and up to the present. The Hamidian massacres shaped Turkish attitudes towards violence and sanctioned its use in both the Islamification and nation-building processes. Turkish Islamic synthesis transcended politics. The institutionalization, religious justification (even in a secular society), and state politicization of structural violence validated the mass killings and furnished impunity for the perpetrators.

The Hamidian massacres were a stage in the genocidal process carried out by the Ottomans. In that vein, the panelists emphasized the process of Turkish nationalism, which marginalized religious and ethnic minorities and left them susceptible to mistreatment. The European emphasis on reform as well as conspiracies regarding an Armenian alliance with Russia left European states reticent to react with force. These factors incited the Ottoman population to participate in violent mechanisms, during the Hamidian era, and eventually contributed to the Armenian genocide. While Sultan Abdul Hamid had not formulated the intention to annihilate the Armenians, there was an organized effort at the local level to restore order and preserve empire. This translated to Islamizing the population to secure territory, a tactic that the Committee of Union and Progress adopted in 1915. Mass killing became a conservative policy to influence Ottoman demography. The Republic of Turkey, shaped by these experiences, established itself on a foundation of violence.

*Ani Garabed Ohanian*
Collecting and analyzing survivor and witness testimony is critically important for the writing and interpretation of Holocaust history. In her lecture examining how language and place shape memory, Hannah Pollin-Galay, who holds the Naomi Foundation Professorship at Tel Aviv University, highlighted her efforts to rethink how historians assemble, measure and integrate survivor testimony. In her research on testimonies, she noticed that, rather than allowing survivors space to construct their own narratives, interviewers often impose their own narrative ideas onto their subjects. Observing this pattern as a common feature of Holocaust testimonies, Pollin-Galay was motivated to explore this problem further and to challenge the standard assumptions regarding traditional assessment and interpretation of Holocaust testimonies.

Presenting a case study from her research, Pollin-Galay discussed her theories regarding the various ‘ecologies of witnessing’—developed in her recent book, *Ecologies of Witnessing: Language, Place, and Holocaust Testimony* (2018)—and illustrated her central argument that the post-war environment as well as the language in which one testifies shape the narrative. At the start of her lecture, Pollin-Galay challenged the notion—put forth by many contemporary institutions—that the Holocaust should be presented in a way that is ‘easy to digest.’ Using the example of “Daniel’s Story,” the popular exhibition housed at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C., she argued that introducing the Holocaust through ‘digestible’ family narratives reflects an American particularistic ecology that is not universally translatable nor necessarily reflective of other contextual ecologies.

Pollin-Galay compared the testimonies of three Lithuanian Jewish survivors. Although they endured similar events during the Holocaust, they presented their experiences through different contexts and used different vocabulary when testifying in Yiddish, English and Hebrew. Incorporating photographs and videos into the presentation, Pollin-Galay masterfully elucidated key differences that underlie the content and language of these accounts. For instance, she analyzed how the survivors described familial relationships during the Holocaust to demonstrate how their specific ecologies may have impacted the narration of their experiences. Juxtaposing the English and Yiddish testimonies, Pollin-Galay pointed out how the survivors describe family relationships in accordance with their American-English and Lithuanian-Yiddish contexts. In the English language testimony of “Suzanne H.” familial love is perceived through intimate family settings and a keen focus on personal relationships and individual losses. In contrast, the Yiddish testimony of Lithuania-based “Doba Rozenberg” emphasized the broader context of one’s inclusion within a collective community based on geographic matrices and broad familial relations. The comparison shows how a distinct narrative ecology, based on geographic, social, and linguistic context, emerges.

Nuances can be lost through translation. In her conclusion, Pollin-Galay surmised that sensitivity to language can lead scholars to new factorial discoveries that can better inform research. These findings can potentially lead to important implications for understanding and writing Holocaust history. Too, she stressed the importance of ‘untranslation’—the process of deconstructing Holocaust narratives that have been shaped to fit within specific normative social contexts that perpetuate a particularistic historical discourse—and the need for scholars to engage thoughtfully with testimonies and develop a thorough understanding of their ecologies when analyzing and writing history.

Pollin-Galay’s visit to the Strassler Center concluded with a productive workshop for the doctoral students in which she provided feedback on their dissertation topics and research methodologies. She curated constructive responses for each student as well as suggestions for improvement. This was an especially worthwhile exercise and allowed the students a unique opportunity to seek guidance and advice from a preeminent scholar and expert in the field of oral narrative and testimony—critical mediums of research and study for every scholar of Holocaust and Genocide Studies.
The Austrian musician Anton Bruckner composed musically avant garde, even modernist, symphonies during his lifetime (1824-1896). So why did the Nazis, typically tradition bound in their aesthetic preferences, co-opt his music for their political ends? Clark University Music Professor Benjamin Korstvedt addressed that fascinating contradiction in a talk given as part of the Especially for Students lecture series at the Strassler Center. Beginning in the 1930’s, the Third Reich appropriated Bruckner’s music as an exemplar of the German classical heritage in the tradition of Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms. During the Nazi period, his music introduced the Nuremberg rallies, routinely played on radio broadcasts, was performed in government festivals, and was the subject of frequent articles in the popular press, and in scholarly publications.

Seeking to avert an imagined spiritual decline, the Nazis promoted traditional classical music while denouncing innovative musical styles that had emerged in the early 20th century. As with the visual arts, Nazi musical tastes favored conservative and conventional forms, in contrast to modernist work they derided as “decadent,” “degenerate,” or “Bolshevist,” terms tinged with antisemitism. What made Bruckner appealing was the monumentality of his music, which suited Nazi aesthetics as well as the perception that he was part of a German musical legacy that embodied national greatness. His origins in upper Austria, the region of Hitler’s birthplace, conveniently underscored Nazi claims about a cultural “bridge” between the German Reich and Austria. And propagandists characterized him using blood and soil terminology. At the same time, Nazi ideology ignored details about the composer that did not fit their narrative. Thus, the fact that he was not German and never embraced anti-Jewish views, as did Richard Wagner and his descendants, was overlooked. In actuality, during his lifetime, Bruckner enjoyed close relationships with Jewish friends, including his student Gustave Mahler and his “artistic father” the conductor Hermann Levi.

Korstvedt described how the Nazi regime instrumentalized the image of Bruckner. Their fascination and campaign of exploitation culminated with a June 1937 festival devoted to his music in Regensburg. On that occasion, officials unveiled a bust of Bruckner on a pedestal emblazoned with a swastika in Walhalla, the fantasy temple to German culture and history in Bavaria. During the ceremony, Hitler laid a wreath at the base of the pedestal and Joseph Goebbels extolled Bruckner as a “son of the Austrian soil...that unites the entire German people.” This event was part of a prelude to the Anschluss in March 1938 that annexed Austria to Greater Germany.

In this highly politicized setting, scholarly debates about different versions and editions of Bruckner’s music were hardly academic. These disputes fit into the Nazi’s ideological embrace of German cultural forms which they aimed to free from Judaizing and modern influence. Here, Korstvedt highlighted the work of Robert Haas, a committed Austrian Nazi and music scholar, who praised Bruckner’s music for its pure German essence. Espousing flagrantly antisemitic language, Haas asserted that a cadre of former pupils, friends, and the composer’s music publisher, all Jewish, deceptively doctored the text of Bruckner’s compositions. Haas was committed to producing a critical edition that would restore the oeuvre to its supposedly original form. At the Regensburg festival, Goebbels pledged state financial support to the Bruckner Society, under Haas’ leadership, to publish an officially approved edition that would carry Hitler’s imprimatur. The Nazi investment in Bruckner proved long lasting and his work carried this taint for decades.

Authoritarian regimes, Korsvedt explained, take music more seriously than democratic governments. The case of Bruckner demonstrates how aesthetic symbols can be put in service to totalitarian ideologies. Laying bare the Nazi exploitation of Bruckner, Professor Korstvedt shows the power of music as an emotional force whose meaning can be subordinated to the state. Music turns out to be another important avenue for understanding genocide and underscores the significance of interdisciplinary research and teaching at the Strassler Center.

Mary Jane Rein
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Postwar nostalgia for the pre-Nazi Jewish presence in Vienna, helped create distance between Austrians and Nazi Germany. Austrians used representations of Jewish art to redefine and rebuild their identity and culture after the war yet almost half the Austrian population did not want Jews to return. Frances Tanzer, a Visiting Assistant Professor at the Strassler Center, presented a public lecture on this process through the lens of modern art and representations of Jewish absence. Tanzer, who earned a PhD from Brown University in 2018 and also works as a practicing artist, researches Jewish history, art, nationalism, and cultural identities in Central Europe during the 20th century.

Tanzer linked the prewar history of Vienna as the epicenter of modernity, art, and Jewish life in Central Europe to the postwar reconstruction of Austrian cultural identity. The Jewish presence in the city had been constitutive before 1938. Ninety percent of Austrian Jewry, which totaled 191,000 persons in 1934, lived in Vienna, constituting ten percent of the city’s inhabitants. The community was diverse in social class and professional background. Tanzer highlighted the connection between Jews and urban modernity in Vienna. Representations of Jews, “Jewishness” and modernity were entangled in the understanding of the art of Jews and non-Jews alike. After the Anschluss however, a process of cultural translation occurred in which exhibitions of Viennese modern art, galleries, film, and literature were redefined along National Socialist lines. The physical removal of Jews through forced emigration and deportations to ghettos and concentration camps accompanied the erasure of Jewish representations in art.

Tanzer showed how Jews also influenced the postwar cultural landscape, albeit in an ironic way. As Jewish presence had shaped Austrian and Viennese culture before 1938, Jewish absence became intrinsic after 1945. Although antisemitism remained pervasive in politics and society, the Austrian attitude towards Jews was more complex than outright rejection. A fascination with Jews and “Jewishness” still depended on stereotypes of Jews and modern culture. This nostalgia for the pre-Nazi Jewish presence was future oriented as it drew on the past in order to reimagine Austria and its place in Europe and the world. By 1945, Vienna had transformed from a central, modern, and cosmopolitan capital of Europe into a provincial outpost. While the Holocaust made Vienna the capital of Jewish absence, postwar Austrians reintegrated Jewish culture, art, and absence. Representations of Jewish absence functioned as a way for Austrians to connect to their culture and their identity. The departure of Jews had deprived them of their “genuine” Austrian self; nonetheless, they had little desire for Jews to return.

Art was key to the process of cultural reorientation. Tanzer analyzed how politicians, officials, and dealers exploited the art of Gustav Klimt, Egon Schiele, and Oskar Kokoschka to present a continuous cultural identity that would distance the Austrians from the Nazis. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Klimt, Schiele, and Kokoschka were associated with modernity and Jewishness in Austrian culture, although none was actually Jewish. Rather, they were coded Jewish due to their alleged representation of Jewish taste and because they had Jewish patrons. In order to celebrate Klimt and Schiele, the Nazis erased their perceived Jewish connections.

Tanzer argued that the Austrians built upon the Nazification of these artists and “Austrianized” them. They created a victim narrative for Klimt and Schiele, which falsely claimed their work had not been shown since 1938. Postwar exhibitions promised a reconnection to Austrian identity and to a Viennese modernism unrelated to the Nazi past. In the 1960s as a part of this effort, the recently established Second Republic reclaimed Kokoschka as an exemplar of invisible philosemitism and in celebration of modernism. Art dealers played a central role in promoting these ideas as they exhibited and sold the art of Kokoschka, Schiele, and Klimt.

Representations of Jewish absence helped to restore Viennese modernism and offered a critical framework to the discourse on postwar identity. Ironically, the effort to normalize Jewish presence and absence redefined the post-Nazi national identity for a homogeneous population. Tanzer concluded that we can still observe representations of Jewish absence today as they remain embedded in Austria’s cultural code.
Placing memories of the Holocaust into a comparative framework with memories of slavery and violence against American Indians, crimes at the heart of America’s founding, was the subject of the conference, *E Pluribus Unum? Memory Conflicts, Democracy, and Integration*. Participants examined whether it is possible for the United States to deal constructively with its racist and even genocidal past, as post-Nazi Germany has largely done regarding the Holocaust. Collective memory can be a tool for building national identity and promoting integration but it can also serve the opposite end. Given the recent intensification of harmful rhetoric and violence based on white supremacy in the US and elsewhere around the globe, it is clear that we have not come to terms with the legacies of mass violence and racism. In fact, nostalgia for the past has fueled memory conflicts and threatened democratic values.

In the keynote address, *Bad Memories*, Ian Buruma (Bard College) examined the negative effects of recalling only victimhood or triumph. Some nations glorify heroic resistance against tyranny, as in the Dutch struggle against Spanish tyranny often conflated with the Dutch resistance to Nazi occupation. Other nations celebrate national martyrdom that fosters a desire for revenge, such as the 14th century Battle of Kosovo that led to Serbian atrocities in the Balkan Wars. Moving to memories of World War II in Germany and Japan, Buruma advocated facing historical truths in order to understand contemporary politics. In his view, when suffering becomes the core of identity, it can function like a religious sensibility that resists honest examination. Historians should avoid writing history from the perspective of a particular culture in order to escape the noxious bias of nationalism. Legitimate remembrance of suffering differs from dangerous remembering rooted in a sense of collective victimhood, which can be a powerful source of political mobilization.

Thomas Kühne (Clark University), the academic organizer, examined memory politics in terms of national identity, citing Lincoln’s first inaugural address that appealed to the “mystic chords of memory” to avert the Civil War. Following the Civil War, competing ideas about the conflict gave way to a rigid hegemonic structure that fostered white supremacy at the expense of mechanisms to establish peace and justice. A century later, the rise of the Civil Rights movement introduced counter narratives challenging a single collective memory that effectively whitewashed history. The rise of the conservative movement in the 80s and 90s and the legacy of the Vietnam War prompted renewed fascination with Civil War symbols, including the rebel flag and confederate monuments, that continue to polarize American society. By contrast, post-war Germany confronted Nazism and took responsibility for the crimes committed. Despite some continuities with the Nazi past, a negative memory culture emerged that entailed a deliberate break. Driven by shame and a desire to return to the community of nations, Germany embraced pacifism and refused to heroize the past. Today, Germany’s negative memory culture serves as model for a common European approach to Holocaust memory.

Panel I, *Collective Identity and Memory Politics in the United States*, began with John Bodnar (Indiana University) who defined patriotism in response to America’s War on Terror. War-based patriotism, rooted in an authoritarian view of an all good, all powerful nation, rekindled nativism and led to racist violence following 9/11; while empathic patriotism is able to offer critical views of state sponsored violence. These divergent expressions of patriotism challenge efforts to construct a uniform national identity and frame ideas about what it means to be a devoted citizen in a time of conflict. Phia Salter (Texas A&M University) kept the focus on the US context with a discussion that examined how schools use Black History Month to
respond to racist concepts and to affirm black youth through stories highlighting black accomplishment. Yet, she cautioned against celebrating individual success at the expense of recognizing the structures of injustice that remain intact. Citing her ethnographic study of a highly segregated Kansas City school that measured responses to representations of black history, she concluded that broad support for racial justice can only succeed when it aligns with white America.

Irene Kacandes (Dartmouth College) explored victimhood on the panel German Memories, American Memories. Victim status, she explained, secures sympathy in a victim saturated world but also provokes counterclaims of victimization. Drawing on personal observations and informed by her scholarship on trauma and memory, she questioned who is allowed to be a victim. Reversals in victimization include Germans who became targets of the Allied Air War, Europeans who consider themselves victims of the current refugee crisis, and white males who feel penalized by diversity politics in the US. Kacandes introduced the concept of “co-witnessing,” which allows real victims to keep their identity but gives space for allies. Continuing the comparative framework, Jeffrey Herf (University of Maryland) contrasted the US response to its violent past after the Civil War with Germany’s approach following the Holocaust. Referencing the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, he posited that the key to reconciling conflict has typically been to forget. The US obeyed western norms by withdrawing the Federal Army from the south and ignoring the development of the Ku Klux Klan. In contrast, Germany’s total defeat allowed the allies to bring many Nazis to trial at Nuremberg. After that, no West German politician could overlook the enormity of the Holocaust, a reckoning with the past that extended to German sympathy for Israel.

Dirk Moses (University of Sydney) examined the supposed threat of “white genocide” as understood by the far right in Europe and settler colonial nations including the US, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Citing white power propaganda on the Internet, he described the inversion of reality that mobilizes white rage. Pithy statements, such as “we have the right to preserve our ethnocultural identity,” capture the white power movement’s response to the ideology of diversity. Globalization, deindustrialization, ethnic competition, and multiculturalism fuel far right anxieties about maintaining a white demographic majority. Jennifer Evans (Carleton University) explained how social media and online conversations serve as repositories of cultural memory. Describing technology’s “black box effect,” she demonstrated how historians might harness the digital footprint and rich demographic data that users willingly provide for archival research. Digital content offers a window into how past trau-
mas shape the present. Her social media analysis further showed how memories of mass violence can be weaponized. Yet, while highlighting the ethical challenges to monitoring user data, she cautioned that the more we clamp down, the harder it will be to access information.

Opening the panel *Trauma, Identity, and Reconciliation*, Johanna Vollhardt (Clark University) spelled out the psychological motivations underlying collective identities and how they shape different construals of the same events. Vollhardt identified five dimensions that prompt disagreement: who is the victim; who is responsible; perpetrator intent; severity of harm; and timeline of the violence. She showed how responses to past events play out differently between high power perpetrator groups seeking to avoid responsibility and low power victim groups seeking acknowledgement. The former is typically less willing to recognize harms, while the latter tends toward pro-social behavior in supporting other victims. Ron Eyerman (Yale University) analyzed group formation in making white American identity. Drawing on social theories of trauma and his research on social movements, he described the mechanisms behind the white supremacy revival. Public symbols from the traumatic past, such as the Lee statue in Charleston, serve as sites of public memory that embody deeply felt emotions and become sites of mass mobilization. Threats to remove the statue provoked a massive alt right protest, which became a performative act that strengthened the original protest group, incited a counter group, and served to recruit the wider public to the movement.

Ousmane Power-Greene (Clark University) also looked at social and political movements in his discussion of reparations for victims of the Red Summer of 1919. The racial pogrom against the African American community in East St. Louis, Illinois resulted in more than 500 deaths that shocked the nation. While President Wilson resisted calls for a federal investigation, violence against black communities unfolded across the nation. The movement to secure financial reparations has historically focused on slavery but Power-Greene advocated for compensation to repair the intergenerational consequences of the devastating race riots of 1919 and to redress the material conditions of black people living in those cities today. Pauline Wakeham (Western University) addressed the imperative to reckon with the Indian Residential School System in Canada. In 2015, Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) concluded its inquiry into the century long practice of forcible separation and aggressive assimilation of Indigenous children. A key mechanism of transitional justice, the TRC process aims to transition nations to liberal democracy once an unjust system ends. Yet, in Canada, the structural injustice of white settler colonialism persists on land expropriated from Indigenous Nations. Moreover, the politics of post-truth North America coincide with settler denialism in ways that seek to recuperate Canada’s image as a tolerant multicultural democracy.

Museums as a form of repair informed panel IV, *Museums, Memorials, and National Imagination*. Paul Chaat Smith (National Museum of the American Indian), a member of the Comanche tribe, asserted that widespread Native imagery shapes American consciousness in profound ways. It is acceptable to love imaginary Indians, he argued, because genuine Indians are mostly invisible to the American public. In creating an exhibition at NMAI, he leveraged nostalgia to create an emotional connection. While many activists and scholars reject this approach as hate speech, Smith used levity to address the crime at the heart of the American project without excusing the brutal truth that the US exists because of the massive displacement of Indian Nations. Robyn Autry (Wesleyan University) interrogated museums as sites for making collective sense of the nation and its painful past. Her research into the politics of museum development shows how US history museums represent racial violence, especially the treatment of slavery and the black American experience, as part of a unifying national narrative. These museums are sites of memory but they are also institutions that must sustain themselves and so they cast difficult history into neat narratives. In contrast, artists who refuse collective memory, recast traumatic events in their work and complicate the idea of a uniform version of the past.

Marita Sturken (New York University) shifted to memorials that commemorate victims of terrorism, focusing on the National September 11 Memorial (New York City) and the National Memorial for Peace and Justice (Montgomery, Alabama). Both emerged in the early 21st century, and despite radically different origins, employ a vocabulary of modernism to tell stories about America. One uses memory to affirm the nation, the other demonstrates that terrorism was at the heart of the nation’s story despite the myth of American exceptionalism. But they both draw on minimalism, which is devoid of emotion and artistic expression, in service to commemoration and mourning. Alison Landsberg (George Mason University) continued discussion of the Legacy Museum and the National Memorial for Peace and Justice already nationally acclaimed since its spring 2018 opening. While historians have written powerful accounts of slavery, terror lynchings, the Jim Crow era, segregation, and mass incarceration, they have not changed the national narrative or advanced social justice around race. Bryan Stevenson, founder of the Equal Justice Initiative, which established the Montgomery memorial, recognized that this failure of national memory abets the crisis of mass incarceration. Unlike other nations that have endured inhumanity and cruelty on a massive scale, the US has been disinclined to confront its violent past
through public memorials and memorial museums. Drawing a distinction between memory and history, Landsberg argued that as long as state sponsored violence remains in the realm of history, it cannot be mobilized to advance political change.

Meditating on loss, absence, and regeneration as themes that have informed Holocaust memorials, James Young (University of Massachusetts) reflected on whether the negative forms of the 9/11 Memorial qualify it as another Holocaust monument. Highlighting Maya Lin’s Vietnam Veteran’s memorial as a paradigmatic example of the counter memorial, Young described her use of minimalism to formalize loss. Her design, indebted to WW I and II memorials, opened a wound in the landscape to create space for memory. Rejecting the idea of repair, her black horizontal design gives expression to unresolved emotions about the war and contrasts with conventional monuments built in soaring white marble. Subsequent Holocaust monuments follow Lin’s abstract approach to counter memorialization. The fraught process for selecting a design for the Berlin Denkmal asked how to remember and reunite Germany on the bedrock of a national crime. In the end, the memorial’s waving field of stelae lacks historical logic but the museum, located below, anchors the memorial in the specific history of the Holocaust. This interplay between museum and minimalist architecture became the model for the 9/11 memorial, with its monumental footprints articulating absence.

*E Pluribus Unum* called on participants to consider whether remembering state sponsored violence contributes toward unitifying national identity or whether it deepens divisions. The complicated tension between memory and history raised important debates about the traumatic past focused on victimhood, identity formation, national shame, truth and reconciliation, collective memory, individual trauma, repair, memorialization, and national narratives. While the papers did not reach consensus, the presenters acknowledged generative threads that might shape future research and modes for thinking about conflicted history. Massive crimes, if confined to the category of history, are resistant to change in the present. In contrast, a vibrant memory culture calls on citizens to challenge consensus narratives, to question structural injustice, to intervene in present-day genocides. Monuments and museums are not substitutes for action. Yet, the National Memorial for Peace and Justice, a tour de force in memory, asks visitors to “co-witness” historical violence and to render the past alive. Redemption is possible if memory is put in service to history with the aim of advancing justice in the present.

*Mary Jane Rein*
December 2018 marked the culmination of a significant initiative for Taner Akçam and his international team of researchers, translators, and doctoral students, as they launched the Krikor Guergerian archive online. Under Akçam’s direction, the project began by scanning thousands of pages that the Armenian Catholic priest Krikor Guergerian assembled that document the planning and execution of the Armenian Genocide. A survivor of the atrocities, Guergerian travelled the globe collecting documentation, which he left to his nephew Dr. Edmund Guergerian. Akçam gained access to these materials in 2015 and oversaw the multi-year project to scan, classify, transcribe, translate, and index the materials written in Ottoman Turkish, Armenian, French, and English. The fruit of this undertaking is a digital repository that is finally accessible to researchers, students, and the global public.

Incriminating materials from the archive are at the heart of Akçam’s 2018 book, Killing Orders: Talat Pasha’s Telegrams and the Armenian Genocide, first published in Turkish in 2016. Among other findings, he authenticates coded telegrams found in the archive, which the interior minister Talat Pasha sent and that contain orders to kill Armenians. A laudatory review by historian Mark Mazower in the prestigious New York Review of Books (April 2019) praises Akçam for his forensic work proving the authenticity of these primary source documents. Moreover, Mazower highlights a major argument of the book, “What Killing Orders makes quite clear is the central involvement of the Interior Ministry and its head, Talat Pasha, in initiating and monitoring vast movements of civilians across empire, setting guidelines for their treatment, and—perhaps most important of all—making the personnel decisions that ensured trustworthy figures were in the right place at the right time.”

Akçam has characterized his findings as “an earthquake in Armenian Genocide studies.” Eager to bring this research to an international audience, he welcomes translations of Killing Orders that have begun to appear in Armenian, Arabic, French, German, Greek, Italian, Russian, Persian and Spanish. In addition, during a spring 2019 sabbatical, Akçam traveled extensively to lecture and promote his book. In addition to major American cities, he visited Armenia, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, Lebanon, New Zealand, and Sweden.

The respite from teaching also provided time for Akçam to complete an article that substantially advances scholarship. He published important research on the formation of the Ottoman government’s genocidal plans against the Armenian population in the July issue of the Journal of Genocide Research. In “When was the Decision to Annihilate the Armenians Taken?” Akçam challenges the conventional wisdom that the genocide began in Istanbul with a purge of intellectuals in April 2015. Telegrams discovered in the Ottoman archives demonstrate that the genocide actually started in the provinces of Van and Bitlis as early as December 2014. Communication between Istanbul and the provinces shows that decisions taken at the regional level were sanctioned by the central government and informed policies that Istanbul adopted and expanded. These discoveries captured wide media attention and were the subject of coverage on television, radio, and in print publications.

Akçam, who holds the Robert Aram and Marianne Kaloosdian and Stephen and Marian Mugar Endowed Chair of Armenian Genocide Studies, has made the Strassler Center a preeminent venue for Armenian Genocide scholarship by convening important scholarly discussions and training young scholars. In fall 2018, he organized a panel discussion, The Abdul Hamid Era and Beyond: Massacres and Reform, Rupture and Continuity, which examined the question of continuity and asked whether the Hamidian massacres were a phase of the genocide (page 5). Throughout the year, Akçam also contributed important opinion pieces to the Turkish press elucidating current issues often with reference to historic events. Facing the past honestly by coming to terms with history underlies the extraordinary scholarship and tireless research that have made Akçam an internationally respected scholar, teacher, and public intellectual.

Mary Jane Rein
Strassler Professor of Holocaust History Thomas Kühne devoted the 2018-19 academic year to initiatives that strengthen the scholarly profile of the Strassler Center, which he directs. An expert on Nazi perpetrators and bystanders, he is renowned for his seminal scholarship on comradeship and male bonding. Thus, he served as the guest editor for a special issue of the journal *Central European History* examining how different conceptions of masculinity have motivated perpetrators, bystanders, and victims of the Holocaust.

In his academic work, Kühne remains committed to locating the Holocaust and Nazi Germany in the continuities and discontinuities of the 20th century. More recently, he has pursued comparative approaches as they have become fundamental to the scholarly discourse. To that end, he devoted most of the time that his work as director left for research to conceptualizing and organizing the April 2019 conference, *E Pluribus Unum? Memory Conflicts, Democracy, and Integration*. Resurgent white nationalism in the United States and a new age of populism and nationalism in Europe led Kühne to pose a serious question. Why are 150-year-old symbols of slavery and oppression—confederate flags and monuments—kept alive, even glorified, in the present? American awareness of its racist and violent history has done little to prevent ongoing repercussions; rather, many Americans romanticize the past while other societies seem to have better advanced inclusion, diversity, and tolerance by means of persistent efforts to address national responsibility for racism, violence, and genocide. Kühne’s introductory paper, “Memory Conflicts, Democracy, and Integration,” compared collective memories of the Holocaust and Germany and the remembrance of violent pasts in the United States and warned of idealizing the German case. Filled with shame, Germany’s often-praised “negative memory” deals self-critically with its genocidal history to strengthen national self esteem and identity, promoting lessons of tolerance from its racist past. The United States’ national memory, by contrast, is deeply divided between shame about the country’s ‘original sin’ and a rather different popular strand of remembrance that distorts or glorifies past violence to maintain supremacist and aggressive ideologies.

In addition to his intense and close study of war, mass violence and atrocities in U.S. history, Kühne resumed his work on Nazi perpetrators. Invited to give a series of public and academic talks throughout south Florida, he lectured about popular images of and academic inquiries into Nazi perpetrators and on comradeship among German soldiers during the Holocaust. In summer, he travelled to Phnom Penh, Cambodia to attend the 14th conference of the International Association of Genocide Scholars for which he had organized a panel on new directions in the study of perpetrators of the Holocaust and the Cambodian and Rwandan genocides.

Kühne’s highly regarded scholarship draws students who are eager to work with him. Two of his advisees completed their dissertations during 2019. Kim Allar wrote *Education in Violence: Training Guards in Nazi Concentration Camps and Killing Centers* and Mike Poliec submitted *A Dangerous Proximity: The Civilian Complicity During the Holocaust in Romania’s Borderlands, 1941-1944.* “Training doctoral students,” he emphasizes, “requires our program to embrace cutting-edge scholarship. We seek to enroll the most ambitious PhD candidates who will demand innovative teaching and research, excellent library facilities, first-class lectures and conferences, and eminent faculty determined to advance the field of Holocaust and Genocide Studies.” Having chaired the the search for a new Leffell Professor of Modern Jewish History, and as chair of the search for a new Rose Professor of Holocaust History, Kühne recognizes that these faculty hires will shape the continued development of the Strassler Center. He is committed to keeping the program at the forefront of scholarship and training.

As a senior figure in the field of Holocaust History, Kühne helps to foster the publication of new research. Thus, he continues to co-edit the Palgrave Histories of Genocides book series with now eleven volumes on perpetrators, bystanders and victims of the Holocaust and the genocides in Armenia, Cambodia, Indonesia, and Tasmania. He also serves on the editorial boards of *Central European History* and the *Journal of Holocaust Research* (formerly *Dapim*). While service to the university, the profession, and scholarship are important to Kühne, it is his dedication to his students, both undergraduate and graduate, that distinguishes his work at the Strassler Center.

Mary Jane Rein
Driven by a passion for human rights and transitional justice, anthropologist Ken MacLean has devoted his career to teaching and research about humanitarian crises and ethnic conflict in Burma/Myanmar. He has developed several courses that address these critical and contemporary issues, including “Visualizing Human Rights,” “Political Economy of Food and the Ethics of Eating,” “Transitional Justice: Theoretical Debates, Institutional Frameworks, and Development Impacts,” and a wide array of directed readings. As a core faculty member at the Strassler Center, as well as Associate Director and Associate Professor in the Department of International Development and Social Change, MacLean is a dedicated teacher, advisor and mentor. With his regional focus on mainland Southeast Asia and the Greater South China Sea, he also serves as Director of Asian Studies. Along with his intellectual expertise, MacLean has extensive experience working with NGOs in Southeast Asia, is fluent in Vietnamese and Thai, and has conducted and published an impressive body of research on human rights violations in Myanmar and Vietnam.

Recently, MacLean’s research has focused on the escalating violence and gross human rights abuses perpetrated against the Rohingya, a Muslim minority population in Myanmar. In September 2018, he organized a panel discussion on the Rohingya crisis (page 2). He also published two significant pieces: “The Rohingya Crisis and the Practices of Erasure,” published in the Journal of Genocide Research and a 600-page independent report, “Famine Crimes: Military Operations, Forced Migration, and Chronic Hunger in Eastern Burma/Myanmar (2006-2008).” In this groundbreaking report on what he terms “famine crimes” in southeastern Myanmar, MacLean builds on his earlier work documenting crimes against humanity and war crimes committed during a major military offensive in Karen State between 2005-2008. He details how the military uses the destruction of food as a weapon of war to starve targeted populations out of the mountains and into Thailand.

Currently, MacLean is engaged with completing a book project, Search and Destroy: Human Rights Fact Production on Burma/Myanmar, an ethnographic study of human rights archives regarding large-scale violations, including alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity in Burma/Myanmar. The book examines the ways in which fact finding produces facts about human rights violations rather than simply “finding them,” as the expression suggests. Specifically, he investigates how we come to know about forced labor in conflict areas, destruction of food as a weapon of war, shoot to kill policies in conflict zones, and an international campaign for a commission of inquiry into atrocity crimes in Myanmar. Along with finalizing his book, MacLean is launching a new research project examining issues at the intersection of international law, human rights, and digital technologies focusing on satellite imagery, discussing how this contemporary technological resource can be approved as evidence to be introduced into International Criminal Court proceedings. While he is still in the exploratory stage of this project, MacLean intends to examine crowdsourcing human rights documentation through twitter and similar social media platforms.

During summer 2019, MacLean traveled to Myanmar to conduct field research. He also presented a paper on the Rohingya at the International Association of Genocide Scholars annual conference in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. At Clark, MacLean continues his important role of helping to develop the Strassler Center’s evolving research program, especially in relation to the field of comparative genocide studies. He organized a fall 2019 event on the conflict in Syria looking at human rights documentation practices in the context of the ongoing violence against civilians. With his interest in archives and knowledge production, he invited three experts to discuss how archives are being created with an eye to future transitional justice proceedings in preparation for when the conflict in Syria comes to a close.

Ali Avery
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“The only thing that you absolutely have to know is the location of the library.”

- ALBERT EINSTEIN

During a year of transition, in which we packed, stored, and eventually transferred a large portion of the Rose Library collection to the new Colin-Flug Graduate Study Wing, Einstein’s words assumed particular meaning. With space to double the library’s holdings, thanks to compact shelving situated in a climate controlled book annex, we have finally unpacked hundreds of books previously squirreled away in boxes throughout Cohen-Lasry House. While providing space to shelve the current collection is essential, the new wing also supports our mission of continued growth.

Launched with a donation of around 1,500 books from the NYC based book collector Diana Bartley, the library was initially dedicated to Holocaust titles. Strassler Professor Thomas Kühne, in his capacity as faculty advisor to the library, encouraged Ms. Bartley to widen her book buying to encompass the Armenian Genocide and other cases. Her contributions over more than a decade, recorded in meticulous notebooks as she did not use a computer, eventually reached many thousands. But Ms. Bartley’s passing in 2011, together with space shortages, threatened to make the library obsolete.

Acquiring new titles is vital to libraries and to the scholars who depend upon them for research and teaching. With a limited acquisitions budget, the Rose Library has relied on the generosity of donors to expand its collection. Thus, we happily accepted a book donation from the estate of Marion Pritchard. A Dutch resistance fighter who was committed to rescuing Jews during the Holocaust, Pritchard passed away in 2016. Having settled in Vermont, she taught an annual seminar for several years beginning in 1997 with then director and Rose Professor Debórah Dwork. The Pritchard books are displayed prominently in the new wing for students to use and to reflect on her legacy of rescue and resistance. In fall 2018, Barry Hoffman, another inveterate book collector, donated 1,000 books. Eager to support the needs of our PhD students, Mr. Hoffman has allocated funds and purchased books that have reinvigorated the acquisitions process.

Library staff are committed to providing access to special collections that are another important dimension of our holdings. The Robert Messing ’59 Holocaust Numismatic Collection, which contains an assortment of monetary notes and coins from camps and ghettos, is a resource for faculty and students. Another important special collection came to Clark University in 1998 thanks to the generosity of Lisa Friedman ’85 and her parents Carole and Michael Friedman, Lisa ’82 and Michael ’81 Leffell, and the family of Milton Sheftel ’31. They all contributed to purchasing the Kline collection even before the Rose Library was built. Goddard Library is home to several thousand volumes from that collection. In addition, it includes over 50 boxes of Jewish history materials, antisemitic propaganda, Holocaust era publications, German history, documents related to displaced persons, and film reels. These are now being processed thanks to the meticulous work of the Center’s graduate student assistant Casey Bush ’19. Visiting Professor Frances Tanzer serves as faculty advisor to the project. When finished, the newly created finding aid will provide access to the contents of this rare collection.

Making the Rose Library collection accessible to the entire Clark community advances with the help of Michelle Mathews and Goddard Library’s cataloging staff, who continue to enter our book collection into Goddard Library’s Voyager cataloging system. To date, about one third of the library is searchable through Goddard. Our hope is complete the entire process within the next several years.

Robyn Conroy
GRADUATE STUDENT NEWS

The Strassler Center PhD students moved into bright, comfortable offices in the newly constructed Colin-Flug Graduate Study Wing in February 2019. After two decades in cramped attic space on the third floor of Cohen-Lasry House, the airy brightness of the new wing is a welcome change for the students. They can now conduct their challenging work examining the traumatic past in offices that are as comfortable as they are full of light. They are also in close proximity to the resources of the Rose Library and its book annex. At the same time, the layout of shared offices and common space will continue to promote intellectual camaraderie that contributes to incubating ideas. Our PhD students come from around the globe to pursue diverse research questions that range across different cases, depend on scholarship in diverse languages, and draw on various methodologies. Nonetheless, their doctoral projects benefit from the perspectives they share by working together so closely. The success of the doctoral program is manifested in the academic and professional accomplishments of the students whose work is described here.

Tapper Fellow Maayan Armelin examines the dynamics of violent behavior in the context of intergroup relations and conflicts. For her dissertation, she explores how the Einsatzgruppen (EG) became instrumental for the Nazi regime to promote genocide against the Jews and mass crimes against other victim groups. The units’ inner social hierarchies and the officers’ leadership styles are central elements of the project. Armelin looks at the Einsatz- and Sonderkommandos, the battalions to which members were assigned, and at the Teilkommandos, the small operating platoons within them. These groups formed the perpetrators’ immediate social environment and were comprised of members of the various security police institutions including from the SD, general SS, Gestapo, Kripo, and Waffen-SS. Conceptual frameworks of social psychology and sociology such as intergroup relations, leadership, military psychology, and conformity in novel groups reveal how the Teilkommandos’ social structure and composition enhanced members’ willingness to participate in mass executions. Armelin also examines how concepts like comradeship, Ian Kershaw’s principal of “working towards the Führer, German military traditions, and the culture within the Nazi institutions interacted to promote genocide.

Two EG units that operated in the Nazi occupied Soviet Union are the focus of her research. Einsatzkommando 3 (Einsatzgruppe A), operated in Lithuania, and Sonderkommando 7a (EG B) advanced through southern Lithuania and Belarus. Studying both of these battalions helps to establish the nature of social relations and leadership styles across EG units, as well as differences and similarities between them. Her main sources are testimonies provided by former EG members during trials conducted in West Germany during the 1960s and 1970s. Armelin assembled much of the relevant protocols in the German national archive in Ludwigsburg, and at the main German state archive of Hessen in Wiesbaden. She plans another research visit to Wiesbaden and a visit to the German national archive in Koblenz, in order to review files containing demographic data and career information on the units’ officers.

In July, Armelin presented her work at two international conferences. The first was the annual conference of the International Society of Political Psychology held in Lisbon, Portugal titled Empowering Citizens in Illeberal Times: The Political Psychology of Oppression and Resistance. She presented “Social Hierarchies
early postwar testimonies of Dutch Jews at NIOD. At Yad Vashem, with the support of a summer research fellowship, he analyzed all the collections and documents pertaining to the persecution and deportation of Dutch Jews, mainly looking for testimonies and other relevant material. At the Freie Universität in Berlin he searched for oral testimonies of Dutch Jews in the university’s extensive testimony collection. De Leeuw has selected nine of the 103 trains that ran between the Netherlands and German concentration and death camps between July 1942 and September 1944 based on the metadata of all available testimonies at NIOD, Yad Vashem, and the USC Shoah Foundation which he has acquired during this and previous research trips. For his dissertation he will drill down on the transports and what happened to the deportees using survivor testimonies. Having reviewed all the available testimonies, he plans to utilize seventy to a hundred of them for his analysis.

De Leeuw has already taken opportunities to present his preliminary findings. He attended three conferences in Amsterdam in June and July including, Comparing the wars of decolonization: Extreme violence during reoccupation and counter-insurgency, 1945-1975; Holocaust Studies and its Social Setting: Challenges and Trends; and Holocaust Studies in the Digital Age. What’s New?. He also presented “Experiences of Jewish Slave Labor during World War II: A Spatial Analysis” at the June conference Spaces of War: Spatial Perspectives of Modern War and Conflict held at Kent University in the United Kingdom.

Agnes Manoogian Hausrath Fellow Burçin Gерęcek, recipient of the and the Asbed B. Zakarian and Margaret M. Zakarian research award, successfully passed her comprehensive exams and defended her dissertation prospectus in spring 2019. For her doctoral project, she researches the mindset of perpetrators of the Armenian Genocide in Ankara Province. She has identified diverse sources that help to illuminate the dynamics of the violence, including trial documents, memoirs, newspaper interviews and articles, oral and written depositions from bystander trials, witness accounts from observers and some righteous figures.

Now engaged full-time in the research phase of her dissertation, Gерęcek relocated to Paris. She has worked in the Nubarian...
Shirley and Ralph Rose Fellow Simon Goldberg, recipient of the Hilda and Al Kirsch research award, examines documents fashioned in the Kovno (Kaunas) ghetto in Lithuania to explore the broader question of how wartime Jewish elites portrayed life in the ghetto. The texts that survived the war years in Kovno offer rich insights into ghetto life: they include an anonymous history written by Jewish policemen; a report written by members of the ghetto khevre kedishe (burial society); and a protocol book detailing the Ältestenrat’s wartime deliberations. Yet these documents primarily reflect the perspectives of a select few. Indeed, for decades, scholarship on the Holocaust in Kovno has been dominated by the writings of ghetto elites, relegating the testimonies of Jews who did not occupy positions of authority during the war to the margins. Goldberg’s dissertation explores how little-known accounts of the Kovno ghetto both challenge and broaden our understanding of wartime Jewish experience.

At the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Goldberg examined records from the Central States Archives of Lithuania (LCVA). LCVA’s vast repository includes protocols, daily reports, arrest records, and meeting minutes that shed light on the institution of the Jewish police in the Kovno ghetto and the chronicle
its members wrote in 1942 and 1943. The LCVA materials also include songs and poems that highlight social and cultural aspects of Jewish life across ghetto society. As the 2018-2019 Fellow in Baltic Jewish History at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York, Goldberg studied the early historiography of the Kovno ghetto as reflected in the various newspapers and periodicals published in DP camps in Germany and Italy, including Unzer Weg and Ba’Derech. He also explored the papers held in YIVO’s “Territorial Collection: Baltic Countries” that relate to the events of the Holocaust in Lithuania. His fellowship concluded with his Max Weinreich Fellowship Lecture, “Reimagining the History of the Kovno Ghetto,” which highlighted Yiddish and Hebrew accounts from Kovno whose evidentiary value has been minimized or ignored.

Fall 2019 began with a presentation of his dissertation research at the Weiner Library in London as part of the “PhD and a Cup of Tea” series. He also spoke at the Special Lessons & Legacies Conference held in Munich, the first ever such gathering to take place in Europe. During the 2019-20 academic year, Goldberg is in residence at the USHMM’s Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies as a Visiting Fellow.

Hana Green, recipient of the Samuel and Anna Jacobs research award, is a Claims Conference Fellow whose research lies at the intersection of gender, identity, sexuality and resistance. She explores how such identity compositions shaped the experiences and survival of Jewish women during the Holocaust. Green’s dissertation project will highlight Jewish women and consider the deeper implications of what it meant to “pass” under the guise of a false identity during the Holocaust. She will explore the ways in which these Jewish women navigated survival on a day-to-day basis in this context, considering diverse case studies of Jewish women “passing” in regions and settings across German-speaking Europe.

During her MA studies at the University of Haifa, Green conducted research in Israeli archives such as the Ghetto Fighters’ House Museum and Yad Vashem. She also utilized oral histories available through the USC Shoah Foundation’s Visual History Archive. While interning at the Virginia Holocaust Museum in Richmond, Green visited the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to collect written testimonies and was able to incorporate several unpublished works into her research. Green will draw on materials written in German and Yiddish as part of her dissertation project. Over the summer, she studied Yiddish intensively at the Naomi Prawer Kadar Program at Tel Aviv University. With additional funding from the Naomi Foundation, she was able to extend her visit to conduct research at Yad Vashem.

Green has eagerly presented her research at conferences. At the 13th Biennale Holocaust and Genocide Studies Conference at Middle Tennessee State University, she gave the paper, “Sexual Economy and the Role of Sexual Barter in the Holocaust: Jewish Women in Partisan Groups, in Hiding and Passing as Aryan.” In fall 2018, she attended a workshop presented by the Azrieli Foundation in Toronto, CA entitled Buried Words which explored issues of sexuality and violence in Holocaust testimonies and memory. This fall, she presented “Whose Stories Do We Commemorate and Teach? Passing as a Distinct Category of Survival during the Holocaust” at a conference at the University of Richmond, The Future of Holocaust Memory: A Global Consideration of Holocaust Commemoration Held in the American South. While at the conference, Green also lectured at the University of Richmond about Holocaust memory in the United States.

Ellen Johnson who holds the Mildred Suesser Fellowship studies the effects of ghettoization on Jewish intergroup relations. Prior to beginning her doctoral studies, she earned an MA in Holocaust and Genocide Studies from Kean University with a thesis that investigated the ideological development of George Lincoln Rockwell’s American Nazi Party in the 1960s. Alarmed
by the increase in antisemitic incidents following the 2016 presidential election, Johnson studied Rockwell’s popularization of Holocaust denial and the connection between his antisemitic and racist rhetoric. Her thesis highlighted Rockwell’s influence on contemporary white nationalism and neo-Nazi organizations.

Her doctoral project examines Jewish identity politics within the Nazi ghetto and camp systems. As a participant in the Leo Baeck Institute Summer University in Advanced Jewish Studies, Johnson researched relations between German and Eastern European Jews in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp, for which she interviewed the last Sachsenhausen survivor still living in Berlin. This research laid the ground for her dissertation, which considers how ghettoization transformed prisoners’ identities in the Riga and Łódz ghettos. She seeks to document the transformation of spaces, Jewish identities, and intergroup relations. As this work entails drawing upon Yiddish language testimonies, Johnson attended the Naomi Prawer Kadar International Yiddish Summer Program at Tel Aviv University. A stipend from the Naomi Foundation supported her research at Yad Vashem studying the testimonies of German Jews deported to Riga. At the Ghetto Fighters House, she examined artifacts from Łódz inscribed with identity markers including clothing, notebooks, a shofar, and toys.

Johnson continues to pursue diverse research projects. At the Annual Scholars Conference on the Churches and the Holocaust at the University of Texas at Dallas, she presented “Jozef Tiso’s Slovakian Nationalism: The Relationship between Collaboration and Catholicism,” which investigated the motivations of the first Nazi-allied state to voluntarily deport its Jews. Her paper, “Watershed Assassination Did Not Ease Rwandan Genocide Recognition,” at the Millersville University Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide, was part of a panel that challenged the notion that visible turning points of violence, such as Kristallnacht, facilitate international responses. She argued that despite having a salient starting point, the international community failed to address the Rwandan genocide as such until after it had ended.

Emil Kjerte is the recipient of the Louis and Ann Kulin Fellowship, which fosters cooperation with Danish and other Scandinavian scholars and institutions dedicated to Holocaust and Genocide research. Kjerte holds a BA in history from the University of Copenhagen and an MA in Holocaust and Genocide Studies from Uppsala University. His dissertation examines the camp personnel in Jasenovac, established by the fascist Ustaša regime and the largest concentration camp in the fascist Independent State of Croatia. During the Second World War, the Ustaša was the only regime that organized and ran concentration camps independently of the Nazis. Compared to the rich and nuanced historiography on the German perpetrators of the Holocaust, the perpetrators who implemented the destructive policies of this regime remain much less explored. By examining the men and women who worked in the Jasenovac concentration camp, Kjerte’s dissertation contributes to filling this gap.

Breaking new ground, Kjerte explores the lifepaths and prior careers of the camp personnel, their activities in Jasenovac, as well as their postwar trajectories. A key focus of his research are the group dynamics and sense of community that existed among the guards, but he also pays attention to conflicts and tensions between them. Another research goal is to shed light on the guards’ general conduct towards the prisoners. Inspired by micro-sociological approaches, Kjerte zeroes in on the situational dynamics of perpetrator-prisoner interactions within Jasenovac and examines which situations tended to generate or amplify physical violence. While violence was an integral part of the perpetrators’ activities, Kjerte’s research examines whether some of the guards acted less cruelly when peers and superiors were not observing them.

Having passed his comprehensive exams and defended his dissertation prospectus, Kjerte turned to full-time research.
During the summer, he worked at the Croatian State Archive in Zagreb where he uncovered statements that former Jasenovac officers and guards made in response to questioning by the Yugoslav security service in the post-war period. Although these statements differ in length and detail, some of them shed valuable light on intergroup relations among the camp guards, and they often contain surprisingly candid self-incriminating confessions. In addition, Kjerte located important contemporary records pertaining to the Jasenovac camp, including records of an internal investigation concerning an officer who collaborated with the Yugoslav partisans. The cases of Jasenovac staff members who worked in cooperation with the partisans or deserted and joined them are particularly interesting in so far as they reveal the camp leadership’s challenges in maintaining group cohesion.

Claims Conference Fellow Alexandra Kramen holds the Marlene and David Persky Research Award for her doctoral project examining notions of justice and symbolic revenge among Jewish Holocaust survivors living in the Displaced Persons Camp Föhrenwald between 1945 and 1957. The longest operating all-Jewish DP camp, Föhrenwald offers the opportunity to investigate the immediate postwar lives of Jewish survivors and their psychological needs in the aftermath of genocide. Kramen’s MA thesis on the lives and experiences of Jewish DPs residing at Föhrenwald and the Jewish aid workers from the United States and Britain working there illuminated the complexity of the postwar experience for displaced Jewish survivors. Her dissertation will highlight how interactions with various international and local forces shaped the lives of Jewish DPs and their quests for justice for the injuries they sustained during the Holocaust. Kramen examines mechanisms outside of the international criminal tribunal system which might serve to restore a sense of justice to survivors of mass violence, a crucial component in the reconciliation process.

As a 2018 Summer Graduate Student Research Fellow at the USHMM, Kramen examined the extensive resources on Föhrenwald in their archives. She is currently reviewing survivor oral testimonies related to the camp within the USC Shoah Foundation Visual History Archive and the Yale University Library Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies. She plans to spend the 2020-2021 academic year conducting research at the Center for Holocaust Studies at the Leibniz Institute for Contemporary History in Munich, the Center for Jewish History, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee Archives, and Yad Vashem.

In November 2018, Kramen presented her findings on Jewish survivors’ conceptions of revenge at the time of liberation in postwar Germany at the Exploring Refugee Data Workshop, a joint initiative of EHRI and the Masaryk Institute held at the Masaryk Institute in Prague. She also presented a public lecture on the role of historical documentation as a form of wartime resistance and postwar justice for the Worcester Public Library’s 2019 Yom HaShoah Program. In June, Kramen participated in the USHMM’s 2019 Curt C. and Else Silberman Faculty Seminar, “Displacement, Migration, and the Holocaust,” where she helped to create a course unit addressing the interplay between the individual, the local community, and political frameworks and regulations in relation to Holocaust-era displacement and migration. After completing the 2019 Naomi Prawer Kadar Intensive Yiddish Summer Program this past summer at Tel Aviv University she conducted research at the Yad Vashem Archives with additional support from the Naomi Foundation.

Ani Garabed Ohanian holds the Armenian Community Fellowship, which includes support from the Nishan and Margrit Atinizian Family Foundation, Michelle Kolligian, Steven and Deborah Migridichian, and Harry and Hripsime Parsekian. Trilingual in English, French, and Armenian, Ohanian spent summer 2019 at Columbia University’s intensive summer Russian language program. Now comfortable working with Russian language sources, she has turned her attention to learning Turkish. Archival materials in these languages are crucial for her doctoral project, which examines the role the Armenian Genocide played in Bolshevik-Kemalist relations. Previous research tends to
focus on the relationship between Kemalists and Bolsheviks, but neglects to address the Armenian Genocide as an essential factor. Moreover, existing studies assess these relations strictly through a Turkish or Russian lens. Adopting a transnational perspective that puts the genocide at the center of these relations, Ohanian will consider how Bolsheviks and Kemalists interacted to undermine Armenian nationalism in the Caucasus.

Ohanian examines the continuing consequences of the Armenian Genocide and how it implicitly led to Armenia’s Sovietization in 1920. Her project will shed light on how the Bolsheviks expanded their influence in the Caucasus and how anti-imperialist sentiments strengthened relations with the Kemalists. Russian and Armenian archival records should reveal information that is lacking from current scholarship and which may highlight different viewpoints regarding the intervention of western powers. Her dissertation concentrates on the final phase of the genocide, specifically during the period of 1918 to 1920, when the Republic of Armenia was an autonomous nation-state. During this period, the Bolsheviks and Kemalists collaborated to combat imperialist influence in the region of conflict. Their alliance led to a series of attacks and massacres that threatened Armenian nationalism. Ohanian’s research will address scholarly debate over the real purpose of this rapprochement between the Russians and Turks, and the true nature of their aims in the Caucasus.

In the summer, Ohanian attended a conference at the 9/11 Memorial museum, which focused on memorials that are dedicated to specific atrocities. The panel discussions inspired her to write an article about the 1965 Armenian Genocide memorial, Tsitsernakabert, located in Yerevan, Armenia. Ohanian partnered with Asya Darbinyan, a Strassler Center alumna, to present a panel at the Association for Slavic, Eastern European, and Eurasian Studies conference in November 2019.

Fromson Fellow Mohammad Sajjadur Rahman who holds the Shahun Parish Research Award is engaged in researching and writing his dissertation, Against Freedom: Understanding the “Anti-Liberation Forces” in Bangladesh’s War of Independence. His project examines different narratives about the East Pakistani loyalists, widely referred to as “collaborators,” who supported Pakistan’s counter-insurgency operations against Bengali freedom fighters in 1971. Rahman argues that the post-war construction of the image of the collaborator as the “enemy within” depended upon many “silences” about the violent birth of Bangladesh.

Local groups, popularly known as “Razakar” (member of a paramilitary group) and “Muktijuddho-birodhi Shokti” (anti-liberation forces), collaborated with the Pakistani army to commit atrocities. Over the last four decades, pro-Pakistani loyalists were seen as ideologues of Islamist parties betraying fellow Bengalis in the name of Islam. Yet, this image obstructs a more nuanced understanding of wartime collaboration, as well as the multilayered and ambiguous motivations of the collaborators. The so-called secular-liberal narrative cannot explain why some non-Muslim indigenous groups opposed the pro-independence Bengali guerilla forces. In fact, the East Pakistani loyalists belonged to a variety of professional backgrounds and political parties, including secular ones. The current historiography of the 1971 War does not explain why pro-state collaboration occurred or provide insights into how the legacy of the idea of collaboration shaped the politics of denunciation and justice in post-war Bangladesh.

Rahman addresses the gap in the literature of 1971 War that mostly focuses on the heroism of the Bengali freedom fighters. While the Bangladeshi state has never denied the mass atrocities, academic research on this topic remains inadequate. Rahman also considers the post-war period when political leaders questioned whether to prosecute the collaborators. As a multidisciplinary project, Against Freedom deepens understanding of wartime collaboration, but also contributes to memory politics, transitional justice and the process of historical production.

Rahman’s research included a trip to the US National Archive in Maryland to explore documents related to the US position on the trial of the collaborators. His interest in this sub-topic emerged from his discovery of detailed policy discussions within the British diplomatic community. As British officials discouraged trying the Pakistani war criminals, Rahman decided to examine additional domestic and international responses to trials held from 1972 to 1973. A number of previously unnoticed memoirs written in Bangla by alleged collaborators between 1976 and 1990 offer additional valuable perspectives to the project.

Rahman has already published his research widely. Thanks to a CGS-Square Fellowship from the Center for Genocide Studies, Dhaka University, he will contribute a paper on British viewpoints on the local tribunal as a fellowship requirement. His co-edited book, Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Bangladesh, was published in 2016. His second co-edited book Neo-liberal Development in Bangladesh: People on the Margin is forthcoming. He has also written two chapters for the forthcoming edited volume Islam in its Plenitude. Finally, Rahman is a senior advisor to a creative project focusing on the digital recreation of the events of the liberation war.
Clark undergraduates Julie Reed ’21 and Amer Macedonci ’20 may have set out for different parts of the world during summer 2019 (Paris and Bosnia), however, they set their sights on studying the same topic: human rights.

Reed enrolled in “Politics of Human Rights” at the American University of Paris—a course that complements her course offerings in international relations and satisfied her long-standing interest in human rights and conflict resolution. According to Political Science Professor Michael Butler, who also serves as Reed’s faculty adviser, the opportunity to take this course in France, a location familiar to Reed as she has traveled and was schooled in France, came “at a perfect time in Julie’s tenure at Clark and fit well into her program of study.”

Reed had her first glimpse into what it’s like to practice human rights law while studying at the American University of Paris; her professor shared stories about her experience working with refugees and asylum seekers.

“Working with a professor who has actually had hands on experience in the field of human rights law showed me what I want to spend my life doing, working to protect and promote Human Rights on an international scale,” said Reed. While in France, Reed also embarked on a research project on the effect of terror attacks on campaign rhetoric regarding immigration and immigration rights. She received additional funding—this time from a Harrington Public Affairs Fellowship—to conduct this research at the French National Archives while in Paris, and used France as the primary case study.

She also met up with her high school French teacher Amanda Greenblatt ’05, who was vacationing in Paris with her family this summer. Reed is considering graduate study in Europe, and a career in human rights that involves children. “I know I’ll find my way back to France someday,” said Reed.

Macedonci interned at the Post-Conflict Research Center (PCRC) and used his communication and foreign language skills to assist with peace education projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He assisted Ron Haviv, an Emmy nominated, award-winning photojournalist and co-founder of the photo agency VII, with a festival he organized through his agency for youth correspondents, and served as a translator for documentary photographer Mitar Simikić at one of his exhibitions in his hometown. Among other things, Macedonci attended a conference hosted by the World Bank and collected petition signatures for an anti-smoking initiative. The psychology major also spoke with individuals at the Association of War Victims of Foca about the cycles of psychological trauma recovery.

Macedonci is continuing to work with Sarajevo-based NGOs to interview parents whose learning-disabled children have been discriminated against by the Bosnian educational system.

According to PCRC Founder and President Velma Saric, Macedonci “played a pivotal role in reaching out to the organizations and parents of these children to set up meetings and interviews.”

“In the beginning, I was aware that specific steps could be taken to expand transitional justice and coexistence in post-conflict societies, but to comprehend the concomitant factors and play a significant role in the process myself was genuinely extraordinary,” wrote Macedonci. “Towards the end, I began to realize how my experience and growing desire to understand a region’s history and present state significantly contributed to my abilities to work with others professionally in this field.

Both students received stipends from the Holocaust and Genocide Studies Program to fund their summer experiences—Reed received the Doris Tager Summer Stipend Fund, Macedonci’s internship was made possible by the Arthur and Rochelle Belfer Fund. “We are delighted to be able to support their summer experiences,” wrote Shelly Tenenbaum, professor and chair of the Department of Sociology and director of the Holocaust and Genocide Studies Undergraduate Program.

Clark’s Holocaust and Genocide Studies program has offered summer internship stipends every year since 1999. Students are awarded the internship stipend on the basis of their academic record and internship proposal.
Fall 2019 finds Strassler Center alumni affiliated with a range of institutions. A select list of appointments follows:

**Kim Allar PhD ’19**, Clinical Assistant Professor of History and Co-Director, Online Master of Arts in World War II Studies, Arizona State University

**Elizabeth Anthony PhD ’16**, Director, Visiting Scholar Programs, Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, US Holocaust Memorial Museum

**Sara Elise Brown PhD ’16**, Executive Director of the Center for Holocaust, Human Rights, and Genocide Education (Chhange) at Brookdale Community College

**Beth Lilach (ABD)**, Director of Education at the Friends of the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, Toronto

**Jody Russell Manning (ABD)**, Assistant Professor, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Rowan University

**Abigail Miller (ABD)**, Director of Education and Historian in Residence, Holocaust Museum and Center for Tolerance and Education, Suffern, New York

**Khatchig Mouradian PhD ’16**, Lecturer, Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies Department and Director, Armenian Studies Program, Columbia University

**Ilana F. Offenberger PhD ’10**, Lecturer, Department of History, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth

**Mike Phoenix (Mihai Poliec) PhD ’18**, Postgraduate Research Associate - Historian at SNA International

**Alicja Podbielska (ABD)**, Vivian G. Prins Fellow at the Museum of Jewish Heritage - a Living Memorial to the Holocaust, New York

**Sara Elise Brown PhD ’16**, Executive Director of the Center for Holocaust, Human Rights, and Genocide Education (Chhange) at Brookdale Community College

**Beth Cohen PhD ’03**, Lecturer, California State University, Northridge

**Sarah Cushman PhD ’10**, Director, Holocaust Educational Foundation, Northwestern University

**Asya Darbinyan PhD 19**, Fellow in Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Stockton University

**Tiberiu Galis Ph.D. ’15**, Executive Director, Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation

**Michael Geheran PhD ’16**, Assistant Professor and Deputy Director, Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies, United States Military Academy at West Point

**Adara Goldberg, Ph.D. ’12**, Director, Holocaust Resource Center and Diversity Council on Global Education and Citizenship, Kean University

**Kathrin Haurand (ABD)**, Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich Foundation Fellow

**Naama Haviv MA ’06**, Director of Development at MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger

**Alexis Herr PhD ’14**, Lecturer, San Francisco State University

**Stefan Ionescu PhD ’13**, Theodore Zev and Alice R. Weiss-Holocaust Educational Foundation Visiting Associate Professor in Holocaust Studies, Department of History, Northwestern University

**Jeffrey Koerber PhD ’15**, Assistant Professor of Holocaust History, Chapman University

**Ümit Kurt PhD ’16**, Polonsky Fellow, Van Leer Institute, Jerusalem and Lecturer, Department of Middle East and African History, Tel Aviv University

**Samantha Lakin (ABD)**, Graduate Research Fellow, Program on Negotiation, Harvard University Law School

**Natalya Lazar (ABD)**, Program Director, Initiative on Ukrainian-Jewish Shared History and the Holocaust in Ukraine, Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, US Holocaust Memorial Museum

**Beth Lilach (ABD)**, Director of Education at the Friends of the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, Toronto

**Joanna Sliwa PhD ’16**, Historian, Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany

**Lotta Stone PhD ’10**, Historian and Research Associate, Middleton Place Foundation, Charleston, South Carolina
As a Clark University undergraduate, Sara Elise Brown ’05, PhD ’16, did not envision that an introductory course on genocide would lead her to work with refugees in Africa, publish a book, or impact 400,000 individuals over the course of a weekend. Yet, Tenenbaum’s course fueled a passion for learning more about Central Africa that inspired Brown to go to Rwanda. In summer 2004, she had an internship with a non-profit organization based in Kigali, working with the nascent Gacaca Courts during commemorations for the 10th anniversary of the genocide. After graduation, Brown carried out aid work with Burundian refugees, both at a refugee camp in Tanzania, and then in Texas with resettled refugees. Eventually, she pursued an MA at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya, Israel and realized that she still had many unanswered questions. This prompted her to contact Professor Deborah Dwork who encouraged her to return to the Strassler Center as a doctoral student where she held the Stern Family fellowship for five years.

Brown posed seminal questions in her research. What are women’s roles in genocide? Are they merely victims or bystanders, as the media often portrays them? Can women exercise agency in a patriarchal society, perpetrating violence and genocide or becoming rescuers? Brown’s dissertation compared women perpetrators and women rescuers during the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda. Her research and fieldwork allowed her to examine women’s agency during genocide, as agents of good, but also as bad actors who committed terrible violence. After defending her dissertation, she quickly incorporated the edits and advice from her committee: chair Deborah Dwork, Cynthia Enloe (Clark University), and David Simon (Yale University). Routledge Press published her dissertation as a book, Gender and the Genocide in Rwanda: Women as Rescuers and Perpetrators (2018).

In October 2018, Professor Shelly Tenenbaum invited Brown to lecture about women perpetrators and rescuers during the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda. Undergraduate students from Professors Akçam, MacLean, and Tanzer’s classes attended her engaging talk. After briefly explaining the history of Rwanda and the genocide, Brown detailed stories of women perpetrators and rescuers she interviewed during her research. She explained that before the genocide, a deeply entrenched system of patriarchy characterized Rwandan society and excluded women from opportunity. However, in the years following the genocide, women have assumed a larger role in Rwandan life, partially due to the intentional efforts of the government, but also because many men perished during the genocide or fled in the aftermath. Brown’s research challenges the widespread belief that women were victims or bystanders and restores their agency for better or worse.

From 2017-2019, Brown held a postdoctoral fellowship at the USC Shoah Foundation Visual History Archive, which comprises 55,000 testimonies of witnesses and survivors of the Holocaust, but also the Nanjing Massacres, the Armenian, Cambodian, and Guatemalan genocides, the genocide in Rwanda, and the recent ethnic cleansing in Myanmar. Brown managed the Visual History Archive Program for post-secondary education, working to expand its college and university educational materials. In summer 2019, Brown concluded her post-doctoral fellowship and accepted the position of Executive Director at the Center for Holocaust, Human Rights, and Genocide Education (Chhange). Housed at Brookdale Community College in New Jersey and established in 1979, Chhange is a non-profit organization committed to education about the Holocaust, genocide, and human rights and promoting the elimination of racism, antisemitism, and all forms of prejudice. Brown oversees annual programs that reach over 25,000 students, educators, and community members. She also manages its recently opened exhibition that gives equal space and attention to three genocides: the Armenian Genocide, the Holocaust, and the Genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, a 6,000 volume library dedicated to Holocaust and Genocide Studies, and over 1,000 artifacts in the only genocide archive in New Jersey.

Hannah King ’19
KLINE COLLECTION: ARCHIVE PROJECT

In 1997, as the Strassler Center was in formation, generous donors purchased a significant collection of books and archival materials from the bookseller Eric Chaim Kline. With their magnificent gift, Michael J. Leffell ’81 and Lisa Klein Leffell ’82, the Sheftel Family, in memory of Milton S. Sheftel ’31 MA ’32, and Carole and Michael Friedman, in honor of Elisabeth “Lisa” Friedman ’85, ensured that the new doctoral program would have the scholarly resources necessary for training PhD students. The collection comprises several thousand books shelved at Goddard Library and nearly 4,000 archival items, including primary and secondary sources related to antisemitism, German history, and the Holocaust. The valuable assortment of books, pamphlets, magazines, reports, journals, newspapers, and screenplays are in 13 different languages and date from 1870 to 1990. Approximately 181 Nazi propaganda films and filmstrips form an assemblage that is far more complete than those found at other leading institutions. Plans are underway to preserve, digitize, and disseminate the film materials.

Ample space in the newly opened Colin-Flug Graduate Study Wing allowed me to work with Center staff to unpack and properly store these precious materials. Though well-preserved and in good shape, extensive work was necessary to make the materials accessible. The process of archiving the Kline Collection was extensive. Visiting Professor Frances Tanzer mentored me throughout the project and Rose Librarian Robyn Conroy, a trained archivist, supervised the work. My objective was to organize the materials thematically, document them within a finding aid, and optimize space by ensuring that they were economically but safely preserved. From this process, I learned valuable skills related to archival and preservation processes. I was able to properly organize the Kline Collection and I learned skills that will be of use to me in my future career as an archivist or museum professional.

Sifting through each document was slow-going but incredibly interesting. The materials I found were frequently upsetting and frustrating, shocking and ridiculous. Many of the English language materials document American attitudes to World War II and the Holocaust from before the war and into the post-war period. Series one, “Antisemitic materials,” stood out to me given my research for Professor Tanzer’s course, “Antisemitism and Islamophobia.” This series contains 233 volumes of antisemitic propaganda, mostly small pamphlets designed for American audiences. Notably, it contains a collection of The Dearborn Independent, also known as The Ford International Weekly, a weekly newspaper established by Henry Ford to broadcast his antisemitic views as well as pamphlets written by Gordon “Jack” Mohr, leader of the Citizens Emergency Defense System, a militant, antisemitic survivalist organization.

I utilized the Mohr pamphlets for a research paper on how the American far right has propagated antisemitic ideas, fears, and policies by mobilizing antisemitic and racist rhetoric. I concluded that Mohr viewed these issues through the lens of the Communist threat, presumably shaped by his time as a POW in Korea. Additionally, likely aided by his strong Christian identity ties, much of Mohr’s antisemitic ideology was, on the surface, in defense of black people—whom he believed Jews exploited—but, in actuality, promoted racist stereotypes of black helplessness. Mohr’s writings contributed to long standing anti-Jewish stereotypes about greed and the desire for world domination as well as stereotypes about black feebleness.

Working on the Kline collection has been a highlight of my career at Clark. This project complemented my coursework and connected directly to my extracurricular involvements and also advanced my professional goals. I am glad to report that there is plenty of material that remains for curious Clark students looking for an inspiring project.

Casey Bush ’19
GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT
DONOR PROFILE: GLENN PARISH ’71

A passion for history has inspired Glenn Parish to read widely since his childhood in New Haven, CT. From a young age, the Holocaust was a particular focus of his attention. His uncle and cousin were survivors; thus, his parents were emotionally engaged with the trauma of the Holocaust. As a consequence of this family history, Glenn was drawn to European history of the late 19th and 20th centuries during his undergraduate days at Clark. In those years, there were no classes dealing with Nazi Germany and his fascination with the subject remained on an amateur level.

Following graduation from Clark, Glenn earned an MA in City Planning from Rutgers University. He worked for the Philadelphia city planning commission in the mid-1970s. From there, he went on to earn an MBA from the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania. His career in commercial real estate, finance, and lending kept him busy for several decades, first in the northeast and eventually in South Florida. Yet, he continued to experience a “loving relationship with knowledge” and felt the tug of history. Shortly after the founding of the Strassler Center, he and his wife Leslie attended a lecture at the Broward County JCC where they were mesmerized by Professor Debórah Dwork. A signed copy of her book, *Holocaust: A History*, was a lynchpin for them. They jointly agreed to invest in the Strassler Center, an initiative that spoke to both of them equally.

Glenn highlights his emotional connection to Clark but emphasizes that Leslie did not attend the same university. Yet, they are partners in giving to Clark because they both believe in doctoral training and they are excited about helping to expand the Strassler Center program. Leslie has always supported education about the Holocaust. Glenn views her decision to join him in establishing the Shahun Parish doctoral research award as a supremely gracious gesture. She recognizes what Clark means to Glenn who describes having been a “fun seeking intellectual who grew up at Clark.”

In fall 2018, Glenn was delighted to underwrite Professor Thomas Kühne’s visit to South Florida. As a member of the regional President’s Leadership Council, Glenn was eager to do something in addition to writing a check. He decided to organize a series of speaking opportunities for Professor Kühne that culminated in a public lecture at the FIU (Florida International University) Jewish Museum of Florida in Miami. This was an opportunity to introduce the work of the Strassler Center to a new audience. Glenn collaborated with FIU Professor Oren Stier to organize the visit, which included a lecture for History MA students. This was a special occasion for Glenn who has been studying in the MA program since his retirement.

If Clark seeks to prepare lifelong learners, then look no further than Glenn Parish. He asserts that his undergraduate history classes taught him to think critically. His retirement years have given him the space to further indulge his fascination with Holocaust history. A highlight of Professor Kühne’s visit was the time they spent driving between events. He felt like a “kid hanging out with a railroad conductor.” The chance to meet students and other faculty members engaged in serious scholarship about the Holocaust is another special treat. Thus, he travelled to campus in April 2019 to participate in the conference *E Pluribus Unum? Memory Conflicts, Democracy, and Integration.* He patiently attended every panel of this intense three-day conference and soaked up knowledge with as much eagerness as any of the doctoral students in attendance.

Glenn’s enthusiasm for learning is a joy to experience, as was evident to all the conference participants. His appreciation for serious scholarship and learning is an inspiration.

*Mary Jane Rein*
The vision and mandate of the Strassler Center resonate strongly with a diverse group of donors including alumni, friends, and foundation leaders who recognize the Strassler Center’s unique role in fostering scholarship about the Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide, and other genocidal events. Their generous support provides funding for the splendid accomplishments of our students and faculty. There is a direct connection between the gifts of such thoughtful donors and the ability of our students to carry out the scholarly work reported in the pages of this report. Contributions in support of research, teaching, public education, and conferences that examine the history of genocide and its continuing consequences shape the intellectual landscape of Holocaust History and Genocide Studies and advance scholarship and activism for generations to come.

Funding for doctoral fellowships and research is our highest priority. As the leading institution committed to training PhD students in Holocaust history and genocide studies, the Strassler Center depends upon dedicated fellowship funds to attract outstanding candidates. Major donations to the Strassler Center during fiscal year 2018-19 strengthened the doctoral program in numerous ways. Special mention must be made of those leadership donors whose generous gifts helped us to finalize funding for the newly completed Colin-Flug Graduate Study Wing. The students working in this beautiful addition are grateful to the Simon and Eve Colin Foundation, and especially Clark trustee Rebecca Colin ’89 PhD, the George F. and Sybil H. Fuller Foundation, David and Lorna Strassler, Stephen Corman, Lisa ’82 and Michael ’81 Leffell, Susan Rein, Erica Rhine ’67, Rosalie Rose, and Al Tapper.

Gifts, large and small, are essential to the growth and development of the Strassler Center program. We thank the many donors listed here whose contributions underwrote the activities of the Strassler Center during the academic year 2018-19.

Mary Jane Rein
DONOR HONOR ROLL

The following list includes gifts made between 1 June 2018 and 31 May 2019

Principal Benefactors ($100,000 and up)
- Rebecca Colin ’89 PhD
- Simon and Eve Colin Foundation
- The George F. and Sybil H. Fuller Foundation
- Celia Schuhoff ’54*
- Asbed B. Zakarian and Margaret M. Zakarian
  Charitable Foundation

Golden Benefactors ($50,000 to $99,999)
Conference on Material Claims against Germany

Benefactors ($25,000 to $49,999)
- MKS Trust
- Artemis and Nazar Nazarian
- Barrington Foundation
- Alice Hoogastian *
- Lorna and David H. Strassler MBA ’11

Patrons ($10,000 to $24,999)
- Anonymous
- Judith T. Bohn ’75 and Lawrence S. Bohn MA’76
  Bohn Family Charitable Fund
- Stephen Corman
- Erica S. Rhine ’67

Sponsors ($5,000 to $9,999)
- A.G.B.U. Asbets Committee
- Betty Dyer ’50
- Stephen Hays
  Cheetah Charitable Trust
- Beverly and Barry D. Hoffman
- Hanne and Howard Kulin
- Jacob C. Nyman ’01
- Marlene and David Persky
  Joseph Persky Foundation
- Stephanie Rein and Edward J. Stern
- Linda Savitsky ’70
- Fran Snyder and David Vorembeg ’72
- Irene D. Stein ’65
- Nathaniel Wheeler Trust

Friends ($1,000 to $4,999)
- Pamela M. Davis and Randy W. DiTata

In honor of David H. Strassler
- Jonathan Edelman ’16
- Elaine ’63 and David Feingold
- Susan G. ’60 and Martin A. ’58 Fischer
- Laura and Wayne Glazer
- Emily and William ’92 Gottlieb
- Marianne and Robert Aram Kaloosdian ’52
- Carol Bolton Kappel ’84 and Jonathan Kappel ’81
- Linda Kaplan and Jeffrey Kraines
  The William P. Goldman and Brothers Foundation

Knights of Vartan
- Carolyn Levy and Alan B. Sharaf ’72 MA ’78 PhD ’78
- Ovsanna Y. ’58 and R. Mihran MA ’58 Mooradian
- Jerair Nishanian Foundation
- Mary and Stephen B.’68 Novak
- Leslie and Glenn ’71 Parish
- Shirley Siff MA ’70
- Debbie Sosland-Edelman and Alan Edelman
  Sosland Family Foundation
- Irene D. Stein ’65
- Elizabeth B. Tromovitch ’56

Supporters ($500 to $999)
- Alan Berkowitz
- Marlene and Stanley Besen
  In memory of Herman O. Stekler ’55
- Libby ’72 and Richard P. ’71 Cohen
- Mary and Robert G. Kinosian ’68
- Daphne and Arnold ’63 Konheim
- Barbara S. Landau ’50
- Ruth Lander
- Patricia Spargo and Mark Tobak
  In memory of Henry Tobak
- Susan Lee Rein
- Paula and James E. Tashjian
- Alice Weinstein and Herman O. Stekler ’55*

Donors ($100 to $499)
- Mary and Van Aroian
- Selwin Belofsky
- Kara Brickman ’97
- Fay and Julian Bussgang
- Virginia Deranian
- Stephanie and Joshua ’06 MA ’07 Franklin
- Barry J. Glick
- Vartan Gregorian HC ’08
Income from the following endowed funds provide a permanent source of support for the ongoing activities and operation of the Strassler Center.

**Armenian Genocide Fund**

**Asher Family Fund**

**Arthur and Rochelle Belfer Fund for Scholars of Holocaust Studies**

**Charlotte Calfaian Doctoral Research Award in Armenian Genocide Studies**

**Melvin S. Cutler Charitable Fund**

**Ferenc and Ilona (Schulhoff) Czigler Family Endowed Fund for Graduate Students in Holocaust and Genocide Studies**

**Howard Fromson Endowment for Graduate Student Support**

**Debra I. and Jeffrey A. Geller Student Research Fund**

**Ina R. and Haskell R. Gordon Fund for Undergraduate Students of Holocaust Studies**

**Agnes Manoogian Hausrath Endowed Doctoral Research Fund in Armenian Genocide Studies**

**Agnes Manoogian Hausrath Research Fund**

**Samuel and Anna Jacobs Doctoral Student Research Fund**

**Robert Aram ’52 and Marianne Kaloosdian and Stephen and Marian Mugar Professor Hilda and Al Kirsch Research Award**

**Mary Jane Rein In memory of Sylvia Rubin**

**Rosalie and Sidney Rose Fund for Doctoral Study in Holocaust and Genocide Studies**

**Shirley and Ralph Rose Fund for Doctoral Study in Holocaust and Genocide Studies**

**Rose Professorship in Holocaust Studies and Modern Jewish History and Culture**

**Strassler Family Endowment**

**Strassler Family Chair for the Study of Holocaust History**

**Mildred Suesser Endowed Fund for Student Research in the Field of Holocaust Studies**

**Margaret and Asbed Zakarian Research Award in Armenian Genocide Studies**

Contributors (Up to $100)

- Ivan A. Backer
- Joanna Feldman ’13
- Walter B. Frankel ’68
- Helen and Larry ’57 Freed
- Michael Gruenbaum
- Ralph Hovanesian
- Betty R. Jaffe
- Pamela J. and David H. Levine
- Rise A. Liskov ’72
- Judith ’53 and Eugene Mann
- Harry A. Mazadoorian
- Maxine ’83 and Leonard Morse
- Cynthia A. Normandie ’83
- Marilyn Paul
- Ian Rosenbluth ’01
- Joshua L. Segal
- Karen Satz and Joshua Segal Fund for Tsedaka
- Hattie M. Ulan and Mark Milner

*Deceased*
The Strassler Center’s small but enthusiastic staff includes librarian and program manager Robyn Conroy, administrative assistant Alissa Duke, and budget manager Kim Vance. The many activities and accomplishments achieved during the 2018-19 academic year would be impossible without their dedication and hard work. “We often take for granted the very things that most deserve our gratitude,” has noted the novelist Cynthia Ozick. A highlight of this report is the opportunity to express thanks to this hardworking and loyal team whose friendship and collegiality lighten our work.

The efficiency and professionalism of our staff members deserve recognition. With the completion of the book annex in the Colin-Flug Graduate Study wing, Robyn Conroy was energized to shelve the many hundreds of books long relegated to storage boxes. This project entailed shifting the entire Rose Library collection to ensure the proper arrangement of books according to call number. With space for 10,000 books in the new wing, she relished the opportunity to resume purchasing titles for our collection. The regular operation of the Center owes much to Alissa Duke who keeps things running smoothly. Her style, gracious demeanor, and attention to detail create a warm and welcoming environment. Kim Vance keeps an eagle eye on the bottom line and produces budget data on demand. The funds that finance the research, lectures, conferences, and scholarly work reported in these pages depend upon her careful accounting. Our student workers, Casey Bush ’19, Spencer Cronin ’18 MA ’19, Hannah Garelick ’20, and Hannah King ’19, all concentrators in Holocaust and Genocide Studies, not only helped in myriad ways, they also brightened our days.

Colleagues from departments across the Clark University campus provide additional and crucial support. Sociology Professor Shelley Tenenbaum, Director of the Undergraduate Concentration, is a valued partner in advising students, overseeing courses, and organizing events. In University Advancement, Vice President Jeff Gillooly, Jonathan Kappel ’81, Dianne Dyslin, Robert Heath, Megan Horvitz, Paul Milionis merit special attention for their fundraising efforts and outreach to donors and alumni. In the Office of Marketing and Communications, Angela Bazydlo, Lori Fearebay, and Jim Keogh offer essential support toward publicizing our activities. Jim Cormier in Media Services, Stephanie Mireku in Events Planning, and catering manager Kim McElroy help ensure the success of events. José Santiago from Physical Plant is always cheerful as he keeps our small complex of buildings looking their best. In the coming months, Clark University President David Angel will conclude his remarkable tenure at the institution he has called home for more than 30 years. His advocacy and friendship have been greatly appreciated; he will be missed.

Mary Jane Rein