Master Thesis

Preserving and (Re)Presenting:

On the Circulation of Dutch WWII Testimonies via New Media

in Participatory Memory Projects

Student: Annika Werkman

Supervisor: dr. Susanne C. Knittel

Second reader: prof. dr. Ann Rigney

Comparative Literary Studies

January 2017, Utrecht University

Abstract

More than seventy years after the Second Wold War the eyewitnesses and first generation survivors are dying out and can no longer transmit their stories to future generations. In order to save their testimonies from oblivion various innovative commemoration initiatives are created that often consist of participatory projects using new media. This thesis focuses on three recent Dutch memory projects, *Joods Monument* and *Open Joodse Huizen, Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* and *Post uit de Vergetelheid* in order to show how new media change the way memory is transmitted and disseminated in participatory memory projects, more specifically, different types of participation are charted and analysed.

Joods Monument is a digital memorial for all the Dutch victims of the Shoah where personal memories can be added by the visitors. This memorial functions as a database for projects like *Open Joodse Huizen*, which, every year on the fourth and fifth of May, organises commemorative events at the houses Jewish families lived in before the Shoah. *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* is an education project during which children interview eyewitness of the Second World War in their neighbourhood and transmit this story via the website and in their capacity as 'heritage carriers'. *Post uit de Vergetelheid* is an exhibition based on correspondence from the Nazi concentration camps relating the past to the present via new media and themes such as communication, identity, and privacy.

The projects are analysed in the context of the history of WWII memory culture in the Netherlands based on studies of Van Ginkel, Van Reijt, and Raaijmakers, and influential concepts within the domain of memory studies such as collective memory (Halbwachs), communicative and cultural memory (Jan and Aleida Assmann), postmemory (Hirsch), mediated memories (Van Dijck), and digital memory (Haskins). The thesis firstly finds that different modes of memory transmission such as communicative, cultural, and digital memory, should not be seen as successive stages but rather overlap and interact in current

memory projects. Secondly, the recent projects thrive both online and offline on the participation of visitors engaged in the projects. Thirdly, the increasing focus on participation via digital media leads on the one hand to a process of remediation, and on the other to a process of democratisation, by which the memories of the eyewitnesses and first generation survivors are taken up by following generations and transmitted and disseminated into the future. Finally, recent memory projects bring the memory of WWII and the Shoah 'into the present' by connecting the past to today's issues and problems.

Contents

Acknowledgements

After studying both history and literature my interest in stories that represent the presence of the past has only increased, not the least by being introduced to cultural memory studies by Ann Rigney and Susanne Knittel during my bachelors and the Research Master Comparative Literary Studies. This field provides a theoretical framework for analysing memory practices in society, and will also be the theoretical context of this thesis on new media and participatory memory projects in current Dutch Second World War memory culture.

As an intern at *Nationaal Comité 4 & 5 mei* in Amsterdam and *CODA* in Apeldoorn I learned a lot about current Second World War memory practices in Dutch society. I specifically want to thank my supervisors, Esther Captain and Stefan Rutten respectively, who in inspiring contexts helped me analyse these practices myself from various perspectives within and outside the academic realm. I have been able to meet people involved in all three case studies that feature in this thesis. They provided invaluable background information, inspiration, and input for my analysis. I want to thank Denise Citroen, Maarten-Jan Vos, and Anat Harel of *Joods Monument* and *Open Joodse Huizen*, Minka Bos of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt*, and Mirjam Huffener of *Post uit de Vergetelheid*.

Coming to an end I would like to mention those people without whom this thesis would not have existed. I would like to thank my twin sister Petra Werkman for proofreading my thesis, and Ann Rigney for being my second reader and providing helpful feedback on my proposal. I owe lots of gratitude to Susanne Knittel for her confidence in my ability to write this thesis, her flexibility and enthusiasm, helpful suggestions, and extensive feedback through which this thesis has become what it is now. Last but not least I would like to thank my husband Roeland Smit for the immense support, comfort, and happiness he gives me by sharing his life and love with me.

Introduction

The Netherlands celebrates the end of the Second World War on the fifth of May with all kinds of festivities. Some well-known examples are the liberation festivals, the concert at the Amstel in Amsterdam, and the igniting of the liberation fire by the prime minister. Besides these traditional events, new, more interactive initiatives could be observed in 2016. One of them was a temporary monument in Amsterdam which consisted of a pontoon bridge over the river IJ. This platform recalled the provisional bridge that had been made at the end of the Second World War by connecting ferries together, which enabled the starving population of Amsterdam to walk across to the other side of the river IJ to receive food. The 'bridge' was created because there was no fuel for the ferries to cross the river. In 2016, the 7500 people who visited the temporary monument could listen to stories of eyewitnesses of the Second World War, told by children from Amsterdam. These children had interviewed elderly people who lived in their neighbourhood during the Second World War for a six week school project called *Oorlog in mijn buurt* (War in my neighbourhood). At the end of the project they were appointed 'heritage carriers' (erfgoeddragers) of the city of Amsterdam by the mayor. On the fifth of May 2016 these children were able to pass on stories of eyewitnesses, and as 'heritage carriers' it is their task to keep telling these stories after the eyewitnesses have passed away.

Oorlog in mijn buurt is only one of many recent memory projects based on the telling of stories of survivors and eye-witnesses of the Second World War. Another example is the commemoration project *Open Joodse Huizen* (Open Jewish Houses). Since 2012, every year on the fourth and fifth of May stories about Jewish families who were deported during the Second World War are being told in the houses these families lived in before the Shoah. These testimonies are told by the survivors themselves, as well as by their children or grandchildren, friends, or former neighbours. Many of these stories are from the digital memorial *Joods Monument* (Jewish Monument), or part of the book series *Joodse Huizen*

(Jewish Houses)*. Also part of this trend is the exhibition *Post uit de Vergetelheid* (Mail from oblivion), about two Jews and a resistance fighter who were deported during the Second World War. The exhibition tells their stories based on the letters they sent home from the concentration camps. Many more examples of recent Dutch memory projects focussing on the passing on of testimonies could be mentioned in this respect.[1]

Of course, recording and preserving testimonies is not new. *Yad Vashem* has been collecting testimonies since 1945 and other large projects started in the 1960s, such as, for example the *Steven Spielberg Jewish Film Archive*. Similar collections that followed are the *Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies* of the *Yale University Library*, and Claude Lanzmann's documentary *Shoah*. Dutch examples can be mentioned as well, for example *getuigenverhalen.nl* (Stories of Witnesses), the series *Jong in Oorlog* (Young during the War) made by *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei* (National Committee for four and five May), and *Tweeduizend getuigen vertellen* (Two thousand witnesses recall), the Dutch version of the Spielberg project which is accessible via the website of the *Joods Historisch Museum* (Jewish Historical Museum)*. The databases mentioned above are of course only a fraction of the recording projects that have taken place during the past 70 years, let alone the textual databases of testimonies, memoires, and published diaries.

However, what *Open Joodse Huizen, Oorlog in mijn buurt,* and *Post uit de Vergetelheid* have in common, besides the fact that they are all recent memory projects founded after 2010, is that they not only record testimonies of the Second World War to save them from oblivion, but also find new and innovative carriers to pass these testimonies on to new generations. Firstly, while other databases focus on books and video recordings, the projects researched in this thesis work with new media networks. Secondly, the interactive character of new media also shows the way to innovative participatory projects where the

---

[1] Examples of other recent Dutch memory projects are: *Geen nummers maar namen* organised by the Dutch *Verzetsmuseum,* the regional commemoration project *Vrijheid doorgeven* by the Tilburg Cobbenhagen Center, and the *V-monument* initiated by the makers of the musical *Soldaat van Oranje.*

stories of the eyewitnesses are disseminated by participants of all ages including young people. The double function of both preserving and (re)presenting stories, and the search for new carriers of memory, whether in person or via media, seems not only to be a recent trend in the Netherlands, but in many other countries sharing the history of the Second World War. Examples can be found in America with the *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's World Memory Project* where people are asked to add materials and information to the digital database, in Germany with the digital and interactive *Memorial Book* for the victims of the Nazi-regime in Wuppertal based on comments, videos, websites, and social media, and the *Memory Loops* website and app in Munich, a virtual memorial consisting of a map connected to audio tracks based on the stories of victims of National Socialism.

The Dutch memory culture is, like the international Second World War memory culture, subject to change since, more than seventy years after the war, the first generation of survivors and eyewitnesses is dying out. This goes hand in hand with a growing realization that the memories of the Second World War will die with them if we do not find ways to conserve them and pass them on to new generations. This awareness can be detected in the memorandum that was compiled by *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei,* the Dutch committee that organises the national commemorations and celebrations related to the (end) of the Second World War, in 2015. In the introduction of this memorandum, which is called *Kom vanavond met verhalen,* it is stated:

> Straks zullen de mensen die de oorlog bewust hebben meegemaakt niet meer onder ons zijn. Dat geeft nieuwe generaties, de huidige derde en vierde generatie, de verantwoordelijkheid om de verhalen en ervaringen van de eerste generatie te koesteren en in hun geest te handelen.[2] (4)

---

[2] Soon those who witnessed the war will no longer be among us. This gives new generations, the current third and fourth generation, the responsibility to cherish the stories and experiences of the first generation and act in their spirit.

This quote illustrates that *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei* emphasizes the necessity to preserve and present WWII testimonies. Moreover, they argue that younger generations have the moral responsibility to act in the spirit of WWII survivors. These stories need not only to be saved from oblivion but need to be saved to inspire new generations in the present and the future to act ethically. Similar tendencies can be observed in the work of organisations such as *COVVS, Stichting Herdenking 15 Augustus 1945, Stichting Pelita, Indisch Platform*, and *Cogis*. All these organisations were engaged in hosting a conference on ways to keep the memories of the Second World War alive. The introduction of the conference description reads:

> De organisaties waarin oorlogsgetroffenen zich verenigd hebben, stellen zich vanuit hun verantwoordelijkheid elk jaar weer de vraag hoe de herdenking in de toekomst op een verantwoorde manier gestalte kan worden gegeven en hoe deze voor toekomstige generaties levend kan worden gehouden en verankerd.[3] (Visser 5)

This quote also indicates a shared experience of responsibility in order to not only keep alive the memories of the Second World War but also anchor them in Dutch culture. Both quotes show that the organisations connect the individual testimonies of the survivors to the collective memory of the Second World War in the Netherlands, and that they see a need for finding new carriers in order for these testimonies to live on. Besides no longer being able to share their testimonies, the first generation witnesses will also no longer be able to organise and support the commemorations and projects created around the memory of the Second World War.

New media, part of all recent memory projects, seems to be able to meet both needs. Via new media, testimonies of the eyewitnesses and survivors can not only be preserved but younger generations will also be able to access these stories via digital projects. Since younger generations may not know someone who witnessed the Second World War or have a

---

[3] The organisations in which war victims are united, pose, on the basis of their responsibility, every year the same question: how will the commemoration in the future be shaped responsibly and how will it be kept alive and anchored for future generations.

personal or family connection to these events, they could easily perceive WWII as "ancient history." However, by sharing individual stories the younger generations will be able to identify with the people who experienced WWII, and therefore the memory of the Second World War will also become meaningful to them. Also, through the interactive structure of digital memory the younger generations will be invited to participate in the organisation and continuation of WWII commemoration and make this commemoration meaningful to them.

Transmitting and disseminating memories to groups or following generations is a central question to memory studies. It was Maurice Halbwachs who coined the term 'collective memory' in 1925 in order to describe a memory shared by a group. According to Halbwachs, even the personal memories of the members will be influenced by the memory of the group. Subsequently, Jan Assmann distinguished different forms of collective memory called communicative and cultural memory. Communicative memory is shared by the living bearers of the memory through everyday communication and is therefore often limited to three generations. Cultural memory is transmitted through cultural carriers and therefore not limited to the living bearers of that memory but continually reinterpreted and remediated.

Cultural memory is a dynamic memory and, according to Jan Assmann, there are two main transformations that account for that. The first is the transition from communicative to cultural memory, which applies to the current changes in Dutch memory culture. With the generation of eyewitnesses dying out, the communicative memory of the Second World War will come to an end. This is of course a theoretical framework. While it suggests that during the time of communicative memory all testimonies are available, we know this was not the case with the memories of the Second World War since millions of victims of the Shoah did not live to tell their story and not all survivors were willing or able to tell about their experiences. Besides, society also has not always been prepared to listen to the testimonies. In the Dutch situation, only from the 1960s onwards more attention was paid to Jewish survivors

of the Shoah and only since the 1980s also the testimonies of other victims of the Nazi-regime were taken into account, such as those of the victims of the Japanese POW camps in the Dutch Indies, the socialist and communist political prisoners, homosexual victims, and Roma and Sinti. The testimonies of the survivors therefore already constitute a limited reflection of what happened during the Second World War. However, the dying out of the first generation survivors and eyewitnesses does not necessarily mean that the memories of the Second World War have to die with them. These memories can be transmitted to new generations through cultural memory. It is exactly the transition from communicative to cultural memory, currently visible in Dutch memory culture, which will be the broader framework of my thesis.

The second transformation that accounts for the dynamics in cultural memory is the transition of memories from the periphery to the centre of attention and vice versa, according to Jan Assmann. Although the living bearers of the memories of the Second World War are dying out, there is a growing will to remember the War in Dutch society. Researchers agree that the engagement with the Second World War has never been as high among all generations as it is now ("Kom vanavond met verhalen." 5). The testimonies should therefore not only be stored in an archive which is rightly called a passive form of remembrance by Aleida Assmann, but be presented and circulated. For testimonies to be part of the dynamic of cultural memory they have to be remediated and become part of the canon, which is to be brought to the attention of the people who remember, according to Aleida Assmann. The dichotomy between the institutions of memory, for example archives, who store and select historical objects, and the audience, who consumes and remediates cultural memory, is about to change in the new media era through which not only the professionals but also the general public work together in preserving and presenting testimonies about the Second World War.

However, besides these two transformations, other ideas about the dynamics of cultural memory have been discussed within cultural memory studies, such as Marianne

Hirsch's concept of postmemory, which describes the process through which memories can be transmitted to second and third generations by bodily practices, but also through stories and photography. Furthermore, Hirsch broadens the group of those being able to internalize a particular memory from the family to the generation – she calls this a move from familial to affiliative memory. That memories do not stay the same through time has been discussed by, amongst others, Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney, who show that the remediation of memory goes together with a constant reinterpretation of the meaning of memory (Erll and Rigney 2-4). Since media have such an important influence on the meaning of memory, it is not remarkable that José van Dijck argues that "[a]s insidious process, digitization, conceived as concurrently a technological and sociocultural transformation – is likely to affect our very concepts of memory and remembering" (50). Digitization could be seen as today's paradigm shift in the way we think about memory, and overlaps with the current transition in Dutch WWII memory culture from communicative to cultural memory. This means that multiple ways of memory transmission and dissemination and new dynamics introduced by digitization need to be taken into account in research on current Dutch WWII memory culture.

Digitization, according to Ekaterina Haskins, Laura Miller, and José van Dijck, accounts, for example, for new forms of participatory memory. While Aleida Assmann emphasizes the importance of participation in cultural memory, she does not conceptualize different forms of participation except for the dichotomy between remediation of cultural memory by the wider public and preserving and selecting historical objects by specialists. However, her strict distinction between the two levels of participation could be questioned in current new media society, because, as Ekaterina Haskins shows, "'digital memory,' more than any other form of mediation, collapses the assumed distinction between modern 'archival' memory and traditional 'lived' memory" (401). This notion has been confirmed by archivist Laura Miller who concludes that today's society is "a society that is increasingly

documenting itself" (3) by which she means that the wider public has taken over the former role of the archivist and both preserves and remediates its perspectives on the past. When new media are implemented in cultural memory, for example in the creation of digital memorials, Kirsten Foot and Barbara Warnick found that myriad ways for interaction and participation among the public come into existence, like for example linking to other media or adding information and photos. This leads to a democratic model of memory making in society which is fundamentally different from the top-down memorialization and commemoration typical for cultural memory transmission (Assmann "Canon and Archive" 103).

In the context of the transition from a communicative to a cultural memory of the Second World War in the Netherlands and the development of digital memory, this thesis will focus on the following research questions:

How do new media change the way memory is transmitted and disseminated in participatory memory projects, such as *Joods* Monument and Open *Joodse Huizen, Oorlog in mijn buurt,* and *Post uit de Vergetelheid*, and how can different types of participation be charted and conceptualized?

By answering these questions I expect to problematize what a carrier of cultural memory is and can be, addressing the integrative character of new media. Besides analogue and digital carriers, survivors and second generation witnesses, I also hope to illustrate how there are more mixed forms of analogue and digital carriers coming into being which influence each other. Furthermore, this thesis will show that through the use of new media, participatory memory will be leading to a growing number of overlapping forms of individual participation which means that a participant can be an interviewer during a conversation with an eyewitness, an archivist when he or she documents and stores the tape of the interview, and a carrier of the testimony when transmitting the story to others, for example at a commemoration ceremony. Finally, I expect to find that the distinction between the specialists

and the wider public will slowly become less influential for cultural memory in general which will lead to a democratization of memory making in society.

The thesis is composed of four chapters. The first chapter will provide a theoretical background and historical context for the analysis of the three projects. Within the context of a brief overview of the development of the Dutch Second World War memory culture from 1945 until 2016 based on Rob van Ginkel, Maud van Reijt, and Ilse Raaijmakers, and building on a number of key concepts and theories from cultural memory studies (most importantly Maurice Halbwachs, Jan and Aleida Assmann, and, among others, Marianne Hirsch), this chapter will address the circulation of Dutch WWII memory in relation to the current debate on the influences of new media on memory transmission and dissemination by, amongst others, José van Dijck, Laura Miller, and Ekaterina Haskins supported by examples from memory projects in Europe and the United States.

Chapter two will discuss *Open Joodse Huizen.* The project began with a poster action in Amsterdam in 2011. The posters indicated where in Amsterdam Jews had lived before the Shoah and were put up in the windows of (almost) all houses where Jews lived until the Second World War, serving as a reminder of the large Amsterdam Jewish community from before the war. In 2012 commemorative ceremonies were organised in several of these houses, which focused on the telling of personal stories of the victims by family members, former neighbours, or historians. The following years the project expanded, and in 2016 *Open Joodse Huizen* took place in 16 cities, at 171 houses, with 365 commemorations, and close to 10.000 visitors. The project *Open Joodse Huizen* is connected to the digital archive *Joods Monument* instituted in 2000. Stories from *Joods Monument* are used to prepare the commemorations of *Open Joodse Huizen* and information that was brought to light during meetings of *Open Joodse Huizen* is added to *Joods Monument.* Since *Open Joodse Huizen* started as an offline projection of *Joods Monument* I expect this to be a perfect case study to

analyse the preservation and presentation of Second World War testimonies via varying forms of memory transmission and dissemination including digital memory.

Chapter three will consist of an analysis of *Oorlog in mijn buurt*. In this recurring six-week school project founded in Amsterdam in 2012, children from the last two classes of elementary school interview eyewitnesses of the Second World War in their neighbourhood. The interviews are recorded in text, audio, and video and become part of the digital *Oorlog in mijn buurt* archive. However, the stories are not only preserved, but also presented by the schoolchildren when they retell the testimonies on various occasions in their capacity of 'heritage carriers'. Again, (re)presenting and preserving Second World War testimonies is central to this project via various ways of memory transmission, including digital memory, and therefore *Oorlog in mijn buurt* is an interesting case study for this thesis.

Chapter four will deal with the exhibition *Post uit de Vergetelheid*, which is based on letters written by two Jews and a resistance fighter who were deported during the Second World War. The letters come from personal archives and are presented together with videos which show the letter-writers or their family members who reflect on the past. There are also video clips which show two well-known journalists and a singer who reflect on the meaning of these stories for the present. Moreover, the three different personal stories all revolve around themes such as censorship, privacy, and communication, which not only connect the stories from the past to each other but also connect them to the present. Since *Post uit de Vergetelheid* is a travelling exhibition consisting of both textual and video components, and has a website with more contemporary and critical background information which is connected to the exhibition by QR-codes, different modes of memory transmission are employed and therefore *Post uit de Vergetelheid* is an appropriate case study to take into account in this thesis.

The research for and interest in this project is based in part on an internship at *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei* through which I specialised in the commemoration of the Second World War in the Netherlands under supervision of Esther Captain. It is also via this internship that I learned more about the various projects that are being organised in order to keep the memories of the Second World War alive. For my internship research project I analysed the telling of stories at the commemorations of *Open Joodse Huizen*. Besides my literature research I visited eight meetings, distributed a questionnaire, and interviewed the creator/curator of the project, Denise Citroen, and project manager Maarten-Jan Vos. I learned more about *Joods Monument* via an interview with editor Anat Haral. I have followed *Oorlog in mijn buurt* for a long time via their Facebook pages and have been in contact with the creator/curator of the project, Minka Bos. Finally, *Post uit de Vergetelheid* is a project I am engaged in through my internship at *CODA,* an organisation in Apeldoorn which includes a library, a museum, and an archive. *CODA* will host the travelling exhibition *Post uit de Vergetelheid* in the spring of 2017. Stefan Rutten, archivist at *CODA,* asked me to add a local dimension to the exhibition based on the archive of a prisoner of war from Apeldoorn, Willem Heijmans, which consists, among other things, of the more than 200 letters he sent to his wife and daughter in Apeldoorn. I made this local addition to the exhibition under supervision of Stefan Rutten and in consultation with Mirjam Huffener, initiator of *Post uit de Vergetelheid*, and Elske de Jong, education professional at *CODA.*

The three case studies will consist of a discourse analysis component, as well as a comparative component. Interviews with the organisers and/or curators of each project, my experiences of visiting the projects, and the documentation of the sites will be part of this thesis. The methodology will be a close analysis of texts, images, and videos, as well as an evaluation of the way the projects relate commemorations, interviews, and exhibitions to their archives. The three projects will be compared and contrasted in the conclusion, where I will

illustrate the influence new media has in participatory projects on the transmission and dissemination of Second World War memories in the present day memory culture of the Netherlands. The conclusion will also present some reflections on how different types of participation can be charted and conceptualized. I will end with a critical reflection on this thesis and suggestions for further research.

Chapter 1 – The Theoretical Background

1.1 – Eyewitness Memory

Since 1945, the public commemoration of the Second World War in the Netherlands has seen many different forms and heated debates. The first commemorations were local and private initiatives according to historian Rob van Ginkel (726). Through the years a combination of official rituals and traditions has developed that can be seen as characteristic for the Dutch commemoration of WWII, such as silent marches, the ringing of the church bells, the two minutes of silence at eight o'clock in the evening, and the national commemoration at the Dam in Amsterdam (Raaijmakers 42-43), but unofficial and private commemoration initiatives continue to exist in the Netherlands until the present day.

Although the recurring traditional rituals might give the impression of a nationally shared, stable, and unified memory of the Second World War, this is not the case. Through the increasing diversification of the Dutch population, changing international politics, the rise of new generations, and the publication of historical research, new and competing perspectives on the Second World War have been gaining ground during the past seventy years. The first decades after the Second World War can be characterised by a national focus on the resistance with which the whole Dutch population was expected to identify (Keesom 20). According to historian Pieter Lagrou the resistance myth was helpful to ignore "[d]efeat, collaboration, economic plunder, deportation of the work-force and unprecedented persecution" (195). However, the resistance myth was exclusive and created discord in Dutch society. Due to the renewed denominationalism in the Netherlands into liberals, socialists, Catholics, and Protestants, and the development of the Cold War, the contribution of the communist resistance fighters was neglected (Ginkel 728-729). Moreover, through the national resistance myth strict moral oppositions were constructed between the good resistance and the bad collaborators (730). The studies *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de*

Tweede Wereldoorlog and documentary series *De Bezetting* of Loe de Jong, the first director of the Dutch Institute of War Documentation, were for instance quite influential in this regard (Keesom 20). Finally, the focus on the resistance meant that there was no attention for victims such as the Dutch Jews, Roma and Sinti, Jehovah's witnesses, civil victims of bombardments or the *Arbeitseinsatz*, and the Dutch victims of the Japanese in the Dutch Indies (Ginkel 731-732).

Except for the discord in society it was also difficult to construct a shared national memory during the first decades after 1945 since everyone had experienced the war in a different way, which resulted in a wide range of differing individual memories. As Aleida Assmann explains, "[t]he memory of the Holocaust, for instance, will vary vastly among survivors depending on whether they endured the torments of the concentration camps, hid in secret places or managed to escape the perpetrators in exile" ("Memory Individual and Collective" 216). However, Assmann also argues that in order for the individual fragmented episodic or autobiographical memories to be provided with form, structure and meaning, they have to be put in a larger framework ("Memory Individual and Collective" 213). Maurice Halbwachs was one of the first to conceptualize personal memories as mediated by groups and suggested in 1925 that "we [often] deem ourselves the originators of thoughts and ideas, feelings and passions, actually inspired by some group" (Halbwachs 139). Halbwachs calls the memory shared by "families, neighbourhood and professional groups, political parties, associations, etc., up to and including nations" collective memory (Assmann "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity" 127). Since personal memories and collective memory do not always fully correspond, and members can be part of several groups, different perspectives on the collective memory can coexist (142) as can be seen when studying the Dutch situation during the first decades after the Second World War.

Expanding Halbwachs' theory, Jan Assmann differentiates collective memory into two concepts through which he analyses the transition of memories within groups. One of them, closely related to Halbwachs' collective memory, is communicative memory which, according to Assmann, can be seen as the "short-term memory of a society" since it is bound to the living bearers of everyday memories and therefore only "encompasses three to four generations" ("Collective Memory and Cultural Identity" 127). Since the horizon of the past "shifts in direct relation to the passing of time", the memories will no longer be transmitted to the fourth generation ("Collective Memory and Cultural Identity" 127). This theory of personal, familial and generational transmission of memories within communicative memory can only partly be applied to the memory of the Second World War because the generational transmission of memories within (family) groups was disrupted by the traumatic events, causing many family memories to no longer being told and remembered. Secondly, the experiences of the victims of the Shoah could only be transmitted and disseminated by those who survived, which is only a small percentage of those who suffered in hiding, concentration- and extermination camps. Thirdly, not all of those who survived had the strength to relive their memories and tell them to their children or grandchildren. Through his studies on the memory of the First World War in Britain, also a war that disrupted generational transmission of memories in various ways, historian Jay Winter found that while "the experience of having lived through an extreme period of time, such as war, can result in the wish of survivors and witnesses to pass on the story to the next generation … also the opposite has been true: in order not to burden their children with difficult and even traumatic memories, or even out of shame for instance, parents have been silent about their own war experiences as eyewitnesses of the war" (Captain and Mooren 15).

Besides the limited readiness of eyewitnesses to tell their children, grandchildren, or the public about their experiences, it can also be questioned whether post-war society was

even prepared to listen to these testimonies. Historian Annette Wieviorka found that the relevance of the genre of testimony "beyond its personal meanings" was only recognized with the Eichmann trial in the early 1960s (389). By including the testimonies of the 111 witnesses in the trial they were given a "political and social significance", and only from then onwards the witness was perceived as the "bearer of history" or "embodiment of memory" (391). Wieviorka defines the "embodiment of memory" as a social identity that was given to the survivors through which they could attest "to the past and to the continuing presence of the past" (391). While "memory had enjoyed little prestige among historians" since "it was not acknowledged as a reliable source" or as anything that could add to our factual understanding of the past, Aleida Assmann found that during the 1980s memories were acknowledged even more broadly as being able to answer different questions about WWII, such as how persons experienced certain events and how they remembered them ("History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony" 269). Also, specific examples showed that memory does sometimes add to our factual knowledge of an event. Literary scholar Lawrence Langer found for example that: "[s]ince the Germans left no archives documenting the atrocity at Jedwabne it would have been lost to history and thus to common memory if it had not been rescued by the testimony of witnesses and participants" (299). Besides the judicial or historical importance, the transmission of testimonies is central to commemorating the past. According to Jay Winter, "[p]ublic commemoration lasts when it draws about overlaps between national history and family history" since "[m]ost of those who take the time to engage in the ritual of remembrance bring with them memories of family members touched by these events" (71). This means that testimonies transmitting personal experiences with which later generations can identify support the continuation of commemoration.

Literary scholar Marianne Hirsch emphasizes the connection between the memories of first and second generations even more by using the concept of 'post-memory' to define the

experience of "descendants of survivors (of victims as well as perpetrators) of massive traumatic events [that] connect so deeply to the pervious generation's remembrances of the past that they need to call that connection *memory* and thus that, in certain extreme circumstances, memory *can* be transmitted to those who were not actually there to live an event" ("The Generation of Postmemory" 105-106). The starting point for her argument is the living connection that bearers of memories form between the present and the past via the transmission of their experiences through "[t]he language of family, the language of the body: nonverbal and noncognitive acts of transfer" in the familial space such as "the pain, depression, and dissociation of persons who have witnessed and survived massive historical trauma" (112). The second generation will, besides the stories of their parents, also recall how their parents tried to cope with their memories. Unlike Jan and Aleida Assmann, Hirsch takes historical ruptures and trauma into account in her analysis of communicative memory resulting in postmemory by later generations (111) and unlike Wieviorka, she also illustrates the embodiment of memory within the familial context describing examples such as "nightmares, the idioms of sighs and illness, of tears and acute aches" (112). However, Hirsch does not specify how many generations can internalize memories of their forefathers. Since the postmemories are deduced from experiencing the previous generation going through their memories, I expect the postmemories of every next generation to be more remote from the events experienced by the first generation in the past and more complemented by the meaning of the family memories in the present.

Although there are of course differences between first and second generation memories, testimonies of second generation survivors can also connect the present to the past during commemorations or educative events, as has also been done internationally and in Dutch society since the 1980s (Hondius 218, 222). Organisations as *Landelijk Steunpunt Gastsprekers WO II-heden* organise classes with guest speakers, including second generation

witnesses and survivors, on various topics such as WWII in the Netherlands or in the Dutch-Indies, the decolonisation war of Indonesia and New Guinea, and the civil war in former Yugoslavia (Groot Koerkamp). In the context of a commemoration or as an educative tool, the testimony of a first or second generation survivor or witness connects the audience to an already remote past, not only by transmitting information about personal past experiences but also by showing how the past influenced the lives of several generations until the present.

Participation in communicative memory is divided into two roles. The first role is that of the storyteller who either has to be someone who participated in or experienced an event in the past, or someone who witnessed someone struggling with their (traumatic) memories, as in the case of the Shoah. The second role is that of the listener of the testimony who, from the perspective of postmemory, can internalize the memory transmitted and become a storyteller for the next generation or embodied representation of the memories of the forefathers. This means that the first and second role can overlap. Central to this model of memory transmission is the encounter between the living bearer of memory and the hearer of the testimony.

1.2 – Cultural Carriers

In the 1960s new research proved that relatively many Jews were deported from the Netherlands, compared to other countries in Europe, and therefore the national resistance myth lost credibility (Ginkel 733). It was Hans Blom, Loe de Jong's successor at the Dutch Institute of War Documentation, who proposed to end historical discussions in terms of right and wrong since it limited the view on the past (Damsma 99). The change of discourse gave the opportunity to acknowledge different layers of perpetrator involvement, but also to commemorate more victims besides the fallen Dutch soldiers and resistance fighters (Ginkel 733). The resistance myth changed into a victim cult, according to Van Ginkel (734), through

which more and more groups of victims sought recognition, ultimately resulting in a hierarchy of victimhood (Ginkel 735). During the 1960s more attention was given to the Jews (44), and during the 1980s also the children of Jews, resistance fighters, and collaborators, and the children born and raised in the Japanese POW camps, were taken into account as victims according to historian Maud van Reijt (65).

In the 1980s together with the growing international acknowledgement and attention for the Shoah the new adage 'never again' (nooit meer Auschwitz) became dominant in the Dutch Second World War memory culture (Ginkel 737). Remembering the Shoah as point of reference for all victimhood became a moral imperative, urging society to prevent new genocides, act against racism, advocate for human rights, and become politically active in order to keep extreme right activists in the Netherlands out of power (Ginkel 738). Simultaneously, with the growing attention for diverse victim groups in Dutch society, but also internationally, more and more attention was given to the victims' testimonies as a representation of a past which should never repeat itself again. Therefore testimonies were recorded in cultural carriers of memory such as video tapes, books, and art works. Internationally well-known testimony databases are for example the *Steven Spielberg Jewish Film Archive*, the *Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies* of the *Yale University Library*, and Claude Lanzmann's documentary *Shoah*.

While communicative memory is bound to the existence of the living bearers, cultural memory, another kind of collective memory, is based on external cultural carriers of memory. According to Jan Assmann, these carriers do not remember themselves, but trigger memories among the members of the group ("Communicative and Cultural Memory" 111) and can transmit these memories to following generations (Assmann "Memory Individual and Collective" 216). According to Jan Assmann, contrary to communicative memory, the

horizon of the cultural memory of a group is fixed and does not change with new generations because it is related to the cultural carriers.

Jan Assmann argues that the fixed horizon does not mean that cultural memory is static. One of the reasons for the dynamics within cultural memory is the influence of individual interpretations of the cultural carriers that changes per person and through time. Besides, through the use of external carriers, cultural memory not only finds a balance between remembering and forgetting but also revolves around passive forgetting which is "the cultural function of storing extensive information in libraries, museums, and archives which far exceeds the capacities of human memories" according to Aleida Assmann ("Memory Individual and Collective" 220). Since not all the stored memories can be part of the active memory or canon of a society, a selection of memories is made to focus on. The other memories are "neither actively remembered nor totally forgotten, because they remain materially accessible for possible use" (Assmann "Memory Individual and Collective" 220). The active memory is available to the whole group, but "[i]t is the task of others such as the academic researcher or the artist to examine the contents of the archive and to reclaim the information by framing it within a new context" ("Canon and Archive" 103). While latent memories can become active memories, this also works the other way around, which means that active memories can lose their meaning and become passively remembered in the archive. The cultural bearers and their selection therefore lead to an inherent and continuous dynamic within cultural memory.

Finally, I also think that the fixity of the cultural object could be questioned and the transformation of cultural carriers can also be perceived as a reason for the dynamics within cultural memory. Faded photos and renovated monumental buildings all have an inherently different meaning than just after they were printed or built. Both the fixed horizon they represent according to Jan Assmann, as well as the notion of the loss of *'Sitz im Leben'* (place

in life) that Aleida Assmann uses to define the status of a cultural object in an archive, do not take into account the material transformation of the cultural object through time which inherently also influences the interpretation of its meaning. José van Dijck calls the neglect of the transformation of the cultural object 'the illusion of fixity' and argues that digitization will change concepts about the nature of the cultural object such as its fixity: "[c]omputers are bound to obliterate even the illusion of fixity: a collection of digital data is capable of being reworked to yield endless potentialities of a past" (47). I will discuss this in more detail in the third section of this chapter.

Jan and Aleida Assmann's cultural carriers could be compared to the concept of *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory) by historian Pierre Nora. Just like the cultural carriers of Assmann, Nora's *lieux de mémoire* embody the memory of a time to which people are no longer directly related (what Nora calls *milieux de mémoire*). Also, just like Assmann's cultural carriers lose their '*Sitz im Leben*' and become open to multiple interpretations through time, Nora's *lieux de mémoire* are *"*forever open to the full range of its possible significations" (24). Similar comparisons could be made between Assmann's communicative memory and Nora's description of memory transmission during the *milieux de mémoire* characterized by "gestures and habits, in skills passed down by unspoken traditions, in the body's inherent self-knowledge, in unstudied reflexes and ingrained memories" (13). Both concepts differ, however, in the way they are valued, since Nora sees the *lieux de mémoire* as prosthetics or substitutes of 'true memory', while Jan and Aleida Assmann, and I agree with them on this point, see cultural memory as an inherently creative and dynamic form of memory transmission in society that is interesting in its own right. However, what is useful of Nora's concept of *lieux de mémoire* is his expanded notion of a 'site' of memory including not only a material or physical component such as monuments or objects in a more general sense, but also symbolic and functional aspects (19). In my analysis I would like to extend

this conception even further to include also digital and practical facets of the projects I discuss in this thesis, as 'sites of memory'.

For the communicative memory of the Second World War to be transmitted and disseminated to future generations it has to be transformed into cultural memory. This transition has already been discussed by the historian and anthropologist Jan Vansina who studied oral cultures in Africa and also found a model of communicative memory that dealt with everyday memories, and cultural memory which dealt with "the origin of the world and the early history of the tribe" ("Communicative and Cultural Memory" 112). Everything between the past 80 years and the history of the origin of the group was only latently remembered or even forgotten. The gap between the historical origin of the group or 'foundational memory' and recent history or 'biographical memory' has been called the 'floating gap' by Vansina because of the changing horizon of the communicative memory (Assmann *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization* 34-37). According to Jan Assmann a similar dynamic between communicative and cultural memory exists in literate cultures where the "living memory does not extend beyond eighty years. The floating gap comes next; this is followed by textbooks and monuments, the official version rather than myths of origin" (*Cultural Memory and Early Civilization* 37).

However, the transition from communicative to cultural memory not only happens when the living bearers of memory are no longer there. "After forty years those who have witnessed an important event as an adult will leave their future-oriented professional career, and will enter the age group in which memory grows as does the desire to fix it and pass it on" (Assmann *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization* 36). This has become visible in the written and recorded testimonies of WWII produced in the past 70 years. This means that communicative memory is already transforming into cultural memory while the living bearers of that memory are still around, and there is no 'floating gap'. Jan and Aleida Assmann

acknowledge that "'cultural' and 'communicative memory' can only be strictly separated in a theoretical context; in the actual memory practice of individuals and social groups, their forms and methods are linked together" (285). The overlap between both ways of memory transmission is visible in Dutch WWII memory culture. The Second World War is both seen as a point of reference for Dutch identity and history in textbooks, films, and commemorations, as well as it is present through survivors and eyewitnesses who experienced the events themselves and form a living connection to the past.

Generations that are part of the overlap between the communicative or living memory and the cultural or national memory are for example analysed by anthropologists Efrat Ben-Ze'ev and Edna Lomsky-Feder who focussed in their research on participants of the 1948 War of Independence and the 1973 Yom Kippur War (1047). For their analysis they used the concept of the 'canonical generation' which "tells the story *of the* nation, while at the same time its own story is told *by* the nation" (1048). Ben-Ze'ev and Lomsky-Feder conclude that "[t]he biographical memories of a canonical generation merge with a key national event and serve as a role model for future generations" but also that "while the canonical generation enjoys a symbolic authority, it is entrapped within a social role, with little leeway for agency" (1060). According to Ben-Ze'ev and Lomsky-Feder society is not prepared to listen to personal testimonies that contradict the canon of national memory. The overlap between the two memories constitutes a framework in which the testimonies need to fit. This means that they find little opportunity for counter stories to influence the grand narrative. If we relate this theory to the Dutch WWII memory culture we find that although it took almost twenty years before more attention was given to the perspective of the victims of the Shoah instead of the resistance in the Netherlands, the grand narrative changed towards a focus on victims and victimhood. Following my interpretation of this historical change in memory culture this

would be an example of the possibility that testimonies not only confirm the national narrative but can also influence and change it through time.

As Jay Winter, among many others, confirms, sites of memory always have a dual function: they are a place of commemoration for the survivors or witnesses but also a place of transmission and education for generations who did not experience the event themselves: "[t]he critical point about sites of memory is that they are there as points of reference not only for those who survived traumatic events, but also for those born long after them" (62). In practice the site or memory only maintains its memorial function if it is "kept alive by the recycling of stories and commemorative events" according to Ann Rigney. She refers to Koselleck when she argues that "building a monument may seem like the ultimate expression of a desire to remember, but it may also mark the first stage of forgetting of an event if other forms of remembrance are not subsequently brought into play in an ongoing symbolic reinvestment of the site in question" (21). According to Winter the recycling of testimonies keeps the memorial alive since "[s]ites of memory inevitably become sites of second-order memory, that is, they are places where people remember the memories of others, those who survived the events marked there" (62).

While individual memories can be represented via memorials and monuments, they can also be more literally transmitted to following generations via recorded and written testimonies. While these testimonies might seem similar in content to communicative or oral memory, the medium influences the roles of participation drastically. Aleida Assmann points out that while oral interviews focus on individual suffering and surviving, video testimonies are often presented in a series through which they are also "testimonies of the collective Holocaust" (267). The second important difference between a video testimony or written memoires and an oral interview is the lack of interaction possible between the storyteller and the listener, viewer, or reader, because, unlike communicative memory, there is no personal

encounter between the two. Besides, the autobiography is structured in a particular manner and based on a pact with the reader, through which the reader becomes "a co-witness or secondary witness of the memory that he or she helps to extend in space and time" (265). The listener of a video interview also becomes a secondary witness because in the case of the Shoah, the victim is a witness as well (269). However, both the listener and the reader cannot respond to the person telling the story. Compared to communicative memory, cultural memory can exist on a much larger scale without personal interaction due to the fact that the memories are transmitted by an external cultural carrier. Since these cultural carriers, in the case of video testimonies and memoirs, have to be made, many more roles come into play. People are involved in both constructing the stories as promoting them among a possible audience. In the case of other cultural carriers such as photos, letters, and personal items, the memories do not need to be constructed but need to be selected by archivists, historians, or artists, who then connect them to the memory they represent in society.

According to Hirsch, memory conveyed via cultural carriers could still be called postmemory since "[p]ostmemory's connection to the past is … not actually mediated by recall but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation" (111). Besides embodied memory transmission in the familial framework, stories and images can also be sources of the creative process of memory making within the affiliative network (111). This does not mean that Hirsch lets go of the embodied living connection to the past as can be illustrated by her appreciation of the medium of photography, which, according to Hirsch, is able to "reembody and to reindividualize 'cultural/archival' memory" (115), and therefore brings a collective history back to an individual story which following generations identify with.[4]

---

[4] Related to Hirsch's concept of postmemory is Alison Landsberg's notion of "prosthetic memories" which are similarly to Hirsch's concept, "memories not strictly derived from a person's lived experience" but unlike postmemory, conveyed to the individual through mass media (25-26). In this thesis I will base my analysis on Hirsch's 'postmemory' since she starts with embodied memory transmission resolving into a creative form of memory making which is also present in my case studies.

Together with Leo Spitzer, Hirsch also shows that objects can function as cultural carriers of memory. Striking examples she provides are a book of recipes and a miniature artists' book from the Terezín and Vapniarka concentration camps. Besides being traces of the past, these objects also "reembody the very process of its transmission" (355) since they are already part of a practice of exchange and transmission as the recipes are "exchanged among women and bequeathed from mother to daughter" (356). To study these objects as carriers of memories they use Roland Barthes' notion of 'punctum' or 'points of memory' which function as "points of intersection between past and present, memory and postmemory, personal remembrance and cultural recall" (358). By relating the present to the past via an object or punctum, the voyage of the object from the past to the present and the way it brings along memories of former generations becomes visible.

In order to narrate that which cannot be told because the victims are no longer around to convey their testimonies, or because victims cannot find words to describe what they experienced, Lawrence Langer argues that literature can be used. According to Langer, history gives us information about the Shoah but literature, "whether testimony, memoir, or belles lettres" (307) make us hear the Shoah and "participate in the creative process" (308) of remembering. In cultural memory transmission, unlike communicative memory, the listener is no longer passive but helps creating memory.

1.3 – New Media Memory

In the 1980s the motto 'never again' was not only used to focus on the Shoah as the point of reference for all victimhood in the Second World War but also to connect the past to the present. This was part of a general awareness that a generation was growing up that had not experienced the war themselves. By connecting the past to the present the Second World War would not become a passive history. It was also in this vein that *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei*

was instituted in 1987 (Keesom 28). Their primary focus was the organisation of the commemorations and celebrations on the 4th and 5th of May through which not only the generation who experienced the war but also those who were born after the war would be addressed (Ginkel 739). During the past 30 years also a research and education department were set up in order to mediate policies and information from the academic realm to local organisations occupied with the organisation of educative events, commemorations, and celebrations related to WWII.

According to theologian and cultural scholar Liesbeth Hoeven, the dominant collective memory or, as she calls it, master narrative 'never again Auschwitz' in the Netherlands, will need to make room for smaller and competing counter narratives because, firstly, it is "losing its *grip on* reality" because of the genocides that followed the Shoah in the 20th and 21st century (301). Secondly, the master narrative "makes clear what we do NOT want to identify with: Auschwitz. The question as how a positive profile of remembrance culture is to be constructed remains as yet unanswered" (301). Finally, "[t]he big story is increasingly being confronted with the loss of the many small stories that originally lent significance to the message 'Never again!'" (301). In her research Hoeven discusses various counter stories[5] that are personal but still portray a positive group identity with hope for the future, taking into account what has been lost in the past. Finally, although she focuses on four stories as her case studies, she argues that the new meaning does "not only lie in the *story* as a product of culture, but in the cultural and social processes that the *telling* of these stories may create in the future" (301).[6] It is exactly this act of telling stories as crucial part of commemorative events that is reflected upon in this thesis. While the national commemoration ceremony is

---

[5] She discusses Art Spiegelman's *Maus,* Anne Frank's diary, Charlotte Salomon's *Leben? Oder Theater?*, and Jochen Gerz' *2146 Steine – Mahnmal gegen Rassismus.*
[6] This has also been discussed by, amongst others, Ann Rigney for example in her article "Plenitude, scarcity and the circulation of cultural memory" where her "media-based approach, emphasizing the way memories are communicated, circulated and exchanged, allows us to see how collective identities may be (re)defined through memorial practices and not merely reflected in them" (11).

still highly appreciated (*Nationaal Vrijheidsonderzoek* 2016), this thesis focuses instead on additional local commemorations such as organised by *Joods Monument* and *Open Joodse Huizen*, education projects like *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* and exhibitions as *Post uit de Vergetelheid.* The following chapters will show how the (re-)telling of (counter-) stories is not only done via communicative and cultural memory but also by new media specifically designed for this purpose.

Digital media also play a major role in transforming the transmission and dissemination of WWII memory in recent projects. José van Dijck uses the concept of 'mediated memories' to point out the importance of media for memory transmission since they are part of the "complex interaction between brain, material objects, and the cultural memory from which mediated memories arise" (28). She is not the first to argue that the medium influences the message,[7] however, while taking this into account in her concept of mediated memories, this also influences her position in the debate of memory studies. Van Dijck argues that since all factors of the dynamic of memory making, brain, material objects, and cultural memory, are subject to change, memories are always newly constructed upon recall. Although this dynamic concept of creating mediated memories is in line with Aleida Assmann's dynamic definition of constructing memory (12), Van Dijck includes the transformation of the medium and finds that Assmann "clearly does not know how to account for the role of media and media tools in the formation of cultural memory" (14). In my opinion Assmann ascribes a clear role to cultural objects in her theory as cultural relics are open to multiple interpretations through time ("Canon and Archive" 109), but locates all agency and interpretation with the archivists and the wider public. Van Dijck, on the other

---

[7] Marhsall McLuhan already postulated in the 1960s that 'the medium is the message'.

hand, treats the media themselves also as agents subject to change influencing the variation of interpretations through time.[8]

To research the personal media objects relating the individual to the collective and vice versa she uses the concept of 'personal cultural memory' with which she means "the acts and products of remembering in which individuals engage to make sense of their lives in relation to the lives of others and to their surroundings, situating themselves in time and place" (6). By focussing on the personal lived memories through her concept of personal cultural memory, Van Dijck does not discuss the trans- and intergenerational transmission of memories which is central to the cultural memory theory of Jan and Aleida Assmann, Hirsch and this thesis. However, since her analysis shows how new media influence and shape individual memory, and maps out the participation of individuals in the process of collective memory, Van Dijck's concept of mediated memories is productive for this thesis.

Van Dijck is not the only one who argued that the individual seems to be forgotten in collective memory theory and needs to be discussed again. Susan A. Crane for example argues in her article "Writing the Individual back into Collective Memory" that "[p]erhaps the *practice* of history, redefined as the active participation in remembering and forgetting within collective memory by each member, can become characteristic of historical consciousness, rather than simply reference to the *knowledge* of history" (1385). With her focus on personal cultural memory Van Dijck does not argue for an overview of all individual memories such as the "inclusion of numerous individual testimonies in public representations of the Holocaust" (11). She agrees with Halbwachs that "no collective experience … can ever be represented in a singular collective memory" (11) but larger narratives construct a collective memory in

---

[8] Van Dijck does not perceive the medium as an object from the archive functioning as a trigger of memories like Assmann, or as prosthetic and artificial memory that can be internalized by all who encounter the medium like Landsberg, but as one of the knots through which, in relation with culture and brain, memories are created. Finally, both Assmann and Landsberg "approach cultural memory from the […] angle of collectivity" while Van Dijck "approaches memories from the opposite direction, privileging private memory objects, regardless of whether they have gained recognition in the public realm" (28).

which the individual stories are given meaning. Although Van Dijck agrees with the relation between the individual and collective memory set out by Halbwachs she misses the notion of culture in Halbwachs' concept of collective memory (12), since she argues that mediated memories not only come forth out of the relation between the individual brain and collective culture, but media is also part of this dynamic. This is also the reason that Van Dijck argues that"[d]igitization, rather than being a replacement of analog by digital instruments, encompasses everything from redesigning our scientific paradigms probing the mind to readjusting our habitual use of media technologies, and from redefining our notion of memory all the way to substantially revising our concept of self and society" (42). Digitization, or the introduction of new media, initiates a paradigm shift in memory studies.

One of the changes in how memory is perceived through digital media is the fact that neurobiologists are nowadays able to "envisage and conceptualize memory functions" through fMRI and PET (42). Although this might give the impression that the use of new media leads to the disembodiment and dematerialization of memory, Van Dijck argues that new media make even more clear that brain, machine and memory are related (47). Besides, digital technologies disprove the illusion of an 'original' memory since "[c]omputers are bound to obliterate even the illusion of fixity: a collection of digital data is capable of being reworked to yield endless potentialities of a past" (47). So, according to Van Dijck, the use of digital media changes the way memory as a concept is perceived in relation to where it resides, how it transforms, and how it relates the individual in the present to the collective and the past.

Besides transforming the understanding of memory, digital media also change the way memory functions in society according to Van Dijck: "[w]hereas in the analogue age, photos, cassette tapes, or slides were primarily intended to be shared or stored in the private sphere … the emergence of digital networked tools may reform our habits of presentation and

preservation" (48). One of the consequences of the emergence of digital networked tools is that "digital memory items are becoming networked objects … in constant interaction with other people, even anonymous audiences" (48). An example she gives herself is the difference between analogue photobooks aimed for use in the familial sphere and digital photo albums shared via social media with a network of familiar and unfamiliar visitors of the websites.

A second consequence of the emergence of digitization in society is not that digitization takes over the older analogue memory objects, but that a hybrid coexistence is the result (49). Van Dijck notes for example that "weblogs only partly overlap with the conventional use of paper diaries, laminated pictures are still printed despite the rise of digital photography, and MP3 files are not exactly replacing our tangible music collections" (49). This means that while weblogs partly take over the role of diaries as networked objects through which personal experiences are shared with a larger group of followers, and may be hybrids including text, videos, photos, and links to webpages, a physical diary may still be used to write down personal information (54-55).

Digitization not only influences the way memory is perceived or functions in society but also the participation of individuals in collective memory making. Aleida Assmann finds in her theory of cultural memory a dichotomy between the archivists, historians and artists who store and interpret memory objects, and the public who takes them up in their collective memory (Assmann, "Canon and Archive" 101). But archivist Laura Miller argues in her talk entitled "What is the Role of the Archivist in Documenting Society in a Society that is Increasingly Documenting Itself?" that "[w]idespread access to digital and social media tools – not just in developed countries but everywhere in the world – is breaking down hierarchical modes of governance, changing the essence of social interaction, and giving people a freedom – as individuals and within organizations – to create, change, destroy, share, and keep the ideas, their images, their records however and where they wish, whether those records are

innocent byproducts or intentional creations" (5). This means that the traditional dichotomy Assmann detects is changing due to the influence of digitization. Through digitization many more people and organisations are able to document themselves, they do that with "products neither physical nor static", and this means that the "traditional linear process: acquisition before preservation, preservation before description, description before access" does no longer function according to Miller (6). Therefore, while the traditional role of an archivist was to "acquire, preserve, and make available the documentary evidence of society's communications, actions and transactions" (3), the current archivists need to "raise awareness of the value of records and archives across society" and "to participate actively in building tools that will make records creation and records preservation – and description and access – much easier for the average person" (12). All in all, Miller comes to the conclusion that in the age of digitization, archivists needs to facilitate the preservation of documents instead of doing this themselves. As an example of the enormous capacity of new media and amateurs preserving and presenting information she discusses her own search for more information about her grandfather who served in the First World War. While the official archives preserved some official records of him, she only found out through the genealogical website Ancestry that he had three brothers who fought there, one of whom died (2). It was only via the website of Ancestry, where volunteers make connections, add all kinds of information, and show family relations that she learned more about this relative (11). This confirms her argument that archivists need to better facilitate media that can absorb all information found and shared by the public.

The participation of the individual in both constructing and interpreting the archive is also confirmed by the sociologist Mike Featherstone who argues that "[t]his may not just be the activity of the solitary researcher wandering through the scholarly or official archives, but the activity of individuals in everyday life who seek to preserve documents, photographs,

diaries and recording to develop their own archives as memory devices" (549). Featherstone rightly points out here that amateurs are often not adding to official archives but constructing personal archives and document their own past with digital media.

According to Van Dijck, individuals not only construct personal archives with mediated memories to document their own past but also to relate their individual experiences to the collective (25). Van Dijck discusses livelogs, music, photography, and video recording in the context of digitization as examples of media bridging the personal and the collective, and the past, present, and future. In her chapter about music she finds that "cultural practices like communal listening mixing, and swapping recorded music appear crucial in understanding how and why we construct shared memories through embedded experiences: musical memories are shaped through social practices and cultural forms as much as through individual emotions" (94). However, as noted earlier, Van Dijck focusses on constructing, sharing, and preserving memories of individuals in the present and not on intergenerational memory transmission.

Studies of new media were participants take up a role in the transmission of testimonies from the past to the future are done by communication scholars and specialists Kirsten Foot, Barbara Warnick, and Steven M. Schneider on interactive digital memorials. They constructed a matrix through which web-based memorials could be compared on the basis of seven dimensions, such as the focus of the commemoration, coproduction, voice, immediacy of production, fixity, intended audience, and the positioning of victims (91), of which coproduction, voice, and intended audience "could be analysed as reflecting various forms of interactivity" (93). Coproduction was defined by "creating something jointly" and could be found in content, postings, a photo gallery, database or links between sites (77-78). Voice shows whether a site was produced by an individual or a collective and the degree in which different voices can be identified (89). Finally, websites sometimes give clues about

their intended audience which says something about which public they would like to address and is possibly asked to respond or interact on the website (89-90). They concluded that "Web-based memorializing bears a diverse array of characteristics, some of which are consistent with offline memorializing, and some of which are divergent" (92). One of the differences between offline and online memorializing they found was that "the distinction between public and vernacular memorializing that has been useful in scholarship in offline memorials is harder to sustain, and perhaps less useful, in studies of Web-based memorializing" (92) since they "found that some institutionally-produced sites became venues for individual and seemingly private grieving, whereas some individually sponsored memorial sites were places where visitors mourned the collective losses resulting from September 11 events" (74). This could be interpreted as another confirmation of the democratization of digital commemoration, since the creators and initiators of the website do not longer decide how the website is used in practice by the public.

The same effects of online or new media memorializing have been found by Ekaterina Haskins, in her study of digital memorials related to 9/11, who finds that "[a]lthough even 'permanent' memorials and museums are now being built with an eye to stimulating public engagement, their capacity to share memory work with ordinary people pales in comparison with 'digital' memorials and archives" (405). Haskins finds lots of possibilities for participation in collective digital memory making because "it becomes possible to collect, preserve, sort, and display a vast amount of texts, drawings, photography, video and audio recordings" (405). However, while the internet has made collective authorship possible, there is also no longer a clear distinction between the public and the private. Although she seems to agree with Miller that "professional historians, archivists, and museum curators find themselves compelled both to acknowledge the role of ordinary people in history making and to include diverse forms of popular expression into the official record of history" Haskins also

thinks that "[t]o remain relevant, they must strike a delicate balance, as it were, between a desire to accommodate as many different voices as possible, on the one hand, and a responsibility to provide a common ground for this diversity, on the other" (408). Haskins clearly argues here, just like Miller, that although digital memory comes with an increasing democratization of memory transmission, professionals in the field do not lose their function but acquire another in managing the democratic development of digital memory. This also applies to online interaction, according to Haskins, since it "has been extolled for its potential to foster communitarian intimacy, it is necessary to ask what kind of exchange actually occurs – whether it indeed creates bridges between demographically and politically diverse audiences or promotes balkanization" (409). Haskins concludes that new media broaden the ways in which the public is able to become a participant instead of a visitor of a memorial. This means that digital memory not only offers new ways of transmitting and disseminating memories, but also creates ways for visitors to interact with, and access memories in their own times.

In this introduction I have provided a theoretical framework for the case studies I will analyse in the following chapters, consisting both of the historical context and a discussion of the major concepts in memory studies. I highlighted and analysed the major changes in Dutch WWII memory culture during the last 70 years due to historical, political, and societal influences based on research by Van Ginkel, Van Reijt, and Raaijmakers. In my description of the major concepts in memory studies I took into account Jan and Aleida Assmann's concepts of communicative and cultural memory and the overlapping transition between them currently visible in Dutch WWII memory culture. I discussed (the need for) the circulation of stories within memory cultures on the basis of Marianne Hirsch's concept of postmemory concerning the embodied and creative practice of memory transmission and Pierre Nora, Jay Winter, and Ann Rigney's argument that monuments can only be kept alive by the continuation of

storytelling and transmission of testimonies. When it comes to digital memory I discussed José van Dijck's concept of 'mediated memories' foregrounding the way media shape memories. I took into account Laura Miller's article to illustrate how new media initiate participation and democratization and Ekaterina Haskins's argument to discuss how participation and interaction via new media can be analysed critically, for example by taking into account the dangers of open access interaction.

While communicative memory transmission consists of two roles, storytellers and listeners, and both roles can overlap, more roles come into existence in cultural and digital memory. Since cultural carriers need to be interpreted by specialists in cultural memory transmission this leads to a division in the process of memory making by professionals and the public. In digital memory transmission everybody who has access to the media can participate and interact with both the medium and other users. While all theories introduced above have been discussed before, often also in relation to each other, I will apply them to three recent WWII memory projects in the Netherlands containing elements of all three ways of memory transmission, communicative, cultural, and digital. The combination of case studies with a hybrid character, in the context of a dynamic process of memory transmission in the Netherlands, as well as the focus on distinguishing various participatory roles, often neglected in memory studies, results in new insights on memory transmission.

Chapter 2 – *Joods Monument* and *Open Joodse Huizen*

2.1 – Network of Commemoration Practices

Open Joodse Huizen is part of a network of memory practices connected through their shared aim to commemorate all Dutch Jewish victims of the Shoah. In this thesis I interpret the network as an extended 'site of memory' which consists of various components, although it is difficult to entangle them. The book series *Joodse Huizen* is a physical component, *Joods Monument* functions as a digital memorial, and a poster action shows the activity aspect of the network. In *Open Joodse Huizen* all these components are combined: the activity aspect in the organisation and continuous expansion of commemorations, the digital facet in the research that is done about the victims of the Shoah and that derives from/is fed into the website, and the physical aspect in the locations of the commemorations, the houses were the victims lived before WWII.

Joods Monument

     Joods Monument is a digital monument, dedicated to the commemoration of the more than 100.000 Dutch Jews who did not survive the Shoah. Every victim has a personal page on which photos, factual information like date and place of birth and death, and memories or stories can be shared, accessed, and amended by those visitors of the website who have an account. All the victims are visually represented on the homepage of the digital monument through purple squares that link to the personal pages of the victims. Only by zooming out the can the user see all the squares, which by then are barely distinguishable, and only by zooming can one select a personal page and read about individual victims of the Shoah.

     In 2000 Isaac Lipschits (1930-2008), emeritus professor in history and politics at the University of Groningen (Redactie Joodse Monument "Over dit monument."), began to work

on *Joods Monument*, which started as the *Digitaal Monument Joodse Gemeenschap in Nederland* (hereafter: *Digitaal Monument*) and was published online in 2005. Lipschits had lost his parents, brothers and sister during the Second World War. The family separated when they went into hiding and only Isaac Lipschits and his younger brother Alex survived, while the other family members were killed in Auschwitz and Sobibor (Redactie Joods Monument "Gezin Sander Lipschits.").

The idea for the website is based on the Jewish saying that a person stays alive as long as he or she is remembered. A digital monument could be seen as the ultimate form to achieve this aim since it can encompass personal pages of all victims and more information can be added if necessary. Also, the digital monument is everywhere accessible. While many victims of the Shoah do not have a grave or a designated place where they can be mourned, the website is a public place to commemorate individuals. ("Digitaal Monument Joodse Gemeenschap in Nederland."). Besides keeping the memories of the Dutch victims of the Shoah alive, the monument aimed at providing information about the victims for family and others interested in the Shoah (Faro 195). The monument was financed by *Verbond van Verzekeraars* and created by the *Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis.* Finally, the website was designed and constructed by *Mediamatic* (Redactie Joods Monument "Over dit monument."). Since 2006 the website has been maintained by the *Jewish Historical Museum,* which is part of the *Jewish Quarter* in Amsterdam and also includes other sites of memory related to the Shoah such as the *Children's Museum, the Portuguese Synagoge, the Hollandsche Schouwburg,* and *the National Holocaust Museum.*

In 2010, the design firm *Mediamatic*, commissioned by the *Jewish Historical Museum*, made the *Community Joods Monument*, an interactive website in addition to *Digitaal Monument* where visitors with an account could upload photos, information, and stories about the victims (Faro 195). This means that the information that can be found does not only

consist of objective information about the victims such as former addresses, family connections, and date and place of birth and death, but also subjective information such as memories and stories. In order to commemorate a person, both objective and subjective information can be helpful, but visitors interested in learning more about the past from a historical point of view will have to take the differences between the sources into account.

The community was financed by the program *Active European Remembrance* of the European Union and *Stichting Collectieve Maror-gelden Nederland*, which manages the financial means of the Jewish community that were given by the Dutch government, insurance companies, and banks as compensation for the confiscation of Jewish property during WWII. While 80 percent of the money was distributed among the Jewish people via individual payments, 20 percent was donated to projects like *Joods Monument* ("Oorsprong Maror-gelden")*.* This means that the Jewish community financed this part of the monument themselves. In 2015-2016 both parts, the *Digitaal Monument* and the *Community Joods Monument*, were combined in the current *Joods Monument*, constructed by *Driebit* and financed by subsidiaries from the *Claims Conference, the BankGiro Loterij Museumprijs*, and the *Nora Salmon Fonds* (Redactie Joodse Monument "Over dit monument.").

The website not only includes all Dutch Jewish victims of the Shoah but also invites visitors to interact with the monument. After making an account, everybody can add information such as photos, family relations, and memories of a person. As discussed with reference to Ekaterina Haskins in the previous chapter, an inclusive and participatory website can be very successful in engaging the public in its commemorative purpose, but can also make the website vulnerable for criticism, spamming, or, as in this case, anti-Semitic comments. Except for spam or commercials placed by a bot, the editors have not yet encountered unwanted additions such as anti-Semitic or Neo-Nazi messages, according to Anat Haral, one of the editors. All additions are directly visible after publication by the

visitor, who is also allowed to work with a pseudonym. Editors primarily check factual information such as dates and help visitors to work with the community part of the website. All other visitor additions are accompanied by the message that the information is not verified by the editors. This provides room for family members to add memories that cannot be checked, but also makes the website vulnerable to unwanted comments and remarks and possibly inadequate information. The editing process reminds of Wikipedia where every user can add information but every edit is checked by an editor. Information that is not followed up with a source or footnote is flagged, for example with 'citation needed'. However, Wikipedia aims to be an online and free encyclopaedia where information needs to be objective and falsifiable, while *Joods Monument,* besides providing information, aims at keeping memories alive which can differ per individual and therefore cannot always be checked.

Poster project

When he bought his house in Amsterdam 1980, Frits Rijksbaron, copywriter and commercial editor, discovered that it was owned by a Jewish family who were forced to sell it during the Second World War. Except for the youngest son, the whole family was killed in concentration camps. Prompted by the story of his new house, Rijksbaron set out to find more houses with a similar history. In order to make the effects of the Shoah on Amsterdam visible he initiated a poster project: he asked all the current habitants of the houses where victims of the Shoah had lived before they were deported to put a poster in the windows. The poster read: "Dit is een van de 21.662 huizen waar Joden woonden die in de Tweede Wereldoorlog werden vermoord"[9]. On the back of the poster were printed all the 21.662 addresses of the houses where Dutch Jewish victims lived in 1940. The poster was designed by the local Amsterdam 4 en 5 Mei Comité and *Mediamatic*, the addresses were provided by the *Digitaal Monument*,

---

[9] This is one of the 21.662 houses where Jews who have been murdered during the Second World War lived.

and the posters were distributed by the newspaper *het Parool*. This means that the posters were not sent to the home addresses since this could be perceived as too confronting and intrusive by the habitants. The poster was also available for download.

While many of the present day residents did put the poster in the window on the fourth of May in 2011 (the national day of commemoration), and got interested in the history of their houses ("Het Ontstaan."), others[10] did not, for various reasons. One resident felt uncomfortable because he did not want to draw attention through the suffering of others, another just found out about the history of the house and its former habitants and wanted to reflect on it a bit longer before taking part in a public poster action (Thie). Criticism was also given by members of the Jewish community of Amsterdam. Although the victims of the Shoah were commemorated through this poster action, not all Jews were prepared to deal with this inevitable confrontation in their daily lives. One woman called the editorial office because she was worried about her old Jewish mother and what this confrontation with the consequences of the Shoah in Amsterdam would do with her (Thie). The poster action seems to be designed to create an uncomfortable feeling and inevitable confrontation, not only among the habitants of the houses, but among all the people who would see the posters on the windows of houses in the streets where they live, work, shop, or travel. It could, however, be questioned whether this initiative did respect those who for personal reasons could not bear this confrontation in their daily lives and have their own ways of dealing with the past. Nonetheless, the initiative raised awareness and was the beginning of all the other projects like *Open Joodse Huizen.*

---

[10] I do not know how many people put the poster in the window and how many did not.

Open Joodse Huizen

The relative success of the poster project made clear that people who were or had been made aware of the Second World War history of their house, street, and city wanted to talk about this history and learn more about it. People thought that not only the houses of the deported families should be made visible by posters, but also the stories of these families should be told ("Achtergrond."). In this vein the initiator of *Open Joodse Huizen*, Denise Citroen, started to organise commemorations in the living rooms of the houses were Jewish families had lived until they went into hiding, were forced to move to the ghetto, or were deported to the concentration camps. These commemorative activities are small-scale and highly individual. Only a maximum of ca. fifteen to twenty people can visit the commemoration, which results in an intimate atmosphere. The meetings take approximately 45 minutes and consist of a recitation of the names of the family members and their life-stories. These stories may be told by family members, children, former neighbours, historians, archivists, or anyone interested and touched by the history of this family. The stories are sometimes illustrated with pictures, objects, a poem, or a musical performance. At the end, there is always time to ask questions and to talk with the other visitors ("Wat is Open Joodse Huizen.").

For my research internship at *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei* I attended several commemorations of *Open Joodse Huizen* in Gouda on 2 May 2016. One of them was organised on the Lange Tiendeweg 54. The current resident, who had turned parts of the house into a Bed and Breakfast, told about the nine-year-old Jewish doctor's daughter Edith Roseij Beek who was found while in hiding and murdered in Auschwitz. I was one of the first visitors welcomed by the owner and the hostess who immediately offered me a cup of coffee or tea. The house was old and beautifully renovated, and the commemoration was held in a room that used to be the doctor's waiting room before WWII. During the next fifteen minutes more and more people assembled in the room, filling all the seats and some were leaning

against the wall. The owner started the commemoration at exactly twelve o'clock, asked the hostess to close the door and the visitors to turn off their phones. He sat down and began by introducing himself and the history of the house, showing photos of the house and the Jewish family from the archive. Not so much is known about Edith Roseij van Beek except that she received instruction from a governess, went into hiding without her parents, was betrayed, deported, and murdered in Auschwitz. The parents survived the Shoah in hiding, returned to their home after WWII and the doctor continued the medical practice until his retirement. After telling the story, taking approximately fifteen minutes, the owner asked for a minute of silence. Afterwards he asked whether anyone amongst the visitors has a question or remark he or she would like to share. This was the start of a conversation among the visitors about what the loss of a daughter would have meant to them as parents, especially after having tried to save her by hiding her somewhere else. After a while, a woman said that the doctor had helped her mother deliver her. She remembered the doctor from her youth but never knew he lost his daughter during WWII. The visitors and the owner exchanged information about the family and the owner took notes to complement the story of the house. Various visitors stayed for a little while longer to talk or reflect.

The commemorations of *Open Joodse Huizen* differ a lot from each other. This is not only due to the large variation in locations; a commemoration in a current shop has an inherently different character than in a former synagogue, or school for example, but is also caused by a large variety of storytellers. While historians or archivist might give a more informative talk, relatives and friends of the victims often bring the story with more emotion. Finally, also the group of listeners and the questions they ask differ per meeting which results in a variation of interaction between the storyteller and the audience. What combines all is the fact that stories are told about the victims in the houses they lived in before the Shoah.

Similarities with other forms of commemorations can easily be found but the combination of components in this project is fairly unique. The telling of stories about the victims of the Shoah could be compared with other testimonies since, even if the stories are not told by someone who survived the Shoah during the meetings of *Open Joodse Huizen*, there is always a personal encounter between the visitors and the storyteller. Besides, the storytellers are always, in some way or another, connected to the story as owners or residents of the house, through extensive research, or by knowing stories second or third hand. Also, the stories are often complemented by pictures, objects owned by the family, music, poems, or other forms of mediation. More importantly, the commemorations take place in the houses were the people who are commemorated lived before the war. This physical context helps the visitors to connect and identify with them, and to realise they were part of Dutch society. The physical context of the house the victims lived in also relates to the Jewish custom of remembering someone's life instead of death. This Jewish tradition can also be traced in Gunter Demnig's *Stolpersteine,* stones with a copper layer in which the name, and dates and places of birth and death are inscribed. The stones are placed outside the house in which the victim lived before the Shoah. Just like *Open Joodse Huizen* the copper stones mark the absence of the victims in the midst of society. However, unlike the *Stolpersteine* the commemorations of *Open Joodse Huizen* are temporary and only take place once or twice on the fourth of May. It does not consist of an object, but of a human encounter the visitors chose for themselves. After the commemorations the house regains its former function. According to Citroen, the commemorations complement the official national ritual of two minutes of silence at eight o'clock in the evening. There has been silence in so many families for so long, because people could not or did not want to talk about the Shoah. However, in order to remember the victims, we need to break through the silence, save their stories from oblivion,

and keep transmitting them. Through storytelling the victims stay alive in our collective memory of the Shoah.

The first commemorations took place on the fourth of May in 2012 in Amsterdam. The project started on a small scale in houses Citroen had already visited for her research on her own Jewish family history and the history of the houses in the Plantagebuurt (Dallinga 40). The project was received well, and in 2013 *Open Joodse Huizen* was organised in six cities. In every city *Open Joodse Huizen* were organised by local workgroups, assisted by the *Joods Historisch Museum*. Since then, the project has expanded to sixteen cities with 171 houses, 365 commemorations, and around 10.000 visitors in 2016 ("Achtergrond."). From 2013 onwards there were also *Huizen van Verzet* (houses of resistance) in Amsterdam. Just like *Open Joodse Huizen* it is based on the telling of stories about people who lived in the houses during the Second World War, only in these cases the resistance fighters are commemorated ("Huizen van Verzet."). The commemorations always take place in one room of the house, do not include more than ten to twenty visitors and are hosted or attended by the current owners/residents. It is remarkable that so many people are willing to open their houses for the commemorations, which can only be explained by their own interest in the past and engagement with the process of storytelling about the Shoah.

For organising *Open Joodse Huizen* Citroen worked together with the *Joods Historisch Museum* and specifically *Digitaal Monument* and the *Community Joods Monument* ("Achtergrond."). There is no regular funding, except for a limited contribution of the *Joods Historisch Museum*, so every year financial means are raised at various local and national foundations. The uncertain financial means, in combination with the extensive workload, in particular for the workgroup leader, complicate the continuation of *Open Joodse Huizen.* In Apeldoorn the experienced workgroup leader could not participate without financial compensation and since the raised funding was too limited, the organisation of *Open Joodse*

Huizen in Apeldoorn in 2017 was cancelled. The work of volunteers is essential for the realisation of the commemorations, which can make it a precarious undertaking.

Joodse Huizen

Frits Rijksbaron wanted to do more than simply mark the houses the Jewish families lived in with his poster action: he wanted a tangible monument in which the stories of these families would be preserved. He considered an art project but then decided on a book series with stories related to the more than 36.000 Jewish houses in the Netherlands. In order to produce and publish these books, the foundation *Stichting Joodse Huizen* was established ("Het Ontstaan"). There was a public call for stories, and professional and amateur writers, amongst others Denise Citroen, sent in over 30 stories which led to the first collection of the series *Joodse Huizen* edited by Rijksbaron, Esther Shaya, who also participates in *Open Joodse Huizen/Huizen van Verzet* in Amsterdam, and Gert Jan de Vries whose publishing house not only published Joodse Huizen but also other books related to the Shoah such as *Het Stempel,* and *Onder de Klok* ("De Initiatiefnemers."). Although the book contains stories from a large variety of cities[11] it has been reviewed mostly in the context of Amsterdam.[12] A year after the presentation of the first collection in April 2015, a second collection was presented at the Lloyd Hotel in Amsterdam in 2016. The stories in this collection[13] are also written by both amateur and professional writers, amongst others Esther Shaya ("Joodse Huizen – Tweede Boek"). A third edition is currently in the making and again there is a public call for stories. The guidelines of the editors ask writers to limit their story to 2000-2500 words and focus on the pre-war lives of the Jewish families. The combination of professional and amateur writers

---

[11] Amsterdam, Weesp, Arnhem, Haarlem, Groningen, Borne, Tuindorp Oostzaan, Bergen op Zoom, Rotterdam, Den Haag, and Hengelo.
[12] There were positive reviews by the newspaper *Het Parool*, which started as a resistance newspaper in 1940, the local magazine *Ons Amsterdam*, the Jewish magazine *Misjpoche*, and *NRC Handelsblad* a newspaper based in Amsterdam and Rotterdam ("Joodse Huizen – Eerste Boek.").
[13] This volume included stories from Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Apeldoorn, Bergen op Zoom, Winterswijk, Voorburg, Maastricht, Muntendam, Groningen, Scheveningen, Dordrecht, and Aalten.

results in large differences between the stories regarding length, style, structure, annotation and the use of sources and pictures for example. The aim of the book series therefore does not seem to produce a high quality reference book or beautifully written novel but to provide an inclusive overview of the houses and their stories.

The stories consist of a historical description of major events in the lives of the Jewish families up to the moment of their deportation and end with factual information about when and in which concentration camp they were killed. Some tell the stories in a more documentary style, others more subjectively from the perspective of one of the family members, and there are also stories in the style of an omniscient narrator. One of the stories in the second volume describes the lives of musician Paul Goldwin, born as Polish-Jew called Pinkus Godfajn, and his wife. He was a successful violist and conductor of his own orchestra but had to flee Germany in 1933, lived in Amsterdam during the Second World War, and survived the Shoah because his wife had no Jewish background (59-66). His story is a good example to illustrate the transmission of stories within the network of commemoration projects: this story was also part of a commemoration of *Open Joodse Huizen* on the Tweede Helmerstraat 14 (Hotel Jupiter) on 4 May 2014. During the commemoration the former neighbour of Paul Godwin, and Ernestine Brikkenaar van Dijk who wrote a biography on Paul Godwin talked about their memories and their research. The commemoration was accompanied by violin music ("Tweede Helmersstraat 14."). Since Paul Godwin survived the war he is not included in *Joods Monument* but he is mentioned in an article about forced labour at Schiphol ("Tewerkstelling Schiphol 1944."). The description above shows that Godwin's story travels from medium to medium, and from event to event, by being told during a commemoration, written down in a book, and included in an informative article on a digital memorial. Although the projects I relate to *Joods Monument* do not officially form a

network, the travelling of stories between them shows how the projects complement each other in the transmission and dissemination of memory.

2.2 – The Function of *Joods Monument*

I will now discuss the diverse functions of the website of *Joods Monument* in the context of commemorating the individual victims of the Shoah from the Netherlands. The first function of the website is providing information. Much of the information presented on the monument is based on *In Memoriam,* a book "containing the names of the 101,414 Jewish war victims deported from the Netherlands during World War II and whose graves are unknown" (Redactie Joods Monument "In Memoriam."). The data about the victims come from the "memorial books of the Oorlogsgravenstichting [war graves foundation] … "the Dutch Red Cross, the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation and the ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs" (Redactie Joods Monument "In Memoriam."). These sources provide the following information: "first and last names, date, month and year of birth and date, month, year and place of death" (Redactie Joods Monument "In Memoriam."). However, in many cases much more information about the victims can be found on the website. The personal pages of family members are linked to each other, which makes genealogical ties visible. Besides the familial connections, information is given about the last house they lived in on the map entitled "address and residents". For more factual information, the personal pages can also be linked to other archives and databases such as the Jokos files and Liro carts (files of confiscated Jewish property). Finally, photos and personal stories can be added to the personal pages.

Besides informing individual visitors of the website, *Joods Monument* also serves as an archive or database for a large variety of commemoration projects such as *Open Joodse Huizen* and *Joodse Huizen* since they rely on the database to search for Jewish houses as well

as for family stories. Other location-related commemoration projects that use *Joods Monument* as a database are the local organisations who would like to place *Stolpersteine* in their neighbourhood and *Oorlog in Mijn Buurt,* which I will discuss in the next chapter. Thus, *Joods Monument* can be seen as a hub, or a home base for several projects related to each other.

Joods Monument has also created education projects in connection with the website. For elementary schools, the editors of *Joods Monument* make specific workshop or teaching packs based on a selection of victim stories from the digital monument. The teaching materials provide background information and related assignments. Another education project, created in collaboration with *Open Joodse Huizen,* allows elementary school children to learn more about the inhabitants of a certain house that would be taken into account in the commemorations of that year. However, this was not successful since teachers found it difficult to incorporate the programme in their schedules. Finally, *Joods Monument* also assisted with a project from *Open Joodse Huizen* in collaboration with history teachers who asked their students to prepare a commemoration for *Open Joodse Huizen* in a course on public history. *Open Joodse Huizen* gave background information on the project and advice for organising a commemoration, and *Joods Monument* provided sources for the research the students had to conduct.

The most interesting aspect of *Joods Monument* with respect to this study is its interactive function. Every month the website is visited approximately 30.000 times. The more active and frequent users of the website are often retired or older than 50. While most of the active and frequent users also have a Jewish background, this is not necessarily the case for all users of the website. The website was conceived as participating in a sort of feedback loop where organisers of *Open Joodse Huizen*, or writers of *Joodse Huizen* also contribute their stories to the website. Unfortunately, this almost never happens despite of frequent

requests by *Joods Monument*. This means that projects often only use the database to get information, while it is largely on individual users to add information. According to Anat Haral, a similar dynamic is at play when it comes to younger visitors. They are encouraged to add information they find during their research for a school project, to share their reason to visit the website, and what impact it has on them (Haral), but this it is not often done. Thus, the main contributors to the website seem to be people of older generations.

The additions made to the website by the visitors are diverse. A recent addition by Michiel Drommel on 10 January 2017 consists of a photo of the pension of Nathan Streep and his wife Sara Streep-Soester on the Zeestraat in Zandvoort. Another comment is made by Rob van het Groenewoud who corrects information on the family of Hargot Eliazer and makes clear that the man and the woman are not married but siblings. *Educatie Joods Cultureel Kwartier* (Education Jewish Cultural Quarter) added a message to the personal page of Alexander Bernard Cohen on 9 January 2017 about the fact that he attended the first Montessori school in the Corellistraat in Amsterdam. The editors check the factual information that is added or corrected, also edit personal pages, and help users to work with the monument. Visitors of the website can also select personal pages which have been edited recently by contributors of the website.

The visitors of the monument play various roles in the distribution of information via the digital monument. On the one hand they can find information on the website and use the monument as a database. On the other hand, they are also welcome to participate in the accumulation of information on the website by adding family links, correcting or adding factual information such as dates and places, and sharing photos and memories for example. The visitors can therefore both be 'users' and 'creators' of information on the website. Besides the visitors there are also editors who publish information themselves, as well as

check the information added by the visitors. This means that their task of 'creators' partly

overlaps with one of the roles of the visitors, but that they also check and curate the platform.

Besides functioning as an archive collecting and providing data for a large variety of

projects and commemorations, *Joods Monument* is also a place of commemoration. Although

browsing through the site, reading and adding information and learning more about the Shoah

and the lives of various victims is also seen as an act of commemoration by the editors of

Joods Monument (Haral), certain specific features are added to the site to facilitate

commemoration practices. One of these features is the various ways in which the magnitude

of the event is being visualized on the website. On a timeline visitors can scroll the marker

from 1940 on the left to 1945 and see how many people were killed and when. Visitors of the

website who want to commemorate can also see which persons have been commemorated

lately. When they select the button next to the timeline certain squares turn orange showing

these personal pages have been visited or reworked recently. A visitor can therefore

consciously choose to commemorate a family member or friend, but also someone who has

not been commemorated lately. If preferred, one can also select a personal page with a photo

and a story in case someone wants to commemorate a victim through getting to know his or

her life story. Of course it could be questioned whether browsing and editing a website should

be considered an act of commemoration since it depends on the website and the intention of

the visitor. Besides, there are no rituals involved. However, according to cultural scientist

Laurie Faro, who studied *Joods Monument* in relation to three other postponed monuments in

the Netherlands, people experience the fact that they can visit this place, instead of a

cemetery, as a complement to the traditional memorial repertoire (205). Also, especially the

first generation experiences a sense of healing after sharing stories with the public after not

being able to share them for a long time (205). This would mean that there is a certain experience of ritual involved in visiting *Joods Monument*.[14]

Connecting people has been one of the aims of the community part of the database, also present in the current version of the *Joods Monument*. Although people can find out more about family members who were victims of the Shoah, they can also get in contact with other people editing the website. This contact between family members, researchers, and people interested in the Shoah could lead to more information, shared stories and close connections. However, people really get in touch through the meetings organised by the *Jewish Historical Museum* for active participants of *Joods Monument*. During these meetings the website is discussed and active participants can meet each other. Although the visitors of these meetings are often older people who are retired and therefore have time to do genealogical research and attend during working hours (Haral), the *Jewish Historical Museum* also sees *Joods Monument* as a project that connects generations ("In Memoriam: Isaac (Ies) Lipschits."). In practice the monument is less inter-generational than aimed for in theory.

2.3 – New Media and Participation

Joods Monument and *Open Joodse Huizen* are not individual memory practices, but part of a network of projects related to each other. I chose to discuss this network since it illustrates the influence of digital media on participatory memory making.

The network described and analysed above shows that new media participatory memory projects do not replace traditional forms of commemoration like attending ceremonies or visiting monuments. *Joods Monument,* published in 2005, also does not replace the older forms of memory transmission, present in more recent projects such as the poster project (2011), *Open Joodse Huizen* (2012), and *Joodse Huizen* (2015). The physical places,

---

[14] Faro's analysis is based on a set of interviews she conducted during her research, and her own observations. The article does not include more specific information about the number of interviews, the interviewees and the questions that were asked.

personal interaction, and tangible objects are still central to memory practices related to *Joods Monument.* Van Dijck argues that instead of replacing older forms of commemoration and transmission of memories, new media and analogue memory will forge into a hybrid coexistence (49), this seems the case with the projects related to *Joods Monument*, since they function as a closely related network covering multiple media.

This coexistence can partly be illustrated by the participation of individuals in multiple memory projects related to each other, since people participating in the construction of the digital memorial are also active in the offline memory projects based on information drawn from *Joods Monument.* An example is Denise Citroen who wrote about her family who died in the Shoah, but also initiated *Open Joodse Huizen* to facilitate meetings through which stories about Jewish victims could be shared, and contributed a story to the book series *Joodse Huizen* about the Jewish residents of the Henri Polaklaan 25 in Amsterdam. So the roles that someone like Citroen assumes range from researcher, to memory activist, to writer, organiser, storyteller, and archivist. Frits Rijksbaron is also an example since, after becoming aware of the history of his own house, he not only started a poster project but also started the book series *Joodse Huizen.* Not all participants in the network are as active as the initiators, but in theory everybody could participate in all the projects. Although the different ways of memory transmission can hardly be separated, all can be detected in the network.

The memory transmission in *Open Joodse Huizen* could be seen as a derivative form of communicative memory since there is a personal encounter between a storyteller and, in this case, a group of listeners in a context where interaction is possible. On the other hand, the storyteller and the audience do not know each other and the transmission of memory is ritualised, unlike the familial transmission of communicative memory in daily life meant by Jan and Aleida Assmann. Concerning the communicative transmission of memory, *Open Joodse Huizen* will also have to take into account that the first generation eyewitnesses and

survivors of the Second World War are dying out and will no longer be able to tell their story during the commemorations in the future. In line with Hirsch, organisers of *Open Joodse Huizen* also think second generation survivors and eyewitnesses capable of transmitting family memories. In practice also people that have no familial connection to the story, such as historians, archivists, and habitants, are asked to transmit the memories. Often there is a relation between the storyteller and the memories, whether he or she conducted extensive research or, for example, is the current habitant of the house, but it stays questionable to what extent memories can be transmitted to and by an affiliative network in my opinion. The storytellers do not longer form a direct connection between the present and the past, and in my experience the commemorations with storytellers from the affiliative network felt more informative.

Cultural carriers play an important role in various commemoration activities. In *Open Joodse Huizen* photos and the objects of the former Jewish habitants play an important role in the embodied memory transmission. Especially the house could be seen as a medium taking part in Van Dijck's concept of mediated memories. In combination with the collective memory of the Shoah in the Netherlands, and what the visitors of the commemoration learn about the family who lived in the house, it mediates the memory of the Second World War. The house also shows Van Dijck's emphasis on the changeability of cultural objects, which in her opinion is not fully acknowledged by Aleida Assmann. The house does not lose its 'Sitz im Leben' but acquires other functions over time since different families live in the house, houses are turned into shops or a school, and are renovated and redecorated to meet the expectations of its owners. The changing of the house also brings forth new meanings, it is not a stable trigger of memories or open to all perspectives since only in the context of the collective memory of the Shoah, and when visitors come to know more about the former Jewish family who lived there, does the house assume new/additional meaning.

Joods Monument is the digital manifestation of the network functioning mostly as a database of information. The community building which results from the sharing of memories via the internet seems to correspond to Van Dijck's analysis of digital memory items "becoming networked objects … in constant interaction with other people, even anonymous audiences" (48). However, in this case I would not want to see *Joods Monument* as an object but as a platform or 'home base' facilitating participation in memory making and transmission in offline and online contexts.

Although the aim of the website, as well as of the other projects, is to remember all victims of the Shoah there are not always memories available. This means that in practice personal pages can also be filled with objective information such as names, dates and places of birth and death, and the houses one lived in. I would not call the information from archives and from organisations like the *Oorlogsgravenstichting* 'memories'. By including this information of victims in an accessible database it is less likely they will be forgotten, but does not necessarily also mean they are remembered. This corresponds to Aleida Assmann's notion of passive remembrance. The only difference with her presumption of tangible archives, it that the information in digital archives is widely available via the internet, which means there is no archivist or historian necessary to mediate between the public and historical knowledge preserved in the archive. Every visitor of the website can choose any of the victims to remember which confirms Van Dijck's, Miller's, and Haskins', argument that digital memory transmission is more democratic than cultural memory transmission.

Not only the transmission of memories, but also memory making has become more democratic. Since *Joods Monument* is representing more than 100.000 victims of the Shoah and financial means do not make it possible for the editors to work fulltime on filling the personal pages of all the victims, the help of participants of the community is necessary. Not only because there is much work to be done, but also because they have information such as

personal memories and photos which the editors cannot access. Through new media, these personal memories and photos can be shared via the Internet. *Joods Monument* therefore seems a typical example of what Laura Miller expects from a modern archive which would need to "raise awareness of the value of records and archives across society" and "to participate actively in building tools that will make records creation and records preservation – and description and access – much easier for the average person" (12). Miller comes to the conclusion that in the age of digitization, the archivists need to facilitate the preservation of information and memories and this is exactly what *Joods Monument*'s function is.

On the other hand the democratization of memory making and transmission in the context of a participatory digital memory project could also be questioned since there are still fundamental elements that need to be provided by professionals before projects like *Joods Monument* can function. This is also true for offline projects like *Open Joodse Huizen,* the poster action, and *Joodse Huizen,* since funds need to be raised to cover the inevitable investments and costs, professional editors check and edit stories whether published in a book series or on a website, and researchers check and provide historical and factual information. Without the coordination of larger organisations like *Open Joodse Huizen,* supported by the *Jewish Cultural Quarter* the local projects in various cities would probably not have existed.

However, there is no doubt that both in the online and offline projects the public is just as essential for the realisation of commemorative practices as the professionals. Except for listening or telling stories, the roles in the process of memory making have been expanded into promoting or initiating memory projects, searching for information, and producing art or events through which memories can be transmitted for example. Furthermore, the role of individuals can also become more diffuse in the participatory memory projects, since editing a personal page can be seen as an editorial but also as a commemorative act. When editing a personal page of a victim on the website of *Joods Monument* this could be done to correct or

add information, but if it is the personal page of a family member editing the page could also be experienced as a ritual compared to looking after a grave of a loved one. In my opinion, the greater variety of roles available for individuals in the process of memory making and transmission, as well as the growing diffusion between the various roles could be seen as influenced by digital memory.

Although the projects described above are not officially part of a network, I chose to analyse them in this context because together they provide complementary components of a shared memory practice. Besides, they all use *Joods Monument,* and various participants are involved in multiple projects of the network. Also, all projects are connected by various institutions and organisations, and, above all, share the same aim of remembering all Dutch Jewish victims of the Second World War. While Van Dijck focussed in her research on personal memory connections between the present, past, and future, this network thrives on the moral obligation of remembering the victims of the past instead of finding a need in the present or personal motivation to relate to their past. Halbwachs and Van Dijck argued the mere adding up personal stories does not make a collective memory, which in their opinion should be a larger story connecting the individual memories of a group. By focussing on the individual victims, the network of projects neglects the broader framework of collective memory since in all of them there is a strong focus on victimhood, and in *Joodse Huizen* this is partly complemented by the theme of resistance. The agency of the Jews in the Second World War is often not taken into account, and the different roles they took are not problematized, such as the influence of the Jewish Council. Besides, by focussing only on the victims of the Shoah and excluding Roma and Sinti, for example, a broader context is neglected. Often the figure of the perpetrator is left out entirely, and therefore the issues of complicity, collaboration, and guilt are skirted. By leaving out the broader perspective of an international Second World War and

neglecting to complicate concepts such as 'victimhood' and 'perpetratorship', the network does not correspond to the collective memory of the Second World War in the Netherlands were the dichotomy between right and wrong has been problematized and the development of the Second World War is perceived in the context of the international developments. The other memory projects discussed in this thesis have another approach to the discussion of perpetratorship and victimhood, which can be explained by the fact that the projects relate to other frameworks of collective memory with a clear focus on the present or the future.

Chapter 3 – Oorlog in mijn Buurt

3.1 – Education Project

Oorlog in mijn Buurt is a Dutch education project situated in Amsterdam (since 2012) and The Hague (since 2015) where elementary school children (ten to twelve year olds) interview elderly people who witnessed the Second World War in their neighbourhood. The recordings of these interviews are made available via the website connected to the project. Moreover, the stories of the elderly people are transmitted via the children in their capacity of 'heritage carriers' since they retell the stories during commemoration ceremonies and liberation festivals. Besides the current practice of memory transmission *by* the children the initial aim of the project was memory transmission *to* children in Amsterdam in order to make them aware of the memories of the Second World War in their neighbourhood in preparation for the commemorations on the fourth of May. This can be seen as part of the more general move, in the commemoration of the Second World War, of combining a focus on *Alltagsgeschichte* (everyday history, or history from below) with oral history. While *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* started in one district, it currently includes fifteen neighbourhoods in Amsterdam. Since 2015 the project has also been running in three neighbourhoods in The Hague and there are plans to add another two major cities of the Netherlands, namely Rotterdam and Utrecht, when funding is provided through subsidies. The interest in the project from so many schools shows how highly the concept is appreciated (Bos).

Oorlog in mijn Buurt was set up by project leader Minka Bos in Amsterdam in 2012. While working as a journalist, she became interested in the stories of the elderly people she encountered in her own neighbourhood and who, while recalling events of a long time ago, told about their memories as if they were based on events that happened yesterday. These conversations became the basis for the education project *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* because they

are an immediate and personal way for children to find out about the Second World War in their own neighbourhood (Bos).

The interview is part of an education module that runs for six weeks. Teachers can apply to the program with their class, and all children in one class participate. Although the decision on whether or not to apply lies with the teacher, the children are often very eager and enthusiastic about participating in the project, partly because certain aspects of the project take place outside the classroom. Every class spends approximately 2.5 hours a week on the project. In order to prepare for the interviews, the children follow five masterclasses. Several of these masterclasses consist of history lessons given by university teachers and professionals, and serve to supplement the often limited pre-knowledge of the pupils in the seventh and eighth grade. In other masterclasses the children learn skills such as conducting research and giving presentations ("Oorlog in mijn buurt op uw school?").

After due preparation, the children visit an elderly person in groups of two or three, accompanied by a journalist or history student. The organisation of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* arranges and plans the interviews with the eyewitnesses, but the children prepare the questions. Although elderly people can volunteer via the website, *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* also conducts research on the neighbourhood and campaigns to find eyewitnesses who are prepared to participate in the project. For some eyewitnesses it can be difficult to tell their story. For example, Carla Kaplan-Gobitz explains during a video interview that she found it difficult to prepare since she did not know what kind of questions the children would ask. She did not want to show her emotions, which might distress the children, but simply answer their questions ("Oorlog in mijn buurt in beeld."). But others feel a desire or even an obligation to share their story. Ronald Israël explains that for a long time he was not able talk about the fact that his father was shot during the war, but more recently, he has felt an increasing need to talk about it and to share his story with the children ("Oorlog in mijn buurt."). Thus, while the

eyewitnesses experience it as a moral duty to transmit their memories and stories to younger generations, reliving their memories again and talking about war and the loss of loved ones with children who were raised in peace can be a very difficult task.

The children have different roles during the interview. One of them asks questions while another records the interview or takes pictures. As the interview proceeds they can change roles so that the pupil who fulfilled the role of photographer can become the interviewer and the other way around. After the interview the journalist or historian who accompanied the children writes a report for the website of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt*. The video or audio recording of the interview is also included in the online database on the website ("Interviewen en schrijven."). The videos are approximately ten minutes in length. The written reports often comprise between 250 and 500 words, usually written in the form of a small story, structured around approximately three questions, and written in a style that can also easily be understood by children. Although adult visitors of the website may want to have more detailed information, the written reports are largely geared to the expectations of the children.

Recording and preserving the interviews is not the end of the project. After all the interviews are conducted the children learn to tell the story of the elderly people through speech coaching. While the project initially focussed on teaching the children to write the reports of the interviews themselves, the writing classes are currently no longer given since it appeared to be very difficult to improve the children's writing in only a couple of hours. Instead, speech coaching was added, which has proven very successful so far because the children learn fast and they are better able to transmit the story they heard during the interview (Bos). After the speech coaching classes the children present the stories they have heard at their own schools in the presence of the elderly people they interviewed, parents,

children of other grades and other interested visitors of the presentation ("Oorlog in mijn buurt op uw school?").

An example of an interview is that of Lian, Lois, and Jayvelinio who interviewed eyewitness Henny de Kat-Belkmeer, who was twelve in 1940 and lived in the Amelandstraat number sixteen in Alkmaar. Her mother hid a Jewish couple who escaped from Camp Westerbork. In response to the children's question about what she knew about the resistance, Henny answered that her mother had participated in the resistance. When asked whether she was afraid at the time, she told the children she at first did not even know it was dangerous and that various people in the neighbourhood knew they had people in hiding. Still, they were betrayed and in 1944, when Henny was fifteen, her mother and the Jewish couple were arrested. The children asked what happened with Henny's mother, and Henny told them that her mother was deported to Dachau and had to work in an ammunition factory, but that, despite the severe circumstances, she survived the war[15] ("Amelandstraat 16.").

The project can be seen as an inclusive format since not only stories of Jewish victims are told, but all perspectives are taken into account, which results in a broad spectrum of stories containing, amongst others, memories of children, collaboration, resistance, fear, bombings, the famine during the winter of 1944. Contrary to *Open Joodse Huizen* not only the Jewish experiences are discussed but also the stories of collaborators, people who went into hiding, people who had no food during the famine in the winter of 1944-1945, or people whose house was bombed or whose brother or father had to work in the *Arbeitseinsatz*. The stories that were told during the project showed that the experiences differed a lot per neighbourhood partly because of variation in social status and political affiliation. While some neighbourhoods had a Jewish background and experienced major changes during the Second World War, other districts were characterized by collaboration and national socialist

---

[15] The reports do not include indications of how the children reacted to the information.

sympathizers. *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* also includes interviews with people who knew people from the NSB, the Dutch National Socialist Party, people who worked for the Nazis, and people who volunteered for the Waffen-SS, such as Andre Engelaar.[16] Although he hesitated at first, he decided to tell his story for the first time in the context of this project. In 1940 he was fourteen, came from a poor family, and was impressed by the appearance of the Nazis in Amsterdam. In 1943 he volunteered and was accepted. Only after the war he realised which cruelties were committed by the Nazis ("Ogentrooststraat."). Although Engelaar might not have known about the crimes, ignorance is often used as an excuse by people who supported the Nazi-regime. In the report there is no indication that his story or excuse is challenged by the children or accompanying adults. In general there is no evidence of any critical engagement with stories considering perpetratorship in *Oorlog in mijn Buurt.* However, the education team consists of, amongst others, Cees Kleijn and Steijn Reurs, a historian and a journalist respectively, who are specialized in the NSB and the Dutch SS so it could be expected that children receive the necessary information to interpret the interview.

This inclusive aspect does not only apply to the eyewitnesses and their stories but also to the participants since all children are welcome to participate regardless of religious or ethnic background. This means in practice that, especially in the context of Amsterdam and The Hague, the children participating in the project can have a wide range of cultural backgrounds, and also children of immigrants participate. Bos thinks that the project is so successful because it is based on conversations between generations and cultures (Bos).

3.2 – First Hand Memory Transmission

Through the education project *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* children encounter eyewitnesses whose personal stories help pupils to connect to a past that is sometimes not even theirs.

---

[16] The report of this story on the website of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* does not contain photos of him or the children, but instead includes posters from the SS. Although it is not mentioned that the site uses a pseudonym I expect the photos are left out to protect Engelaar from being recognized in the street.

Grandchildren of Moroccan and Turkish immigrants who came to the Netherlands in the 1960s have no family history related to the Second World War in Amsterdam but learn to associate with a history they do not know through the personal stories set in their local neighbourhood. By interviewing the elderly people and presenting their stories they make the history of their neighbourhood their own.[17] Besides bridging cultural diversity, the project also overcomes generational differences since children are asked to listen to and try to understand the story of an elderly person. Because the elderly people had often been children during the Second World War they can easily explain and help the children imagine how the lives of children were influenced by the war (Bos).

The transmission of the story from the elderly people to the children could be seen as communicative memory. Although the children have no familial relationship with the elderly people, they have the age of their grandchildren and come to their home in small groups of two or three pupils at a time. This means that, instead of a class interview, the format gives the impression of several grandchildren visiting their grandparents. The children experience the storytelling of the elderly people including the "language of the body: nonverbal and noncognitive acts of transfer" in the familial space of the house of the eyewitnesses ("The Generation of Postmemory." 112) which is, according to Hirsch, central to the creation of postmemory. According to Hirsch, even non-familial relations can access this memory through the imagination, projection, and creation of memories on the basis of stories and images into the affiliative network ("The Generation of Postmemory." 111). On the one hand one could argue that, since the children not only listen to the memories but also learn to present and transmit the story, they 'inherit' the story in an affiliative way by making the memories their own. On the other hand, memory transmission via an interview cannot be compared to the transmission during a lifelong relationship between (grand) parents and

[17] In their article considering a local project called *Stadtteilmütter* Michael Rothberg and Yasemin Yildiz already concluded that "substantive citizenship and political identity are the result of a fidelity to the past that is cultivated and performed in common in the present" (44).

(grand) children, and therefore necessarily encompasses a certain sense of distance, which needs to be filled in by imagination, projection, and creation.

The inheritance of memories is important for the initial aim of the project, namely helping pupils understand and relate to the commemorations on the fourth of May. This can be done by learning about the memories of others, according to Jay Winter, who talks about 'second-order memory' when it comes to sites of memory: "[s]ites of memory inevitably become sites of second-order memory, that is, they are places where people remember the memories of others, those who survived the events marked there" (62). By being aware of the memories of those who experienced the Second World War in their neighbourhood, the children will be able to understand the need to commemorate. In this respect the neighbourhood becomes literally a 'site of memory' since the children learn to engage with its past and the memories related to them told by the eyewitnesses.

The extensive body of individual personal memories of the Second World War does not automatically result in a collective memory. However, it is not the aim of the project to construct a "complete" collective memory. By collecting personal stories from witnesses of the Second World War the project is orientated towards the present and the future instead of the past. The past is only a common ground that can serve as the basis for conversations and that connects people of different generations and cultural backgrounds with each other. According to Bos, not a shared and uniform memory of the past but the activity of sharing stories is what connects the people involved in the project. The shared conviction behind the project is not based on the past but on a vision for the present and the future in which people listen to each other and pay attention to one's background, thereby creating mutual understanding.

Bos, the originator of the project, hopes that the pupils who participate learn that the past is still present in the people who carry their memories with them in present day society.

The personal encounter in this history education project is essential since it is important for the children to meet people who experienced events in the past, in order to learn how the past influences the present. Besides, for the elderly people it is very important to be able to share their story with younger generations while knowing these children will continue telling their story when they will no longer be able to do that themselves. According to Bos, the project is about sharing the pain that people carry with them, and therefore *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* could be seen as a social processing project through which pain can be turned into resilience towards discrimination in the present (Bos).

Since *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* is based on the processing of pain through conversations, according to Bos also other histories than the Second World War could be taken into account in the project. One of the histories she would like to include in the future is the colonial past of the Netherlands because it has so many implications for present day discussions in society. In this project, new storytellers would tell their family histories. Just as it will no longer be possible to interview first generation witnesses of the Second World War in a couple of decades, it will be no longer possible to interview direct victims of Dutch colonialism. However, later generations can take over this role according to Bos, who would take current implications of colonialism and slavery into account. By discussing these histories the project aims to bring generations and cultures in current society in contact with each other. This idea is still in an exploratory phase (Bos).

3.3 – Second Hand Memory Transmission

At the end of the education project, the children are appointed *erfgoeddragers* or 'heritage carriers' by the mayor of their city. Through this appointment the children are given the responsibility to keep transmitting and disseminating the story they heard during the interview. Through *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* the pupils not only learn about the history of their

own neighbourhood but also take on a particular role in the local community and society in general. During the project the children have multiple roles. First they are the researchers and interviewers who dive into the history of their neighbourhood. After the project, they become the experts who are asked to talk about their experiences during the project, but most of all to tell the story they set out to transmit. The children are therefore both the receivers and the carriers of the stories. This leads to overlapping forms of individual participation and a democratisation of memory making in society. While, according to Aleida Assmann, cultural memory transmission is led by experts and professionals who could access and interpret the information in the archives and decide which information could enhance public memory practices, according to Haskins, in the age of digital memory experts and professionals are no longer the only ones who have a guiding role in society. *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* shows that children can enhance their own knowledge by conducting interviews and recording them. Of course they are coached by experts and professionals. However, they still learn to participate from an early age. Through their role in the process of constructing a story based on the memories of the interviewee, they become participants. Moreover, the children are treated as experts by other media and in their role of heritage carriers of one of the stories of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt.*

After the conclusion of the project all children receive support to fulfil their task as heritage carriers until they are eighteen years old. For example, they are invited to annual come-back-days. In addition, *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* also actively helps pupils to find opportunities to fulfil their task. Currently, the initiators of the project are in contact with organisations like *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei* and the *Anne Frank House*. The *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei* is planning to install a children's committee in which heritage carriers could possibly take part. Moreover, the heritage carriers could also take part in the youth team of the *Anne Frank House*, a team of adolescents from sixteen to twenty years old who in

memory of Anne Frank try to prevent discrimination and prejudice and participate in projects and exchanges related to human rights ("Jongerenteam Anne Frank Huis.") Finally, all children are expected to visit their elementary schools again when they are eighteen years old to tell about their experiences during the project and transmit their story to younger generations. Since the program has only been running since 2012 this has not taken place yet (Bos).

Currently there are 120 heritage carriers, several of whom have already told the story they 'inherited' during commemorations. The first event they participate in is the presentation they give at their school which is also attended by the eyewitnesses themselves, the parents of the children, and other classes ("Oorlog in mijn buurt op uw school?"). Older heritage carriers currently also assist in organising fourth of May commemorations such as the one in the neighbourhood 'Diamantbuurt'. Others have had a role during activities and celebrations on the fifth of May, for instance in storytelling in the large tent at the liberation festival in Amsterdam ("Een geslaagde dag op het bevrijdingsfestival.") or at the pontoon bridge described in the introduction ("Erfgoeddragers op de pontonbrug."). Furthermore, walks are organised during which children tell the stories of the inhabitants of houses in the neighbourhoods ("7 buurtwandelingen door de stad."). Besides its impact on a local level, the concept of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* has also been discovered by the media, and children are often invited to share their story or their experiences with the project in television programs such as the youth news program *Jeugdjournaal.* Moreover, the heritage carriers have been interviewed by the newspaper *het Parool* and during the television program *Koffietijd.* On the one hand I can imagine that not all children who participated in *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* will always be prepared to participate in commemoration projects and they will also have other priorities as they grow older. Only after a decade will it become clear whether *Oorlog in mijn*

Buurt produced a lasting team of heritage carriers. On the other hand these children have experienced that they can make a difference already in their youth.

The stories of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* are not only transmitted via the embodied heritage carriers, but also via an easily accessible digital database containing all the stories. This database is not the focus of the project, since the core of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* is the encounters between elderly people and children. Still, the database currently consists of 346 written reports, each accompanied by one or more photos ("Oorlogsverhalen."). Moreover, a start has been made with the developing of video interviews. Currently six edited interviews are available on the website ("Oorlog in mijn buurt in beeld"). This database functions as an archive that is also used for other projects related to the commemoration of the Second World War in the Netherlands. For example, historical television programs such as *Andere Tijden* ask the project coordinators of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* for permission to interview / contact details of the people who are interviewed for *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* to interview them again for their television program. The project *Open Joodse Huizen* also uses this database for their program on the fourth and fifth of May. Besides these larger projects, Bos also hopes that schools use the videos and the interview reports during class projects on the Second World War. However, the database needs to be organised in a more interactive way so that teachers and their pupils can use more media and tools to find and process information. These tools are now being developed in cooperation with the *Waag Society*, an institute specialised in digital media (Bos).

In addition to the archival function, the website itself, just as the Facebook page and Twitter account of *Oorlog in mijn Buurt*, is a medium through which the visitor of the website, interested in *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* is invited to participate. One of the ways to become involved in the project is to find and read more information about the experiences of people in a certain neighbourhood during the Second World War. The interviews can be

selected according to different neighbourhoods. Moreover, there are e-books about certain neighbourhoods that can be read on the website ("Oorlog in mijn buurt boeken."). Secondly, visitors, especially children, are inspired to do research themselves in their own neighbourhood. There is a booklet they can print and use as a guide in their own research ("Onderzoeksboekje."). The project is of course always in need of elderly people who witnessed the Second World War and who volunteer to tell their story. Additionally, since all pupils need to be accompanied by adults during the interviews, history students and journalists are asked to assist in the project by accompanying children on their interviews, making photos, and writing interview reports. Subsequently, schools and teachers are invited to bring *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* to their school. Finally, the project relies on donations in order to continue the project and facilitate its expansion to more schools.

The list of tasks above shows that the work of volunteers is indispensable for the daily functioning of *Oorlog in mijn buurt.* However, the project has a large network and professional background surrounding the day to day practice as well. It receives financial support through government subsidies, as well as funding from (local) organisations in Amsterdam and The Hague. Besides, it has a scientific council containing prominent representatives from the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam, NIOD, the city archives of Amsterdam and The Hague, and the museum *Museon*. The solid framework of social partners and professionals functioning as project leaders, educators, writers, and coordinators, supports the work of volunteers ("Oorlog in mijn buurt algemeen."). This of course challenges the democratization aspect discussed by Miller and Haskins. Although participation of volunteers is indispensable for *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* it has to be led by professionals to become a success.

Although *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* seems primarily focussed on the communicative transmission of memory between the eyewitnesses and the children, and the children and their listeners during commemoration projects, it also consists of a more hybrid form of memory making. Cultural and digital media such as video and audio recordings, text, and photography, and in the future possibly also virtual and digital tools, play an important additional role of memory making and transmission to society. Through the use of audio and video recordings the homely and intimate setting of the interviews with two to three pupils is made available to a potentially global audience, when the interviews are added to the website. The familial setting has become accessible for large groups of people who never had these kinds of conversations and who can be touched by the personal stories of these people. As Van Dijck already argues "[w]hereas in the analogue age, photos, cassette tapes, or slides were primarily intended to be shared or stored in the private sphere … the emergence of digital networked tools may reform our habits of presentation and preservation" (48). Through the possibilities of the Internet "digital memory items are becoming networked objects … in constant interaction with other people, even anonymous audiences" (48). In this case anonymous audiences can use the interviews for other commemoration projects, which would disseminate the interviews even further, but the interviews can also be used in order to learn more about a local neighbourhood by persons living in the same neighbourhood. This situation illustrates what Van Dijck means with her concept of personal cultural memory. Since the personal memory, related to the larger history of the Second World War in the past but still influencing the present, is mediated through digital devices, it becomes part of the relation between the individual sharing a memory and the collective of, in this case, the neighbourhood or those commemorating the Second World War in the Netherlands.

Oorlog in mijn buurt shows how digital media does not replace other (older) forms of memory transmission but instead creates a hybrid coexistence involving the participation of

people from different generations and with a variety of cultural backgrounds. The participants are related to the neighbourhood they live in, and therefore share its history.

Chapter 4 – Post uit de Vergetelheid

4.1 – Exhibition

Post uit de Vergetelheid is a travelling exhibition based on letters and postcards sent by inhabitants from Nazi ghettos, concentration- and extermination camps preceding and during the Second World War ("Home."). The exhibition is created by the Lotty Veffer foundation, which is named after initiator Mirjam Huffener's mother, who survived the Shoah ("Lotty Veffer Foundation."). The foundation supports and creates projects about the Second World War. The idea for the exhibition *Post uit de Vergetelheid* came from Bennie Vlaskamp who currently works at the *Memory Museum* in Nijverdal but has been a stamp collector since his youth. In 1994 he accidentally found two postcards from Dachau at a flea market in Warsaw, and then began collecting mail items and other philatelist objects from concentration camps and ghettos. After ten years he made an exhibition with the objects in collaboration with Mirjam Huffener who created the project design, and her husband Arie van Dalen who provided research and text. This exhibition, the precursor to *Post uit de Vergetelheid*, travelled through the Netherlands between 2009 and 2015, and was set up in various public buildings such as schools, libraries, and churches in Westerbork, Velsen, Medemblik, Amstelveen, Axel, Vught, Elburg, Arnhem, Rijssen, Nijverdal, and Enschede. While both exhibitions tell the stories of the concentration camps and ghettos based on postcards and letters, the first version also portrayed Nazi stamps and discussed propaganda. The second exhibition, created in 2015, is currently travelling through public buildings in the Netherlands, was not only shortened but is also structured around themes like communication and privacy, and based on new material that was donated by private persons in response to the first version of the exhibition. The donations included letters from Wanda Verduin, Nico Peeters, and Jules Schelvis, who feature as main characters in the second version of *Post uit de Vergetelheid* ("Tentoonstelling staat als een huis.").

The first storyline in the exhibition follows the Jewish Wanda Verduin and her family who were arrested during a razzia in Amsterdam in 1943. Wanda and her brother Ernst were deported to Auschwitz where Wanda died of typhus at the age of eighteen, probably due to a medical experiment. Ernst managed to become part of the workgroup of Monowitz and survived the death march at the end of the War. ("Wanda Verduin."). The second story line considers Nico Peeters, who helped people in hiding and got involved in the production and distribution of the resistance newspaper *De Waarheid* during the first years of the Second World War. In February 1942 Nico was arrested by the *Sicherheitsdienst.* During the following years he was kept prisoner in the Oranjehotel, Camp Amersfoort, Camp Haaren, and Camp Vught. In 1944 he was deported to Dachau where he died of typhus in February 1945 ("Nico Peeters."). The third storyline relates the experiences of Jules Schelvis who was fired at Lindebaum in 1941 because of his Jewish background. In 1943 Jules and his wife were arrested in their house and deported to Westerbork and Sobibor. Jules' wife and her parents were killed immediately but Jules managed to join the workgroup. Jules survived seven Nazi-camps and ghettos ("Jules Schelvis.").

The exhibition currently consists of twelve panels and five banners on which the stories of the main characters are told and the historical context is explained. The first two panels on which the main characters, Wanda, Nico, and Jules, are introduced, are followed by panels that give a broader overview of concentration camps in the Netherlands, Germany, the Nazi-Empire, France, Italy, and Croatia. Distinctions are made between ghettos and extermination, concentration, work-, *Nacht und Nebel-,* and transition camps in Europe. One panel adds information on the Aktion T4 euthanasia program. The exhibition ends with two panels on the death marches and the liberation ("Tentoonstelling.").

The panels mostly display information, (parts of) letters, and photos of the main characters and of the camps. While photos have captions and general information is given on

every panel, the visitor of the exhibition has to interpret the connection between the various documents and the main stories themselves. The photos, letters and texts seem like pieces of a large puzzle, and by combining all information the visitor gets an overview of the experiences of the main characters within the historical context. Besides the photos and texts there are also videos which feature family members of the main characters or, in Jules' case, the main character himself, reflecting on the letters. Wanda's brother Ernst Verduin reflects on passages from her letters and diary and shares his memories from the war with the viewer of the video. Nico Peeters' daughter Tonny reflects on her father's letters. She tries to reconstruct the moment when he became ill and how this is indirectly reflected in the letters since he could not write about it explicitly because of censorship ("Nico Peeters."). Jules Schelvis tells about his own letters from the ghetto called Radom and explains that he could not write about the gas chambers because of the censorship. He wrote his letters to a non-Jewish aunt since he did not know whether his parents were deported and which family members were still alive ("Jules Schelvis.").

The panels and banners of the exhibition do not call for much interaction with the audience. The visitors have a largely passive role of reading texts, looking at photos, letters, and objects, and listening to videos. Besides, because of the large amount of text in the whole exhibition, and the rather long videos of approximately six minutes each, a visitor planning on seeing the whole exhibition will be spending a lot of time there. This is also the reason that class or group visits usually focus only on parts of the exhibition, for example only the panels related to one or two of the storylines, and they are often accompanied by a guest speaker. But even during group visits, a largely passive role is assigned to the visitors, where they are not making but receiving memories.

4.2 – Past and the Present

Post uit de Vergetelheid does not only tell the stories from the past but also makes connections to the present in various ways. Firstly, the videos of Ernst, Tonny, and Jules are combined with video recordings of three well-known Dutch people. Singer Karsu reads bits and pieces of Wanda's letters and diary and talks about her understanding for Wanda's impatience for letters from her friend Els, especially since nowadays people are already waiting for an answer on a WhatsApp message when they know the addressee has read it. ("Wanda Verduin."). The journalist and writer Ad van Liempt, who wrote several books about the Second World War and produced the television series *De Oorlog*, reflects on Nico Peeters' story from a more historical point of view when he notes that based on what we know now it is remarkable that Nico was arrested so early during the war. Journalist and writer Natascha van Weezel, a grandchild of Shoah survivors who wrote about the experiences of the third generation in her book *De derde generatie. Kleinkinderen van de Holocaust* (2015), reflects on Jules' letters. From his first letters from Westerbork she concludes that he did not yet know what was going to happen since he even had brought his guitar to play in the evenings at the campfire. In his later letters from Radom he knew what happened with his family but could not write about it because of censorship. On the one hand the mediation of the stories from the past by these three well-known "mediators" from the present is a very productive way of engaging young people, who may find it difficult to relate to the past. On the other hand this example problematizes the democratization of memory transmission discussed by Miller and Haskins, since, especially in van Liempt and van Weezel's case, it is experts who are asked to comment on and interpret the letters for the audience.

I would argue, though, that the exhibition leaves enough space for visitors to make their own connections and find their own trajectory through the stories. All the main characters in the exhibition are from different generations. This, I believe, also plays a role in

relating the past to the present for the audience, since all types of visitors will have someone with whom they can identify. Wanda is a young girl in her teens, similar to the youngest visitors of the exhibition. Jules was in his early twenties during the War, but in his nineties while his video was recorded. Karsu and Natascha are in their late twenties and early thirties, Nico was in his forties during the Second World War, and Ad is in his sixties. Through the different generations, different experiences and viewpoints are conveyed to which also various generations among the visitors will relate.

Another way in which the exhibition explicitly connects to present-day issues are the themes of communication, censorship, and privacy that form a focus throughout. Just like during the Second World War also nowadays not everybody has freedom of speech and the possibility to communicate freely without restrictions. Although the themes are touched upon while telling the stories of Wanda, Nico, and Jules, such as by discussing the restrictions on the amount and length of the letters they were allowed to write, they are specifically addressed at the end of the exhibition, when the visitors are encouraged to go into a voting booth. In the booth a short video is shown which discusses the meaning of communication, privacy, and censorship. Afterwards visitors are asked to answer questions on specific issues. Although the voting booth is only a limited form of participation since it does not influence the exhibition as such, it does activate the visitor to reflect on personal principles. Examples of themes touched upon are internet bullying, the amount and kind of information you share via social media, and the role of the government in protecting privacy. An example that illustrates the relation between the past and the present is the modern and extensive Dutch population registration system that during the Second World War helped the Nazis to efficiently identify, segregate, and deport the Jewish population. Nowadays even more personal information is available via the internet, social media, and digital communication. Jules Schelvis emphasizes how he deliberately has no account on Facebook in order to avoid

the distribution of personal information via the internet. Finally, visitors are asked to take into account those who do not have freedom of speech even today and are encouraged to write a letter to political prisoners of dictatorial regimes brought under the attention of the public by *Amnesty International*. In addition, they receive information about *Bits of Freedom*, an organisation that defends digital civil rights and focuses on both, freedom and privacy on the internet ("Educatie."). Writing the letter for *Amnesty International* is a participatory act facilitated by the exhibition, encouraging the visitors to consider the continuities between the past and the present day reality of dictatorial regimes.[18] In practice this means that the exhibition does not necessarily interact with its visitors in a direct way but employs stories from the past to help them reflect on their attitude in the present. The connection between the present and the past is also made via social media. The facebook page of *Post uit de Vergetelheid* often shares messages from *Amnesty International* and *Bits for Freedom*, a virtual extension of the physical exhibition ("Post uit de vergetelheid."). Subsequently, connections between the present and the past are made on pages of the website of *Post uit de Vergetelheid.* A clear example is an extensive overview of the refugees in the late 1930's fleeing Eastern Europe and Germany and often asking in vain for shelter and asylum in the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and the United Kingdom. Although the page does not make any explicit reference to the present refugee a comparison between both is suggested ("Vluchtelingen.").

Finally, the present and the past are connected through the education material for children between fifteen and eighteen years old. Younger children are welcome to visit the exhibition but often only focus on a selection of panels or one story line during a class visit. According to the curators, visits of elementary school children have not always been a success since some children got distressed by the stories, which was partly due to their lack of pre-

---

[18] I do not know how many visitors of the exhibition write a letter for *Amnesty International.*

knowledge of the Shoah. Through the questions in the education material, the pupils are helped to get to know the main characters. In relation to Wanda Verduin, for example, the children are asked to read parts of her diary and write down how they know she is in love with Kees. Regarding Nico's story, the children are asked about his political background ("Onderzoeksopdracht."). The educational material also helps the pupils reflect on the historical information about the concentration camps as well as themes such as communication, privacy and censorship ("Educatieve opzet."). Not all answers are obvious, more often the pupils have to read and interpret the letters before they can find an answer. Finally the questions also help the children to learn more about the historical context. For example, the students are asked to find more information about the death marches, concentration camps, *Nacht und Nebel* camps, and rules for the writing of letters concerning the language, the format, and the frequency.

The educational material also consists of an interactive component: students are asked to write messages to the main characters and to the people who feature in the videos. The children are asked what they would like to say to Wanda, taking into account the censorship, but they are also encouraged to think about what they would ask Shoah survivor Ernst and second generation victim Tonny. Students are encouraged to send their questions to Ernst and Tonny via the mail address of *Post uit de Vergetelheid*[19] ("Onderzoeksopdracht."). Through these assignments children can ask questions about the past to people from former generations. Just like the voting booth and the letter writing for *Amnesty International,* the assignments help young visitors to reflect actively on their attitude in the present.

By connecting the past to the present the exhibition fits with the current trends in Dutch cultural memory, where specific attention is paid to younger generations without a direct link

---

[19] Although children have to write down their name, school, and class on the message I do not know whether these letters are always answered. It is only said that they are send to Tonny and Ernst.

to the Second World War. However, when it comes to the discussion of the past, it is clear

that a selection is made with respect to which aspects of the history of the Second World War

are conveyed. The three main characters are two Jews and a resistance fighter. Although the

agency of the victims of the Shoah is discussed, for example by Ernst who talks about how he

managed to get to the workgroup and to survive, the choice of the main characters excludes

other stories of the Second World War. Other victim groups such as Roma and Sinti are not

taken into account, and the perpetrators are not defined or personalized in the exhibition.

This information is given on the website that has been set up to accompany the exhibition.

The website features pages on refugees, Roma and Sinti, and perpetrators. A general page on

perpetrators discusses various prominent Nazi perpetrators and their sentences, besides it is

mentioned that tens of thousands are responsible for the functioning of the Nazi regime. Three

personal pages give short career descriptions of Joseph Goebbels, Reinhard Heydrich, and

Wilhelm Ohnesorge, all of them accompanied with a black and white photo in uniform or suit.

They are selected because they are related to the theme of the exhibition; Goebbels was

responsible for the Nazi propaganda, Ohnesorge for the mail, and Heydrich for the

organisation of the Shoah. Of course the main theme of the exhibition is the postcards and

letters from concentration camps and the people who wrote them. However, since so much

information is given about the functioning of concentration camps, some information about

the perpetrators in the physical exhibition would have been useful. As it is now, the Shoah is a

mechanism without agents and the perpetrators are an undefined 'evil'. The physical

exhibition presents a story of victimhood and survival, the perpetrators and other victims

groups are not really discussed in any depth. The website is the space that provides some extra

info. A direct link between the exhibition and the website is made by the use of QR-codes

through which visitors can easily access more information via the website while or after

visiting the exhibition ("Onderzoeksopdracht."). While the physical exhibition is limited to

the panels and banners, and only presents a selection of stories, the website can encompass unlimited amounts of stories. Besides, the exhibition also has an educative function, and therefore needs to include general information, while the website can also take into account stories for visitors with more pre-knowledge to the Second World War and the Shoah.

4.3 – Travelling stories

Post uit de Vergetelheid is a traveling exhibition that has already been to several places. Sometimes the stories of the main characters are related to the places the exhibition visits, Jules, for example, is from Amstelveen ("Burgemeester Amstelveen opent tentoonstelling.") and Wanda went to the *Baarnsch Lyceum* ("'k heb voor het eerst van het Baarnsch lyceum gedroomd."). Organisations that host the current exhibition are libraries, such as *De Domeinen* in Sittard, *Eemland* in Amersfoort, and *De Mariënburg* in Nijmegen, schools such as *Nova College* in Amstelveen, the *Baarnsch Lyceum* in Baarn, and the *Mollerlyceum* in Bergen op Zoom, churches such as the *Grote kerk van de Hervormde Gemeente* in Loenen aan de Vecht, museums and national memorials such as the *Memory, Oorlogs- en Vredesmuseum* in Nijverdal and *Nationaal Monument Kamp Vught*, and *CODA*, a combination of an archive, museum, and library in Apeldoorn ("Blog.").

The exhibition is therefore not only aimed at a large and varied audience but in some places also aimed in particular at passers-by of all ages who happen to visit the exhibition in the course of their everyday lives. The different locations attract varied audiences. In Apeldoorn the exhibition will be located on the first floor between the museum and the library both situated in the same building. This means that *Post uit de Vergetelheid* will be seen by a lot of passers-by. However, through the large amount of text and the distressing history that is discussed, it is doubtful whether people who were not intending to visit the exhibition will take the time to read everything. Reading it all will take at least an hour. People will probably

read a couple of panels or come back later to read more. Experiences with previous exhibitions in CODA have shown that exhibitions based largely on photos or objects will attract a lot of passers-by, but the text-based *Post uit de Vergetelheid* will most likely address another audience, such as school classes.

Besides the physical travelling of stories in the exhibition, there is also a digital transmission of stories via the website and Facebook page of *Post uit de Vergetelheid.* All the stories discussed in the exhibition, those of Wanda, Nico and Jules, are posted on the website under *de verhalen van…* (the stories of…) but in addition also new stories are added to the website and sometimes also to the physical exhibition, such as the stories of Rie Hakker and the children's transport from camp Vught. The relatives of Rie Hakker made her letters available, among which were a lot of smuggled letters that contain extensive information about the children's transports. Although Mirjam Huffener would have liked to see a local addition on the basis of these letters in the memorial centre of Camp Vught the staff was not interested. Another story is of Max Meents who was a Jew and married to the non-Jewish Elisabeth Bowier but arrested during a razzia and murdered in Mauthausen. His story is also included in the physical exhibition and regularly told by his daughter who gives guest lessons during group visits. Also included is the still developing story of Kitty Wurms, whose father died of exhaustion four weeks after the liberation, and whose experiences cover the children's transports, the dead marches, and the chaos after the liberation. Emmy Cortissos's story, who died in Sobibor but saved her husband and child called Rudie by helping them to go into hiding, was added by the creators of *Post uit de Vergetelheid* when the exhibition visited Amstelveen since Rudie and Emmy lived close by in a Jewish neighbourhood. The story features on the website and on a banner in the physical exhibition. Paul Lévy worked for the Belgian radio service and although arrested early in the war managed to escape to London where he continued his work as a journalist. His story was researched and added by historian

Dimitri Roden. Carla Huisman, education professional at the memorial centre of Camp Amersfoort, provided the story for the resistance fighter Bertus de Raaf who was betrayed and died in Porta-Westfalica ("De verhalen van…").

The additions above illustrate a different kind of participation than what I have discussed with respect to the network of *Joods Monument* and *Oorlog in mijn Buurt*: it does not consist of interaction with the exhibition while visiting it, but either afterwards by sending in personal stories or letters, or, alternatively, in advance by preparing a (local) additional story that can be added to the website, the physical exhibition, or both. The interaction takes place at two levels. The first is that of the public, especially the older generations, who donate letters, diaries, and postcards from the Second World War written by themselves, friends, or relatives to the exhibition. This means that the public drives the work, not only the specialists. What they share with the archive are objects that construct their personal memories of the past which is a good example of Van Dijck's personal cultural memory. However, these objects leave the context of the private and enter the realm of the public by being added to the exhibition. Instead of linking the individual to its own past, present and future, and the collective, the object will also help the public to relate to the memories of individuals. Since the exhibition is built around private materials the selection of objects and stories is based on what is donated, not on what is available. All the donated information is always checked against the historical background, and, depending on donated material, more thematic and historical information is added to the exhibition. As objects related to the past the donated letters could be perceived as cultural objects in Aleida Assmann's view which have lost their *Sitz im Leben*. However, in this case, the objects are not part of an official but a personal archive. The person to whom these objects belong still knows the story behind them and therefore they are not yet open to reinterpretation by the cultural memory. Since the objects like letters and postcards, are still related to individual memories, but also fit into the larger

framework of collective memory, they exemplify the experience of the canonical generation analysed by Efrat Ben-Ze'ev and Edna Lomsky-Feder; the private memories overlap with the public memory. This is also visible in *Joods Monument* where contributors share their personal memories with the visitors of the website through which they cross the boundary between private and individual to public and collective. Although *Post uit de Vergetelheid* is not an archive, in this way it functions as Miller argued would be necessary to assemble memories from the past, namely, providing networks and frameworks to which they can be added by the public.

Another form of participation takes place at the level of professionals and organisations. While organisations invite the exhibition to their public building, historians and education professionals take up the role of doing research and constructing additional stories for both the physical exhibition and the website. On behalf of *CODA* I was asked to add a local story related to Apeldoorn, which will consist of a fourth main character, captain Willem Heijmans. Based on the local archive, this story line was found, which is related to the theme of camps during the Second World War, but is also different, since Heijmans was no political prisoner or victim of the Shoah but a prisoner of war. Based on his archive, containing pictures, diplomas, objects such as psalm books or a wooden box, and a series of more than 200 letters from various prisoner of war camps throughout Europe to his wife in Apeldoorn, a new storyline is created.

Heijmans's story begins in 1940 when he lived in Apeldoorn together with his wife Neeltje and daughter Henderika. Although the whole army had been demobilised during the first months after the war, all the officers were taken prisoners of war in May 1942. It was then that Heijmans started his long journey along four camps; Nürnberg-Langwasser in Central-Germany, Stanislau in the present day Ukraine, Neubrandenburg in the north of Germany close to Berlin, and Tittmoning in the south of Germany close to Salzburg. The

circumstances differed a lot in the various camps. There was never enough food, heating, fresh water and often a lack of hygiene, but the officers, unlike the soldiers, did not have to work, were allowed to receive packages with food and clothes, got medical care and could sometimes participate in sport competitions or go to musical concerts.

Besides the daily lives in the camps, the letters also provide more information about the possibilities and restrictions regarding communication with family and friends. The letters were bound to strict rules regarding the frequency, the language, the content, and the length. Packages were also controlled and strictly regulated. Due to censorship and, later on, a railway strike in the Netherlands and the moving front lines, the post traffic was often delayed. Close to the end of the war, Heijmans does not receive any mail for almost five months. He was also clearly aware of the censorship rules. Probably due to censorship he did not write about the German guards and the punishments that were given to soldiers that tried to flee. From the letters it also does not become clear whether Heijmans knew of the concentration camps, even though there was a large Jewish Ghetto in Stanislau in 1941 before the prisoner of war camp was set up.

Heijmans' story, added to the exhibition, will help the visitors in Apeldoorn to identify with the characters of the family, a husband, a wife and a daughter, who lived their everyday lives in extraordinary circumstances more than 70 years ago.

The fact that most of the construction of additional stories is done by professionals can partly be explained by the fact that the exhibition has an informative and partly educational character. *Post uit de Vergetelheid* transmits knowledge about the past in order to reflect on the present and does not specifically aim to transmit memories. In this respect it differs from, for example, *Joods Monument,* where objective factual information is checked, but subjective personal information is accepted as well and not a clear distinction is made between both

sources, and *Open Joodse Huizen* which is specifically aimed at memory transmission. The exhibition also differs from *Joods Monument* by its form. While *Joods Monument* is almost everywhere accessible and every visitor is free to edit personal pages, this is not the case with the physical exhibition of *Post uit de Vergetelheid.* It is designed in a specific way and therefore additions always have to be made in collaboration with its creators, and need to fit in the format, whether in panels or banners. The same is true for the website. There is no option for visitors of the website to add or edit information and therefore this always has to be communicated with the organisation. While Mirjam Huffener always has a helpful and enthusiastic attitude towards new ideas and local additions, there are certain barriers to creating them. The barriers limit on the one hand (spontaneous) public interaction, but on the other hand protect the quality of the exhibition.

I included *Post uit de Vergetelheid* as a case study in this thesis because it also shows the hybrid relation between the three forms of memory transmission already found in the previous two case studies. While the network of *Joods* Monument revolves around digital transmission, and *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* concerns mostly communicative transmission, *Post uit de Vergetelheid* focusses on cultural transmission since it is based on letters, postcards, diaries, and photos. In practice the exhibition is mediated by guest speakers opening up encounters between eyewitnesses or second generation victims and the visitors of the exhibition which could be seen as a derivative form of communicative memory although people do not know each other. The digital aspect could be expanded in many ways, but plays a major role in the growing accumulation of stories of the exhibition while traveling along public buildings. The participation of the public does not involve direct interaction while visiting the project, but reflection and possibly donating letters and postcards afterwards. The professionals construct and mediate the stories. Through this collective effort *Post uit de Vergetelheid* becomes a growing hub of private stories presented in the public domain.

Conclusion

On 29 October 2016, Gerdi Verbeet, the head of *Nationaal Comité 4 and 5 mei*, inaugurated a digital monument for all Dutch victims of the former concentration camp Neuengamme based on the data from the *Oorlogsgravenstichting* and initiated by the *Stichting Vriendenkring Neuengamme* (Foundation Circle of Friends Neuegamme) ("Gerdi Verbeet opent Digitaal Monument Neuengamme."). This digital memorial is accessible via the website of the foundation and provides of every victim the same data; first and last name(s) and the date and place of birth and death. As Theo Vleugels, director of the *Oorlogsgravenstichting,* puts it, through this digital monument the foundation wants to make it possible for relatives, researchers, and others who are interested, to consult the (personal) history of a victim ("Gerdi Verbeet."). After making an account, visitors can also add information to the database. The additions can correct or add factual information but also contain (personal) stories ("hulp bij het zoeken naar personen.").

The digital monument for the Dutch victims of Neuengamme is the most recent addition to a whole range of innovative initiatives of memory making and transmitting through new media and participatory memory projects, some of which I have discussed in this thesis. I have argued that *Joods Monument* and *Open Joodse Huizen, Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* and *Post uit de Vergetelheid* can be seen as important examples of this development since all of them contain aspects of digital media and thrive on the participation of the public, and they have all been well received and very successful with the public. These initiatives are triggered by two developments; one is the growing influence of new media on society, the other the vanishing of the first generation of eyewitnesses. Since young people communicate and get their information largely via new media, these are employed in order to preserve and (re)present the testimonies of the Second World War for the next generations. Moreover, I argue in this thesis that the introduction of new media also influences the way memory is

transmitted and disseminated and show how it is different from but also similar to former ways of memory transmission such as communicative and cultural memory.

Van Dijck, Miller, Haskins, and Foot and Warnick all mention the democratization of memory making and transmission as one of the major innovations introduced by new media. In my opinion the democratization is apparent in the wide variety of ways in which the public and organisations are welcome to participate and interact with the three memory projects discussed in this thesis. Often they are even indispensable to the functioning of the project. However, since digital memory, just like cultural and communicative memory, does not replace previous forms of memory transmission, but, according to Van Dijck, creates a hybrid coexistence, and all three case studies discussed in this thesis place different emphasis on communicative- cultural-, and digital memory, the ways in which the public participates differs per project. Although distinguishing various forms of memory transmission within a hybrid coexistence could be perceived as artificial, in this thesis it was helpful in order to identify various forms of participation.

Oorlog in mijn Buurt focusses on communicative memory transmission which, according to Jan and Aleida Assmann, can be defined by the familial transmission of everyday memories, but is broadened by Marianne Hirsch into an inter- and transgenerational creation of postmemories. Although the concept of communicative memory is here expanded beyond the context of the family (there is no familial relation between the eyewitnesses and the children who interview them nor between the children in their function of heritage carriers and their audience), the participatory roles of storyteller and listener overlap with the concept. The interview is, however, only one part of the project, in which also other forms of memory transmission take place: the interviews are recorded and shared via digital media, in this case a website, and used and remediated in different circumstances and contexts. In some cases, they might even function as the basis for a more extensive, cultural memory project. While

the active role of the children in this project is in line with the ultimate democratization of memory making and transmission, the guidance of professionals remains necessary to provide frameworks to connect generations and their stories.

Post uit de Vergetelheid focusses more on cultural memory which, according to Jan and Aleida Assmann revolves around cultural carriers which transmit memories related to the identity of a collective after the living bearers have passed away and are continuously reinterpreted from the perspective of the present on the past. The status of the objects is questioned by Van Dijck who argues that the (transformation of the) object also influences the mediated memories it constructs in relation to the brain and the collective memory. Post uit de Vergetelheid is an exhibition and therefore an object which functions as a medium which constructs memories related to the identity of the group. The objects on display such as letters, postcards and photos, complement the exhibition. Visitors of Post uit de Vergetelheid are not invited to interact with the exhibition while visiting it, but encouraged to reflect on their own attitude in the present towards issues of privacy, communication, and censorship. Besides, many visitors and organisations have taken the initiative to participate in Post uit de Vergetelheid by donating their own letters or constructing a local addition to the exhibition which shows that the digital domain does not suppress the local context the public relates to. Besides the cultural transmission of memories the exhibition is also mediated by guest speakers during group visits where a storyteller and listener relation is created as a derivative form of communicative memory. Moreover, the website functions as an endlessly growing framework of digital memory via which private stories can be shared with the public.

Finally, I have analysed the digital memorial Joods Monument (2005), which forms the basis or central node for a whole range of offline projects, such as Open Joodse Huizen and other related initiatives such as the book series Joodse Huizen. It has a major influence on memory transmission and dissemination of the Dutch Jewish victims of the Shoah. All

visitors of *Joods Monument* with an account can participate in editing the database; can use it as a virtual place to commemorate, and search the archive to find information for other projects. Just like Miller argued the archive is no longer a place for the professionals alone, but has to be shared by the public who use the framework to contribute in the process of memory making and transmission.

According to Winter, Rigney, and Hirsch for collective commemorations to be continued after the first generation has passed away, it is important to have a culture of (re)telling and (re)mediating stories. The genre of testimony is especially helpful for individuals to construct a personal relation to the past, a personal cultural memory according to Van Dijck. However, Halbwachs and Van Dijck also argue that the collective memory is more than the combination of individual memories. Although *Joods Monument* aims to construct a complete database of testimonies which consists of all the names, dates, and individual stories of the victims of the Shoah, a collection of individual memories does not form a collective memory. The offline projects use the information of the databases in stories that can be (re)told and (re)mediated in Dutch Second World War memory culture. *Open Joodse Huizen* and *Joodse Huizen* focus on the victims of the Shoah during the Second World War and exclude other victims as well as the perpetrators from the story. The general story of victimhood should be problematized in line with developments in the Dutch memory culture where both the notion of victimhood and perpetratorship are complicated. *Oorlog in mijn Buurt* is not based on a shared image of the past, therefore also counter stories play a role in the education program such as testimonies of collaborators, but aims at a future in which people talk with each other in order to enlarge their mutual understanding. The children are taught to engage with stories of others. *Post uit de Vergetelheid* does not focus on the past or the future, but on the present in which privacy, communication, and censorship are still issues that need to be discussed. Counter memories can be added to the stories of the two Jewish

victims and the resistance fighter, and this is also done, for example by *CODA* where the story of a Dutch prisoner of war is told on the basis of the letters he sent home from the four camps he lived in between 1942 and 1945.

The variation in collective stories in the three case studies discussed in this thesis shows that the focus on personal memories does not come from a shared perspective on the past, present, or future but collective use of the Second World War as a cardinal point on which reflection on the past, present, and future is based.

Although this research has illustrated the hybrid coexistence of communicative-, cultural-, and digital memory and the different roles of participation they employ, this thesis could only give a limited analysis based on my personal experiences and suggestions. Indeed, a comparative study of the real interaction of participants with the projects could have given a clearer image of how participation in practice looks like. Since I chose to use discourse analysis as my methodology and primarily based my analysis on close reading texts, images, and videos of the various projects, and interviews with the organisers and/or curators of the projects, the information I gathered provided mainly a perspective on how the project was intended to address the public. In order to know whether the participation of the intended public was as expected an entirely different approach would have been necessary: the methods from reception studies, which, however, have always been somewhat of a blind spot of memory studies because reception and participation are difficult to research, and it is nearly impossible to get representative and reliable data of practical interaction. A convincing study would have consisted of the distribution and analysis of questionnaires filled in by the public and organisers of all three memory projects, taking into account a diverse and representative response group. Besides the quantitate results, qualitative research based on interviews with participants and professionals would have been needed to complement my analysis. Unfortunately, a large-scale reception study was beyond the capacities and scope of this thesis

but it would be worthwhile to find out how people participate in reality. Interesting case studies from the Dutch context that could be taken into account in further research are *Geen nummers maar namen* organised by the Dutch Verzetsmuseum, the regional commemoration project *Vrijheid doorgeven* by the Tilburg Cobbenhagen Center, and the *V-monument* initiated by the makers of the musical *Soldaat van Oranje*. Furthermore, fruitful theoretical perspectives can be provided by Andrew Hoskins who coined the term digital memory and has written specifically about the transmission of digital memories in relation to war in for example his book *War and Media.* Although he primarily focusses on recent wars in media, which is beyond the scope of the historical context of this thesis, it could be very interesting to use his work for a comparison between the ways in which memories of WWII and more recent wars are transmitted and (re)presented in digital media. Another productive approach to such memory projects, especially the network of *Joods Monument,* is to study how these projects lead to and inspire other genres and forms of commemoration, how stories travel through different media, and into different contexts. In this case Rigney and Erll's concept of (re)mediation can be helpful. An interesting example in their edited volume *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory* (2009) is David Wertheim's discussion of the (re)mediation of Anne Frank's diary. This approach would be fruitful also for some of the stories collected in *Joods Monument*: although the network around *Joods Monument* includes a wide variety of stories from both famous and ordinary people, already between the digital memorial, the book series, and the commemorative events at *Open Joodse Huizen,* stories like Godwin's are transmitted via a large variation of media influencing the story itself. Finally, comparative studies on an international level could help in finding out more about the continuation of commemoration after the disappearance of the first generation. Studies could compare commemorative activities with respect to the historical context of the Second World War and the Shoah in particular based on digital memorials such as the *United States*

Holocaust Memorial Museum's World Memory Project and the offline projects related to them. Moreover, broader contexts could be taken into account such as the commemoration of the First World War, colonialism, or the more recent terrorist attacks. Because of the generational alteration, which will take place in the coming decades, and the growing influence of digital media, I expect more innovative projects will be created to both preserve as (re)present the testimonies of the Second World War in the coming years.

All the projects discussed in this thesis, and especially *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* are about bringing people together and creating a setting in which they talk and listen to each other in order to create mutual understanding between people of different generations and cultural backgrounds. While digital media are popular in recent memory projects, they do not facilitate personal interaction. The internet and new media will therefore not solve today's problems relating to a lack of mutual understanding in society. Although digital media projects can be useful in 'activating' its participants, and making them care for something, offline projects will stay necessary to bring people together.

Works Cited

"Achtergrond." *Open Joodse Huizen, www.openjoodsehuizen.nl/268/nl/achtergrond.*

    Accessed 23 Nov. 2011.

"Amelandstraat 16." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt.* http://www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/amelandstraat-

    16/. Accessed 15 Jan. 2017.

Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and*

    Interdisciplinary Handbook, edited by Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, Walter de

    Gruyter, 2008, pp. 97-107.

---. "History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony." *Poetics Today*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2006, pp.

    261-273. *Duke University Press Journals ONLINE*, doi: 10.1215/03335372-2005-003.

---. "Memory, Individual and Collective." *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political*

    Analysis, edited by Robert E. Goodin and Charles Tilly, Oxford University Press,

    2006, pp. 210-226.

Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." Translated by John Czaplicka.

    New German Critique, no. 65, 1995, pp. 125-133. *JSTOR,* doi: 10.2307/488538.

---. "Communicative and Cultural Memory." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and*

    Interdisciplinary Handbook, edited by Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, Walter de

    Gryter, 2008. pp. 109-118.

---. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization. Writing, Remembrance, and Political*

    Imagination. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Ben-Ze'ev, Efrat, and Edna Lomsky-Feder. "The Canonical Generation: Trapped between

    Personal and National Memories." *Sociology,* vol. 43, no. 6, 2009, pp. 1047-1065.

    Sage Journals, doi: 10.1177/0038038509345698.

"Blog." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/blog/. Accessed

    14 Dec. 2016.

Bos, Minka. Personal interview. 7 Nov. 2016.

"Burgemeester Amstelveen opent tentoonstelling." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de*
 Vergetelheid, www.pudv.nl/burgemeester-amstelveen-opent-tentoonstelling/.
 Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Captain, Esther, and Trudy Mooren. "Family, Generations and War. Historical, Psychological
 and Artistic Views. An Interdisciplinary Introduction." *Family, Generations and War.*
 Historical, Psychological and Artistic Views, edited by Esther Captain and Trudy
 Mooren, Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei, 2014.

Crane, Susan A. "Writing the Individual Back into Collective Memory." *The American*
 Historical Review, vol. 102, no. 5, 1997, pp. 1372-1385. *JSTOR,* doi:
 10.2307/2171068.

Dallinga, Maarten. "Open Joodse Huizen zet levensverhalen centraal. In gesprek met
 initiatiefnemer Denise Citroen." *Onderzoek Uitgelicht,* vol. 4, no.1, 2015, pp. 38-41.
 www.4en5mei.nl/onderzoek/uitgelicht/jaargang_4_nummer_1__2015. Accessed 3 Jan.
 2017.

Damsma, Josje. "Los van 'nieuw fout' en 'grijs': de geschiedschrijving van de Tweede
 Wereldoorlog." *Tijdschrift Holland*, 2011, pp. 98-107. www.tijdschriftholland.nl/wp-
 content/uploads/2011_2_Damsma.pdf. Accessed 3 Jan. 2017.

"De Initiatiefnemers." *Joodse Huizen. Verhalen over Vooroorlogse Bewoners,*
 www.joodsehuizen.nl/de-initiatiefnemers/. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

"De verhalen van…" *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/de-
 verhalen-van/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

"Digitaal Monument Joodse Gemeenschap in Nederland." *Internationaal Instituut voor*
 Sociale Geschiedenis, socialhistory.org/nl/projecten/digitaal-monument-joodse-
 gemeenschap-nederland. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

Dijck, José van. *Mediated Memories in the Digital Age.* Stanford University Press, 2007.

"Documentaire *de verhalen 100 malen." Lotty Veffer Foundation.*

      http://www.lottyvefferfoundation.nl/de-verhalen-100-malen-2/. Accessed 13 Jan.

      2017.

"Educatie." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/educatie/.

      Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

"Educatieve opzet." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,*

      www.pudv.nl/educatieve-opzet/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

"Een geslaagde dag op het bevrijdingsfestival." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,*

      www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/een-geslaagde-dag-op-het-bevrijdingsfestival/. Accessed

      10 Dec. 2016.

Emanuel, Heleen. "Joods Historisch Museum: Digital Monument. Online Community en

      digitaal monument voor de Joodse gemeenschap." *Mediamatic.* April 2004,

      www.mediamatic.nl/67900/nl/joods-historisch-museum-digitaal-monument. Accessed

      23 Nov. 2016.

"Erfgoeddragers op de pontonbrug." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,*

      www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/erfgoeddragers-op-de-pontonbrug/. Accessed 10 Dec.

      2016.

Erll, Astrid, and Ann Rigney, "Introduction: Cultural Memory and its Dynamics." *Mediation,*

      Remediation and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory, edited by Astrid Erll and Ann

      Rigney, De Gruyter, 2009, pp. 1-11.

Faro, Laurie. "Postponed Monuments in the Netherlands. Manifestation, Context, and

      Meaning." *Jaarboek voor liturgieonderzoek,* vol. 31, 2015, pp. 191-208.

      rjh.ub.rug.nl.proxy.library.uu.nl/index.php/jvlo/article/viewFile/19544/17022.

      Accessed 3 Jan. 2017.

Featherstone, Mike. "Archive." *Theory Culture Society,* vol. 23, no. 2-3, 2006, pp. 591-596. *Sage Journals,* doi:10.1177/0263276406023002106.

Foot, Kirsten. Barbara Warnick, and Steven M. Schneider. "Web-Based Memorializing After September 11: Toward a Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* vol. 11, no. 1, 2006, pp. 72-96. *Wiley Online Library,* doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.tb00304.x.

"Gerdi Verbeet opent Digitaal Monument Neuengamme." *Stichting Vriendenkring Neuengamme,* 26 Nov, 2016 www.vriendenkringneuengamme.nl/nieuws/gerdi-verbeet-opent-digitaal-monument-neuengamme. Accessed 17 Dec. 2016.

Ginkel, Rob. *Rondom de stilte. Herdenkingscultuur in Nederland.* Bert Bakker, 2011.

Groot Koerkamp, Gemma, Sandra van Lune, and Sipke Witteveen. *Landelijk Steunpunt Gastsprekers WO II-heden,* 2012, www.steunpuntgastsprekers.nl/index.html. Accessed 12 Nov. 2016.

Halbwachs, Maurice. "from The Collective Memory." *The Collective Memory Reader.* edited by Jeffrey Olick et al., Oxford UP, 2011, pp. 139-149.

Haral, Anat. Personal interview. 25 Oct. 2016.

Haskins, Ekaterina. "Between Archive and Participation: Public Memory in a Digital Age." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly,* vol. 37, no. 4, 2007, pp. 401-422. *Taylor Francis Online,* doi: 10.1080/02773940601086794.

"Het Ontstaan." *Joodse Huizen. Verhalen over Vooroorlogse Bewoners,* www.joodsehuizen.nl/het-ontstaan/. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

Hirsch, Marianne. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2008, pp. 103-128. *Duke University Press ONLINE,* doi: 10.1215/03335372-2007-019.

---. & Leo Spitzer. "Testimonial Objects: Memory, Gender, and Transmission." *Poetics Today*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2006, pp. 353-383. *Duke University Press ONLINE,* doi: 10.1215/03335372-2005-008.

Hoeven, Liesbeth. *Een boek om in te wonen. De verhaalcultuur na Auschwitz.* Verloren, 2015.

"Home." *Waarom schrijf je me niet - Post uit de Vergetelheid*, www.pudv.nl/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Hondius, Dienke. *Oorlogslessen. Onderwijs over de oorlog sinds 1945.* Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2010.

"Huizen van Verzet." *Open Joodse Huizen,* www.openjoodsehuizen.nl/184/nl/huizen-van-verzet. Accessed 23 Nov. 2011.

"Hulp bij het zoeken naar personen." *Stichting Vriendenkring Neuengamme,* monument.vriendenkringneuengamme.nl/help/. Accessed 17 Dec. 2016.

"In Memoriam: Isaac (Ies) Lipschits." *Joods Historisch Museum,* 24 May 2008, www.jhm.nl/actueel/nieuws/archief/in-memoriam-isaac-(ies)-lipschits. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

"Interviewen en schrijven." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/interviewen-schrijven/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Jongerenteam Anne Frank Huis." *Anne Frank Stichting.* http://www.annefrank.org/nl/Metanavigation/Voor-jongeren/Jongerenteam-Anne-Frank-Huis/. Accessed 13 Jan. 2017.

"Joodse Huizen – Eerste boek." *Joodse Huizen. Verhalen over Vooroorlogse Bewoners,* www.joodsehuizen.nl/eerste-boek/. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

"Joodse Huizen – Tweede boek." *Joodse Huizen. Verhalen over Vooroorlogse Bewoners,* www.joodsehuizen.nl/tweede-boek/. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

Joods Monument, www.joodsmonument.nl/. Accessed 4 Aug. 2016.

"Jules Schelvis." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/jules-
schelvis/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Keesom, Jolanda. "Nederland herdenkt en viert." *Breekbare Dagen. 4 en 5 mei door de jaren
heen.* Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei, 2012, pp. 19-30.

"'k heb voor het eerst van het Baarnsch Lyceum gedroomd." *Waarom schrijf je me niet –
Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/k-heb-voor-het-eerst-van-het-baarnsch-
lyceum-gedroomd/. Accessed14 Dec. 2016.

"Kom vanavond met verhalen… Toekomstvisie 4 en 5 mei. Herdenken, vieren en
herinneren." *Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei*, 2015,
www.4en5mei.nl/media/documenten/komvanavondmetverhalen.pdf. Accessed 3 Jan.
2017.

Lagrou, Pieter. "Victims of Genocide and National Memory: Belgium, France and the
Netherlands 1945-1965." *Past & Present,* no. 154, 1997, pp. 181-122. *JSTOR,*
www.jstor.org/stable/651120. Accessed 3 Jan. 2017.

Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: the Transformation of American Rememberance in
the Age of Mass Culture.* Columbia University Press, 2015.

Langer, Lawrence L. "Hearing the Holocaust." *Poetics Today,* vol. 27, no. 2, 2006, pp. 297-
309. *Duke University Press ONLINE,* doi: 10.1215/03335372-2005-005.

"Lotty Veffer Foundation." *Lotty Veffer Foundation.* http://www.lottyvefferfoundation.nl/ .
Accessed 11 Jan. 2017.

Miller, Laura. "What is the Role of the Archivist in Documenting Society in a Society that is
Increasingly Documenting Itself?" Presentation to KVAN, 29 Oct. 2014.

Nationaal Vrijheidsonderzoek 2016. Nationaal Comité 4 en 5 mei, 2016,
www.4en5mei.nl/onderzoek/nationaal_vrijheidsonderzoek/nationaal-
vrijheidsonderzoek-2016. Accessed 3 Jan. 2017.

"Nico Peeters." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/nico-peeters/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire."* *Representations,* no. 26, 1989, pp. 7-24. *JSTOR,* doi: 10.2307/2928520.

"Oogentrooststraat." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* http://www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/ogentrooststraat/. Accessed 15 Jan. 2017.

"onderzoeksboekje." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Onderzoeksopdracht." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,* www.pudv.nl/onderzoeksopdracht/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Oorlog in mijn buurt, www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/. Accessed 4 Aug. 2016.

"Oorlog in mijn buurt algemeen." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/oorlog-in-mijn-buurt-algemeen/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Oorlog in mijn buurt boeken." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/oorlog-in-mijn-buurt-boeken/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Oorlog in mijn buurt in beeld." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/videos-oorlog-in-mijn-buurt/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Oorlog in mijn buurt op uw school." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/oorlog-in-mijn-buurt-op-uw-school/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Oorlogsverhalen." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/alle-oorlogsverhalen/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.

"Oorsprong Maror-gelden." *Maror,* http://www.maror.nl/over-ons/oorsprong-maror-gelden. Accessed 9 Jan. 2016.

Open Joodse Huizen, www.openjoodsehuizen.nl/. Accessed 20 Juni 2016.

"Post uit de vergetelheid." *Facebook.* www.facebook.com/pudv.nl/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Redactie Joods Monument. "Gezin Sander Lipschits." *Joods Monument,* 7 April 2016,

www.joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/491536/sander-lipschits-and-his-family.

Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

Redactie Joods Monument. "In Memoriam." *Joods Monument,* 15 June 2004,

www.joodsmonument.nl/en/page/699/in-memoriam. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

Redactie Joods Monument. "Over dit monument." *Joods Monument,* 27 March 2016,

www.joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/413/over-dit-monument. Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.

Reijt, Maud van de. *Zestig jaar herrie om twee minuten stilte. Hoe wij steeds meer doden*

gingen herdenken. Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2010.

Rigney, Ann. "Plenitude, Scarcity, and the Circulation of Cultural Memory." *Journal of*

European Studies, vol. 35, no. 1, 2005, pp. 11-28. *Sage Journals,* doi:

10.1177/0047244105051158.

Rothberg, Michael, and Yasemin Yildiz. "Memory Citizenship: Migrant Archives of

Holocaust Remembrance in Contemporary Germany." *Parallax,* vol. 17, no. 4, 2011,

pp. 32-48. *Taylor & Francis Online,* doi: 10.1080/13534645.2011.605576.

Rijksbaron, Frits, Esther Shaya, and Gert Jan de Vries, editors. *Joodse Huizen 2. Verhalen*

over Vooroorlogse Bewoners. Gibbon Uitgeefagentschap, 2016.

"Tentoonstelling." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,*

www.pudv.nl/tentoonstelling/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

"Tentoonstelling staat als een huis." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,*

www.pudv.nl/tentoonstelling-staat-als-een-huis/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

"Tewerkstelling Schiphol 1944." *Joods Monument.*

https://www.joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/372003/tewerkstelling-schiphol-1944.

Accessed 10 Jan. 2017.

Thie, Merel. "Posters om drama te herdenken." *NRC.nl,*

https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2011/05/05/posters-om-drama-te-herdenken-12013982-

a499111. Accessed 9 Jan. 2017.

"Tweede Helmersstraat 14." *Open Joodse Huizen.*

http://www.openjoodsehuizen.nl/278/nl/tweede-helmersstraat-14-hotel-jupiter.

Accessed 10 Jan. 2017.

Visser, Wim D, editor. *Eén Wereldoorlog II. Het levend houden van de herinnering aan de*

Tweede Wereldoorlog, Verslag Conferentie 8 Maart 2014,

www.cogis.nl/uploads/documents/685.pdf. Accessed 12 Nov. 2016.

"Vluchtelingen." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,*

www.pudv.nl/vluchtelingen/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

Waarom schrijf je me niet – post uit de vergetelheid, www.pudv.nl/. Accessed 4 Aug. 2016.

"Wanda Verduin." *Waarom schrijf je me niet – Post uit de Vergetelheid,*

www.pudv.nl/wanda-verduin/. Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.

"Wat is Open Joodse Huizen." *Open Joodse Huizen,* www.openjoodsehuizen.nl/267/nl/wat-

is-open-joodse-huizen. Accessed 23 Nov. 2011.

Wieviorka, Annette. "The Witness in History." *Poetics Today,* vol. 27, no. 2, 2006, pp. 385-

397. *Duke University Press ONLINE,* doi: 10.1215/03335372-2005-009.

Winter, Jay. "Sites of Memory and the Shadow of War." *Cultural Memory Studies: An*

International and Interdisciplinary Handbook, edited by Astrid Erll and Ansgar

Nünning, Walter de Gruyter, 2008, pp. 61-74.

"7 buurtwandelingen door de stad." *Oorlog in mijn Buurt,* www.oorloginmijnbuurt.nl/7-

buurtwandelingen-door-de-stad/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2016.