



PROJECT MUSE®

New Paths, New Directions: Reflections on Forty Years of Holocaust Studies and the GSA

Waitman Wade Beorn

German Studies Review, Volume 39, Number 3, October 2016, pp. 589-599
(Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/630378>

New Paths, New Directions: Reflections on Forty Years of Holocaust Studies and the GSA

Waitman Wade Beorn

The Western Association for German Studies (WAGS) was founded in 1976 on the cusp of a public reawakening to the horrors of the Holocaust. A year later, neo-Nazis in the United States argued before the Supreme Court for the right to march in Skokie, IL (a right they won in 1978, though the march took place in Chicago). This spurred the creation of a Holocaust museum there and led many survivors to begin breaking their silence. In that same year, the massively successful TV miniseries *Holocaust* was released, winning an Emmy, and airing on German television in 1979. Also in 1978, the Office of Special Investigations was created to track down Nazi war criminals living in the US. Finally, President Jimmy Carter created a commission on the Holocaust which resulted in the establishment of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM).

These public events should not, of course, obscure the fact that scholars had been researching the Holocaust prior to this point. Raul Hilberg published his groundbreaking *Destruction of the European Jews* in 1961 and Lucy Dawidowicz published her equally important work, *The War Against the Jews, 1933–1945*, in 1975. It was in this scholarly and popular moment for Holocaust consciousness that the nascent Western Association for German Studies held its first conference in 1977. There, for a seven dollar conference registration fee, attendees could attend a panel entitled simply “The Third Reich.” One of the presenters was a young assistant professor at Pacific Lutheran University named Christopher R. Browning who spoke on “Ribbentrop and The Final Solution,” material drawn from his dissertation on the German Foreign Office and the Holocaust. His advisor had told him there was no future in Holocaust studies. Indeed, it might have looked that way at the time. For Browning and others, the WAGS Conference (which later became the GSA) was a vital component of the growing field of Holocaust studies. Indeed, it was the only academic venue for those working on the Holocaust to present their work. The first Lessons and Legacies Conference, sponsored by the Holocaust Educational Foundation, would not be

held until 1989. By and large, the Holocaust was not taught at the university level, let alone in secondary schools. There were no centers for the study of the Holocaust and genocide. In addition, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum did not exist and could not support Holocaust scholarship.

Clearly, however, there *was* a future in Holocaust studies, which, along with genocide studies, represents an important area of historical scholarship. Courses in the Holocaust now routinely fill classrooms and most positions in the area of modern German History require the ability to teach this course. Since the GSA began meeting (and publishing the *German Studies Review*), the field of Holocaust studies has expanded almost exponentially and produced an incredible diversity of philosophical positions, topics of study, and methodologies. In this short essay, I will seek to illustrate some of the important trajectories of Holocaust studies over the past forty years of the GSA's existence and the connections between the development of the discipline and the organization.

The Holocaust and German Studies

For a relatively long time, research on the Holocaust remained separate from work on the Third Reich. It was a small part of the larger (and more dominant) emphasis on the political machinations of the regime, the Nazi rise to power, and World War II. This isolated the topic twice from important larger questions of German and Austrian society. It would take some years for scholars to begin to recognize the Holocaust as inseparable from the Third Reich and from other areas of German studies. One of the early adherents to a more inclusive view of the Holocaust was former GSA President Gerhard Weinberg who argued that the war and the Holocaust could not and should not be separated, for they were not separate in the minds of Hitler and his leadership. He wrote, for example, that Hitler was driven by “a crude Social Darwinism, in which racial groups fought for land” and that “a policy of extreme anti-Semitism would accordingly be a central concern of the government in peace first and in war later.”¹ Military events at the front impacted the path to the Holocaust, which in this view, constituted a parallel campaign against Nazi Germany's enemies. As a result, Weinberg viewed the invasion of the Soviet Union as driven not only by Nazi geopolitical considerations but also by racist and imperialist ideology. Over the last forty years, scholars of German history began to interrogate the place of the Nazi past in such different forms, such as judicial proceedings, memory, and gender; in these subject areas, too, the Holocaust loomed large and could not be separated from simply *die Nazizeit*.

Asking Why? Intentionalism and Functionalism

Conferences organized by Saul Friedlander in Paris in 1982 and by Eberhard Jäckel in 1984 in Stuttgart raised one of the most fundamental questions of the Holocaust: to what extent did the Holocaust have its own *Sonderweg*? The argument centered on

how much of the physical extermination of the Jews was planned from the beginning. At an earlier conference, historian Tim Mason coined the terms “intentionalism” and “functionalism” to describe two ways of interpreting the functioning of the Nazi state. Intentionalists like Lucy Dawidowicz contended that Hitler was firmly in control of the “Final Solution” and intended from the beginning to murder the Jews of Europe, given the opportune moment. These scholars emphasized the ideological motivations and top-down control of the perpetrators and often relied heavily on Hitler’s own words in *Mein Kampf* and other texts. On the other hand, functionalists such as Raul Hilberg, Martin Broszat, and Karl Schleunes argued that the extermination of the Jews represented the last in a series of decisions made by lower level functionaries, evolving over time, and building a “twisted road to Auschwitz” as Schleunes titled his 1970 book. This school viewed the decision to murder the Jews of Europe as the culmination of a “cumulative radicalization” (as Hans Mommsen termed it) that arose from Hitler’s subordinates attempting to divine his desires through ever more extreme plans. While not discounting antisemitism, functionalists argued that situational factors contributed to the “Final Solution” at least as much. They failed to find a smoking gun in Hitler’s earlier texts as intentionalists did.

The so-called “intentionalist-functionalist debate” led scholars to more closely investigate the timing and circumstances of the decision to murder the Jews of Europe. Interest in these questions at the GSA grew over time. A panel in 1983 entitled “From Anti-Semitism to Extermination” featured Browning’s paper “Launching the Final Solution,” as well as new work by Sybil Milton.² In 1985, Browning presented again on “Nazi Resettlement Policy and the Search for a Solution to the Jewish Question, 1939–1941,” the same year in which former GSA President Konrad Jarausch spoke at the luncheon on “Perils of Professionalism: Lawyers, High-School Teachers, and Engineers in Nazi Germany.” By 1986 interest had grown: that conference included a panel on the legacy of Nazi medicine, one entitled “On writing the History of the Nazi Period” (which, according to the program featured only the single speaker Wolfgang Scheffler on “NS-Prozesse als Geschichtsquelle: Bedeutung und Grenzen ihrer Auswertbarkeit durch den Historiker,” and Friedlander as moderator as well as a comment by Gerhard Weinberg), a panel entitled panel entitled “The Holocaust: An Interdisciplinary Analysis,” which included a “social behavioral approach,” and finally a panel entitled “Paradoxes of the Holocaust,” which featured papers by Sybil Milton on the expulsion of foreign and stateless Jews from Nazi Germany, as well as one by Browning, on Nazi ghettoization policy.

The multifaceted perspectives were aptly represented by a panel at the GSA Conference in 1993 entitled “The Nazi Decision to Commit Mass Murder: Three Interpretations,” which featured Henry Friedlander, Richard Breitman, and Christopher Browning, moderated by Gerhard Weinberg. Friedlander placed important emphasis on the T-4 program and its afterlife in the extermination centers, as the same personnel went on to practice what they had learned in T-4 in places like Treblinka.

Breitman, an intentionalist, had published *The Architect of Genocide: Himmler and the Final Solution* in 1991 where he argued that Hitler's prewar statements became SS strategy early on. Browning, meanwhile, focused on determining when the final decision to murder Jews was made as a vehicle to answer the intentionalist-functionalist question. He argued in his work that the decision to turn to extermination was the result of other failed plans and was made in the late summer/early fall of 1941. As the pendulum has swung back and forth, Browning and many others have come to adopt a moderate functionalist position that recognizes more agency from above and the role of antisemitism while remaining attached to a more evolutionary view of the move to the Final Solution. A pure intentionalist position of the kind espoused by Lucy Dawidowicz, Daniel Goldhagen, and others has also become less tenable. Most importantly, GSA meetings helped elevate the historians involved and the vigor of the debate brought the Holocaust into the center of German history where before discussion was focused only on the Nazi rise to power, the political nature of the Nazi state, and the prosecution of World War II.

The *Historikerstreit* and the Holocaust

In the later 1980s, a different conflict over the meaning of the Third Reich tore at the fabric of the historiography. At the heart of the argument was the place of the Third Reich in German history. Hans Mommsen (who addressed the GSA Conference in 1982) and others argued that the Third Reich and its crimes were uniquely German events and that attempts to explore them comparatively served only to relativize and trivialize the magnitude of the crime. His opponents, among them more nationalist scholars such as Ernst Nolte and Andreas Hillgruber argued instead that the Nazis and their crimes should be placed in context with other crimes of the period, particularly those of Stalin and the Soviet Union. In so doing, these historians highlighted German suffering (mass expulsions, Allied bombings, POW treatment, rape of German women) as counterweights to the crimes of the Nazis. Hillgruber and Nolte adopted the extreme position that the behavior of the Third Reich was a response to the crimes of the Soviet state and bore no particularly German signature; indeed, they suggested one could study the Third Reich without the Holocaust. Hillgruber also suggested that Stalin's crimes were analogous in some ways to Hitler's. Hillgruber and Nolte's positions were roundly condemned by most scholars as self-serving, apologetic, and a way to minimize German guilt in the Holocaust and the Third Reich. The academic reputations of many on that side of the debate remain tarnished as a result.

Ironically, despite the discreditation of the apologists, Holocaust studies began to focus on some of the very points they raised without the moral relativization. The repercussions of these pivotal arguments were discussed in a retrospective panel at the 2008 GSA entitled "Making History in Kohl's Republic: The Politics of the Past in the 1980s and 1990s," which dealt in part with the Holocaust, and which included

a paper by the Historian Nicolas Berg entitled “‘Virulenz’ und ‘Richtschwert’: Zur Gedächtnismetaphorik im Historikerstreit (1986–1989),” as well as a commentary by Suzanne Brown-Fleming from the USHMM. Though their reasoning was deeply flawed, the conservative arguments during the *Historikerstreit* arguably helped to place an important focus on Nazi policy and the German experience in eastern Europe. Moreover, other scholars have begun in the last ten years to also place the Holocaust in the context of other German genocides. One of the pioneers here was frequent GSA contributor Isabel Hull who linked German genocides in Africa with the Holocaust.

The Jewish Voice

One of the great ironies of Holocaust scholarship was the treatment Jewish testimony and sources received. Mirroring the German court system itself, which discounted most eyewitness testimony as biased or unreliable, much Holocaust research remained based primarily on documents created by the perpetrators themselves. The historian Raul Hilberg grounded his work almost entirely on German documents. In his last lecture before his death, he justified this focus saying that “the context had to be built record by record.”³ For him and many others, it made sense to approach the Holocaust via the voluminous records left behind by the perpetrators. After all, they were the ones who made the genocide possible and carried it out. Yet, such an approach naturally left large gaps in the historiography and silenced Jewish voices for a second time. As time went on, however, scholars such as Mark Roseman and Saul Friedlander began to forcefully argue for the study of different forms of Jewish testimony in a variety of forms. Friedlander was a GSA guest speaker in 1991 and his powerful two-volume set, *Nazi Germany and the Jews: The Years of Persecution* and *The Years of Extermination* is an eloquent example of the integration of victims’ voices in telling the story of the Holocaust. His work was so impactful that it merited its own panel at the 2008 GSA “Holocaust Interpretation after Friedländer’s Magnum Opus,” featuring papers by Alon Confino, Dan Stone, and Amos Goldberg. The increasing focus on survivor testimony is another development in both topic and methodology, and it has also led scholars to highlight the need to incorporate Yiddish language material into accounts of the Holocaust. These important correctives have had an important impact on Holocaust scholarship. Today, scholars recognize that it is nearly impossible to write about the Holocaust without including Jewish voices. As a result, most new work represents a synthesis of a wide variety of perpetrator, bystander, and victim sources.

Gendering the Holocaust

Perhaps one of the most important developments in the scholarship of the Holocaust has been the acceptance and increased employment of gender as a category of analysis. The gendered approach to scholarship on the Holocaust and World War II (which

can be seen, for example, in the 1990 GSA panel “The Third Reich Through the Eyes of German Girls”) is vital to understanding the event and adds both new theoretical perspectives and new methodologies that simultaneously add depth to our knowledge and raises new questions.

Sybil Milton helped to highlight the differently gendered experience of the Holocaust. In 1983, the same year she presented on a panel with Christopher Browning, Milton and Joan Ringelheim organized a conference on women and the Holocaust at the Stern College for Women of Yeshiva University. The conference was the first of its kind. Milton made the provocative argument that women were better prepared to survive the camps, saying, “women were better able to survive starvation than men. They had better strategies for sharing and extending food.”⁴ Some took issue with this approach, arguing that gender made the experience different, but not better or worse. Regardless, the addition of gender to the study of the Holocaust added an important new lens through, one that has had far-reaching implications.⁵ Dagmar Herzog’s work helped to introduce gender and sexuality to the field; along with Omer Bartov and Patricia Szobar, Herzog presented her research in 1996 on a panel entitled “Sexual Representations of Fascism and the Holocaust.” A decade later, Zoë Waxman, on a panel entitled “Women and the Holocaust: Testimony, Affect, and Representation” presented a paper titled “Writing Ignored: Reading Women’s Holocaust Testimonies,” asking how female survivor testimonies could be read differently. Much work remains to be done, and it continues at the GSA. As recently as 2013 the GSA hosted two panels on “Gender and the Holocaust,” which were organized by Markus Zisselsberger and inspired by Atina Grossmann and Dorota Glowacka’s 2012 seminar (“Teaching the Gendered Experience of the Holocaust”) at the USHMM.

Zoë Waxman and other scholars also drew attention to a subject that had remained taboo, even for many scholars of the Holocaust: that of sexual violence. These historians demonstrated that rape and sexual interactions between Jews and Germans were commonplace; this provided an important counterpoint to conventional wisdom that held that Nazi purity laws had prevented such behavior. New research makes it clear that they did not. Scholarship in this area is expanding to cover sexual and sexualized violence in camps and ghettos, molestation in hiding, forced prostitution, and rape by German soldiers.

In addition, vital work has been done on issues of masculinity and the male-gendered experience in the Holocaust. The work of Geoffrey Giles, a pioneering scholar in the history of the persecution of homosexuals in the Nazi state, was doubly important as it dealt with gay history and other victims of the Holocaust as at the 2015 panel “‘Deviants’ under Fascism: Policing Homosexuality in Central Europe in the 1930s/40s.” Thomas Kühne, on the other hand, argued for the importance of normative male bonding in creating a warped community of criminality that further

drove participation in murder. The progress made in this area is reflected in a 2015 panel at the GSA focused specifically on “Masculinity and the Concentration Camps.”

The Wehrmacht Deconstructed

Thanks to the self-serving memoirs of the Wehrmacht generals themselves, a myth prevailed for years after the war, even among some scholars, that the German army remained aloof from the Nazi genocidal project, fighting only a conventional war. Over the past forty years, the historiography decisively turned on this myopia, demonstrating the depth to which the army became inextricably implicated in the crimes of the Holocaust. This intervention builds on an ever-growing body of scholarship that highlights the myriad ways in which average citizens became involved in the murder of the Jews. Early historians, including Hilberg, focused on the complicity of military leaders at the highest levels. Manfred Messerschmidt, who presented a paper entitled “Reflex der ‘Volksgemeinschaftsidee’ in der Wehrmacht” in 1982 when the organization was still known as WAGS, identified early on what he called a “commonality of aims” between the Nazi leadership and the military authorities. At the GSA fifteen years later, Norman Goda went so far as to identify the ways in which senior generals had been literally bribed for their support.

In the past decades, the scholarship has followed a downward trajectory focusing less on high level policy and propaganda and more on the behavior and complicity at the regional and local levels. Christopher Browning’s classic *Ordinary Men* followed a group of middle-aged policemen who he argued killed out of more mundane yet compelling reasons such as social pressure and situational factors, minimizing to a certain extent a previous emphasis on antisemitism as motivation. Political scientist Daniel Goldhagen inadvertently highlighted this vital discussion with his poorly argued response to Browning in *Hitler’s Willing Executioners* which rejected Browning’s claims in favor of a uniquely virulent antisemitism. The following debate was critical in focusing a subfield of Holocaust studies—the perpetrators. Indeed, the 1990s saw a renaissance in this area.

In the context of the Wehrmacht, the localized approach was also important. The “personalization” of army complicity shattered German public consciousness in 1995 via the controversial *Wehrmachtsausstellung*. At the GSA in 1997, both its creator Hannes Heer and Walter Manoschek addressed the impact of this exhibition; it was also the subject of a film screening, *Jenseits des Krieges*. Alex Rossino previewed in 2011 his pivotal work on the complicity of the army in the Holocaust during the invasion of Poland. Recently, younger scholars have pushed this research to even lower levels, seeking to excavate and explain the behavior of individual soldiers in the Holocaust. The GSA remains quite invested in this aspect of the Holocaust. In 2000, the program included the panel “The Crimes of the Wehrmacht,” which featured a

paper by Omer Bartov on the Wehrmacht exhibition; a panel in 2004 entitled “The Crimes of the Wehrmacht: New Perspectives,” featured Geoffrey Megargee’s “Behind the Wire: The Wehrmacht and the Nazi Camp System” as well as commentary by Doris Bergen; there were two panels in 2010, one on “‘Austrian’ Soldiers in the Wehrmacht” and another on “Military and Gestapo Violence, 1939–1945”; and the 2011 program included the panel, “For an old warrior a somewhat different war”: New Perspectives on the War of Annihilation in the East.” The development of scholarship on the Wehrmacht and the Holocaust powerfully indicates a renewed focus on the individual German and the complexities of participation in the Nazi genocide. Perhaps the most striking example of this is the deeply personal and self-reflective work by former GSA president Konrad Jarausch on his own father, a complex man who both espoused Nazi ideological beliefs at times while also teaching Soviet POWs to read, eventually dying of typhus among them.⁶ The motivations of the perpetrators remain an area in which we continue to search for understanding.

The German East: Nazi Imperialism

The scholarship on the Wehrmacht dovetails with a shift in Holocaust scholarship away from a dominating focus on Germany and Central Europe to a recognition that the epicenter of the Holocaust was in eastern Europe and of the importance of a Nazi imperialist expansionary vision that forecast the deaths of 30–40 million non-Jewish inhabitants. Wendy Lower, who presented on eastern ghettoization policy in 2001, added to an impressive array of scholarship on Nazi empire-building. Viewing the Nazi project in the East as an imperial or colonial project was in and of itself an important change in the received Germany-centric scholarship. It also reflected the vital center-periphery discussion taking place in other historical disciplines. In other words, in a modern update to the intentionalist-functionalist debate, this scholarship asks to what extent actions and policies of local and regional officials influenced decisions of higher authorities and vice versa. Some of these discussions could be seen already taking place in a 1990 panel “German Occupation Policies in World War II” where both papers focused on the occupied East.

Likewise, after the fall of the Soviet Union and the opening of archives in former Soviet republics, Holocaust historians were able to examine more closely German policies and actions in the East, but also those of victims and collaborators. In this way, the fabric of German studies itself was stretched; the eastern European experience of the Holocaust, neglected by much of the discipline of Slavic studies, became an important component in the German experience of the Holocaust even when neither the perpetrators nor the victims were Germans. This meant a focus on the ghetto experience, Jewish resistance, and, importantly, the collaboration of eastern Europeans and *Volksdeutsche* in the Holocaust.⁷

Germany's Other Genocide

Perhaps as a natural consequence of increased scholarship on the Holocaust, scholars began the important work of investigating the first genocide of the twentieth century, the murder of the Herero and Nama peoples in what is now Namibia by the German imperial government. This topic was first broached popularly by Isabell Hull in her seminal work, *Absolute Destruction*, that traced the long institutional history of the German military. She raised the controversial argument for a close connection between the German genocidal experience in Africa and what would follow in the Holocaust. Hull's work in many ways spurred a debate as to the extent of continuity and break between the mass murders of 1904–1907 and those of 1939–1945. Now, we see Germany's colonial experience (and the crimes it committed there) being of increasing importance to German scholars. This can be seen in the GSA conferences themselves, which began to include more and more discussions of the German interaction with Africa and the colonial experiences there. A good example was the 2006 panel "Genocide in Namibia: Memory, Amnesia, and Reconciliation a Century Later," commented on by Hull herself. At that conference in Pittsburgh, the panel was tied to the screening of the 2005 Cameroonian film *Le malentendu colonial*, directed by Jean-Marie Teno. The film focused on the origins and legacy of German colonialism, especially in Namibia. This addition of African genocides is important in its own right but also because it cannot help but influence the way we view the Holocaust. It also follows nicely with a line of historiography that seeks to place the Holocaust in the larger historical context of genocide over time.

What Now? "Aftermath" Studies

Many critical topics of Holocaust studies fall under the umbrella of what we might call "aftermath studies." In other words, they focus on post-1945 but on a wide array of subject areas: memory, memorialization, children of survivors, postwar justice, depictions of the Holocaust in media, and many others. This is a growing field and one that, by its nature, will continue to grow. Some early work in this area has been showcased at the GSA, not least with a panel series in 2000 entitled "Re-membering the Past: German-Jewish Memory of the Shoah," which featured research on Daniel Libeskind and George Tabori; a series of panels on Holocaust film entitled "Re-screening the Holocaust" in 2011; and, in 2015, two panels organized by Erin McGlothlin and Brad Prager on Claude Lanzmann's iconic film *Shoah* (1985). The continuing focus on the multiplicities of "aftermaths" is becoming an important part of Holocaust studies at the GSA.

In addition, the conference has remained strong in looking at the legal repercussions of the Holocaust. Initially, these legal discussions focused mainly on the Nuremberg trials and the *Haupttäter*. However, as the discipline progressed,

scholars like Hilary Earl, Donald Bloxham, Rebecca Wittmann, and Devin Pendas have focused on later German trials which bring a much different perspective and dynamic into play. The GSA served as an important venue for these discussions with such varied panels as “Verfolgung und Ermordung österreichischer Juden in österreichischen Nachkriegsprozessen” (2000), “Gender in the Perception and Prosecution of War Crimes After World War II” (2004), and “Testimony at the Postwar Trials of Nazi Perpetrators and Jewish ‘Collaborators’” (2011). These panels tell us much about both the legal approaches to justice and the role these trials played in shaping German official and public memory. Scholarship presented at the GSA shows how studies of legal repercussions of the Holocaust have moved beyond the courtroom and into areas of memory and cultural analysis.

New Sources, New Methodologies

The field of Holocaust studies has grown both from access to new source material and from scholars who have introduced new ways of looking at sources, traditional and nontraditional. I have already mentioned the incorporation of previously neglected Jewish texts. Other sources, such as Soviet documents from newly opened archives have also changed the way scholars must approach the topic, particularly in dealing with the East. One of the most important new bodies of material is the very newly opened archives of the International Tracing Service (ITS) at Bad Arolsen containing millions of pages of documents that scholars are still both sorting through as well as finding ways to use. A GSA conference panel in 2010 (“Open at Last: The ITS Files in Arolsen”) focused solely on this new resource. A second important source that has become more and more important both as evidence and a topic of study in its own right is the body of oral and video testimony which Joan Ringelheim discussed in 2004.

Finally, in addition to some of the more theoretical interventions in the study of the Holocaust, the discipline is increasingly seeing innovation from the digital humanities and interdisciplinary work. Some of this work can already be seen early on as a panel from 1986 entitled “The Holocaust: An Interdisciplinary Analysis” commented on by Michael Phayer indicates; this discussion featured a comparative paper and a social behavioral perspective. In 2013, a series of panels, “New Spatial Understandings of the Holocaust,” hosted a variety of papers leading the study of the Holocaust into the spatial turn. These included both research and pedagogical interventions. 2014 saw a panel “The Nazi Past in the Digital Age: Maps, Archives, and the Internet” which featured a paper by historian Paul Jaskot entitled “Visualizing the Nazi Agenda, Then and Now: ‘Space’ and ‘Place’ in the Digital Mapping of the Holocaust.” Jaskot is a member of the Holocaust Geographies Collective, which brings together historians and geographers along with both new theoretical perspectives and powerful analytic tools. This interdisciplinary group illustrates the emerging confluence of digital

technologies, new methodological approaches, and collaborative work on the cutting edge of the field and is but one example of this trend.

The field of Holocaust studies has grown with such vigor and diversity in the past 40 years that is almost impossible to summarize *all* the areas in which it has progressed. I have not, for example, mentioned the important work on churches, other victims such as Sinti/Roma, or business and slave labor. In addition, the journal of the association, the *German Studies Review*, has been instrumental in bringing important elements of this work to the larger academic audience. The conference, which has grown from six panels to 330, will hopefully continue to be the site of cutting edge research on the Holocaust and Nazi genocide as the discipline continues to evolve and strike out in new theoretical and methodological directions.

Notes

1. Gerhard L. Weinberg, *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 24.
2. The keynote speaker that year's GSA conference was George Mosse, who spoke about the fiftieth anniversary of the Nazi book burning.
3. Nathaniel Popper, "A Conscious Pariah," *The Nation*, March 31, 2010, <http://www.thenation.com/article/conscious-pariah/>.
4. Nadine Broznan, "Holocaust Women: A Study in Survival," *The New York Times*, March 23, 1983, <http://www.nytimes.com/1983/03/23/garden/holocaust-women-a-study-in-survival.html>.
5. See also Claudia Koonz, *Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family, and Nazi Politics* (New York: St. Martin's, 1987), as well as Wendy Lower's *Hitler's Furies: German Women in the Nazi Killing Fields* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013).
6. See Konrad H. Jarausch, *Reluctant Accomplice: A Wehrmacht Soldier's Letters from the Eastern Front*, ed. Konrad Jarausch (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011).
7. Martin Dean has been a pivotal researcher in this area and presenter at the GSA. Martin Dean, *Collaboration in the Holocaust: Crimes of the Local Police in Belorussia and Ukraine, 1941–44* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).